Proceedings of CLS 59 (2024), 275-295

The locality of cross-clausal A-operations: A view from Telugu

Troy Messick and Sreekar Raghotham
Rutgers University

1 Introduction

The assignment of case to nominal arguments and also predicate-argument agreement are traditionally thought to be bound to the domain of a clause.[1] When we do see case assignment and/or predicate-argument agreement that seems to span clauses in languages like English, the lower clause is taken to be truncated in some way. For example, English allows for Exceptional Case Marking (ECM), where the subject of the embedded clause is marked accusative by the matrix predicate as shown in (1). It is also possible for an argument of an embedded clause to control agreement on the matrix verb if the embedded clause is once again an infinitive (2).

(1) They believed her to be honest.

(2) There seem to be dogs in the park.

If the embedded clauses were finite, then such cross-clausal case assignment or agreement is not possible as shown in (3) and (4).

(3) They believed that *her/she was honest.

(4) It *seem/seems that dogs are in the park.

Hence, the examination of English leads one to expect a tight correlation between the presence of cross-clausal A-dependences and truncated or non-finite clauses. Quite a bit of recent research in other languages have led to a reconsideration of such a tight correlation between A-operations and clause size (Deal 2017, Halpert 2019, Fong 2019, Wurmbrand 2019, Bondarenko 2021). Take for instance, the Turkish example in (5) (Şener 2008). In this example, it appears that accusative case marking of the matrix subject is possible despite the fact that the clause in question does not look truncated (i.e., it is introduced by the element *diye* which is glossed as a complementizer).

(5) John [makarna-yı ye-n-di diye] duy-du
John.NOM pasta-ACC eat-PASS-PST COMP hear-PST
'John heard that pasta was eaten.' (Şener 2008, ex. (5b))

[1]We thank the attendees and organizers of CLS 59 at the University of Chicago for the opportunity to present and receive feedback on this work. For other comments, suggestions, and criticisms, we thank the Syntax at Rutgers Reading Group, the organizers and attendees of the workshop *Crossing Boundaries: Empirical and Theoretical Aspects of A-dependencies in Complementation*, and the students in Rutgers Syntax Seminar held in Fall 2022. The usual disclaimers apply.

There are also languages such as Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001) that allow for agreement to cross clausal boundaries. In the example in (6), the noun class agreement marker on the matrix verb is controlled by the absolutive object in the embedded clause.

(6) eni-r [užã magalu bbãc'-ru-łi] b-iyxo
mother-ERG [boy bread-III.ABS eat-PSTPRT-NMLZ].IV III-know
'The mother knows that the boy ate the bread.'
(Polinksy & Potsdam 2001:584, ex. (1b))

These discoveries (and many more like them) have lead to a rethinking of the locality conditions on A-operations cross-linguistically. To this growing body of literature we add discussion of cross-clausal A-dependences in Telugu (Dravidian). Telugu provides an interesting case study since in different embedding environments, we can find what looks like ECM *or* LDA. While both ECM and LDA have been investigated cross-linguistically for a few decades now, there are few examples of languages that have both constructions. As shown in the examples below, Telugu has something that appears to be ECM in (7) and LDA in (8). In (7), the subject of the embedded copula clause is the pronoun *vaaḍu* (3MS.NOM). This pronoun may also surface with the accusative case suffix *ni*. This also triggers a stem change in the pronoun resulting in the form *vaaḍi-ni* (3MS.OBL-ACC). In (8), the embedded subject is *nuvvu* (2SG.NOM), and the matrix subject is the dative form *naaku* (1SG.DAT). The agreement morpheme found on the matrix verb is *-vu*, indicating agreement with the embedded subject. Note that in both examples the embedded clause includes the element *ani*, which is typically taken to be a complementizer, giving this the appearance that these are instances of case assignment and agreement across a finite clause boundary.

(7) nenu vaaḍi-(ni) piĉĉi-vaaḍu ani bhavinčæænu
1SG 3MS-ACC mad-one ANI consider.1SG
'I considered him mad'

(8) naaku [nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi ani] anipinc-aavu
1SG.DAT 2SG good-one-2SG ANI feel-2SG
≈ 'I felt that you are a good guy'

As Telugu has both ECM and LDA in similar types of constructions, it allows us to give a side-by-side comparison of the two operations. This comparison, we believe, sheds some light on the locality of A-operations narrowly within the language, but more ambitiously, cross-linguistically as well. We find an interesting difference in the locality of the two operations by slightly manipulating the embedded clause. This is shown in the examples below. In (9), we have modified the example in (7), by having the embedded clause occur in the future tense. This can be seen by the addition of the overt copula verb *avu* with the appropriate tense and agreement markers. When this is done, the embedded subject must occur in the nominative form; the accusative form is no longer possible, suggesting that ECM is somehow blocked in such constructions. Now let us turn our attention to the example in (10). This example has similarly modified its counterpart in (8) by the addition of an overt

copular verb with tense/agreement morphology to the embedded clause. Unlike the ECM example in (9), which completely blocks the assignment of accusative in such constructions, LDA still is possible in such constructions; but, note that LDA was once obligatory in (8), but is apparently optional in (10), alternating with default agreement (i.e., *di*, third person neuter singular).

(9) nenu vaaḍu-(*ni) piccci-vaaḍu avu-taa-ḍu ani bhavinčæænu
1SG 3MS-ACC mad-one be-FUT-3MS ANI thought.1SG
'I thought he would become mad'

(10) naaku [nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi avu-taa-vu ani] anipinc-aavu/indi}
1SG.DAT 2SG good-one-2SG be-FUT-2SG ANI feel-2SG/3NS
≈ 'I felt that you'd become a good guy'

The above data raise two questions about the locality of ECM and LDA in Telugu: (i) why does the presence of overt tense and agreement morphology in the embedded clause block ECM if *ani* is already in the structure projecting a CP; and (ii) why is ECM completely blocked in such constructions while LDA is still possible? We put forth the following solutions for these two issues: first, we argue, following a number of recent works both in Telugu and cross-linguistically, that elements often glossed as complementizers are in fact verbs. It is known that the element *ani* is diachronically related to the verb stem *an* ('say') (Krishnamurti & Gwynn 1985, Messick 2017). This is not uncommon cross-linguistically, but what recent work has argued is that these so-called complementizers still behave grammatically as verbs synchronically as well (Balusu 2020, Driemel & Kouneli 2021, Major 2021). As we will argue later on in the paper, this analysis of *ani* allows us to analyze clauses in which *ani* is present as something smaller than a CP. To account for the difference between ECM and LDA, we will adopt a particular view of locality that argues that a higher the probe is in the matrix clause, the larger its search space is in the embedded clause (Keine 2019, 2020). This is stated as a descriptive generalization in (11).

