

## Hyper-raising and Evidentiality

**Introduction.** Raising-to-subject constructions display cross-linguistic variation. In **English**, a raising predicate requires subject movement out of TP-clauses (=1a), but *hyper-raising* (raising out of a CP, see Ura 1994) is disallowed (=1b). However, in **Cantonese** (Mandarin as well) and **Vietnamese**, some attitude verbs (‘feel.like’/‘hear.say’) show an apparent raising pattern, where the surface subject is thematically related to the embedded predicate (i.e. surface subject ≠ attitude holder), as in (2), despite the presence of a CP boundary (marked by complementizers).

- (1) a. The rain<sub>i</sub> seems *t<sub>i</sub>* not to stop.                      b. \*The rain<sub>i</sub> seems that *t<sub>i</sub>* will not stop.  
 (2) a. *Coeng-jyui* gamgok tengman *waa t<sub>i</sub> m wui ting*                      [Cantonese]  
       CL-rain    feel.like hear.say C                      NEG will stop ‘The rain, (I) feel/hear, will not stop.’  
       b. *Con-mưa này* cảm giác nghe nói *rằng t<sub>i</sub> sẽ không dừng*                      [Vietnamese]  
       CL-rain this feel.like hear.say C                      will NEG stop                      *same as (2a)*

Adding to the picture, other attitude verbs (‘feel w/perception’/‘know’) pattern with English (1b), but not (2). (3) is only acceptable on an irrelevant topic reading, requiring a pause after ‘the rain’.

- (3) a. \**Coeng-yui* gamgok-dou zidou *waa t<sub>i</sub> m wui ting*                      [C]  
       CL-rain    feel-RESULT know C                      NEG will stop ‘The rain, (I) felt/know, will not stop.’  
       b. \**Con-mưa này* cảm-thấy biết *rằng t<sub>i</sub> sẽ không dừng*                      [V]  
       CL-rain this feel-RESULT know C                      NEG will stop                      *same as (3b)*

**Goals.** (i) (1b)/(3) are ruled out by classic Phase Theory (that requires long-distance movement proceed via Spec CP) and a ban on Improper Movement (that bans a A’-A chain). We argue that raising in (2) is allowed when the PIC is obviated by an Agree relation between the matrix verb and the CP. (ii) We further propose that this Agree relation is made possible by an evidential component (materialized as an [uEV] feature) on attitude verbs in (2), but those in (3) lack it.

**Evidence for A-movement in (2).** We first show that the movement in (2) is an instance of A-movement (but not A’-movement), where the embedded subject lands on matrix Spec TP. **First**, (4) suggests that the movement privileges *subjects* over *objects*, an asymmetry attributable to a locality condition for A-movement: subjects are closer Goals to the matrix Probe. This suggests that the embedded subject is not raised by topicalization (and no pause is required in (2) or (4a)).

- (4) a. *go-toifung*<sub>subj</sub> gamgok [CP *t<sub>subj</sub> wui ceoiwai jat-zo-singsi*]                      *Subj-obj asymmetry* [C]  
       CL-hurricane    feel.like                      will destroy one-CL-city  
       b. \**jat-zo-singsi*<sub>obj</sub> gamgok [CP *go-toifung wui ceoiwai t<sub>obj</sub>* ]  
       one-CL-city    feel.like                      CL-hurricane will destroy  
       ‘The hurricane, (I) feel, will destroy a city.’

**Second**, (5b) shows that the moved subject can bind pronominal variables that it fails to bind before movement (=5a), instantiating a typical property of A-movement. Data in Cantonese:

- (5) a. \**[on keoi<sub>i</sub>caandei ge m-tung] tengman* [CP *mui-lap-zyunsek<sub>i</sub> dou jau m-tung gwongzaak*]  
       accord it    origin MODdifferent hear.say    every-CL-diamond all havedifferent luster  
       b. *mui-lap-zyunsek<sub>i</sub> [on keoi<sub>i</sub>caandei ge m-tung] tengman* [CP *t<sub>i</sub> dou jau m-tung gwongzaak*]  
       every-CL-diamond accord it    origin MODdifferent hear.say    all havedifferent luster  
       ‘Every piece of diamond<sub>i</sub>, according to its<sub>i</sub> origin, (I) heard, will have different lusters.’

