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Today’s topics and goals

• Hyperraising
  ▶ What hyperraising is.
  ▶ Exiting finite clauses via Spec-CP.
  ▶ A- vs. Ā-movement (Weak Crossover; locality; Ban on Improper Movement).

• Hyperraising: movement vs. base-generation
  ▶ Hyperraising vs. prolepsis.
  ▶ Island sensitivity.
What is hyperraising?

Raising to the subject position:

(1)   a. Sue seems \([_{TP} ___ \to \text{have won the prize}].\)

    b. *Sue seems \([_{CP} (\text{that}) ___ \text{won the prize}].\)

  • (1b) is an instance of **hyperraising** = raising out of a finite clause.
What is hyperraising?

Raising to the subject position:

\[(1)\]

a. Sue seems \([_{TP} \text{__} \text{to have won the prize}].\]

b. \*Sue seems \([_{CP (that)\__} \text{won the prize}].\]

• (1b) is an instance of **hyperraising** = raising out of a finite clause.
Raising to the object position:

(2)  
   a. Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{TP} \_ \_ to have won the prize]\).  
   b. *Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{CP} (that) \_ \_ won the prize]\).  

- (2b) is an instance of hyper-raising to object.
Raising to the object position:

(2)  
  a. Mary proved Sue conclusively \([TP \underline{\_}\_\_\_\_\_\_\text{to have won the prize}]\).
  b. *Mary proved Sue conclusively \([CP \text{(that)} \underline{\_}\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\text{won the prize}]\).

- (2b) is an instance of hyperraising to object.
Raising to the object position:

(2)  

a. Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{TP} \_ \text{to have won the prize}]\).

b. *Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{CP} \text{(that)} \_ \text{won the prize}]\).

c. Who did Mary prove conclusively \([_{CP} \_ \text{won the prize}]\)?

• (2b) is an instance of hyperraising to object.
Some notes on the data

- Why add *conclusively*?

  (2a) Mary proved Sue conclusively \( [_{TP} \underline{__} \text{to have won the prize}] \).

  ➤ Because it gives us a benchmark as to where the embedded clause begins.

(3) a. Mary proved \( [_{TP} \text{Sue to have won the prize}] \).

  b. Mary proved Sue \( [_{TP} \underline{__} \text{to have won the prize}] \).
Some notes on the data

• Why add *conclusively*?

(2a) Mary proved Sue conclusively \([TP \_\_\_ \text{to have won the prize}]\).

▶ Because it gives us a benchmark as to where the embedded clause begins.

(3) a. Mary proved \([TP \text{ Sue to have won the prize}]\).
    b. Mary proved Sue \([TP \_\_\_ \text{to have won the prize}]\).
The same goes for the “null that”:

(4)  
   a. Mary proved $[\text{CP that Sue won the prize}]$.  
   b. Mary proved Sue $[\text{CP ___ won the prize}]$.

More on the prohibition of that in (2b) later.

(2b’) * Who did Mary prove $[\text{CP that ___ won the prize}]$?
The same goes for the “null that”:

(4)  
   a. Mary proved \([_{\text{CP}} \text{ that } \text{Sue won the prize}]\).
   b. Mary proved \([_{\text{CP}} \text{ __ won the prize}]\).

More on the prohibition of \(that\) in (2b) later.

(2b′)  
   * Who did Mary prove \([_{\text{CP}} \text{ that } \text{__ won the prize}]\)?
Back to the main question

(1b) *Sue seems [CP (that) ___ won the prize].

(2b) *Mary proved Sue conclusively [CP (that) ___ won the prize].

• Why are (1b) and (2b) ungrammatical?
• Answering this question will require discussions about:
  (i) how movement from a CP proceeds
  (ii) different types of movement
(1b)  *Sue seems [CP (that) ___ won the prize].

(2b)  *Mary proved Sue conclusively [CP (that) ___ won the prize].

- Why are (1b) and (2b) ungrammatical?
- Answering this question will require discussions about:
  (i) how movement from a CP proceeds
  (ii) different types of movement
(1b) *Sue seems \[\text{CP (that)} \_ \_ \text{won the prize}\].

(2b) *Mary proved Sue conclusively \[\text{CP (that)} \_ \_ \text{won the prize}\].

- Why are (1b) and (2b) ungrammatical?
- Answering this question will require discussions about:
  (i) how movement from a CP proceeds
  (ii) different types of movement
(5) a. Each other_k’s parents invited John and Mary_k.
b. Which side of herself was Mary proud of?

