



An (only apparent) case of hyper raising in Spanish

Javier Fernández-Sánchez

Abstract

This paper deals with an apparent case of hyper raising in Spanish (*Juan parece que llegará tarde*) and concludes that no actual raising takes place: that is, the allegedly A-moved subject (*Juan*) appearing at the left edge of the raising predicate is actually in an A'-position in the left periphery of the matrix clause. The thesis defended in this paper has been challenged recently by Fernández-Salgueiro (2011), who proposes an analysis in terms of A-movement. In this paper I will argue against this view (i) by showing that it leads to empirical and conceptual inconsistencies and (ii) by providing evidence of the A'-status of the subject. I will further reject a monoclausal analysis of this construction, which considers *parecer* a modal verb (Ausín 2001, (Torrego 2002) or a grammaticalized adverb as suggested by Cross (1945) and Bolinger (1946).

Keywords: raising, movement types, Spanish, left periphery, information-structure

1 Introduction¹

In this paper I focus on the syntax of a very productive construction in Spanish which features the raising predicate *parecer* ('seem') in what appears to be a case of hyper raising (i.e. raising out of a finite embedded clause). The phenomenon, which I will refer to as Further Raising (FR hereafter), after work by Fernández-Salgueiro (2005, 2008, 2011), is illustrated in (1):²

¹This paper started as a project for one MA course while I was at University College London. I thank Klaus Abels for valuable comments and corrections. I would also like to thank Maria Lluïsa Hernanz, Ángel Gallego and two anonymous reviewers for their excellent input, as well as the audiences at the AJL 2012 in Seville and the Encuentro de Jóvenes Investigadores en Lingüística at the University of Girona, where parts of this work were presented. This research has benefited from the project FFI2011-29440-C03-01 by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and the project 2014SGR1013 by the Catalan Government. All remaining errors are mine.

²Adapted from Spanish newspaper *El País* (26/12/2014): http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2014/12/26/actualidad/1419580821_195139.html



- (1) La Policía parece que ha encontrado la mejor manera de usar las redes sociales.
the police seems that has found the best way of use the nets
socials
socials

‘The Police seem to have found the best way to use social networks.’

In (1), it looks as if the subject has raised from the embedded domain. Such an operation should be unavailable because the embedded clause contains a finite T node, in whose specifier the subject should get its case valued and become frozen for further applications of A-movement. This follows from Chomsky (2000: 131)’s Activity Condition, which states that it is unvalued features on syntactic objects that keep the latter active for computation. Once these features get valued, the syntactic objects become frozen (see also Chomsky 2001). These restrictions are clearly observed in raising constructions, as illustrated with the following English sentences:

- (2) a. [TP Angela_i seems [TP t_i to have [VP t_i reconsidered your offer]]].
- b. * [TP It seems [TP Angela_i to have [VP t_i reconsidered your offer]]].
- c. [TP It seems [CP that Angela_i has [VP t_i reconsidered your offer]]].
- d. * [TP Angela_i seems [CP that t_i has [VP t_i reconsidered your offer]]].

In (2a) the subject DP moves from its base generation position (the specifier of the VP under the Predicate Internal Subject Hypothesis, see Koopman & Sportiche 1991) to the specifier of the embedded TP. Because the T-node is non-finite, the subject cannot value its nominative case there. This case valuation failure explains the ungrammaticality of (2b) which contrasts with (2c), whose embedded clause is finite, so the case requirements of the subject can be satisfied in the specifier of the embedded TP. Besides, according to the Freezing Principle (Chomsky 2001), once these requirements are satisfied, the subject cannot keep raising, as shown in (2d), which is an example of hyper raising.

At the core of this paper lies the relationship between (1) and (2d). The thesis I am going to defend is that (1) is not a case of hyper raising in Spanish and therefore (1) and (2d), despite the apparent similarities, are derived differently, which explains the difference in grammaticality. More specifically, I will show that the subject DP *La Policía* does not raise (i.e. A-moves) from the embedded domain, but rather reaches its surface position via A'-movement. Most cases will be compatible with an analysis in terms of topicalization, but any A'-movement operation can be applied to FR, as also noted, albeit briefly, by Fernández-Leborans (1999: 2454).



A raising analysis of FR is entertained by Fernández-Salgueiro (2005, 2008, 2011), who proposes to lax the timing under which case valuation proceeds in Spanish by allowing this operation to be delayed until a later point in the derivation. Under this view, then, *La Policía* in (1) undergoes case-induced A-movement from the embedded domain to the specifier of the matrix TP via the specifier of the embedded TP. In section 2 I review his proposal and reach two main conclusions: (i) there is no evidence of A movement in FR constructions and (ii) case valuation cannot be independently delayed in Spanish. In section 3 I show that an analysis in terms of A'-movement is empirically more adequate.

Even though I am defending that no raising is at stake I will continue to refer to the phenomenon as Further Raising for expository reasons. Similarly, I will be talking about the 'further raised subject' to refer to the subject DP that appears at the left of the raising predicate in FR. Given that I defend that FR involves no raising at all, my analysis is in principle compatible with monoclausal approaches that take *parece que* as a modal verb (Ausín 2001, Torrego 2002) or as a grammaticalized adverb (Cross 1945, Bolinger 1946) akin to other forms like *dizque* (from *dice que*, 'says that') used in some varieties of Spanish spoken in South America (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2014). Section 4 argues against such analyses. Finally, section 5 concludes the main findings.

2 The raising analysis

2.1 Further raising

Fernández-Salgueiro (2005, 2008, 2011), F-S hereafter, proposes that the subject in (1) undergoes A-movement from the embedded domain to the specifier of TP in the matrix clause. Even though this movement operation should not be available given that (i) A-movement is assumed to be related to case and that (ii) the subject can get its case valued in the embedded domain, this author proposes that certain languages allow case valuation to be delayed until further stages in the derivation, thus making the Freezing Principle subject to parametric variation. Spanish, accordingly, is one such language.

For example, in (1), *La Policía* could get its unvalued nominative case feature valued in the embedded domain because it is a finite clause and finite T qualifies as a probe for nominative case valuation. However, in a system in which case valuation can be delayed, the unvalued DP can continue to raise (i.e. undergo A-movement), in principle, *ad infinitum*.³ In this particular example, case valuation takes place in the highest TP. In this system there is no risk of look-ahead: in the languages that allow case valuation delay, the subject can leave the derivation without its case valued, in which case PF will simply not pronounce it, giving

³Note that F-S's analysis necessarily involves abandoning the standard assumption that A-movement is clause-bound.

rise to null subjects. F-S hence reinterprets null subjects as a repair strategy for derivations in which nominative case in a subject DP remains unvalued.

In F-S's proposal, only case valuation is allowed to be delayed. This means, for example, that phi-feature valuation which triggers subject-object agreement cannot be delayed in Spanish. As shown in (3), a further raised plural subject cannot trigger plural agreement on the raising predicate. Instead, number features must be valued in the embedded clause, as shown by the plural morphology of the embedded verb:

- (3) Los niños parece / *parecen que han hecho los deberes.
 the kids seem.3SG seem.3PL that have done the homework
 'The kids seem to have done their homework.'

