

**RESPONSE TO URA (1994),
VARIETIES OF RAISING AND THE FEATURE-BASED BARE PHRASE STRUCTURE THEORY**

Anna Dailey-McCartney, Victor Eskenazi, Chia-Hui Huang

Department of Linguistics
University of Washington

1. Introduction and Overview

A widely held view concerning NP movement is that a noun phrase (NP) cannot move to a higher subject position across another distinct intervening subject NP. This restriction, known as a *Ban on Superraising* or illicit NP-movement, is exemplified in (1).

- (1) (a) It seems that [John] is believed [t] to be a Democrat.¹
(b) John seems [t] to be believed [t] to be a Democrat.
(c) *[John] seems that it is believed [t] to be a Democrat.

Sentence (1a) is an instance of one-step NP-movement and (1b) is an instance of successive-cyclic NP-movement. (1c) is ruled out in violation of the Ban on Superraising although the resulting A-chain satisfies a Case requirement.

Lasnik's (1985) binding approach, Rizzi's (1990) chain-theoretic approach, and more recently, Chomsky's (1995) derivational approach all argue for a ban on superraising. Chomsky's Minimal Link Condition (MLC) requires that an element which undergoes movement in the course of derivation be the closest one to the target position. Hence, any intervening distinct NP always invokes a violation of the MLC for another NP that attempts to cross over it unless head movement expands the checking domain. However, Chomsky leaves open the question of whether superraising is ever allowed, citing Ura's (1994) work on a correlation between multiple specifiers (in languages that allow multiple specifier positions) and apparent cases of superraising. In contrast, the analysis of superraising in Rizzi (1990) disallows any possibility of superraising, even if multiple specifiers are assumed.

As is well attested, superraising is impossible in all Germanic and Romance languages. The empirical issue, then, is this: Do natural languages never have superraising? Ura (1994) claims to falsify current syntactic accounts of the Ban on Superraising. He claims that languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Indonesian, Persian, and Japanese do exhibit superraising.

If not disproved, Ura's reported cases of superraising pose a serious challenge to the standard account of the Ban on Superraising. However, we have conducted field research with native informants of several of the languages discussed by Ura and, in each case, his analysis has turned out to be inaccurate. Since we are able to show that none of Ura's examples in these languages are genuine cases of superraising, the universal Ban on Superraising in their respect can still be upheld. Confirming the existence of superraising is clearly important, since even a few solid cases would necessitate radical rethinking of the current theory of locality and movement. Our findings so far suggest the need for further investigation before superraising can be accepted.

¹ Abbreviations in this paper are as follows:

ACC	accusative	ASP	aspect	BENE	benefactive
COMP	complementizer	CP	complement phrase	F	feminine
IP	inflectional phrase	M	masculine	MLC	Minimal Link Condition
NOM	nominative	NP	noun phrase	PASS, PSS	passive
PRO	pronoun	SG	singular	SUBJ	subjunctive
RMC	Relativized Minimality Condition	t	trace (origination of moved NP)	TRANS	transitive

Ura provides an analysis of how superraising could be possible. He claims that in languages such as Indonesian and Arabic, there is an extra specifier position in the non-finite clause which can be used as an escape hatch to make superraising possible. Let us look at the structure in (2).

- (2) $[_{IP} \text{John}_i \text{ seems } [_{CP} \text{that } [_{IP_1} t_i [_{IP_2} \text{it is believed } [_{IP_3} t_i \text{ to be a Democrat}]]]]]$

The extra specifier (IP_1 in (2)) is held to serve as an escape hatch for superraising. This relies crucially on Chomsky's definition of equidistance. (In (2), IP_1 and IP_2 are equidistant from IP_3 .)

In this paper we will examine four of the eight languages cited in Ura's paper. They are Indonesian, Arabic, Persian and Mandarin Chinese. We will show that, contrary to his claim, these languages do not permit superraising.

2. Indonesian

Let us start with Ura's example of Indonesian in (3).

- (3) Mereka meng-anggap [bahwa saja beri-kan surat itu kepada Tini].
 they TRANS-believe COMP I give-BENE letter the to Tini
 'They believe that I gave the letter to Tini.'

In (4), which has the same meaning as (3), the object of the embedded clause, *Tini*, is moved to the subject position of the matrix clause.