(11) *The height-locality connection*
The higher the structural position of a probe π, the more kinds of structures π can search into. (Keine 2019:32, ex. (33))

We take the locus of ECM in the matrix clause to be somewhere around *v* while the locus for agreement in LDA examples to be matrix T, given the generalization in (11), we then expect the T in LDA to have a larger search space than that of *v* in ECM. We hash this with the Horizons framework.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives relevant background on the case and agreement system in Telugu. Section 3 discusses prolepsis in the language and argues that the ECM and LDA constructions illustrated above cannot be analyzed as instances of prolepsis. Section 4 presents additional data concerning these constructions. The analysis is presented in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes with some open questions and future directions.

2 Background on case and agreement in Telugu

Telugu is one of the major Dravidian languages, spoken by approximately 80 million speakers mostly in the Southern Indian states of Andra Pradesh and Telangana. The word order is SOV but the language does allow for scrambling. It displays nominative-accusative case alignment. Some experiencer predicates have dative subjects with nominative or oblique objects. Nominative case is unmarked and accusative is marked with the suffix *ni/nu*; the backness of the vowel is determined via vowel harmony with the stem. Telugu accusative marking shows a pattern of differential object marking (DOM), where animate and/or specific objects are marked with accusative case while inanimate and nonspecific objects are left unmarked. Observe the examples in (2). In both examples the subject is the first person singular pronoun *nenu*, which is in the (unmarked) nominative case. This argument is also the element that controls the agreement morphology on the verb, hence we see the agreement morpheme *nu* at the end of the verb stem. In (12), the object is interpreted as specific, hence it is marked with the accusative case marker. In (13) however, the object is nonspecific, hence it does not display the accusative case morphology (Raghotham 2019).

(12) nenu dosa-nu tinn-aa-nu
1SG dosa-ACC eat-PAST-1SG
'I ate the dosa.'

(13) nenu dosa tinn-aa-nu
1SG dosa eat-PAST-1SG
'I ate a dosa.'

Specificity and DOM marking do seem to correlate with height of the object in the VP. While Telugu, like other Dravidian languages, allows for VP-internal scrambling, in neutral context, accusative-marked objects appear before VP adjuncts (15) and also the GOAL argument of ditransitive verbs (17), while unmarked objects appear to the right of these elements, as shown in (14) and (16).

(14) nenu tondaragaa čettu koṭṭ-ææ-nu
1SG quickly tree hit-PST-1SG
'I quickly cut a tree.'

(15) nenu čettu-ni tondaragaa koṭṭ-ææ-nu
1SG tree-ACC quickly hit-PST-1SG
'I quickly cut the tree.'

(16) nenu ataniki dosa icc-aa-nu
1SG.NOM 3MSG.DAT dosa give-PST-1SG
'I gave him a dosa.'

(17) nenu dosa-nu ataniki icc-aa-nu
1SG.NOM dosa-ACC 3MSG.DAT give-PST-1SG
'I gave him the dosa.'

An analysis of the word order differences can be given in terms of object shift of specific and animate NPs to a position higher in the VP—say, perhaps, to the

specifier of *v*P—while nonspecific objects stay in their base position. Evidence in favor of such an analysis may come from coordination. Observe the example in (18). In this example, a specific DOM-marked object is coordinated with a non-specific bare object. The result is ungrammaticality. This can be explained via the object shift analysis of DOM, because in order for *dosa* to be marked accusative, it must have moved to a higher position, but such a movement in (18) would violate the coordinate structure constraint, explaining why coordinating the two objects is ungrammatical in such constructions.

(18) * nenu iḍli-luu dosa-la-nuu paḍeesæænu
1SG idli-PL.CONJ dosa-PL-ACC.CONJ throw.PERF.1SG
Intended: 'I threw away idlis and the dosas.'

As we have seen in the previous examples, when the subject of the clause is nominative, it is that NP that controls agreement on the verb. As mentioned previously, there is a class of experiencer predicates that take dative subjects with nominative objects. The dative marker is *ki/ku*, once again conditioned by vowel harmony. In such constructions, agreement is instead controlled by the nominative object and not the dative subject as shown in (19). Note that accusative on the object in the dative subject construction is not possible, as shown in (20). Only nominative objects are possible here; or, depending on the predicate, instances of oblique marking of the object are also possible.

(19) Rani-ki nenu iʃtam-lee-nu
Rani-DAT 1SG like-NEG-1SG
'Rani does not like me.'

(20) Rani-ki Ravi-(*ni) ištam-leedu
Rani-DAT Ravi-(*ACC) like-NEG.3SG
'Rani does not like Ravi.'

If we adopt a dependent view of accusative case assignment, the rule would be something like (21).

(21) If NP_1 is c-commanded by an unmarked NP_2 in TP, then assign ACCUSATIVE to NP_1.

Moving on to agreement morphology in the language, in addition to clausal agreement typcially associated with a probe on the T head, Telugu has another set of agreement markers that occur in non-verbal predication. Some examples are given in (22)-(23). These markers are only overt for first person singular and plural and second person singular. They are null throughout the rest of the paradigm.

(22) nenu vidyaardhi-ni
1SG student-1SG
'I am a student.'

(23) nuvvu vidyaardhi-wi
2SG student-2SG
'You are a student.'

Person features partaking in this type of non-verbal predicate agreement is cross-linguistically somewhat rare. (Compare, for instance, case and number agreement in such constructions.) It has been suggested that superficially similar-looking constructions in other languages are in fact T agreement that has undergone m-merger with the predicate noun or adjective (Baker 2008, 2011). Take as an example Baker's analysis of Sakha predicate agreement. The example in (24) looks like we have first person plural subject agreement on the predicate adjective similar to how we have person agreement on predicate nouns in the previous Telugu examples. When there is an overt auxiliary verb in the sentence as in (26), however, we see that the agreement morphology only appears on the verb and can no longer appear on the adjectival predicate.

(24) Bihigi bytaam-myt
1PL.NOM slow-1PLS
'We are slow.'