F-S argues that the raising predicate exhibits default agreement, or possibly agreement with the CP.⁴ This unavailability of phi-feature valuation delay sets FR aside from reported cases of hyper raising, an apparently similar construction found in other languages like Portuguese, Greek or Romanian, where a plural subject triggers plural agreement on the raising verb (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998, Nunes 2008, Rivero & Geber 2004):

- (4) a. Os meninos parecem que fizeram a tarefa. (Portuguese)
 the children seem.3PL that did the homework
 'The boys seem to have done their homework.'
- b. Ta pedhia dhen fenonte na doulevoun. (Greek)
 the children not seem.3PL SUBJ work
 'The children do not seem to work.'
- c. Copiii par să lucreze bine. (Romanian)
 children seem.3PL SUBJ work well
 'The children seem to work well.'

Note that in some of these languages extraction is out of a subjunctive (SUBJ) clause. For some reason having to do with syntactic defectivity, subjunctive patterns like infinitive in freely allowing raising in these languages. A characterization of this phenomenon and a comparison with FR are beyond the scope of this paper, though.

⁴See Picallo (2002) for the claim that CPs have phi-features, and Iatridou & Embick (1997) for the contrary view.

I agree with F-S that the subject in FR undergoes movement from the embedded domain to the left edge of the clause. Consider the following example given in the abstract of this paper:

- (5) Juan parece que llegará tarde.
Juan seems that will arrive
'It seems that Juan will be late.'

If *Juan* was generated in the matrix clause, we would have to postulate the existence of a null *pro* as the subject of the embedded clause (6). But then we would have to stipulate that this *pro* is special and behaves unlike other *pros*, given that as a pronoun, it should have both a bound and a free reading, as indicated in (7a). However, the free reading is completely unavailable in (6), as shown in (7b). These facts therefore show that movement must be at stake.

- (6) Juan parece que *pro* llegará tarde.
- (7) a. María_i cree que *pro*_{i/k} llegará tarde.
Maria thinks that *pro* will arrive
'María_i thinks that she_{i/k} will be late.'
- b. Juani parece que *pro*_{i/*k} llegará tarde.

Island effects provide further evidence for movement. Islands are opaque domains for extraction, so the prediction is that if we create a configuration in which the further raised DP is generated inside an island, the result should be ungrammatical. The examples in (8) corroborate this prediction. More specifically, (8a) instantiates a complex NP violation and (8b), a relative clause island. Both examples are from Fernández-Salgueiro (2011: 6).

- (8) a. *[Muchas parejas]_i parece que el hecho de que t_i se divorciaron
many couples seem that the fact of that divorced
sorprendió a todo el mundo.
surprised to all the world
'It seems that the fact that many couples got divorced surprised everyone.'
- b. *[Muchos clientes]_i parece que el cuadro que t_i compraron es muy
many clients seem that the picture that bought is very
bonito.
beautiful
'It seems that the picture that many people bought is very beautiful.'



F-S provides four arguments that, according to him, show that the subject in FR undergoes A-movement. I disagree with this claim. In the next subsection I review his arguments and I conclude that the evidence put forth by this author is not strong enough and that some of the tests used are either inaccurate or inconclusive to determine the kind of movement of the subject.

2.2 Apparent signs of A-movement

F-S provides a battery of tests that allegedly argue for an A-movement analysis of FR. The logic of the argument is the following: for a given phenomenon P, there exists an asymmetry in terms of grammaticality whether P is constructed in a syntactic configuration involving A-movement or whether, on the contrary, P shows up in a context involving A'-movement. F-S takes this asymmetry as a starting point and shows that FR, when applied to P, behaves like the A-movement examples.

2.2.1 Idiomatic readings

F-S (2011: 7) starts from the premise that whereas A-movement is able to maintain idiomatic readings (9a), A'-movement is not (9b). F-S shows that the idiomatic expression is maintained in FR contexts (10). FR thus patterns like A-movement:

- (9) a. [Mala hierba]_i nunca muere t_i.
bad grass never dies
'Bad blood never runs dry.'
- b. [Mala hierba]_i, mi padre dice que nunca muere t_i.
bad grass my dad says that never dies
'My dad says that bad grass never dies.' (no idiomatic reading)
- (10) Mala hierba parece que nunca muere.
bad grass seems that never dies
'It seems that bad blood never runs dry.' (idiomatic reading OK)

If we accept Nunberg et al. (1994)'s thesis that idioms can participate in the same set of syntactic operations as other constructions (with a more or less varying degree of flexibility, see O'Grady 1998: 288, fn.4 and Maher 2013) it is not clear why A'-movement should not maintain idiomatic readings. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary: in (11) the object of the idiom undergoes wh-movement (11a) and topicalization (11b), and crucially the idiomatic reading is maintained in both cases. Both operations involve A'-movement (Chomsky 1977, Cinque 1977):



- (11) a. [How much advantage]_i did they take t_i of the situation? (O’Grady 1998)
- b. [Those strings]_i he wouldn’t pull t_i for you. (Nunberg et al. 1994)

The problem with (9b) is not that it is unable to maintain the idiomatic expression. I believe (9b) is plainly ungrammatical. To see the reason why, consider the following example, which is structurally identical but in this case no idiomatic reading is independently available:

- (12) *Mala hierba, mi padre dice que ha crecido en el jardín.
bad grass my dad says that has grown in the garden
‘My dad says some bad grass has grown up in the garden.’

The problem with (12) – and with (9b) – stems from a general semantic constraint that precludes bare NPs from undergoing topicalization, probably for reasons having to do with their lack of anaphoricity, specificity or definiteness (von Stechow 2002, Gutiérrez-Rexach 2012). Interestingly, an anonymous reviewer points out that in Italian, the equivalent to (9b), is able to maintain the idiomatic reading:

- (13) L’erba cattiva mio nonno dice che non muore mai.
the grass bad my grandfather says that not dies never
‘My grandfather says that bad blood never runs dry.’

The subject used by the Italian version of the idiom is a definite expression and as such it can independently be topicalized, which explains the grammaticality of (13). In turn, (13) poses a problem for F-S’s claim that idiomatic expressions cannot be maintained under A’-movement, as an A-movement analysis of the subject in (13) is untenable.

Finally, Leonetti & Escandell (2009: 180) contend that there exists evidence that a large number of idioms in Spanish are actually formed by the application of A’-movement. These authors defend that the internal argument of some idioms undergoes verum focus fronting, a fronting operation which is usually associated with polarity and emphasis in Spanish (Batllori & Hernanz 2009). Just to mention a few:



- (14) a. [A la fuerza]_i ahorcan t_i.
to the force hang
‘Hanging is done by force.’
- b. [De casta]_i le viene al galgo t_i tener el rabo largo.
from cast him comes to.the greyhound to.have the tail long
‘From its cast it comes to the greyhound to have a long tail.’
- c. [Menos]_i da t_i una piedra.
Less gives a stone
‘Less would give a stone.’

2.2.2 Quantified expressions

F-S argues that non-referring nominal elements like *nada* (‘nothing’) cannot be topicalized (15a) and yet they can appear in FR contexts (15b). Given that topicalization is an A'-movement operation this author concludes that FR cannot involve A'-movement:

- (15) a. *Nada, yo creo que va a cambiar España.
nothing I think that goes to change Spain
‘Nothing is going to change the way Spain is, I think.’
- b. Nada parece que va a cambiar España.
nothing seems that goes to change Spain
‘It seems that nothing is going to change the way Spain is.’

