

Pseudo-raising in English and Portuguese

Portuguese at first sight seems to violate the well known ban on raising out of tensed CPs. In the structure in (1), the matrix verb exhibits agreement with the apparently raised subject NP. As a result, (1) cannot be analyzed as the sentence with left dislocation in (2), where no raising is involved. Besides (1), Portuguese also has raising out of untensed complements as in (3):

- (1) Tu pareces que estás doente (2) Tu, *pro*_{imp} parece que estás doente
'You seem_{2P.SG} that you are_{2P.SG} sick' 'You, it seems that you are sick'
(3) Tu pareces estar doente 'You seem_{2P.SG} to be sick'

The structure in (1) resembles the highly restrictive English constructions in (4), where there is an anaphoric relation between the matrix subject NP and the embedded pronoun. This pronoun might be viewed as a resumptive pronoun spelled out after raising out of the CP. The complementizer of the CP must be expressed as *like*. The complementizer status of *like* can be deduced from its distribution in (5).

- (4) a. The cows seem like/ ??as if/ *that they have eaten too much grass
b. The cows look like/ ??as if/ *that they have eaten too much grass
(5) a. It looks as if/ like/ *that the cows have eaten too much grass
b. *It looks that like/ like that the cows have eaten too much grass

The constructions in (1) and (4) display a number of similarities and differences. In both English and Portuguese, there is a definiteness effect on the matrix subjects. The sentence in (6b) is grammatical if the indefinite is unselectively bound by the quantificational adverb *always*, but not if the indefinite has an existential interpretation.

- (6) a. Cows *(always) seem like they have eaten too much grass
b. *Umás meninas parecem que estão doentes 'A few girls seem that (they) are sick'

Both languages also semantically restrict this construction to raising verbs of the *seem* type. English and Portuguese are different in the types of verbs that may occur in the complement of *seem/ parecer*. English allows for any verb to occur in the complement of *seem*, as is clear from (4), while Portuguese restricts the structure in (1) to embedded predication verbs (*estar, continuar*) which select small clauses (SCs):

- (7) a. *Tu pareces que comes o bolo b. Tu pareces comer o bolo
You seem that (you) eat_{2P.SG} the pastry 'You seem to eat the pastry'
(8) Os rapazes parecem que continuam felizes
The boys seem_{3P.PL} that continue_{3P.PL} happy 'The boys seem to continue to be happy'

Unlike in Portuguese, the bound pronoun in English is restricted to 2nd and 3rd person. There is a minimal contrast between ungrammatical (9a) and its untensed raising counterpart (9b):

- (9) a. *We seem like we have eaten too many quails
b. We seem to have eaten too many quails
c. Nós parecemos que estamos felizes We seem_{1P.PL} that (we) are_{1P.PL} happy

Importantly, languages such as Spanish or French do not feature these constructions:

- (10) a. *Tu pareces que estás enfermo b. (Tu) pareces estar enfermo (Spanish)
*Tu sembles que tu es malade Tu sembles être malade (French)
'You seem_{2P.SG} that you are_{2P.SG} sick' 'You seem_{2P.SG} to be sick'

Although Romanian and Greek also display raising out of tensed subjunctive complements, the subjunctive in these languages functions in the same way as infinitival complements in other languages w. r. t. control and raising. Raising out of subjunctives has none of the restrictions in (6-9), and is to be analyzed on a par with raising as in (3), (7b), (10b) (Motapanyane 1994).

The sentences in (1) and (4) pose a number of theoretical challenges. If these sentences involve overt raising out of the tensed CP, they are a blatant case of improper movement, since on its way to the matrix SpecAGR_{SP} position, the embedded subject has to move through SpecCP, an A'-position. Recall Chomsky (1981, 1986, 1992) assumes that raising verbs with infinitival complements as in (3), (7b), (10b) involve CP deletion/ AGR_{SP} selection. Moreover, if overt raising out of tensed CPs were freely allowed, we would not only expect the option to be much more widely available crosslinguistically (cf. (10a), but there would also be no immediate explanation for the restrictions noted in (6-9).