(25) Bihigi bytaam-(*myt) buol-a-byt
1PL.NOM slow-(*1PLS) be-AOR-1PLS
'We are slow.' (Baker 2011:881–882, ex. (10), (12c))

Telugu, on the other hand, shows different behavior in the same types of constructions. In (26), there is an overt auxiliary verb that expresses tense and agreement morphology. Unlike the previous Sakha example, the agreement morphology found on the predicate in Telugu must also be expressed. The omission of the marker leads to the sentence being judged as unacceptable.

(26) nenu adhjaapakudi-*(ni) avu-taa-nu
1SG teacher-*(1SG) be-FUT-1SG
'I will become a teacher.'

We can see that these two agreement markers are truly independent of one another from investigating another rare construction in the language. Telugu has a phenomenon sometimes referred to as *Monstrous Agreement* (or *indexiphoricity*) where a non-first person pronoun with *de se* construal can control first person agreement on verbs and predicate nouns and adjectives when embedded, as shown in (27) and (28) (Messick 2023, to appear). In these examples, the embedded pronoun *tanu* can control first person agreement in the embedded clause. Note that in both cases, this type of agreement is optional and can alternate with 'regular' third person agreement.

(27) raju [tanu parigett-ææ-nu/-Du ani] čepp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG run-PST-1SG/-3MSG COMP say-PST-3MSG
'Raju said that he ran.'

(28) Akhil tanu manci-vaaḍi-ni ani bhaavinc-ææ-ḍu
Akhil 3SG good-3SG-1SG ANI consider-PAST-M.SG
'Akhil thought himself a good chap.'

Interestingly, when there is both an auxiliary verb and a predicate noun in the embedded clause, we see that both agreement morphemes can surface as first person, or both can surface as third person. It is also possible that the predicate noun shows (null) third person agreement, but the verb shows first person agreement. The other mismatch however, is not acceptable. While an account of this pattern lies outside of the scope of this paper, what the example in (31) shows is that the agreement marker on non-verbal predicates is completely independent of the probe found on T.

(29) raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-ni ava-taa-nu ani] čepp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-1SG be-FUT-1SG COMP say-PST-3MSG
'Raju said that he will become a teacher.'

(30) raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-∅ ava-taa-Du ani] čepp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-3SG be-FUT-3MSG COMP say-PST-3MSG
'Raju said that he will become a teacher.'

(31) raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-∅ ava-taa-nu ani] čepp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-3SG be-FUT-1SG COMP say-PST-3MSG
'Raju said that he will become a teacher.'

(32) *raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-ni ava-taa-Du ani] čepp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-1SG be-FUT-3MSG COMP say-PST-3MSG
'Raju said that he will become a teacher.'

The fact that the two markers can mismatch from one another indicates that they are truly indpendent of one another. We take the auxiliary to be the probe on T, and for the probe on the predicate, we will follow Balusu (2014) and Raghotham (2021) and place the agreement probe for non-verbal predication on the PRED head. An additional piece of evidence for this placement comes from the fact that this agreement suffix is in complementary distribution with the morpheme *gaa* which is independently analyzed as an eventive PRED head (Balusu 2016). This is shown in the examples below.

(33) nenu president-gaa-(*ni) unnaanu
1SG president-GAA be.PRES.1SG
'I am (temporarily) president.'

(34) nenu president-(*gaa)-ni
1SG president-1SG
'I am the president.' (Balusu 2016, ex. (24)-(25))

To summarize this section, in simple clauses, Telugu displays accusative object marking with nominative subjects that is conditioned by specificity and animacy. It also has a set of predicates that have dative subjects. In such cases, the agreement probe (if there is one) will agree with the nominative object and not the dative subject. Finally, in addition to an agreement probe on T, Telugu has an agreement probe for person and number on certain PRED heads. In the next section, we consider, and ultimately dismiss, an analysis of Telugu ECM in terms of base generation in the matrix clause (i.e., a proleptic object).

3 Against a prolepsis analysis

A potential analysis of what we have been calling ECM, whereby the embedded subject is assigned accusative case from the matrix clause, is to instead argue that the accusative marked NP is base generated a proleptic object in the matrix clause with the "true" embedded subject being a null pronoun of some sort. As Telugu does allow for argument drop, this analysis is conceivable. Here we present several pieces of evidence that argue against such an analysis (this follows the line of argumentation given in Messick & Raghotham (to appear)). Let's begin by showing that Telugu does have something like prolepsis, as shown in (35). In this example, there is a pronoun introduced in the matrix clause by the postposition *gurinči* ('about'). This pronoun is obligatorily co-referent with a pronoun in the embedded clause; in the example below, the embedded subject.

(35) nenu tana-gurinči [tanu picci-vaaḍu ani] bhaavinč-ææ-ḍu
1SG 3SG-ABOUT 3SG mad-3MS ANI consider-PST-3MS
'I thought of him that he was mad.'

Let us first note that examples like (35), but with the NP in the matrix clause having accusative case instead of being introduced by the postposition, result in the sentence being judged as unacceptable. This is shown in (36).

(36) * nenu tana-ni [tanu picci-vaaḍu ani] bhaavinč-ææ-ḍu
1SG 3SG-ACC 3SG mad-3MS ANI consider-PST-3MS
'I thought of him that he was mad.'

Other arguments against the proleptic analysis of accusative embedded subjects come from differing restrictions when compared to true proleptic objects. Recall from the introduction that overt tense and agreement morphology blocked apparent ECM from occurring. It is however possible for proleptic object construction to occur when the embedded clauses are tensed and have full agreement morphology, as shown in (37) and (38).

(37) akhil sameer-gurinči [tanu annam tinn-aa-ḍu ani] bhaavinč-ææ-ḍu
akhil sameer-ABOUT 3SG rice eat-PST-3MS ANI consider-PST-3MS
'Akhil thought of Sameer that he ate rice.'

(38) nenu tana-gurinči [tanu picci-vaaḍu avu-taa-ḍu ani] bhaavinč-ææ-ḍu
1SGl 3SG-ABOUT 3SG mad-3MS be-FUT-3MS ANI consider-PST-3MS
'I thought of him that he would become mad.'

Another argument comes from selection while prolepsis is possible with verbs of communication like *čep*. ECM is not possible with such verbs and is only possible with verbs of thought or belief. This distinction is found cross-linguistically, with prolepsis being more permissive in many, but not all languages.

(39) akhil ravi-gurinči [tanu pičči-vaaḍu ani] čepp-ææ-ḍu
akhil ravi-ABOUT 3SG mad-3MS COMP say-PST-3MS
'Akhil said of Ravi that he was a mad man.'