The argument is not thorough, though: (15a) does not show that quantified expressions cannot undergo A'-movement. Rather, it only illustrates that indefinite expressions cannot be topicalized (Cinque 1977, 1990, Rizzi 1997), as already observed in the previous subsection. Note that focus fronting, a clear instance of A'-movement, allows quantifiers to be fronted, as exemplified in (16). It could be then that (15b) involved some sort of focus fronting. See section 3.3 for further elaboration on this idea.

- (16) NADA, creo yo que cambiará España.
nothing think I that change.FUT Spain
‘NOTHING, I think, will change the way Spain is.’

2.2.3 *Ad sensum* agreement

Ad sensum agreement, also known as semantic agreement, is illustrated in (17), from RAE (2009: 2573):

- (17) Un puñado de soldados intenta / intentan detenerlo.
a bunch of soldiers try.3SG try.3PL to.stop.it
'A bunch of soldiers is/are trying to stop him.'

The optionality between singular and plural agreement is a reflection of a 'competition between syntactic agreement, that is, agreement to the form, and semantic agreement, agreement according to meaning' (Corbett 2003: 113). F-S claims that A'-movement allows semantic agreement (18b). However, FR appears to trigger syntactic agreement only (18a):

- (18) a. Ese equipo parece que juega / *juegan mejor bajo presión.
this team seem that play.3SG play.3PL better under pressure
'It seems that this team plays better under pressure.'
- b. Ese equipo, yo creo que juega / juegan mejor bajo presión.
that team I think that 3SG play.3PL better under pressure
'This team, I think they play better under pressure.'

This argument was used by Suñer (2002) to argue against Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998)'s idea that preverbal subjects in Romance are dislocated by showing that dislocated phrases allow semantic agreement (as in (18b)) whereas preverbal subjects do not. These are the two examples:

- (19) a. El jurado, María nos aseguró que estaba / estaban presionados.
the jury María us assured that was were pressured
'The jury, María assured us that that they felt pressured.'
- b. El jurado estaba / *estaban presionados.
the jury was were pressured
'The jury felt pressured.'

The purpose of this section is to compare the availability of *ad sensum* agreement with respect to passivization (A-movement) and focus fronting (A'-movement). The conclusion to be drawn is that the availability of semantic agreement does not really hinge on movement type. Before addressing the data though, let me



add a caveat. Many Peninsular Spanish speakers will agree with me that (18b), if not as ungrammatical as (18a), is quite deviant. This is because (at least) this variety of Spanish rarely allows semantic agreement with simple DPs like *ese equipo* ('this team'), unlike English (in *committee*-kind of nouns).⁵ In the section on semantic agreement in the *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española* (sections 33.8 and 33.9), all the examples mentioned involve subjects with the following form:

(20) Indefinite article + (inherently quantificational) Noun + *de* ('of') + Noun

- (21) a. Un montón de fotógrafos. 'A lot of photographers.'
- b. Un sinfín de rumores. 'No end of rumours.'
- c. Una serie de explosiones. 'A series of explosions.'
- d. Un aluvión de personas. 'A barrage of people.'
- e. Una multitud de seguidores. 'A crowd of followers.'

Let me thus construct an example where semantic agreement can independently apply:

- (22) Un montón de seguidores llegó / llegaron al lugar donde
a crowd of followers arrived.3SG arrived.3PL to.the place where
actuaba Bono.
performed Bono
'A crowd of fans showed up where Bono performed.'

For this section, I checked ten speakers of Spanish to make sure of my own judgements regarding agreement types. They all agree that (22) can be used indistinctively with a singular or plural inflection on the verb. To see whether there is a difference with respect to the availability of semantic agreement that has to do with movement types I constructed the following two sentences: (23) is a case of passivization (hence A-movement) and (24) involves focus fronting, a quantificational A'-movement operation.

Following F-S, one would expect passive voice to disallow semantic agreement (i.e. plural agreement). Contrary to this prediction, 8 of the 10 speakers, including myself, actually prefer the semantic agreement:

⁵There are many factors that may help 'tolerate' *ad sensum* agreement. For example, semantic agreement with committee-kind of nouns may be allowed in Spanish if the noun is considerably separated from the verb with which it agrees, as Ángel Gallego has pointed out to me in p.c., or if a strong prosodic boundary separates the noun from the agreeing verb.

- (23) Un montón de seguidores fue visto / fueron vistos por los periodistas
 a crowd of followers was seen were seen by the journalists
 cerca del lugar donde actuaba Bono.
 near of.the place where performed Bono
 ‘A crowd of fans were seen close to the place where Bono performed.’

Conversely, F-S claims A'-movement allows both semantic and syntactic agreement. (24), an example involving focus movement, illustrates that his claim is true, although I found a slight preference (6 out of 10 speakers) for syntactic (i.e. singular) agreement in this case. Glosses are not provided as (24) is identical to (22), modulo the information structural properties of the subject, here interpreted as corrective focus.

- (24) UN MONTÓN DE SEGUIDORES, llegó/llegaron al lugar donde actuaba Bono.

Both semantic and syntactic agreement were allowed in both A and A'-movement configurations, although semantic (i.e. plural) agreement was clearly favoured in A-movement. When we test how FR behaves in this respect, the speakers consulted showed no preference:

- (25) Un montón de seguidores parece que llegó / llegaron al lugar
 a crowd of followers seems that arrived.3SG arrived.3PL to the
 donde actuaba Bono.
 place where performed
 ‘It seems that a crowd of fans showed up where Bono performed.’

Given the judgements plotted in this subsection, the claim that semantic agreement only arises with A'-movement is not justified. In fact, A-movement showed a clear preference for semantic agreement (23). Therefore, the availability of semantic agreement cannot be used as a diagnostic for movement types.

2.2.4 Scope freezing effects

Finally, F-S uses data from scope freezing effects to argue for the A-status of the movement chain headed by the subject in FR. To see how the argument goes, observe the following example, which is scopally ambiguous:

- (26) Algún problema afecta siempre a toda pareja.
 some problem affects always to every couple
 ‘Some problem always affects every couple.’ (∀ > ∃; ∃ > ∀)

As standardly assumed, the reading in which the universal quantifier takes wide scope obtains via quantifier raising (QR). F-S (2011: 8) claims that if the existential quantifier undergoes further raising, the scopal ambiguity is maintained:

- (27) Algún problema parece que afecta siempre a toda pareja.
 some problem seems that affects always to every couple
 ‘Some problem always affects every couple.’ $(\forall > \exists; \exists > \forall)$

In order to account for the interpretation in which the universal scopes over the existential, we must assume that the former must have QRed across one clausal node. Given that QR is generally believed to operate very locally, the alternative explanation must be that this reading is obtained if the existential quantifier reconstructs in its base generation position in the embedded clause. In this position, it can be under the scope of the universal after the latter undergoes QR:

- (28) Parece [_{CP} que [_{TP} a toda pareja [_{TP} algún problema afecta a toda pareja]]].