**An evidential component.** Attitude verbs can be classified into two groups based on whether the attitude report is *indirect-evidence-based*. (6a) suggests that verbs like *gamgok-dou* are compatible direct evidence, whereas (6c) suggests the opposite for verbs like *gamgok* ‘feel.like’. The latter ones are only compatible with indirect evidence. The distinction in evidentiality

correlates with their raising possibilities: only the *indirect-evidence-based* attitude verbs can trigger raising.

(6) Scenario: It is 10°C. Aaming went out without wearing a coat. Shivering, he said:

- a. ngo gamgok-dou zidou ceotmin hou dung [C, same for V cảm-thấy/biết]  
 1SG feel-result know outside very cold ‘I feel/ think/ know it is cold outside.’
- b. #ngo gamgok/tengman ceotmin hou dung [C, same for V cảm giác/nghe nói]  
 1SG feel.like/hear outside very cold ‘I feel like/ hear that it is cold outside.’

The evidential component proposed here can be seen as an extension of von Stechow & Gillies’ (2010) proposal on English *must*, which encodes an evidential component in its lexical semantics. The correlation between raising possibility and evidentiality is further supported by evidence in Romanian (Alboiu & Hill 2016): when perception verbs take indicative clauses, raising(-to-object) is allowed only if the sentence comes with an indirect evidential reading.

**Analysis.** We suggest that there are two C heads, C<sub>[EV]</sub> and C, where [EV] is an interpretable feature that marks an evidence-based proposition (see Kratzer 2006). Attitude verbs in (2), but not in (3), carry an uninterpretable counterpart [uEV], which agrees with the embedded CP. With this featural setup, we adopt the idea of “phase unlocking” advocated in Rackowski & Richards (2005), which suggests the PIC is obviated if a higher head first agrees with a phase and then goes on to agree with a phase-internal element. Substantially, the [uEV] feature on attitude verbs in (2) agrees with the [EV] feature on CP (=7a). This Agree relation ‘unlocks’ the CP phase. Consequently, it enables a *second* Agree relation (e.g. for Case) between the attitude verb and the embedded subject (=7b). A-movement across a CP boundary is achieved with no intermediate touchdown in Spec CP, hence no Improper Movement. The derivation goes on as (7c) depicted.

(7) a. An attitude verb c-selects and agrees with a CP phase:

[<sub>VP</sub> V<sub>[uEV]</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C<sub>[EV]</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> S VP ] ] ]

b. It further agrees with S and triggers movement:

[<sub>VP</sub> S<sub>i</sub> V<sub>[uEV]</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C<sub>[EV]</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> VP ] ] ] (if there is no DP/*pro* in the numeration)



c. The S is further raised to the matrix Spec TP (= raising-to-subject constructions).

It follows that verbs in (3) and in English lack an [uEV] feature, and the step in (7b) is thus impossible without the mediation of Spec CP, subsequent A-movement from which instantiates Improper Movement. Note that if there is a DP or *pro* in the numeration, the Case feature on the verb in (7b) can be alternatively satisfied by Merge (rather than Move), deriving (6b).

**Discussions.** (i) The proposal attributed some ‘exceptional’ raising behaviors to the lexical semantics of predicates. That is, the [uEV] feature on some attitude verbs provides a way for an embedded subject to escape from the requirement of the PIC, giving rise to A-movement across a CP boundary without stopping at Spec CP (non-successive cyclic hyper-raising, *pace* Fong 2019). While the difference in raising possibilities among verbs is said to be idiosyncratic (see Polinsky 2013), the finding in this paper capitalizes some lexical property that crosscuts attitude verbs in Cantonese and Vietnamese, which has a syntactic reflex. (ii) This paper reported another feature (i.e. [EV]) whose Agree relation with a phase may ‘unlock’ a phase. The finding is consistent with Rackowski & Richards’ (2005) claim that Agree relation on Case between *v* and CP helps explain the pattern of multiple *wh*-movement in Tagalog, and with Halpert’s (2019) proposal that T *phi*-agrees with a CP in Zulu, which then allows for hyper-raising of an embedded subject. The idea of phase unlocking provides a way to explain why the PIC appears to be ‘selective’.