(40) *akhil vaaḍi-ni [__ picci-vaaḍu ani] čepp-ææ-ḍu
akhil 3SG-ACC __ mad-3MS COMP say-PST-3MS
Intended: 'Akhil said him was a mad man.'

The next argument against a prolepsis analysis of accusative marked embedded subjects comes from minimality effects. As shown in (41), the proleptic object can bind an NP in the embedded clause that is not the subject of the clause; here it binds a possessor of the subject. If one tries to mark an NP that is not the subject of the embedded clause as accusative, as shown in (42), the resulting sentence is judged as unacceptable.

(41) akhil sameer-gurinči [tana tanḍri picci-vaaḍu ani]
akhil sameer-ABOUT 3SG.GEN father mad-3MS ANI
bhaavinč-ææ-ḍu
consider-PST-3MS
'Akhil thought of Sameer that his father was mad.'

(42) * akhil sameer-ni [__ tanḍri picci-vaaḍu ani] bhaavinč-ææ-ḍu
akhil Sameer-ACC __ father mad-3MS ANI consider-PST-3MS
'Akhil thought Sameer's father was mad.'

The final argument against a prolepsis analysis comes from island effects. As shown in (43) and (44), a proleptic object can bind a pronoun inside of coordinations or relative clauses (i.e., island environments).

(43) ravi raaju$_i$-gurinci tanu$_i$ mariyu raamu picci-vall-ani
Ravi.NOM Raju-ABOUT 3SG and Ramu mad-3PL-COMP
bhaav-is-taa-ḍu
consider-DO-HAB-3MSGL
'Ravi thinks of Raju that he and Ramu are mad.'

(44) nenu ravi-gurinci manasaara [tana-ni kalisina ammayi]
1SG.NOM ravi-ABOUT wholeheartedly [3SG-ACC met girl]
telivayinadi ani anukunnanu
intelligent COMP thought
'I thought of Ravi wholeheartedly that the girl who met him was intelligent.'

If we try to do the same with accusative marked NPs, the resulting structures are ungrammatical, as shown in (45) and (46).

(45) *ravi raaju-ni [__ mariyu raamu] picci-vall-ani
Ravi.NOM Raju-ACC __ and Ramu mad-3PL-COMP
bhaav-is-taa-ḍu
consider-DO-HAB-3MSGL
Intended: 'Ravi thinks of Raju that he and Ramu are mad.'

(46) *nenu ravi-ni manasaara [__ kalisina ammayi] telivayinadi
1SG.NOM ravi-ACC wholeheartedly [__ met girl] intelligent
ani anukunnanu
COMP thought
Intended: 'I thought wholeheartedly that the girl who met Ravi was intelligent.'

Given the evidence provided in this section, we conclude that accusative marked embedded subjects are not an instance of prolepsis whereby the the accusative NP is base generated in the matrix clause and binds a (potentially null) pronoun in the embedded clause. In the next section, we diagnose the locus of accusative marked embedded subjects and also the locus of the agreement controller.

4 The locus of the subject in ECM and LDA

In this section, we present several pieces of evidence to diagnose the position of the embedded subject in ECM and LDA constructions. The conclusion of these diagnostics point to the subject raising to a position in the matrix clause in ECM, but staying *in situ* when controlling LDA.

4.1 The locus of ECM subjects

We will present arguments from scope, adverbs, complex reflexives, and NPIs that the embedded subject in the embedded clause is located in the matrix clause in Telugu. Taken together with the island data presented in the previous section, these data suggest that the embedded subject undergoes a type of raising to object in the matrix clause.

The first argument that accusative embedded subjects occupy a position in the matrix clause comes from the scope of *wh*-operators. Telugu *wh*-words do not obligatorily move to sentence-initial position. There is a tendency for *wh*-words to be left-adjacent to the verb (this is a focus position in Telugu and other Dravidian languages), but this is not absolute. Compare the examples in (47) and (48). In both examples the embedded subject is the *wh*-word *evaru* ('who'), but in (47), the subject is marked with accusative case, while in (48), the subject is nominative. Note the differences in interpretative possibilities of the two examples. In (48), *evaru* can take either matrix or embedded scope, but in (47), *evari-ni*, can only take matrix scope. This difference can be accounted for under the assumption that ECMed NPs undergo raising to object, and that such movement blocks reconstruction.

(47) nuvvu evari-ni picci-vaaru ani bhaavinčæævu?
2SG WHO-ACC mad-3PL ANI thought.2SG
'Whom did you consider mad?'
*'You thought, "Who's crazy?"'

(48) nuvvu evaru picci-vaaru ani bhaavinčæævu?
2SG WHO.NOM mad-3PL ANI thought.2SG
'Whom did you think mad?' (or)
'You thought, "Who's crazy?"'

The next argument comes from the word order of the embedded subject relative to matrix adverbials. As shown in (49), an accusative marked embedded subject proceeds the adverb *manasaara* ('wholeheartedly'). which modifies the matrix predicate. When the embedded subject is nominative, as in (50), the NP follows the same adverb. This once again suggests a height difference between accusative subjects and nominative subjects.

(49) nenu vaaḍi-ni manasaara piccči-vaaḍ-ani bhaavinčææ-nu
1SG 3MS-ACC wholehearetdly mad-one-ANI thought.1SG
'I considered him mad with all my heart.'

(50) nenu manasaara vaaḍu piccči-vaaḍ-ani bhaavinčææ-nu
1SG wholehearetdly 3MSG mad-one-ANI thought.1SG
'I considered him mad with all my heart.'

Another piece of evidence comes from the monstrous agreement paradigm discussed in the background section. Recall that Telugu allows for non-first person embedded pronouns to control first person agreement on the embedded predicate. A representative example is given in (51). Now turn your attention to the example in (52). All that has changed in this example is that the embedded subject is now in the accusative case. When this happens, the embedded pronoun can no longer control monstrous first person agreement and instead must control (null) third person agreement. This follows a similar pattern that has been shown to exist for languages like Uyghur that display the similar (but distinct) phenomenon of indexical shift. While analyses differ, almost all analyses of monstrous agreement posit that in order for the pronoun to control monstrous agreement, it must be in the scope of some element in the periphery of the embedded clause. In (52), the embedded subject has moved into the matrix clause, and hence is no longer in the scope of element in the embedded periphery, hence monstrous agreement is no longer possible.

(51) akhil tanu manci-vaaḍi-ni ani bhaavinc-ææ-ḍu
Akhil 3SG good-3SG-1SG ANI consider-PAST-M.SG
'Akhil thought himself a good chap.'