However, F-S notes that quantified phrases undergoing A'-movement exhibit scope freezing effects, as shown in Barss (1986). This predicts that in (27) only the surface reading (i.e. $\exists > \forall$) should be available, contrary to fact. Therefore, the fact that FR does not show such effects can be taken as a proof that FR cannot involve A'-movement.

The argument is of course dependent on the claim that QR is clause-bound. However, this has been challenged (see, among others, Lasnik & Uriagereka 1988 and Bošković 2008). For example, as stated in Bošković (2008: 251), many speakers allow the wide scope of the universal quantifier in the following sentence, which constitutes a counterexample to the clause-bound property of QR:

- (29) Someone thinks that Mary solved every problem. $(\forall > \exists; \exists > \forall)$

Uribe-Etxebarria (1992) also challenges the idea that QR is a clause-bound operation. She provides the following example:

- (30) Qué dices que ha comprado todo dios?
 what say that has bought all god
 ‘What do you say that everyone has bought?’

This example has a reading in which the existential scopes over the wh-operator. Uribe-Etxebarria argues that this interpretation obtains via QR of the NP *todo dios* (literally, ‘all god’, meaning ‘everyone’) into the matrix clause from



the embedded domain. More research needs to be carried out in this particular domain, but the existence of unbound QR makes F-S's argument inconclusive.

In this section I have shown so far that the diagnostic tests used by F-S to determine the A-movement status of the further-raised subject are weak or inconclusive. In the remaining of this section I argue that his technical implementation of case valuation delay does not actually work as it leads to empirical and conceptual inadequacies.

2.3 Nominative case valuation cannot be delayed

2.3.1 Improper movement

The first problem with allowing the grammar to delay the valuation of nominative case is that there is no way to prevent improper movement. Consider the following example:

- (31) *Ángela parece que ha reconsiderado tu oferta.*
Ángela seems that has reconsidered your offer
 'Angela seems to have reconsidered your offer.'

In the embedded domain, the subject moves from its thematic position in the specifier of the VP to the specifier of TP so as to check its unvalued case feature (the position of the participle is irrelevant for our purposes):

- (32) [TP [DP *Ángela*]_i [T' [T° *ha*] [VP t_i [V' [V° *reconsiderado*] [DP *tu oferta*]]]]].

Let us assume that case valuation can be delayed⁶ and therefore *Ángela* has to continue moving so as to get its unvalued case feature checked. But in order to be visible for further computation, it needs to escape the CP phase by moving to its edge:

- (33) [CP [DP *Ángela*]_i [C' [C° *que*] [TP t_i [T' [T° *ha*] [VP *reconsiderado tu oferta*]]]]].

Once the matrix verb merges and moves to T (as required by the syntax of Spanish), the specifier of the matrix TP constitutes the next place where the subject can get its case checked. But at this point improper movement will take place, as the subject DP is moving from an A'-position into the specifier of T, a case-assigning position, i.e. an A-position.

⁶Note that the problem arises of how to formalize this optionality. Delaying the application of a syntactic operation is clearly less economic than applying valuation as soon as possible. In the spirit of the Minimalist Program, this is certainly undesirable. I leave this argument aside.

2.3.2 Null subjects all the way down

F-S works on the original idea that null subjects are a corollary of his system. In particular, case valuation in his proposal does not need to look ahead. Subjects may indeed end up caseless. In these cases, PF will not pronounce the DP. As I pointed out before, null subjects thus become a repair strategy. The crucial point is that case valuation is unrestricted, in the sense that subjects do not need to look ahead to know whether they must value their case or whether they can keep moving caseless. But this predicts that null subjects should occur anywhere. Brucart (2004: 169) mentions this one case where the subject cannot be null:

- (34) Tengo más libros de los que tienes *(tú).
 have more books of the than have you

‘I have more books than you have.’

Brucart is building on the hypothesis that deletion targets uninterpretable features given that they can be more easily recoverable. Person features are interpretable on pronouns and uninterpretable on verbs, (34) being an illustration of this state of affairs. Note, however, that in order to avoid a null subject in (34) we must somehow force the subject to value its case in the embedded domain.

An anonymous reviewer points out that the presence of *tú* in (34) is compulsory because it is contrastively interpreted. I completely agree with the reviewer that this is a case of contrastivity and that in this situation the pronoun is not recoverable. What F-S is defending is that case can be delayed without the need to look ahead because there exists the chance that the subject never gets its case valued, in which case it will be not pronounced. My argument here is that if null subjects are the byproduct of case delay it is difficult to account for the compulsory presence of the subject in (34), as crucially other factors must come into play when dealing with null subjects. Unless the Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky 1995: 225) is violated, I do not see any obvious way of accounting for (34) under F-S’s proposal.

In this section I have shown how the raising analysis of FR is inadequate. Such a proposal hinges on two ideas: (i) movement of the subject in FR is a case of A-movement and (ii) nominative case may not be valued in a T node fully specified for tense and agreement. First, I have argued against the idea that FR involves A-movement by going through his four arguments and rendering them inconclusive. Second, I have pointed out that delaying the valuation of nominative case has undesirable effects. Hence, I think it is safe to reject the raising analysis. For the sake of simplicity I will continue to talk about FR even though there is no actual raising involved.

3 The A'-movement analysis

In this section I explicitly defend that FR involves a regular case of A'-movement. Note that, immediately, we account for the fact that phrases other than subjects can appear to the left of the matrix predicate without having to stipulate that we are dealing with different syntactic structures:

- (35) a. [_{Adjunct} En este departamento] parece que no trabaja nadie cuerdo.
 in this department seems that not works nobody sane
 'It seems that nobody is sane in this department.'
- b. [_{DO} Las normas] parece que su primo se las pasa por el forro.
 the rules seems that his cousin SE them passes by the lining
 'It seems that his cousin does not care about the rules.'
- c. [_{IO} A mi madre] parece que le ha regalado mi tía un ramo.
 to my cousin seems that her has given my aunt a bucket
 'It seems my aunt has given my mum a bucket of flowers.'

It is obvious that the examples above involve some sort of left peripheral/discourse fronting. For example, (35b) is a case of clitic left dislocation, as the object is resumed by an accusative clitic in the embedded domain. The same holds for (35c), where the fronted indirect object is resumed in the embedded clause by a dative clitic *le*. Other types of peripheral fronting like focus fronting are incompatible with resumption, at least in Spanish. The lack of a resumptive clitic in (35a) should not be a problem for the left dislocation analysis: this is because Spanish lacks locative clitics independently. Crucially note that the equivalent example in Catalan, a language that has locative clitics, must have it:

- (36) En aquest department sembla que no *(hi) treballa ningú entenimentat.
 in this department seems that not LOC works nobody sane
 'It seems that everyone in this department is a fool.'

It seems reasonable to regard what F-S calls Further Raising (raising of a subject out of an embedded, finite T) as a regular type of A'-movement to the left periphery of the matrix clause. The first thing I am going to do is to show that FR is indeed A'-movement. The discussion in this paper assumes a two-way distinction between movement types (Postal 1971), something which has been disputed in the literature (Weibelhuth 1989, Mahajan 1990, Abels 2009, 2015), but I will adopt Postal's distinction throughout this paper.