(6) Which side of herself did Mary say that John was proud of?
(5) a. * Each other\textsubscript{k}’s parents invited John and Mary\textsubscript{k}.  
b. Which side of herself was Mary proud of?

(6) Which side of herself did Mary say that John was proud of?
(i) How movement from a CP proceeds

(5)  a. * Each other\(_k\)’s parents invited John and Mary\(_k\).
     b. Which side of herself was Mary proud of which side of herself?

(6) Which side of herself did Mary say that John was proud of?
(i) How movement from a CP proceeds

(5)  
   a. * Each other_k’s parents invited John and Mary_k.
   b. Which side of herself was Mary proud of which side of herself?

(6) Which side of herself did Mary say that John was proud of?
(5)  a.  * Each other\textsubscript{k}’s parents invited John and Mary\textsubscript{k}.

    b.  Which side of herself was Mary proud of which side of herself?

(6)  Which side of herself did Mary say that John was proud of which side of herself?
(i) How movement from a CP proceeds

(5)  
   a.  * Each other \(k\)’s parents invited John and Mary \(k\).
   b.  Which side of herself was Mary proud of which side of herself?

(6)  Which side of herself did Mary say that John was proud of which side of herself?

• **Assume**: in order to exit a finite CP, move through Spec-CP.
(5) a. * Each other_k’s parents invited John and Mary_k.
    b. Which side of herself was Mary proud of which side of herself?

(6) Which side of herself did Mary say which side of herself that John was proud of which side of herself?

• Assume: in order to exit a finite CP, move through Spec-CP.
Exercise

1. The sentence below is ambiguous. What are the possible interpretations?
2. How can we explain this range of possible interpretations?
   
   (7) Which side of himself did John say that Fred liked?
• We can now consider why *that* is prohibited in (2b) (repeated below as (9b)).

(8)  
   a. Mary proved/believed [CP that Sue won the prize].  
   b. Mary proved/believed [CP Sue won the prize].

(9)  
   a. Who did Mary prove/believe [CP ___ won the prize]?
   b. *Who did Mary prove/believe [CP that ___ won the prize]?
• Under the assumption that exiting an intermediate CP requires moving through Spec-CP:

(9b’) Who did Mary prove \([\text{CP} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{won the prize}]\). 

• **Doubly Filled Comp Filter:** it cannot be the case that both Spec-CP and \(C^0\) are filled at the same time.

(10) a. I wonder \([\text{CP} \quad \text{who she saw}]\).

b. I wonder \([\text{CP} \quad \text{if/whether she saw Jaimie}]\).

c. * I wonder \([\text{CP} \quad \text{who if/whether she saw}]\).

• More on this: Pesetsky (to appear).
• Under the assumption that exiting an intermediate CP requires moving through Spec-CP:

\[(9b') \quad \text{Who did Mary prove } \left[\text{CP } \quad \text{that } \text{TP } \quad \text{won the prize}\right].\]

• **Doubly Filled Comp Filter**: it cannot be the case that both Spec-CP and C⁰ are filled at the same time.

\[(10) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \quad I \text{ wonder } \left[\text{CP who she saw}\right]. \\
\text{b. } & \quad I \text{ wonder } \left[\text{CP if/whether she saw Jaimie}\right]. \\
\text{c. } & \quad * I \text{ wonder } \left[\text{CP who if/whether she saw}\right].
\end{align*}\]

• More on this: Pesetsky (to appear).
Under the assumption that exiting an intermediate CP requires moving through Spec-CP:

\[(9b') \text{ Who did Mary prove } [\text{CP } \_ \_ \text{ that } [\text{TP } \_ \_ \text{ won the prize}]].\]

**Doubly Filled Comp Filter**: it cannot be the case that both Spec-CP and C\(^0\) are filled at the same time.

\[(10) \text{ a. I wonder } [\text{CP who she saw}].\]
\[\text{ b. I wonder } [\text{CP if/whether she saw Jaimie}].\]
\[\text{ c. * I wonder } [\text{CP who if/whether she saw}].\]

More on this: Pesetsky (to appear).
• Under the assumption that exiting an intermediate CP requires moving through Spec-CP:

\[(9b')\quad \text{Who did Mary prove } [\text{CP } \_ \_ \text{ that } [\text{TP } \_ \_ \text{ won the prize}]]].\]

• **Doubly Filled Comp Filter**: it cannot be the case that both Spec-CP and C⁰ are filled at the same time.

\[(10)\quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{I wonder } [\text{CP who she saw}]. \\
\text{b. } & \text{I wonder } [\text{CP if/whether she saw Jaimie}]. \\
\text{c. } & * \text{I wonder } [\text{CP who if/whether she saw}].
\end{align*}\]

• More on this: Pesetsky (to appear).
(ii) Different types of movement

• Recall a Weak Crossover violation in Wh-movement:

  (11) Which child\_\_k does his\_\_\_k/j mother love __?