(52) akhil tana-ni manci-vaaḍi-(*ni) ani bhaavinc-ææ-ḍu
Akhil 3SG-ACC good-3SG-(*1SG) ANI consider-PAST-M.SG
'Akhil thought himself a good chap.'

We also find a similar argument based on the distribution of complex reflexives in the language. It has been shown in previous work that the complex reflexive in Telugu, which is created by the doubling of a pronominal element, must be in the same clause as its antecedent. As shown in (53), the complex reflexive bound by the matrix subject is possible if it is accusative. (Note that the structural case of the complex reflexive is displayed on the linearly first of the two doubled pronouns; the second pronoun displays case "copied" from the antecedent.) A complex reflexive is not possible when the embedded subject remains nominative, as in (54), suggesting that the two elements are separated by a clause boundary.

(53) akhil tana-ni tanu manci-vaaḍu ani bhaavinc-ææ-ḍu
Akhil 3SG-ACC 3SG good-3SG ANI consider-PAST-3MSG
'Akhil thought himself a good chap.'

(54) *akhil tanu tanu manci-vaaḍu ani bhaavinc-ææ-ḍu
Akhil 3SG 3SG good-3SG ANI consider-PAST-M.SG
'Akhil thought himself a good chap.'

The final argument that accusative marked embedded subjects are in located in the matrix clause comes from the distribution of strict (i.e., clause bound) NPIs in the language. The NP *okkarii* ('even one') is a strict NPI that must be licensed by a classmate negation. As shown in (55), when the NPI is nominative, it can be licensed by the embedded negation *kaadu*, but if the embedded subject is marked with accusative, the NPI can no longer be licensed by embedded negation.

(55) nenu okka-ri-(*nii) pičči-vaaru kaad-ani bhaavincæænu
1SG one-HUM-ACC.EVEN mad-ones NEG-ANI thought.1SG
≈ 'I thought that even one person is not mad.'

4.2 The locus of LDA subjects

In this section, we will present evidence that unlike ECM subjects, subjects that act as LDA controllers do not occupy a position in the matrix clause. This can be shown by a subset of the tests used above, adverbs and NPIs.[2]

First, we can compare the order of LDA controller relative to adverbials that are modifying the matrix predicate. Recall that ECMed NPs must proceed matrix adverbials. This is not the case for LDA controller which must follow matrix level adverbials as shown in (56) and (57).

(56) naaku (manasaara) nuvvu (*manasaara) manči-vaaḍi-vi ani
1SG.DAT (wholeheartedly) 2SG (wholeheartedly) good-one-2SG ANI
anipinc-{aavu/indi}
feel-2SG/3NS
'I wholeheartedly felt that you'd become a good guy.'

(57) naaku ninna nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi ani anipinc-{aavu/indi}
1SG.DAT yesterday 2SG good-one-2SG ANI feel-2SG/3NS
≈ 'I felt that you became a good guy yesterday.'

Similarly, an LDA controller, as shown in (58), can be a strict NPI licensed by embedded negation while still controlling agreement on the matrix predicate. This again contrasts with ECMed NPs discussed in previous section, where an ECMed strict NPI could not be licensed by embedded negation.

(58) naaku [evar-uu manči-vaaru avvaru ani] anipinc-{ææru/indi}
1SG.DAT who-NPI good-3PL BE.FUT.NEG ANI feel-3PL/3NS
'I felt that no one would become a good person.'

[2]Monstrous agreement is independently not possible when the matrix predicate takes a dative subject (Messick 2023) and the CCR data may be inconclusive as it might be independently ruled out via the Anaphor Agreement Effect.

So far we have seen that the ECMed subjects occupy a position in the higher clause while LDA controllers stay low in the embedded clause. The other difference we see between the two concerns the context where they are possible. First, we do not have ECM in clauses that are not copular, as shown in (59). We also do not get ECM when the embedded clause is copular, but contains an overt auxiliary that displays tense and agreement, as the example repeated in (60) shows.

(59) nenu vaaḍu-(*ni) paḍḍææḍu ani bhavinčæænu
1SG 3MS-ACC fell ANI thought.1SG
'I thought he fell.'

(60) nenu vaaḍu-(*ni) pičči-vaaḍu avu-taa-ḍu ani bhavinčæænu
1SG 3MS-ACC mad-one be-FUT-3MS ANI thought.1SG
'I thought he would become mad.'

Unlike ECM, LDA is still possible with an overt auxiliary (though it does become optional when it is typically obligatory in the absence of the embedded auxiliary). This is shown again in (61). Now, it is not the case that LDA is always possible; when the embedded clause contains the question particle *aa*, which attaches to the embedded predicate turning the embedded clause into an indirect question, LDA is no longer possible. The only option is for the matrix predicate to show default agreement, as shown in (62).

(61) naaku [nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi avu-taa-vu ani] anipinc-{aavu/indi}
1SG.DAT 2SG good-one-2SG be-FUT-2SG ANI feel-2SG/3NS
≈ 'I felt that you'd become a good guy.'

(62) naaku [nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi avu-taa-v-aa ani]
1SG.DAT 2SG good-one-2SG become-FUT-2SG-Q ANI
anipinc-{indi/*aavu}
feel-3NS/2SG
'I wondered if you'd become a good guy.'

Now recall that in all these examples, the embedded clause is uniformly introduced by the element *ani*, often discussed and glossed as a complementizer in the language. This poses an interesting question about the locality of ECM and LDA: why should the addition of structure below the highest C layer block these operations? The second related question is: why does the overt embedded auxiliary block ECM, but not (completely) LDA, while the embedded question particle blocks both of them? In the next section we turn our attention to coming up with answers to those two questions.

5 An analysis of the locality of ECM and LDA in Telugu

In this section we lay out the analysis for the locality of ECM and LDA in Telugu. The first portion of this section discusses our analysis of *ani*. The second portion of this section discusses the view of locality we adopt in our analysis.

5.1 *Ani* as heading a verbal projection

As noted in the intro, *ani* is a form of the verb *anu* ('say'). Following a trend in recent literature both in Telugu and other languages, we will argue *ani* is not a complementizer, but instead a verb heading a verbal projection. There are a few reasons to think this. Here we review the facts discussed by Balusu (2020).

First, it is possible for *ani* to introduce things other than clausal complements. In the examples below, it introduces an onomatopoeia adverb. Note that in these examples, *ani* can take aspectual morphology typically only found on verbs in the language. In (63), it takes the perfective ending, while in (64), it takes progressive morphology.