Following Leonetti & Escandell (2009) I assume there are three types of A'-movement operations in Spanish: left dislocation⁷, focus fronting and verum focus fronting. Even though I have shown that (35) and (36) are cases of left dislocation, FR is compatible with any of the A'-fronting operations. The specific theoretical apparatus we need to account for each of these operations is completely orthogonal for the purposes of this paper. That is, my findings have no bearing on what triggers dislocation or focalization. I only assume that these are triggered by formal features which front elements carrying them and places them in the specifier of a functional projection *à la* Rizzi (1997).

3.1 Raising over an experiencer

In general terms, raising of a subject over an experiencer yields an ungrammatical configuration in most languages in the world. English is a well-known counterexample⁸ (Kitahara 1997, Boeckx 1999, Collins 2005):

- (37) a. Juan_i parece t_i comer bastante.
 Juan seems to.eat quite
 'Juan seems to eat quite a lot.'
- b. *Juan_i me parece t_i comer bastante.
 Juan to.me seems to.eat quite
 'Juan seems to me to eat quite a lot.'

A subject can be further raised over an experiencer (38). This example directly militates against an A-movement analysis of FR: if FR was indeed A-movement, we would expect (38) to pattern with (37b), contrary to fact:

⁷This issue is somewhat controversial for left dislocated constituents. On the one hand, left dislocation does not exhibit all the properties of prototypical A'-moved constituents. For example, they are unable to license parasitic gaps and they do not give rise to WCO effects, which has been taken as evidence for a non-movement account of topics (Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1995). On the other hand, left dislocation is sensitive to islands and shows reconstruction effects, which is hard to reconcile in a non-movement approach, as argued by many (Villalba 2000, López 2009). This paradoxical behaviour of left dislocated phrases has been termed Cinque's Paradox by Iatridou (1995); see Ott (2016) for discussion and a very interesting proposal that attempts at reconciling the Janus-faced nature of topics. I will assume without further discussion that left dislocation involves movement (see López 2009, Rubio 2014, a.o.).

⁸Some counterexamples are found in Spanish. See Pujalte & Saab (2011), who claim that there are two different types of experiencers, those selected by the verbal root and those introduced by an applicative head. According to these authors, only the latter show intervention effects.

- (38) Juan me parece que es inteligente.
Juan to.me seems that is intelligent
'Juan seems to me to be intelligent.'

In Spanish, as well as in other Romance languages, there is a double experiencer configuration in which the experiencer materializes twice: as a DP introduced by *a* ('to') and as a verbal clitic. Raising over double experiencer configurations is as ungrammatical as raising over single verbal clitic experiencers (39a). However, FR is grammatical in these contexts (39b). Again, this is unexpected under an A-movement analysis of FR, which predicts (39b) to be as ungrammatical as (39a):

- (39) a. *Juan_i me parece a mí t_i llegar tarde.
Juan to.me seems to me to.arrive late
'Juan seems to me to arrive late.'
- b. Juan me parece a mí que llegará tarde.
Juan to.me seems to me that arrive.FUT late
'It seems to me that Juan will arrive late.'

An A'-movement analysis, however, can capture the facts easily. As illustrated in (40), left dislocated constituents can easily move over raising verbs with experiencers. The left dislocated status of the fronted DP is confirmed by the presence of a resumptive accusative clitic *las*:

- (40) Las alcachofas estas me parece (a mí) que las han sacado de la
the artichokes these to.me seems to me that them have taken.out of the
basura.
rubbish
'It seems to me that they got these artichokes out of the rubbish bin.'

3.2 Reconstruction and Principle C effects

It is well-known in the literature that A-movement reconstructs whereas A'-movement doesn't (Fox 1999, Sportiche 2006, Takahashi & Husley 2009). Observe the following two examples:

- (41) a. [The claim that John_i was asleep]_m seems to him_i t_m to be correct.
b. [Every argument that John_i is a genius]_m seems to him_i t_m to be flawless.

In these examples the complex NP subjects are generated in the non-finite, embedded domain. In that position nominative case cannot be valued, so they must raise to the specifier of the matrix T via regular raising. However, under such a derivation, coreference between *John* and *him* should be banned, contrary to what (41) shows. This is because in the base generation position, the referential expression *John* is c-commanded by the pronoun *him*, which should yield a Principle C violation. That the experiencer c-commands the embedded clause is evidenced by the following example:

(42) It seems to $him_{i/k}$ that $John_i$ is happy.

The lack of Principle C violations in (41) cannot be due to the so-called Lebeaux effects (Lebeaux 1988). This author found that nominal adjuncts (like relative clauses) can be inserted in the derivation countercyclically and be generated in surface position. But this cannot be extended to nominal complements (complex NPs), see Miyagawa (2010) for recent discussion. Crucially, the examples in (41) all feature nominal complements.

To solve this problem, several authors have defended that A movement does not generally reconstruct (Lasnik 2003, Sportiche 2006). However, A'-movement is fundamentally different in that it always reconstructs, as illustrated in the following example (by Fox 1999). Reconstruction explains the impossible coreference between *John* and *he*:

(43) [Which argument that $John_i$ is a genius] $_m$ did $he_{i/k}$ believe t_m ?

This asymmetry provides us with some testing ground for FR. (44a) shows that the experiencer c-commands the embedded CP, as evidenced by the impossibility of coreference between *Juan* and *él* ('he')⁹ (44b) shows that when the subject is further raised, coreference continues to be impossible because of reconstruction, which is expected under an A'-movement analysis.

- (44) a. *Le parece a $él_i$ que $Juan_i$ es inteligente.
to.him seems to he that Juan is intelligent
'It seems to him that John is intelligent.'
- b. * $Juan_i$ le parece a $él_i$ que es inteligente.
gloss
'trans'

⁹See Ausín (2001: 50–53) for extensive evidence that the experiencer c-commands the embedded domain in Spanish raising configurations.

In order to test Principle C in the examples above I have made use of examples containing raising predicates with experiencers. In the previous section I showed that such cases must be analyzed as A'-movement independently, given that run-of-the-mill instances of raising cannot take place when the raising predicate selects for an experiencer in Spanish. Principle C effects can be however tested in configurations where no experiencer is required. Consider (45):

- (45) [El bulo de que Carmen_i está saliendo con Jaime]_m parece que *pro*_{i/k}
the lie of that Carmen is going.out with Jaime seems that
os comentó que t_m había causado furor en el pueblo.
you told that had causes rage in the town

(int.) 'It seems that Carmen told you that the rumour about her going out with Jaime was all the rage in town.'

In its base generation position (t), the complex NP containing the R-expression is c-commanded by a null *pro*. If this complex subject undergoes reconstruction after further raising, an A'-movement analysis predicts coreference between *Carmen* and *pro* to be impossible. This prediction is borne out, which provides more solid evidence for the A'-movement of FR defended in this paper.

3.3 Back to non-referring nominals

Some of the arguments adduced by F-S to defend an A-movement of further raising stem from the empirically wrong assumption that A'-chains behave uniformly. In general terms, there is a distinction between operator-variable chains like focus-movement or wh-movement on the one hand and topicalization/clitic left dislocation on the other. Both are generally assumed to be types of A'-movement on the standard assumption that A-movement is only case-induced¹⁰, but the two behave differently with respect to certain properties (see discussion in footnote 7).