- (4) Tini_i di-anggap [bahwa saja beri-Ø surat itu t_i].
 Tini PASS-believe COMP I give letter the
 Lit., 'Tini_i is believed that I gave t_i the letter.' [same meaning as (3)]

Our Indonesian informant judged (4) to be ungrammatical. Such a judgement is, in fact, predicted by Rizzi (1990) and Chomsky (1995) since the movement of *Tini* in (4) violates both the Relativized Minimality Condition (RMC) and the Minimal Link Condition. However, let us consider the possibility that some speakers accept (4) and try to determine what its structure would be. We will first establish that *di-anggap*, 'believe' as it is shown in (4–5), is a raising predicate.

- (5) (a) Itu di-anggap (bahwa) Mary mem-ukul John.
 it PASS-believe (that) Mary TRANS-hit John
 'It is believed that Mary hit John.'
- (b) Mary di-anggap mem-ukul John.
 Mary PASS-believe TRANS-hit John
 'Mary is believed to have hit John.'
- (c) John di-anggap di-pukul oleh Mary.
 John PASS-believe PASS-hit by Mary
 'John is believed to have been hit by Mary.'

Examples (5a–c) are all semantically equivalent. This suggests that *di-anggap* is indeed a raising predicate. In all these sentences, *Mary* and *John* bear the same theta-relations, while *di-anggap* assigns no external theta-role.

It is important not to confuse the use of *di-anggap* in (5) above with that shown in (6a). In (6a), the surface subject, *John*, has undergone pseudopassivization. Example (6b) has the same underlying structure as (6a), but in this case the internal DP argument of *di-anggap*, *John*, has remained *in situ*. The ungrammaticality of (6c) shows that the relationship between the surface subject and the object of *kiss* is not derived via movement.

- (6) (a) John_i di-anggap bahwa Mary cium dia_{i/*j}.
 John PASS-believe that Mary kissed him
 'It is believed of John_i that Mary kissed him_{i/*j}.'
- (b) Itu di-anggap tentang John_i bahwa Mary cium dia_{i/*j}.
 it PASS-believe about John that Mary kissed him
 'It is believed of John_i that Mary kissed him_{i/*j}.' [same meaning as (6a)]
- (c) *John di-anggap tentang John bahwa Mary cium.
 John PASS-believe about John that Mary kissed
 'It is believed of John that Mary kissed (him).'

Now compare (6c) to Ura's example (4). It appears that his informant allows the goal argument of *give* to be implicit. Furthermore, in order for the sentence to be interpretable, the matrix subject, *Tini*, which is the internal argument of *di-anggap*, must be understood as being coreferential with the implicit argument of *give*. This is demonstrated by the coreference facts in (6a) and (b).

Supporting evidence for the pseudopassivization structure we are proposing here comes from the minimal pair in (7). (7b) has the same meaning as (7a), despite the difference in the main verb. (7b) is ungrammatical because, unlike *beritahukan* in (7a), the main verb of (7b), *jelaskan*, does not subcategorize for an *about*-phrase. The verb *beritahukan* in (7a) has roughly the argument structure of *inform* in English, whereas *jelaskan* in (7b) has that of *explain*.

- (7) (a) Tini_i diberitahukan kepada saya bahwa dia_i sakit.
 Tini_i PASS.explain₁ to me COMP she_i sick
 'It was explained to me about Tini that she was sick.'
- (b) *Tini_i dijelaskan kepada saya bahwa dia_i sakit.
 Tini_i PASS.explain₂ to me COMP she_i sick
 'It was explained to me about Tini that she was sick.' [same meaning as (7a)]

To summarize, because Ura's Indonesian example can be accounted for as a pseudopassivization structure, it is unnecessary to posit superraising based on this data.

3. Arabic

Moving on to Arabic, Ura's examples of Moroccan Arabic are listed under (8).

- (8) (a) Ttshab-li [belli shaf-ha muhend mmi fsefru]
 seemed-3SG.to.1SG COMP saw-3SG.F Mohand mother.1SG in.Sefrou
 'It seemed to me that Mohand saw my mother in Sefrou.'
- (b) Ttshab-et-li mmi_k [belli shaf-ha muhend t_k fsefru]
 seemed-F-3SG.to.1SG mother.1SG COMP saw-3SG.F Mohand in.Sefrou
 Lit., 'My mother_k seemed to me that Mohand saw t_k in Sefrou.' [same meaning as (8a)]

Ura claims that the Moroccan Arabic example (8b) shows superraising. However, according to our informant this sentence is ungrammatical. In fact, we were unable even to find examples of regular subject-to-subject raising in Moroccan Arabic; our informant rejected all potential candidates. This suggested to us that raising predicates in Moroccan Arabic select only CP and not a bare nonfinite IP. For this reason, we concentrated on the Cairene dialect of Arabic, which did have pairs like (8a) and (b). One of these is shown in (9).