(63) 'grr' an-i aagindi
QC-PERF stopped
'It stopped with a 'grr'.'

(64) 'grr' an-ṭuu aagindi
QC-PROG stopped
'It stopped with a 'grr'.' (Balusu 2020:3, ex. (10)-(11))

In addition to introducing onomatopoeia adverbs, *ani* is also used in naming like constructions such as the example in (65). Here we see that *an* once again takes verbal morphology. This time a form on non-past tense.

(65) ravi an-ee vyakti
Ravi QC-REL.NON.PST person
'a person called Ravi' (Balusu 2020:3 ex. (14))

Finally, we also see that the *an* can also be suffixed with the Q morpheme *aa*, as shown in (66). Once again this morpheme typically only is found attached to verbs.

(66) vaadu tinnaaḍu an-aa nuvvu čeppindi?
3MS ate QC-Q 2SG said
≈ 'Was it he ate that you said?'

So what does all this data tell us? At the very least, it appears to tell us that *ani* is not a one-to-one translation of English *that*. This seems very clear, as English *that* does not take aspectual or tense morphology and also does not appear in naming or onomatopoeia constructions. So if not a complementizer like English *that*, then what is *ani* when it appears to be the element that introduces embedded clauses? Here we follow Balusu (2020) and suggest that *ani* is still a verb in this usage. (For analyses along similar lines see Major (2021) for Uyghur and Driemel & Kouneli (2021) for Kipsigis.)

Once we dispose of the assumption that *ani* is a complementizer like English *that*, this also means that we no longer must assume that every clause introduced by *ani* must be a finite CP. This is what we would like to propose here. The head *ani* is not a reliable marker of finiteness in embedded clauses. In fact, clauses introduced by *ani* can be of varying sizes: as small as *v*P, but as large as CP. This is shown schematically in (67).

(67) [… [$_{VP_{mtrx}}$ [$_{vP_{ani}}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{CP/TP/vP}$ …] ani] v_{ani}] V_{mtrx}] …]

Hence, the fact that we get ECM and LDA in the presence of *ani* does not necessarily mean we have A-operations that span finite clause boundaries. In fact, we will argue that the differences in locality we see between ECM and LDA follow most naturally from an analysis that assumes that these operations are only possible when the emebedded clause is something smaller than a CP. In the next subsection, we show how the locality conditions found in Telugu ECM and LDA once we couple the analysis of *ani*, the structure in (67), and the Horizons theory of locality.

5.2 Accounting for the differences between ECM and LDA

So far, we have argued that the element *ani* is not a complementizer analogous to English *that* and instead should be treated like a verbal projection. This move allows us to analyze clauses introduced by *ani* as sometimes smaller than CPs: TP or even *v*P. This allows us to view Telugu more similarly to English. We argue that in both languages A-operations can only span clauses if the embedded clause is truncated (i.e., smaller than a full CP).

Now let us turn to the puzzle about why LDA and ECM seemingly have different locality conditions. Recall from the previous discussion, that the insertion of an overt tense auxiliary in the embedded clause blocks the possibility of ECM, but it does not block the possibility of LDA (it does, however render it optional). This is a surprising finding from the point of view of locality. Perhaps the standard mechanism for regulating locality within minimalism is the concept of *phase* and the *Phase Impenetrability Condition* (PIC). The PIC renders the complement of phase heads inaccessible for the rest of the syntactic derivation. If we were to try to account for the Telugu data in terms of the PIC, we might be tempted to say that the introduction of the overt auxiliary introduces a phase boundary, hence (with some ancillary assumptions) this may block the embedded subject from moving into the matrix clause and receiving accusative case. We would, however, expect for the introduction of the phase to also interfere with agreement in the LDA configuration, contrary to fact.

There are, of course, other strands of research in locality that seek to complement (or in some cases replace) phase theory. We believe a strand of research pioneered by Edwin Williams may be particularly helpful in accounting for our data here (Williams 2003). The idea pursued in this research is that cross-clausal operations can only cross certain heads in a functional sequence in the lower clause if they are interacting with a head higher in the functional sequence in the higher clause (see Abels (2007) for a similar idea). This is sometimes referred to as the *Williams Cycle* in the literature. We summarize the idea in (68) based on the formulation in Poole (2022).

(68) **Williams Cycle**
Within the current XP, a syntactic operation may not target an element across YP, where Y is higher than X in the functional sequence.

(69) A dependency relating α and β occurs ACROSS XP iff XP dominates β but not α.

(70) *fseq* = ⟨ C > T > *v* > V ⟩ (Poole 2022:370, ex. (46)-(48))

While there have been several ways of implementing the *Williams Cycle*, for concreteness, we follow the implementation by Keine (2019, 2020). In this system, the Williams Cycle is implemented via restrictions on agreement probes (movement is restricted by the fact that movement piggy-backs off of an established Agree relation as in Chomsky (2001)). Keine refers to this restriction as the probe's *Horizon*. The definition of *Horizon* is given in (71).

(71) If a category label X is a horizon for probe π, then a π-initiated search terminates at a node of category X. (Keine 2019:36, ex. (38))

We assume, following Lasnik & Saito (1991) and much subsequent work, that ECM involves movement of the embedded subject into the matrix VP. (As we have shown in previous sections, there is lots of empirical evidence that this indeed the case for Telugu.) While the exact position of the movement is somewhat still a matter of debate (specifier of AgrO, specifier *v*, etc.), what is important for our purposes is that this position is below the matrix TP. For now, we will assume that the landing position is the specifier of *v*P. The probe on the matrix *v* undertakes search and finds the embedded subject (i.e., the goal); this triggers movement of the embedded subject to the specifier of the matrix *v*, where it can be assigned accusative case. The example below has the schematic representation in (73).[3]

(72) nenu vaaḍi-(ni) piccci-vaaḍu ani bhavinčæænu
1SG 3MS-ACC mad-one ANI consider.1SG
'I considered him mad.'

(73) [$_{vP}$ he-acc [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{vP}$ he [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP\text{-}ani}$ [$_{vP}$ he [$_{v'}$ [$_{PredP}$ he [$_{Pred'}$ [$_{DP}$ mad-one] . . .]

Note that in the example above, we assume that the copula clause is truncated, lacking both a TP and CP projection. Hence, establishing a relation between the matrix *v* and the embedded subject is possible. When there is an overt auxiliary that encodes tense information, we assume that such embedded clauses must project (at least) a TP. As T is a horizon for the probe on *v*, the probe terminates at that projection; hence, raising to the matrix clause is not possible, as shown in (75).