Relevant for the purposes of the discussion are the data on non-referring nominals, which F-S claims to be precluded in FR contexts. Observe the contrast in (15), reproduced below:

- (46) a. *Nada, yo creo que va a cambiar España.
nothing I think that goes to change Spain
'Nothing is going to change the way Spain is, I think.'

¹⁰But see Zubizarreta (1998) and Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa (2014) for the claim that clitic left dislocation involves an A-chain.



- b. Nada parece que va a cambiar España.
nothing seems that goes to change Spain

‘It seems that nothing is going to change the way Spain is.’

As I claimed before, the asymmetry between (46a) and (46b) is not a reflex of the properties of A vs. A'-movement. (46a) is ungrammatical because left dislocation imposes semantic restrictions on certain QPs (Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997, von Stechow 2002), indefinites not being good topics. But once we assume that topic chains are different from operator-variable chains even though both are instances of A'-movement, the contrast in (46) does not follow necessarily from the distinction between A and A'-movement. So where does the difference in grammaticality come from?

First, the two sentences are different prosodically. F-S uses a comma in (46a), which corresponds to the typical prosody of topic-comment structures (see Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007 for more elaboration on this). The pause is absent in (46b). Second, in (46a) the fronted word is not adjacent to the matrix verb, whereas in (46b) it is. I claim that (46b) instantiates a case of verum focus fronting. An analysis in these terms cannot be extended to (46a), which can only be interpreted as a topic, hence its ungrammaticality.

Verum focus fronting, also referred to as mild or weak focalization (Batllori & Hernanz 2009, Leonetti & Escandell 2009, Gallego 2010) is syntactically identical to focus fronting (Zubizarreta 1998, Szendrői 2004) for example in requiring strict adjacency between the verb and the focused constituent although it differs with it along two dimensions. Semantically, it is not interpreted as contrastive but rather it expresses some kind of ‘emphasis’, as proposed by Zubizarreta. Prosodically, weak fronted elements never get emphatic stress and are never separated from the clause by a pause. This had led some authors working in the cartographic approach to argue for a special projection hosting these elements (Benincà & Poletto 2004, Batllori & Hernanz 2009). Another crucial property of verum focus fronting is that it targets quantificational elements.

Example (46b) can straightforwardly receive a verum focus analysis, but (46a) cannot: first, the comma indicates the presence of a prosodic break which verum focus constructions lack altogether. Second, nada is a quantificational element, thus being a potential target for verum focus fronting. These elements, on the other hand, do not make very good topics. Third, the subject in the matrix clause breaks the adjacency requirement between the matrix verb and the fronted element in (46a), which is a typical property of topics, but not of focus fronted constituents.¹¹ Crucially, if (46a) is modified by removing the comma and placing the verb adjacent to the fronted phrase the example becomes grammatical (47). The

¹¹There is some dialectal variation with respect to the adjacency requirement between fronted

reason why (47) is grammatical is that it can immediately receive an analysis in terms of verum focus fronting:

- (47) Nada creo yo que vaya a cambiar España.
 nothing think I that goes to change Spain
 ‘I think nothing is going to change the way Spain is.’

Gallego (2010) notes that verum focus fronting is highly restricted in Catalan. This explains the following contrast between Catalan (48a) and Spanish (48b). The raising analysis of FR, on the contrary, does not predict any grammaticality distinction between these two languages:

- (48) a. ??Pocs aprovats sembla que ha tingut la Mònica aquest semestre.
 few passes seems that has had the Mònica this semester
 ‘It seems that Mònica has had few passes this semester.’
 b. Pocos aprobados parece que ha tenido Mónica este semestre.
 gloss
 ‘trans’

Note that I am not saying that FR is a case of verum focus fronting. The main claim I have been defending in this paper is that FR does not exhibit properties of A-movement, but rather, it instantiates a run-of-the-mill case of A'-movement. Thus far I have been showing cases where FR was compatible with an analysis in terms of clitic left dislocation, as illustrated more explicitly in the examples (35) through (36). In this subsection I am examining a set of cases which the left dislocation approach cannot deal with, given that the further raised constituents in these examples are quantificational elements – which are independently unavailable in topicalization structures – and which trigger obligatory adjacency with the matrix verb, contrary to topicalization.

Focus fronting cannot be at stake, either. This is because this operation, at least in Spanish and Catalan, triggers a contrastive or corrective interpretation (see Jiménez-Fernández 2015 for a case of dialectal variation in Spanish), which is not present in the examples provided in this section. I have argued that the data

foci and verbs in Spanish. Andalusian is probably one variety where adjacency is not necessary (see Jiménez-Fernández 2013). For the varieties in which adjacency holds, like mine, this condition can be seen as some sort of V2 requirement exhibited by some Germanic languages. Crucially, as noted by Ott (2016) and references therein, left dislocated constituents in German do not trigger V2. Left dislocation shows some parallel behaviour between some varieties of Spanish and German.

presented in this section is perfectly compatible with a verum focus fronting analysis. Not only is this empirically adequate, it also accounts for why further raised quantificational elements sound deviant in Catalan but not in Spanish, which follows from the fact that verum focus fronting is way more restricted in Catalan than in Spanish, as Gallego (2010) has argued. Of course concluding that further raising involves A'-movement automatically makes it compatible with topicalization, focus fronting or verum focus fronting. There exists yet a third type of analysis that needs to be rejected. This is the purpose of the following section.

4 A monoclausal analysis

In the discussion of the data and analysis so far I have been assuming that the phenomenon of FR involves a biclausal structure, where *parecer* selects for a finite clause complement. However, Torrego (2002: 259) has argued that this use of *parecer* is best analyzed monoclausally, where the apparently raising predicate is actually a modal verb (see Ausín 2001 and Gallego 2009: 181 for similar ideas). These authors examine cases of *parecer* followed by a finite clause but crucially in their examples the subject of the embedded clause does not front to the left of the raising predicate or, to be consistent with the terminology used in this paper, they consider cases where the subject does not further raise:

- (49) Parece que Juan cocina.
 seems that Juan cooks
 'It seems that Juan cooks.' (from Gallego 2009: 182)

Under this view, fronting of the subject cannot be a case of raising, as *parecer* is not considered a raising predicate. Thus, these analyses are compatible with my claim that the further raised subject undergoes A'-movement to the left periphery of the clause. However, in the remaining of this paper I would like to argue that a proposal along those lines raise some issues.

First, the modal analysis fails to explain why modal or aspectual verbs cannot select for a finite clause but *parecer* can:

- (50) a. Juan {debe / acaba de} saber la verdad.
 Juan must finishes of to.know the
 'Juan has just discovered the truth.'
- b. *Juan {debe / acaba de} que sabe la verdad.
 Juan must finishes of that knows the truth.
 (intended) 'Juan has just discovered the truth.'



- (51) a. Juan parece saber la verdad.
Juan seems to.know the truth
‘Juan seems to know the truth.’
- b. Juan parece que sabe la verdad.
Juan seems that knows the truth
‘It seems that Juan knows the truth.’

