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1. Introduction
Raising-to-subject constructions display cross-linguistic variations. Hyperraising (HR, Ura 1994) is disallowed in English.

(1) English
a. The rain, seems it not to stop.
b. *The rain, seems that it will not stop.

In Cantonese and Vietnamese, we observe an apparent HR pattern with some attitude verbs.

(2) Baseline examples
a. Ngo gamgok/tengman waa coeng jyu m wui ting [Cantonese]
   1SG feel.like/hear C CL rain NEG will stop
   ‘I feel like/hear the rain will not stop.’
b. Tôi cảm giác/nghe nói ràng còn mưa này sẽ không dừng [Vietnamese]
   1SG feel.like/hear C CL rain this will NEG stop
   ‘I feel like/hear the rain will not stop.’

Importantly, these attitude verbs demonstrate an (optional) alternation in terms of the argument structure. We call these attitude verbs raising attitude verbs (RAVs) and the relevant constructions RAV-constructions.

(3) Apparent HR pattern
a. Coeng jyu gamgok/tengman waa m wui ting [C]
   CL rain feel.like/hear C NEG will stop
   (I) feel/hear that the rain will not stop.’
b. Còn mưa này cảm giác/nghe nói ràng sẽ không dừng [V]
   CL rain this feel.like/hear C will NEG stop
   (I) feel/hear that the rain will not stop.’

Such alternation, however, is not observed with other attitude verbs. We call these verbs non-raising attitude verbs (NRAVs).
The availability of such alternation crosscuts the class of attitude verbs.

### Table 1 – Two classes of attitude verbs in Cantonese and Vietnamese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raising Attitude Verbs (RAVs)</th>
<th>Non-raising Attitude Verbs (NRAVs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloss</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cantonese</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'feel like'</td>
<td>gamgok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hear'</td>
<td>tengman/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'guess'</td>
<td>gugai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'believe'</td>
<td>soengseon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'suspect'</td>
<td>waaiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'seem (lit.: fear)'</td>
<td>paace/taipaa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be sure'</td>
<td>hangding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'talk-prog'</td>
<td>gong-gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'say-perf'</td>
<td>waa(-zo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this paper, we argue for three claims.

- First, we show that hyper-raising constructions are attested in both Cantonese and Vietnamese.
- Second, the availability of hyper-raising is associated with evidentiality. In particular, we suggest that hyper-raising constructions are only possible for attitude verbs that presumes indirect evidence for their clausal complements.
- Lastly, we propose a phase deactivation account for hyper-raising in these languages, following the spirit in Rackowski and Richards (2005), Nunes (2008) and Halpert (2019).

Two implications:

- First, “exceptional” raising behaviors are related to the lexical semantics of predicates. Raising possibilities might not be entirely idiosyncratic (contra Polinsky 2013).
- Second, this paper reports another feature (i.e. evidence feature) whose Agree relation with a phase may “unlock” a phase, in addition to selectional features (Rackowski and Richards 2005) and phi-features (Halpert 2019)
Roadmap:
- Section 2 shows that RAV-constructions involve HR.
- Section 3 draws a correlation between indirect evidence and the possibility of HR.
- Section 4 presents our phase deactivation account.
- Section 5 concludes.

2. Hyper-raising
Descriptively, the sentences in (3) share the schema in (5).

(5) RAV-constructions
S RAV [ V (O) ] where S is thematically associated with V but not RAV

What we are trying to convince you:
- The subject is in its derived position (not a hanging topic)
- The movement displays A-movement properties (not topic movement)
- The VO-clause is a finite CP (not a reduced clause)

2.1. Movement, not base generation
Resumptive/coreferent pronouns. The surface subjects cannot co-index with an embedded pronoun, suggesting they are in a derived position.

(6) Aaming, ne, ngo gamgok [ waa keoi, m-wui lai ] (Base-generated topic)
Ming TOP 1SG feel.like C 3SG NEG-will come
‘As for Ming, I feel like he will not come.’

(7) Aaming, gamgok [ waa (*keoi) m-wui lai ] (Ban on resumptive pronouns)
Ming feel.like C 3SG NEG-will come
‘(I) feel like Ming will not come.’ (cf. OK ‘Ming feels like he will not come’)

Island effects. The surface subject cannot be thematically associated with an embedded predicate in an island, such as the complex NP island in (9).