(74) nenu vaaḍu-(*ni) piccci-vaaḍu avu-taa-ḍu ani bhavinčæænu
1SG 3MS-ACC mad-one be-FUT-3MS ANI thought.1SG
'I thought he would become mad.'

(75) [$_{vP}$ [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{vP}$ he [$_{v'}$ [$_{VP\text{-}ani}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{vP}$ he [$_{v'}$ [$_{PredP}$ he [$_{Pred'}$ [$_{DP}$ mad-one] . . .]

Now let us turn to LDA, unlike in ECM where the locus of the probe is the matrix *v*, we take the locus of the ϕ-agreement probe for LDA to be on a higher head: namely, T. Since T is higher in the functional sequence than *v*, we expect it to have a larger search space (i.e., its horizon is not T, but instead is C). Hence, the presence of an overt auxiliary in the embedded clause does not block the probing of the matrix T like it does the matrix *v*. This is shown in the representation below.

[3]Here we assume that the embedded subject moves through the extended VP projection headed by *ani* before moving to its final landing position. Nothing hinges on this assumption.

(76) naaku [nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi avu-taa-vu ani] anipinc-aavu/indi
1SG.DAT 2SG good-one-2SG be-FUT-2SG ANI feel-2SG/3NS
≈ 'I felt that you'd become a good guy.'

(77) $[_{TP} \ldots [_{v_{ani}P} \ldots [_{vP/TP}\ \mathrm{Sub}_{emb} \ldots] \ldots]\ \mathrm{T}\ ]$

When there is unambiguously a CP projected in the embedded clause, however, as is the case when there is the Q-marker *aa*, LDA is blocked. This is because C is a horizon for the ϕ-probe on T, hence T's search terminates at CP, hence agreement with the embedded subject is not possible. Instead, we find default agreement, which take to be an instance of failed Agree in the sense of Preminger (2014). This is shown below.

(78) naaku [nuvvu manči-vaaḍi-vi avu-taa-v-aa ani]
1SG.DAT 2SG good-one-2SG become-FUT-2SG-Q ANI
anipinc-{indi/*aavu}
feel-3NS/2SG
'I wondered if you'd become a good guy.'

(79) $[_{TP} \ldots [_{v_{ani}P} \ldots [_{CP}\ [\ \mathrm{Sub}_{emb} \ldots]\ \mathrm{C}\ ] \ldots]\ \mathrm{T}\ ]$

Let us now turn to apparent optionality of ECM and LDA. When there is no overt auxiliary in the embedded clause, it is possible for the embedded subject to surface as either nominative or accusative. How should we model this apparent optionality? We would like to suggest that such optionality boils down to structural ambiguity: when there is no overt tense morphology, the clause is ambiguous between truly lacking a TP layer and having a TP layer with a null tense. Evidence for such an analysis comes from looking at predication with *gaa* (briefly discussed in the previous section). Note that non-verbal predication with *gaa* requires an overt auxiliary to act as an independent clause, which differentiates it from the types of non-verbal predication we have focused on so far that does not require an overt auxiliary in the simple present tense. Relevant examples are repeated below.

(80) nenu president-gaa *(unnaanu)
1SG president-GAA be.PRES.1SG
'I am (temporarily) president.'

(81) nenu president-ni
1SG president-1SG
'I am the president.' (Balusu 2016, ex. (24)-(25))

Let's assume that this difference boils down to selection: non-verbal predicates headed by *gaa* cannot be selected by a null T. This means that *gaa* predicates without an overt auxiliary can only be *v*P in embedded environments, hence we would expect that ECM is the only option in such constructions. This turns out to be correct: ECM is obligatory when the predicate is headed by *gaa* and there is no overt auxiliary in the embedded clause (Balusu 2016).

(82) nenu ninnu/*nuvvu koopam-gaa baavinc-ee-nu
1SG.NOM 2SG.ACC/*2SG.NOM anger-GAA consider-PST-1SG
'I considered you angry.' (Balusu 2016, ex. (70))

The structural ambiguity between *v*P and TP, however, does not have an effect on LDA, as both structures are transparent to probes on T. Clauses with an overt auxiliary are ambiguous between a TP and CP, hence we find the apparent optionality of LDA in this type of construction.

5.3 Raising to Subject

While we have devoted a majority of this paper to the comparison of LDA and ECM in Telugu, our analysis makes predictions about other types of cross-clausal operations such as subject-to-subject raising. Given that subject-to-subject raising also involves a probe on the matrix T, we would expect it to pattern with LDA and be possible with when the embedded clause has an overt tense auxiliary. Preliminary evidence suggests that this is indeed correct. Consider the example in (83). Here the embedded subject appears to raise above the matrix experiencer into the matrix clause. Note that the matrix experiencer is a complex reflexive anaphor which must be bound by by a c-commanding antecedent in an A-position. The fact that it is licensed in this example suggests that the movement of the embedded subject is raising and not A'-scrambling or topicalization.

(83) ravi tanaku tanu *t* manči-vaaḍu avu-taa-ḍu ani anipincaa-ḍu
Ravi 3SG.DAT 3SG.NOM *t* good-one be-FUT-3MSG ANI seem.3MSG
≈ 'Ravi seemed to himself like he'd become a good guy.'

We have only begun our exploration of these types of examples and hope to have further data on subject raising in Telugu in future work.

5.4 An extension to Japanese ECM

While our focus here has been attempting to account for the locality conditions on ECM and LDA in Telugu, we would like explore the possibility that our analysis may have utility in explaining the locality conditions of these operations in other languages as well. As a brief case study, consider ECM constructions in Japanese. Like Telugu, Japanese has what appears to be optional ECM constructions, where embedded subjects may surface in either nominative or accusative case. In the example in (84), the embedded subject *sono otoko-ga* ('the man-NOM') is marked with the nominative case suffix *ga*. In (85), all that has changed is that the embedded subject now bears the accusative case suffix *o*, giving this the appearance of ECM. Note that in both examples, the embedded clause is introduced by *to*, which, like *ani*, is often glossed as a complementizer. Just like *ani*, however, it has recently undergone a reevaluation, where it is argued that is a quotative marker (Shimamura 2018), and that the presence of *to* does not necessarily indicate the presence of a CP.

(84) Kanojo-wa [sono otoko-ga sagishi da to] shinjiteiru
she-TOP the man-NOM swindler is QUOT believes
'She believes that the man is a swindler.'