- (13) (a) In bəʔid æst [ke æli ketab-ra be Hæsan, be-dæh-æd].
 It unlikely is COMP Ali book-ACC to Hasan SUBJ-give-3SG
 ‘It is unlikely that Ali gives Hasan the book.’

- (b) Hæsan_i bæʔid æst [ke æli ketab-ra t_i be-dæh-æd].
 Hasan unlikely is COMP Ali book-ACC SUBJ-give-3SG
 Lit., 'Hasan_i it is unlikely that Ali gives t_i the book.' [same meaning as (13a)]

However, our Persian informant found (13b) strongly ungrammatical, indicating that superraising does not exist in Persian. Ura also gives examples of topicalization in Persian, this is shown in (14a) and (b):

- (14) (a) *Hæsan_i in bæʔid æst [ke æli ketab-ra t_i be-dæh-æd].
 Hasan it unlikely is COMP Ali book-ACC SUBJ-give-3SG.
 'Hasan_i, it is unlikely that Ali gives t_i the book.'
- (b) Hæsan_i, in bæʔid æst [ke æli ketab-ra be t_i be-dæh-æd].
 Hasan it unlikely is COMP Ali book-ACC to SUBJ-give-3SG.
 'Hasan_i, it is unlikely that Ali gives the book to t_i.' [Ura's informant's judgment]

The only difference between (14a) and (b) is the presence of the preposition *be* in (14b). Our informant had the reverse grammatical judgments for (14a) and (b): our informant found, contrary to the judgement of Ura's informant, example (14a) to be grammatical and (14b) ungrammatical. (14b) is apparently ruled out due to a prohibition on preposition stranding.

5. Mandarin Chinese

The last language we are examining here is Mandarin Chinese. Ura's examples are shown in (15). According to Ura, (15b) has the same meaning as (15a).

- (15) (a) Keneng [Zhangsan reng-le nei kuai rou gei ta].
 Possible Zhangsan toss-ASP that piece meat to he
 'It is possible that Zhangsan has tossed that piece of meat to him.'
- (b) Ta_i keneng [Zhangsan reng-le nei kuai rou t_i]
 he possible Zhangsan toss-ASP that piece meat
 Lit., 'He_i is possible that Zhangsan has tossed t_i that piece of meat.'

The status of *keneng* 'possible' shown in (15a–b) as a raising predicate is still highly controversial. This may just be an adverb, in which case it means 'possibly'. But assuming that movement does occur, we feel that the apparent cases of superraising in Mandarin are actually topicalization.

Ura's example (15b) is a case of movement of the indirect object. However, the judgements of our native speaker (including one of us) show that (15b) is strongly ungrammatical. Interestingly, it appears that any sort of movement of the indirect object from the embedded clause is disallowed, as it is shown in (16), which has a non-raising predicate.

- (16) *Leetsu_i [Zhangsan chiau Wangwu chi shing t_i]
 Leetsu Zhangsan ask Wangwu send letter
 Lit., 'Leetsu, Zhangsan asks Wangwu to send the letter.'

Notice that the movement of indirect object is also not possible when the preposition is moved with the NP indirect object. This is shown in (17).

- (17) *Gei Leetsu_i [Zhangsan chiau [Wangwu chi shing t_i]]
 to Leetsu Zhangsan ask Wangwu send letter
 'To Leetsu, Zhangsan asks Wangwu to send the letter.'

Here we see that, while the preposition *gei* 'to' is moved together with the NP indirect object, the sentence is still ungrammatical.

If (15b) does involve topicalization, we predict that it should not be possible to front an indefinite NP. There is a general semantic restriction on topicalization requiring that the fronted element be definite. Unfortunately, Ura did not provide examples of superraising with indefinite subjects in Chinese, or for that matter, any of the languages he discussed in his paper, therefore we cannot test this prediction at present.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, if Ura is correct and superraising does exist, then this will pose a serious challenge to the standard account of the ban on superraising. However, we have looked at four of the languages Ura discussed and, in each case, we have been able to show that Ura's examples are not, in fact, genuine cases of superraising.

We believe that confirming the existence of superraising is clearly important, since even a few solid cases would necessitate radical rethinking of the current theory of locality and movement. Our findings so far suggest the need for further investigation before superraising can be accepted.

References

- Chomsky, Noam 1995. *The Minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader 1993. *Issues in the structure of Arabic clauses and words*. Dordrecht/Boston: Kluwer Academic. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory, 29.)
- Lasnik, Howard 1985. A note on illicit NP-movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16: 481–490.
- Rizzi, Luigi 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ura, Hiroyuki 1994. *Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.