(8) *Aaming, tenggong [ waa [dp [cp t, jijing zau-zo] ge siusik] hai gaa ge ]
Ming hear C already leave-PERF MOD rumor be false SFP
‘(I) hear that the rumor that Ming already left is false.’

Idiomatic meaning. Displacement of the subject of a sentential idiom retains the idiomatic reading.

(9) ni-zek laaihaamou, gamgok[ waa t, soeng sik tinggaojuk ]
this-CL toad feel.like C want eat swan.meat
‘(I) feel like (s/he) is aiming at the moon.’
(lit.: ‘(I) feel like that this toad wants to eat swan meat.’)
2.2 A-movement, instead of A′-movement

**A subject-object asymmetry.** The movement in (11) privileges subjects over objects (both direct and indirect), an asymmetry attributable to a locality condition for A-movement.

(10)a. Aaming **gamgok** [ waa t\_subj bei-zo houdou syu Aafan ] (subject)

Ming feel.like C give-PERF many book Fan

b. "*houdou syu gamgok **[ waa Aaming bei-zo t\_do Aafan ] (direct object)

many book feel.like C Ming give-PERF Fan

c. *Aafan **gamgok [ waa Aaming bei-zo houdou syu t\_to ] (indirect object)

Fan feel.like C Ming give-PERF many book

(a-c): ‘(I) feel like Ming gave many books to Fan.’

**New binding possibility.** The surface subject can bind a pronominal variable in the matrix clause after movement, as shown by the contrast in the sentences in (12).

(11)a. **Impossible binding on pronouns**

*[on keoi, caandeige m-tung] ngo tengman ...

accord it origin MOD difference 1SG hear.say

... [ waa mui-lap-zyunsek, dou jau m-tung gwongzaak]

C every-CL-diamond all have different luster

‘According to its, origin, I heard that every piece of diamond, will have different lusters.’

b. **Possible binding on pronoun**

mui-lap-zyunsek, [ on keoi, caandeige m-tung] tengman ...

every-CL-diamond accord it origin MOD difference hear.say

... [ waa t\_i dou jau m-tung gwongzaak]

C all have different luster

(Lit.) ‘Every piece of diamond, according to its, origin, (I) heard, will have different lusters.’

2.3. The complement clause as a (finite) CP

**C head.** waa (Cantonese, Hwang 2000, Yeung 2006) and là/ràng (Vietnamese, Chappell 2008)

**Embedded topics.** Under standard assumptions, topics are base generated in CP peripheral position (Rizzi 1997).

(12)a. ngo **gamgok** [CP gam-do-ceot-hei [TP Aaming zinghai tai-zo ni-ceot-hei]] (transitive)

I feel.like so-many-CL-film Ming only watch-PERF this-cl-film

‘I feel like, among so many films, Ming only watched this one.’

b. Aaming **gamgok** [CP gam-do-ceot-hei [TP zinghai tai-zo ni-ceot-hei]] (RAVs)

Ming feel.like so-many-CL-film only watch-PERF this-cl-film

‘(I) feel like, among so many films, Ming only watched this one.’
3. Evidentiality and the two classes of attitude verbs

The remaining issue: why there is an asymmetry between the two sets of attitude verbs?

Our suggestion:

- RAVs all come with an evidential requirement in their lexical semantics, which requires the attitude report to be based on indirect evidence.
- Such requirement is lacking in NRAVs.

We start with some (near-)minimal pairs in Table 1 (partly repeated below): some RAVs differ from NRAVs in the absence of the verbal suffix -dou.

(13) RAVs: gamgok ‘feel like’ tengman ‘hear’ gugai ‘guess’
NRAVs: gamgok-dou ‘feel-result’ teng-dou ‘hear-result’ gu-dou ‘guess-result’

Descriptively, -dou indicates “accomplishment or successful completion of an action” and it is used to forms verbs of perception (Matthews and Yip 2011:251-2).

(14) Direct context: Ming is playing piano now. You hear the sound and say:

a. ngo | teng-dou/ #tengman | Aaming taan-gan kam (transitive usage)
   1SG hear-result hear.say Ming play-PROG piano
   ‘I hear Ming playing piano.’

b. #Aaming tengman taan-gan kam (RAV-constructions)
   Ming hear.say play-PROG piano
   ‘Ming, (I) heard that Ming is playing piano.’