Second, the possibility of selecting for an experiencer (52) is also at odds with the modal analysis, as modal verbs do not assign theta roles. Even Ausín (2001: ch.3) who analyzes certain types of *parecer* as a modal verb, refuses to extend this approach to cases in which this verb selects for an experiencer.

Third, as defended by Fernández-Leborans (1999: 2448), the clausal complement of *parecer* can be pronominalized by proforms *eso* (‘this’) and *lo* (‘it’), as shown in (52). Any of these options is available for modal or aspectual verbs:

- (52) a. Parece que Juan sabe la noticia.
seems that Juan knows the news
‘It seems that Juan knows the news.’
- b. Sí, {eso / lo} parece.
yes this it seems
‘Yes, it seems so.’

- (53) a. Juan {debe / acaba de} saber la noticia.
Juan must finishes of to.know the news
‘Juan has just received the news.’
- b. Sí, {eso / lo} debe / acaba de.
Yes this it must finish of
(intended) ‘Yes, he certainly must have.’

An modal analysis of *parecer* in our cases at stake is not supported by the facts reviewed above. An alternative monoclausal approach is considered by Cross (1945) and Bolinger (1946). The latter author, using a suggestion from the former, argues that *parece que* should be analyzed as a grammaticalized adverb which expresses some sort of modality. The fact that the raising predicate never inflects for person would follow smoothly from such an analysis. Further, the presence of the

complementizer would not be a problematic aspect: as noted by Hernanz & Rigau (2006: 9), there exists ‘a strong correlation between marked modality and the complementizer *que*’ (see also Etxepare 1997 and Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2014) which can be observed in the following sentences:

- (54) a. Evidentemente *que* María se enfadó con Jaime.
obviously that María got.angry with Jaime
‘Of course María got angry with Jaime.’
- b. Por supuesto *que* Juan hará lo *que* le pidas.
of course that Juan will.do the what him ask
‘Of course Juan will do whatever you ask him to do.’

Given the fact that *parece que* sequences admit a paraphrase with ‘everything seems to hint at the possibility that X’ or ‘it is highly probable given the evidence that we have that X’ (X being the proposition selected by the verb) it seems rather plausible to argue that this grammaticalized form should be marking epistemic modality. One could posit a formalization for such an idea which would place *parece* in the specifier of an epistemic phrase (for arguments that adverbs are in specifier position see Alexiadou 1997 and Cinque 1999). *Que* would be the realization of the head of that projection.

Similar grammaticalization patterns have been proposed in the literature. One such case is the evidential marker in some South American varieties of Spanish *dizque* (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2014, and references therein). In particular, these two authors claim that this particle has grammaticalized from a structure consisting of the verb *dicen* ‘(they) say’ selecting the finite complementizer *que* ‘that’ to become an epistemic modal particle. In this case, the main verb *dicen* has undergone a process of semantic bleaching, the same one that could be argued for the case of *parece* in *parece que*.

I would also like to argue against such a proposal. First, even though adverbials may have time semantics (for example ‘once’ vs. ‘then’), they never inflect for tense. *Parece que* does exhibit tense morphology:

- (55) a. Después del terrible accidente, Juan parecía *que* nunca más iba
after of.the terrible accident Juan seemed that never more went
a andar.
to walk
‘After the terrible accident, it seemed Juan would not be able to walk anymore.’



- b. Si no le dices de comportarse, Clara parecerá que nunca ha estado
if not her say of behave Clara will.seem that never has been
en un sitio fino.
in a place posh

'If you don't tell Clara to behave it'll seem she's never been to a posh place.'

This is easily explained if we adopt the traditional biclausal analysis of *parece* as a verb which selects a finite clause introduced by an overt complementizer *que* and completely unexpected under the monoclausal view that *parece que* is an adverbial, grammaticalized form. In this respect, let me point out the behavior of a clearly grammaticalized modal made up of the third person singular of the verb *puede* ('(s/he) can'), and the complementizer *que* (Rodríguez-Espiñeira & López Meirama 2008), which means something like 'might' (56a). The subject of the embedded finite clause can also precede *puede que*, as with the raising predicate (56b):

- (56) a. **Puede que** Tyrion Lannister traicione a su hermana.
can that Tyrion Lannister betrays to his sister

'Tyrion Lannister might betray his sister.'
- b. Tyrion Lannister **puede que** traicione a su hermana.

In the case of *puede que*, trying to change the tense morphology on *puede* from present to, for example, past, yields a clear ungrammaticality:

- (57) *Podía que Tyrion Lannister traicione a su hermana.

Finally, *parece que* sequences allow wh-movement from the embedded clause to the left edge of the raising predicate, which is a natural consequence of the analysis I have been defending in this paper. This sets this construction aside from adverbials like *evidentemente que*, which do not allow wh-movement out to the left of the adverb:

- (58) a. Quién_i te parece que llegará tarde t_i?
who you seems that will.arrive late

'Who does it seem to you will arrive late?'
- b. *Quién_i evidentemente que llegará tarde t_i?

From what has been observed in this section, we can safely conclude that *parece que* is thus the combination of the verb plus an overt complementizer selecting a finite clause.

5 Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to discuss the syntactic properties of an apparent case of (special) hyper raising observed in Spanish which, following Fernández-Salgueiro (2005) and subsequent work, I have been referring to Further Raising (FR):

- (59) La Policía parece que ha encontrado la mejor manera de usar las redes
 the police seems that has found the best way of use the nets
 sociales.
 socials

‘The Police seems to have found the best way to use social networks.’

For this author, *La Policía* undergoes raising, i.e. A-movement, from the finite, embedded clause. In this paper I hope to have shown two main points with respect to this analysis: (i) that the A-movement properties that F-S discusses are actually rather inconclusive and (ii) that the technical apparatus that this approach requires is both conceptually and empirically inconsistent. Alternatively, I have argued that FR is no raising at all: in other words, I have shown that the apparent raised subject is actually a fronted constituent that sits in the left periphery of the matrix clauses which reaches its surface position via an application of A'-movement. In particular, I have defended that my analysis is compatible with various fronting operations that involve A'-movement in Spanish (Leonetti & Escandell 2009).

My claim is therefore that FR does not involve raising. This makes my analysis compatible, at first blush, with monoclausal views of *parece que*, which assume that the apparent raising predicate is actually a modal verb (Ausín 2001, Torrego 2002) or a grammaticalized adverb (Cross 1945, Bolinger 1946). Even though one can still maintain this view and claim that further raising is an A'-movement operation that fronts a constituent to the left of the modal verb/adverb, I have argued instead that such an approach also raises a number of issues that otherwise follow naturally from the biclausal view, where *parecer* is a predicate that selects an embedded clause.

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2009. Some implications of improper movement for cartography. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (ed.), *Alternatives to cartography*, 325–359. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Abels, Klaus. 2015. Word order. In Tibor Kiss & Artemis Alexiadou (eds.), *Syntax: Theory and practice*, 1400–1445. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.