We claim that the constructions with apparent raising out of tensed CPs in (1) and (4) actually do not involve raising at all. Therefore, we call them Pseudo-raising. Rather, we extend to Pseudo-raising the Chomsky's (1977, 1992) analysis of *easy-to-please* constructions in (11):

- (11) John_i is easy [CP O_i [IP to please t_i]]

In (11), the relation between *John* and *O* in SpecCP is established via strong binding. The chain link between *John* and *O* must obtain to provide the NP *John*, which sits in a non-theta position, with a theta-role. We claim that the subject *pro* in the embedded SpecAGR_{SP} position in (1), and the pronoun *they* in (4) equally function as variables for the matrix NP sitting in the non-theta subject position of *seem/ parecer*. Strong binding provides the matrix subject with a theta-role. As a result, the sentences in (12) are ruled out as a violation of the theta-criterion:

- (12) a. *Tu pareces que o João esta doente 'You seem_{2P,SG} that João is sick'
b. *The cows seem like the elephants have eaten too much grass

Strong binding immediately explains the restriction of embedded subjects in English to 2nd/ 3rd person pronouns: only these pronouns can receive a quasi-universal interpretation in the sense of Cinque (1988): *In Portugal, they drive like madmen/ You never know*. These quasi-universal interpretations arise through binding by a universal operator, e.g. generic tense. In (1) and (4), the antecedent must be a definite NP because only 'strong' NPs can function as universal operators for the variables *they/pro*. Quasi-existential and definite interpretations of *they/pro* do not function as variables. This prevents a chain from being established between the matrix NP and *they/pro*, in violation of the theta-criterion. As a result, only 'variable' *they/pro* are allowed as embedded subjects, forcing the antecedent to be universal, lest a theta-criterion violation occur. The definiteness effect exemplified in (6) is thus derived. Moreover, we predict that English 1st person pronouns cannot function as variables, since they are too definite. As a result, (9a) is ruled out. Portuguese (cf. 9c) does not have this restriction since the embedded subject *pro*, unlike the pronoun *we*, has entirely underspecified features.

An important question now arises as to how strong binding comes about in (1) and (4), since the variables *pro/they* are nonlocally bound by their matrix antecedent over a CP Barrier. The only way for these variables to be bound locally by the matrix subject is to covertly move at LF to the embedded SpecCP, in the same way as *O* in (11). However, covert movement of *they/pro* by themselves predicts that it should be available in all languages, contrary to fact. We claim that the Binding accessibility of *they/pro* in (1)(4) results from the covert movement of a constituent containing *they/pro* to SpecCP. Following Rooryck (1994), we take it that *bona fide* raising as in (3) involves movement of the embedded AGR_{SP} to SpecCP and subsequent movement of the embedded subject to the matrix SpecAGR_{SP}. Rooryck (1994) argues that movement of AGR_{SP} to SpecCP is independently motivated by a comparative [+Focus] feature in C°, *seem/ parecer* being essentially comparative elements. Movement out of SpecCP is possible as argued by Chomsky (1986), Piccolo (1985).

- (12)[AGR_{SP} Alfred [seems]AGR_{SP}]] [VP tv° [CP [AGR_{SP} tAlfred to be here] [C' C°_{FOC} tAGR_{SP}]]]

We assume that the overt movement of AGR_{SP} to SpecCP in (12) has its covert counterpart in (4). (4) involves LF-movement of the tensed AGR_{SP} to SpecCP, allowing the pronoun *they* contained in AGR_{SP} to be bound by the matrix subject.

- (13) The cows_i seem [CP [AGR_{SP} they_i have eaten to much grass] [C' [C°-like] tAGR_{SP}]]
↑ LF-movement

We furthermore claim that such covert movement is restricted to C°s that are fully comparative, that is *like*, but not *that*. Focus movement of projections lesser than CP is independently attested in English structures involving overt movement as *Eat too much grass, I am sure the cows will*, where the embedded projection moves to the higher SpecCP. In Portuguese, movement of such projections is not attested, and thus excluded. The reason that Portuguese restricts the Pseudo-raising construction to SCs is related to the fact that only SCs can covertly raise to SpecCP in (1). Again, this movement can be independently motivated by an overt counterpart. Portuguese complementizer *que* can function as a comparative complementizer for SCs in overt structures such as (14):

- (14) Tão inteligente que és, podes fazer o que queres
'(As) intelligent as you are, you can do what you want

The restriction to comparative complementizers explains why French and Spanish disallow (1). The French and Spanish C° *que* cannot function as a comparative C° as shown in French (15).

- (15) Intelligent comme/ *que tu es, tu peux faire ce que tu veux
'Intelligent as you are, you can do what you want

As a result, all restrictions on Pseudo-raising derive from independent facts and principles.