The requirement of indirect evidence also applies to other RAVs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raising Attitude Verbs (RAVs)</th>
<th>Non-raising Attitude Verbs (NRAVs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloss</strong></td>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘feel like’</td>
<td>gamgok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hear’</td>
<td>tengman/tenggong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘guess’</td>
<td>gugai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘believe’</td>
<td>soengseon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘suspect’</td>
<td>waaiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘seem (lit: fear)’</td>
<td>paace/taippa/paahai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘be.sure’</td>
<td>hangding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘talk-prog’</td>
<td>gong-gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘say-perf’</td>
<td>waa(-zo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Two classes of attitude verbs and their evidential component
There is supporting evidence for this distinction. It patterns with epistemic modals in English which display a similar requirement (von Fintel and Gillies 2010).

(15) [Seeing the pouring rain] (direct evidence)
   a. It’s raining.
   b. ??It must be raining.

(16) [Seeing wet rain gears and knowing rain is the only possible cause] (indirect evidence)
   a. It’s raining.
   b. It must be raining.

The correlation between raising possibility and evidentiality is further supported by evidence in Romanian (Alboiu and Hill 2013, 2016).

(17) Raising correlates with indirect evidentiality in Romanian (Alboiu and Hill 2013:295-6)
   a. Văd [că e murdar pe mâini] (direct evidence)
      see.1 that is dirty on hands
      ‘I see his hands are dirty.’
   b. Am auzit [că Mihai repară casa] (indirect evidence)
      have.1SG heard that Mihai fixes house.the
      ‘I’ve heard that Mihai is fixing the house.’
   c. L-am auzit pe Mihai [că repară casa] (RtO, indirect evidence)
      him-have.1SG heard DOM Mihai that fixes house.the
      ‘I’ve heard Mihai (claiming that) he’s fixing the house.’

4. Towards a proposal
   Standard generative theories are too restrictive in that they systematically rule out any instance of HR constructions, by virtue of (#1) the ban on Improper Movement (IM, Chomsky 1973, Chomsky 1986), (#2) the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC, Chomsky 2001)

   Three families of proposals on HR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Featural distinction on A/A’-positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Spec,CP as A-positions (Obata and Epstein 2011, Fong 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Hyper-raising as A’-movement with A-movement effects (Alboiu and Hill 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2 Conditioned deactivation of PIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Selective opacity of a domain: (i) Phase unlocking (Halpert 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Deactivation of phasehood: (i) Defective CP (Nunes 2008); (ii) Exfoliation (Pesetsky 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3 Parametrization on Multiple Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Parametrization on Multiple Agree (Halpert 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Spec,TP.fin may not be Case positions (Ura 1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Table 3: Different approaches on hyper-raising
Our proposal: along the line of conditioned deactivation of PIC (#2).
- We suggest that PIC can be obviated under certain circumstances.
  - PIC is obviated by an Agree relation between the matrix verb and the entire CP.
  - the requirement of indirect evidence materializes as a syntactic feature [EV].
- The proposal bears a family resemblance to approaches to locality in Rackowski and Richards (2005), Nunes (2008) and Halpert (2019).

(18) Featural setup
  a. There are two (null) C heads, namely, C and C_{EV}.
  b. [EV] is an interpretable feature that marks an indirect-evidence-based proposition.
  c. RAVs (≠NRAVs) carry an uninterpretable counterpart [uEV], which agrees with a CP.

Crucially, it is the Agree relation between RAVs and CP in terms of the proposed evidential feature that enables A-movement from within the finite CP.

(19) Graphic representation of the proposed derivation of RAV-constructions
  a. [EV]: the first Agree relation between the probe v and the CP

b. [EPP] on v: the second Agree relation between the probe v and the embedded subject

c. [EPP] on T: the subject is further raised to Spec TP (not shown).
5. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we argue for three claims.

- First, we show that hyper-raising constructions are attested in both Cantonese and Vietnamese.
- Second, the availability of hyper-raising is associated with evidentiality. In particular, we suggest that hyper-raising constructions are only possible for attitude verbs that presumes indirect evidence for their clusal complements.
- Lastly, we propose a phase deactivation account for hyperraising in these languages, following the spirit in Rackowski and Richards (2005), Nunes (2008) and Halpert (2019).

Two implications:

- First, “exceptional” raising behaviors are related to the lexical semantics of predicates. Raising possibilities might not be entirely idiosyncratic (contra Polinsky 2013).
- Second, this paper reports another feature (i.e. evidence feature) whose Agree relation with a phase may “unlock” a phase, in addition to selectional features (Rackowski and Richards 2005) and phi-features (Halpert 2019)

References