(85) Kanojo-wa [sono otoko-o sagishi da to] shinjiteiru
she-TOP the man-ACC swindler is QUOT believes
'She believes that the man is a swindler.' (Kawai 2006, ex. (1a,b))

Again very similar to Telugu, it has been noted that having non-simple present tense in the embedded clause causes ECM to become much more degraded (Kawai 2006). Compare the examples in (86) and (87). When the embedded clause is in the simple present tense, as in (86), ECM is possible, and the embedded subject can surface with accusative case. When the embedded clause is in the past tense, as in (87), then accusative marking of the subject is judged as degraded.

(86) Kanojo-wa sono otoko-o [sagishi $da_{[-PAST]}$ to] shinjiteiru
she-TOP that man-ACC swindler is QUOT believes
'She believes the man to be a swindler.'

(87) *? Kanojo-wa sono otoko-o [sagishi $datta_{[+PAST]}$ to] shinjiteiru
she-TOP that man-ACC swindler was QUOT believes
'She believes the man to be a swindler.' (Kawai 2006, ex. (4a,b))

An analysis parallel to the one given in Telugu presents itself: *to* like *ani* does not project a CP, hence clauses introduced by *to* can in principle be smaller than CP. Clauses that appear as simple present tense actually do not project a TP, but [+PAST] clauses must project a TP. Again, accusative case/raising-to-object is tied to the matrix *v*, and just like in Telugu, TP is a horizon for the matrix *v* probe. Such an analysis allows us once again to account for why ECM only occurs when the embedded clause seems to lack a tense specification.

6 Conclusion

This paper provided a first look at the locality of cross-clausal A-operations in Telugu by looking at both ECM and LDA constructions. Both of these operations were shown to be possible in the presence of *ani*, which is sometimes called a complementizer in the language. We also showed that ECM had a more restricted distribution than LDA. ECM was shown to be blocked when the embedded clause had an overt tense specification, while LDA is still possible in such situations. Both operations were blocked when the embedded clause had an overt Q-particle. During the course of our discussion we also showed that the ECM and LDA constructions in the language could not be analyzed as a base generated proleptic object in the matrix clause, and that ECM and LDA also differ in the language by the fact that ECMed subjects move into the matrix clause while LDA controllers stay in the embedded clause.

To account for this data, we first argued following Balusu (2020), that *ani* is not a complementizer like English *that*, but rather is a verbal projection. This allowed us to analyze clauses introduced by *ani* as smaller than CPs. We further argued that probing both for ECM and LDA followed the *Height-Locality Connection*. We argued that ECM was triggered via a probe on *v* and that LDA involved a probe on matrix T. Within the Horizon's framework, we argued that the Horizon for *v* was T,

but the Horizon for T was C. This allowed us to account for the differences in locality that we showed between the two operations. While this analysis was specific to Telugu, we suggested that it may have some utility in explaining restrictions on ECM in Japanese. The analysis makes further predictions worth investigating. We mention one here: given the restriction in (11), we should not find a language where LDA is more restricted than ECM. Testing this prediction requires that we find more languages that allow for both constructions. We hope to explore this prediction in future work.

References

Abels, K. 2007. Towards a restrictive theory of (remnant) movement. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7. 53–120.

Baker, M. C. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, M. C. 2011. When agreement is for number and gender but not person. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29. 875–915.

Balusu, R. 2014. Person agreement in adjectival predication in Telugu. Talk delivered at the Bhatt Workshop at LISSIM 8.

Balusu, R. 2016. The eventive predicator *-gaa* in Telugu. *Linguistic Analysis* 40. 199–236.

Balusu, R. 2020. The quotative complementizer says "I'm too baroque for *that*". In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to South Asian Languages*, ed. by B. Dash & G. Kaur, volume 8, 1–12.

Bondarenko, T. 2021. Hyperraising and the semantics of clausal embedding. Talk at Crossing Boundaries: Empirical and Theoretical Aspects of A-dependencies in Complementation.

Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Şener, S. 2008. Non-canonical case licensing is canonical: Accusative subjects of CPs in Turkish. Master's thesis, University of Connecticut.

Deal, A. R. 2017. Covert hyperraising to object. In *Proceedings of NELS 47*, ed. by A. Lamont & K. Tetzloff, 257–270.

Driemel, I., & M. Kouneli. 2021. C-agree is local subject-verb agreement in Kipsigis. Master's thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin & University of Leipzig.

Fong, S. 2019. Proper movement through Spec-CP: An argument from hyperraising in Mongolian. *Glossa* 4. 1–30.

Halpert, C. 2019. Raising, unphased. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37. 123–165.

Kawai, M. 2006. Raising to object in Japanese: A small clause analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37. 329–339.

Keine, S. 2019. Selective opacity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50. 13–62.

Keine, S. 2020. *Probes and Their Horizons*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Keine, S., M. Wagner, & J. Coon. 2019. Hierarchy effects in copula constructions. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique* 64. 617–648.

Krishnamurti, B., & J. P. L. Gwynn. 1985. *A Grammar of Modern Telugu*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Lasnik, H., & M. Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by L. M. Dobrin, L. Nichols, & R. M. Rodriguez, volume 1, 324–343.

Major, T. 2021. *On the Nature of "Say" Complementation*. University of California at Los Angeles dissertation.

Messick, T. 2017. *The Morphosyntax of Self-ascription: A Cross-linguistic Study*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut dissertation.

Messick, T. 2023. On apparent pronominal feature contradictions: Shifty agreement in Telugu. *Syntax* 26. 137–182.
Messick, T. to appear. 3/4 of a monster: On mixed shifty agreement in Telugu. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
Messick, T., & S. Raghotham. to appear. On case-copying reflexives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*.
Polinsky, M., & E. Potsdam. 2001. Long distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19. 583–646.
Poole, E. 2022. Improper case. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 41. 347–397.
Preminger, O. 2014. *Agreement and Its Failures*. Number 68 in Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Raghotham, S. 2019. Telugu: An accusative case study. Handout from FASAL 9.
Raghotham, S. 2021. Privativity and number features: The view from Telugu. Poster presented at CLS 59.
Shimamura, K. 2018. *The Theory of Quotative Complementation in Japanese Semanticosyntax*. University of Connecticut dissertation.
Williams, E. 2003. *Representation Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Wurmbrand, S. 2019. Cross-clausal A-dependencies. In *Proceedings of the Fifty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by E. Ronai, L. Stigliano, & Y. Sun, 585–604, Chicago, IL. Chicago Linguistic Society.