• Compare:

  (12) Every child seems to his mother __ to be the best student in
       the class.

• Takeaway: Wh-movement induces a Weak Crossover violation, but
  raising does not.
(ii) Different types of movement

- Recall a Weak Crossover violation in Wh-movement:
  
  (11) Which child\(_k\) does his\(_{k/j}\) mother love __?

- Compare:
  
  (12) Every child seems to his mother __ to be the best student in the class.

- Takeaway: Wh-movement induces a Weak Crossover violation, but raising does not.
(ii) Different types of movement

• Recall a Weak Crossover violation in Wh-movement:
  
  (11) Which child$_k$ does his$^*_k$ mother love __?

• Compare:
  
  (12) Every child$_k$ seems to his$_k$ mother ___ to be the best student in the class.

• Takeaway: Wh-movement induces a Weak Crossover violation, but raising does not.
(ii) Different types of movement

- Recall a Weak Crossover violation in Wh-movement:
  
  (11) Which child$_k$ does his$_k$ mother love ___?

- Compare:
  
  (12) Every child$_k$ seems to his$_k$ mother ___ to be the best student in the class.

- Takeaway: Wh-movement induces a Weak Crossover violation, but raising does not.
Another difference:

(13) Which pie did Kumba buy?
(14) The pies seem Kumba to have bought.
Another difference:

(13) Which pie did Kumba buy?
(14) * The pies seem Kumba to have bought.
Another difference:

(13) Which pie did Kumba buy ___?

(14) * The pies seem Kumba to have bought.
Another difference:

(13) Which pie did Kumba buy ___?

(14) * The pies seem Kumba to have bought __.
Summary: some differences between *Wh*-movement and raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Wh</em>-movement</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Raising and *Wh*-movement are different types of movement.
Summary: some differences between *Wh*-movement and raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Wh</em>-movement</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Raising and *Wh*-movement are different types of movement.
• Summary: some differences between Wh-movement and raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wh-movement</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Raising and Wh-movement are different types of movement.
• **Summary:** some differences between \textit{Wh}-movement and raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>\textit{Wh}-movement</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Raising and \textit{Wh}-movement are different types of movement.
Summary: some differences between *Wh*-movement and raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Wh</em>-movement</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Raising and *Wh*-movement are different types of movement.
Summary: some differences between Wh-movement and raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wh-movement</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Raising and Wh-movement are different types of movement.
This is a glimpse of the A vs. Ā distinction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ā-movement</th>
<th>A-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more properties: Safir (2019; p. 287ff).
A vs. Ā-positions:

(15) CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ā</th>
<th>C′</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we want to explain:

(2)  
  a. Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{TP} \text{ to deserve the prize}]\).
  b. * Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{CP} (\text{that}) \text{ deserved the prize}]\).

Assumptions:

(i) In order to exit a CP, a moving XP has to pass through Spec-CP.
(ii) Wh-movement ≠ raising.

So why is (2b) ungrammatical?
Putting the pieces together

• What we want to explain:

  (2) a. Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{TP} to deserve the prize]\).
  b. * Mary proved Sue conclusively \([_{CP} (that) deserved the prize]\).

• Assumptions:

  (i) In order to exit a CP, a moving XP has to pass through Spec-CP.
  (ii) \textit{Wh}-movement ≠ raising.

• So why is (2b) ungrammatical?
• What we want to explain:

(2) a. Mary proved Sue conclusively \([TP \text{ to deserve the prize}]\).

b. * Mary proved Sue conclusively \([CP \text{ (that) deserved the prize}]\).

• Assumptions:

(i) In order to exit a CP, a moving XP has to pass through Spec-CP.

(ii) \(Wh\)-movement ≠ raising.