- Alexiadou, Artemis. 1997. *Adverb placement: a case study in antisymmetric syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: word order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(3), 491–539.
- Ausín, Adolfo. 2001. *On A-movement*: University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Barss, Andrew. 1986. *Chains and anaphoric dependence: on reconstruction and its implications*: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Batllo, Montserrat & M. Lluïsa Hernanz. 2009. Foco oracional y polaridad: en torno a una asimetría entre el español y el catalán. In Emilio Montero Cartelle (ed.), *Actas del VIII congreso internacional de historia de la lengua española, 2621–2636*.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In David Adger, Cécile de Cat & George Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries*, 52–75. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 1999. Conflicting c-command requirements. *Studia Linguistica* 53(3), 227–250.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. 1946. Spanish parece que again. *Language* 22(4), 359–360.
- Bošković, Željko. 2008. On the operator freezing effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26(2), 249–287.
- Brucart, José M. 2004. Entre el borrado y la reconstrucción: nuevos enfoques en el tratamiento gramatical de la elipsis. *Linguística teòrica: anàlisi i perspectives* 1, 159–189.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On wh-movement. In Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow & Adrian Akmajian (eds.), *Formal syntax*, 71–133. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.



Cinque, Guglielmo. 1977. The movement nature of left dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(2), 397–412.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: a crosslinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to raising in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(2), 289–298.

Corbett, Greville. 2003. The role of agreement in natural language. In W.E. Griffin (ed.), *Proceedings of the Texas Linguistic Forum* 53, 109–122.

Cross, Ephraim. 1945. Spanish parece que. *Language* 21(4), 265–267.

Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2014. Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. In Andreas Dufter & Álvaro O. de Toledo (eds.), *Left sentence peripheries in Spanish: diachronic, variationist and typological perspectives*, 217–251. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Etxepare, Ricardo. 1997. *The grammatical representation of speech events*: University of Maryland dissertation.

Fernández-Leborans, M. Jesús. 1999. Las oraciones copulativas. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, 2357–2460. Madrid: Espasa.

Fernández-Salgueiro, Gerardo. 2005. Agree, the EPP-F and further raising in Spanish. In Randall Gess & Edward J. Rubin (eds.), *Theoretical and experimental approaches to Romance linguistics*, 97–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fernández-Salgueiro, Gerardo. 2008. The case-F valuation parameter in Romance. In Theresa Biberauer (ed.), *The limits of syntactic variation*, 295–310. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fernández-Salgueiro, Gerardo. 2011. Romance null subjects at the sensory-motor interface. *Syntax* 14(1), 1–28.

Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, binding theory, and the interpretation of chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(2), 157–196.

Frascarelli, Mara & Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In Susan Winkler & Kristin Schwabe (eds.), *On information structure, meaning and form*, 87–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.



- Gallego, Ángel J. 2009. Defective C-T in Romance. *Probus* 21(2), 163–216.
- Gallego, Ángel J. 2010. *Phase theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier. 2012. Quantification. In José Ignacio Hualde & Antxon Olarrea (eds.), *Handbook of Hispanic linguistics*, 307–332. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa & Gemma Rigau. 2006. Variación dialectal y periferia izquierda. Unpublished ms., Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- von Stechow, Klaus. 2002. Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19(3), 245–274.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1995. Clitics and island effects. *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 11–30.
- Iatridou, Sabine & David Embick. 1997. Apropos pro. *Language* 73(1), 58–78.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. 2013. Microvariation at the IS-syntax interface: the case of focus fronting. Paper presented at the International Workshop on the Syntactic Variation of Spanish and Catalan Dialects, Barcelona.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. 2015. When focus goes wild: an empirical study of two syntactic positions for information focus. *Linguistics beyond and within* 1, 119–133.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. & Shigeru Miyagawa. 2014. A feature inheritance approach to root phenomena and syntactic variation. *Lingua* 145, 276–302.
- Kitahara, Hisatsugu. 1997. *Elementary operations and optimal derivations* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1991. The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85(3), 211–258.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2003. *Minimalist investigations in linguistic theory*. London: Routledge.
- Lasnik, Howard & Juan Uriagereka. 1988. *A course in GB syntax: lectures on binding and empty categories*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lebeaux, David. 1988. *Language acquisition and the form of grammar*: University of Massachusetts, Amherst dissertation.

- Leonetti, Manuel & Victoria Escandell. 2009. Fronting and verum focus in Spanish. In Andreas Dufter & Daniel Jacob (eds.), *Focus and background in Romance languages*, 155–204. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- López, Luis. 2009. *A derivational syntax for information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1990. *A/A'-distinction and movement theory*: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Maher, Zachary. 2013. *Opening a can of worms: idiom flexibility, decomposability and the mental lexicon*. Yale University MA thesis.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why agree? why move?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan Sag & Thomas Wasow. 1994. Idioms. *Language* 70(3), 491–538.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2008. Inherent case as a licensing condition for A-movement: the case of hyper raising constructions in Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 7(2), 83–108.
- O'Grady, William. 1998. The syntax of idioms. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(2), 279–312.
- Ott, Dennis. 2016. Connectivity in left-dislocation and the composition of the left periphery. *Linguistic Variation* 15(2), 225–290.
- Picallo, Carme. 2002. Abstract agreement and clausal arguments. *Syntax* 5(2), 116–147.
- Postal, Paul. 1971. *Cross-over phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Pujalte, Mercedes & Andrés Saab. 2011. Dativos agregados y movimiento A: un argumento en favor de la teoría de control por movimiento. In *Cuadernos de ALFAL* 3, 200–215.
- Real Academia Española & Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa.
- Rivero, Maria L. & Dana Geber. 2004. Raising in Romanian: move and agree. Unpublished ms., University of Ottawa.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.



- Rodríguez-Espiñeira, Maria J. & Belén López Meirama. 2008. On the grammaticalization of the Spanish expression *puede que*. In Elena Seoane & Maria J. López-Couso (eds.), *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*, 293–314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rubio, Carlos. 2014. *Syntactic constraints on topicalization phenomena*: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona dissertation.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2006. Reconstruction, binding and scope. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. 4, 35–94. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Suñer, Margarita. 2002. The lexical preverbal subject in a Romance null subject language: Where art thou? In Rafael Núñez-Cedeño, Luis López & Richard Cameron (eds.), *A Romance perspective on language knowledge and use*, 341–360. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Szendrői, Kriszta. 2004. Focus and the interaction between syntax and pragmatics. *Lingua* 114(3), 229–254.
- Takahashi, Shiochi & Sarah Husley. 2009. Wholesale late merger: beyond the A/A'-distinction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(3), 387–426.
- Torrego, Esther. 2002. Arguments for a derivational approach to syntactic relations based on clitics. In Samuel Epstein & Daniel T. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*, 249–268. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, Myriam. 1992. On the structure of spec,IP and its relevance for scope ambiguities. In Jon Amastae, Grant Goodall, M. Montalbetti & M. Phinney (eds.), *Contemporary research in Romance linguistics*, 355–367. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Villalba, Xavier. 2000. *The syntax of sentence periphery*: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona dissertation.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 1989. *Syntactic saturation phenomena and the modern Germanic languages*: University of Massachusetts at Amherst dissertation.
- Zubizarreta, Maria L. 1998. *Prosody, focus and word order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.



An (only apparent) case of hyper raising in Spanish
Javier Fernández-Sánchez

Received: 2015/03/12

Revised: 2015/06/08

Accepted: 2015/07/02

Javier Fernández-Sánchez
Centre de Lingüística Teòrica / Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
javier.fernandez.sanchez@uab.cat