• So why is (2b) ungrammatical?
(2b') \*_{CP} \text{Mary proved Sue conclusively } _{CP} (\text{that}) \text{ deserved the prize}?\

- In order to exit a CP, Sue moves through the embedded CP.
- Assumption: movement to Spec-CP is an instance of $\bar{A}$-movement.
- **Stipulation:** $\bar{A}$-movement can proceed through Spec-CP, but A-movement cannot.
  - Usually known as the Ban on Improper Movement.
(2b’) *[CP Mary proved Sue conclusively [CP (that) deserved the prize)]?

• In order to exit a CP, *Sue* moves through the embedded CP.

• Assumption: movement to Spec-CP is an instance of Ā-movement.

• Stipulation: Ā-movement can proceed through Spec-CP, but A-movement cannot.

  ▶ Usually known as the Ban on Improper Movement.
(2b') \[ \text{CP Mary proved Sue conclusively [CP (that) deserved the prize)]?} \]

- In order to exit a CP, \textit{Sue} moves through the embedded CP.
- Assumption: movement to Spec-CP is an instance of \textit{\(\bar{A}\)}-movement.
- \textbf{Stipulation:} \textit{\(\bar{A}\)}-movement can proceed through Spec-CP, but A-movement cannot.
  - Usually known as the Ban on Improper Movement.
(2b') \ *[_{CP} \text{Mary proved Sue conclusively } [_{CP} \text{(that) } \text{deserved the prize})]?

- In order to exit a CP, \textit{Sue} moves through the embedded CP.
- Assumption: movement to Spec-CP is an instance of \textit{\textbar\text{A}}-movement.
- \textbf{Stipulation}: \textit{\textbar\text{A}}-movement can proceed through Spec-CP, but A-movement cannot.
  
  ▶ Usually known as the Ban on Improper Movement.
(2b’) *[CP Mary proved Sue conclusively [CP (that) deserved the prize)]?  

- In order to exit a CP, *Sue* moves through the embedded CP.
- Assumption: movement to Spec-CP is an instance of $\bar{A}$-movement.
- **Stipulation:** $\bar{A}$-movement can proceed through Spec-CP, but A-movement cannot.
  - Usually known as the Ban on Improper Movement.
Ban on Improper Movement

\(\bar{A}\)-movement of a constituent \(X\) cannot be followed by movement of \(X\) to an \(A\)-position.

\[(2b') \quad *[_{CP} \text{Mary proved } Sue \text{ conclusively } [_{CP} \text{(that) } deserved \text{ the prize}]]?\]
Ban on Improper Movement

\(\tilde{A}\)-movement of a constituent \(X\) cannot be followed by movement of \(X\) to an \(A\)-position.

\[(2b') \quad *[_{CP} \text{Mary proved } \text{Sue conclusively } [_{CP} \text{(that) } \text{deserved the prize}]\]?
The Ban on Improper Movement belongs to the A vs. $\tilde{A}$ distinction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\tilde{A}$-movement</th>
<th>A-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can feed A-movement</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) Rosa seems [TP $\tilde{A}$ to be likely [TP A to have won the prize]].
The Ban on Improper Movement belongs to the A vs. $\bar{\text{A}}$ distinction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\bar{\text{A}}$-movement</th>
<th>A-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Crossover violation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvt of object over subject</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can feed A-movement</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) Rosa seems $\left[{_{\text{TP}}A\left[{_{\text{TP}}A\text{ to be likely [_{TP} to have won the prize]}\right]}\right]$.  

A

A
What about $\bar{A}$-movement out of a finite CP?

(2b) Who did Mary prove conclusively $[\text{CP} \quad [\text{TP} \quad \text{won the prize}]]$?

$\bar{A}$-movement feeding $\bar{A}$-movement $\rightarrow$ no violation of the Ban on Improper Movement.
• What about $\bar{A}$-movement out of a finite CP?

$\text{(2b) }$ Who did Mary prove conclusively $[CP \quad [TP \quad \text{won the prize}]$?

$\bar{A}$-movement feeding $\bar{A}$-movement $\rightarrow$ no violation of the Ban on Improper Movement.
Exercise

1. The sentence below is ungrammatical. Assuming that *which students* moves in the way depicted, explain why.

   (17) *[CP Which students[^k] [TP ___k seem [CP ___k [TP ___k are the best candidates for the job]]]]?

2. Conversely, why is the sentence below grammatical?

   (18) Which students does it seem are the best candidates for the job?
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