

Moving subjects out of finite *je* clauses in Bangla: A case of Hyper-raising?

Mouma Banik, University of Delhi

FASAL 15, 2025

Introduction: Beginning from the GB theory (Chomsky 1973) to the latest work in post-minimalism (Chomsky 2000, 2001), raising constructions have garnered much attention in the realm of syntax. A subject, in canonical raising constructions, is able to move out of a non-finite clause for both EPP and Case reasons. In English, such a movement is readily available (*John_i seems [t_i to be drowning]*). But investigation into other languages such as Brazilian Portuguese (Ferreira 2000, 2004; Martins & Nunes 2005, 2009; a.o.), Bantu languages such as Zulu (Halpert 2015, 2016, 2019), Logoori and Tiriki (Diercks *et al.* 2022) and many more reveal instances where the subjects (and objects) can easily raise out of a finite embedded clause. These structures are called *hyper-raising* (Ura 1994). In this paper, we will show if Bangla (Bengali; Indo-Aryan) allows such A-to-A movements or not. We will follow the non-phase or defective phase analysis (cf. Ferreira 2000, 2004; Martins & Nunes 2005; Zeller 2006; a.o.) partially to account for the hyper-raising instances in Bangla and argue that Bangla hyper-raising involves absence of an overt C head *je*, making the phase boundary weaker for such A-movements.

Hyper-raising in Bangla: Bangla, in the presence of a specific perception verb *mone hoy* ('seem') in the matrix clause, allows embedded subjects to move out to the matrix [Spec, TP] from a finite embedded clause.

- (1) *Oroni_i mon-e hO-y [(*)je t_i gotokal school-e*
 oroni.NOM mind-LOC be-HAB.3 IC yesterday school-LOC
eS-ech-il-o]
 come-PFV-PST-3

'Oroni seems to have come to school yesterday.'

Example (1) exhibits SVO word order where generally a sentence initial complementizer (henceforth, IC) *je* appears after the verb (Bayer 1996; Bhattacharya 2001, 2002, 2015; *among others*). But in this sentence, presence of this IC *je* makes the sentence ungrammatical. This example of subject-to-subject raising is similar to the hyper-raising pattern seen in Bantu languages, where raising out of embedded infinitivals is not allowed but is completely optional out of finite clauses.

- (2) **Oroni_i mon-e hO-y [t_i gotokal school-e aS-te]*
 oroni.NOM mind-LOC be-HAB.3 yesterday school-LOC come-INF
 Int. 'Oroni seems to have come to school yesterday.' (raising is banned out of NF clauses)
- (3) *(amar) mon-e hO-y [(je) Oroni gotokal school-e*
 1SG.DAT mind-LOC be-HAB.3 IC oroni.NOM yesterday school-LOC
eS-ech-il-o]
 come-PFV-PST-3

'To me it seems that Oroni came to school yesterday.' (raising is optional)

In Bangla hyper-raising, the matrix verb has default agreement (3P) which is an example of non-agreeing hyper-raising (cf. Halpert 2019; Diercks *et al.* 2022 for non-agreeing hyper-raising in Bantu languages).

- (4) *Oroni/ ami/ tumi mon-e hO-y [t_i gotokal*
 oroni.NOM/ 1SG.NOM/ 2SG.NOM mind-LOC be-HAB.3 yesterday
school-e eS-ech-il-o/ eS-ech-il-am/ eS-ech-il-e]
 school-LOC come-PFV-PST-3/ come-PFV-PST-1/ come-PFV-PST-2
 'Oroni/I/You seem(s) to have come to school yesterday.'

Diagnosing hyper-raising in Bangla: There has been much debate about the nature of non-agreeing hyper-raising- whether or not they are true A movement. We show a few tests below to confirm that Bangla has true hyper-raising, not copy raising or topicalization.

- A. **Idioms:** Raising predicates generally retain the idiomatic meaning even after the embedded subject moves out of the embedded clause contrary to control predicates or copy raising or topicalization.

- (5) *Ek hate_i mon-e hO-y [t_i taali baje-na]*
 one hand mind-LOC be-HAB.3 clap sound(v)-NEG
 Lit. ‘*One hand seems not to clap.’ Int. ‘It takes two to Tango.’

B. Compatibility with new information: Topicalized phrases are not new information- answering a sudden question like ‘What happened?’ with a topicalized NP will result in ungrammaticality. Whereas, raised subjects as an answer will be completely grammatical (cf. Halpert 2019).

- (6) *ki hoyeche?* ‘What happened?’
 (7) ✓*Oroni_i mon-e hO-y [t_ijanla-Ta bhenge diy-ech-e]*
 oroni.NOM mind-LOC be-HAB.3 window-CLF break give-PFV-PRES.3
 ‘Oroni seems to have broken the window.’

- (8) #*Oroni_i bhab-chi-l-am [(je) t_ijanla-Ta bhenge diy-ech-e]*
 oroni.NOM think-PROG-PST-1 IC window-CLF break give-PFV-PRES.3
 Int. ‘Oroni, I was thinking that he has broken the window.’

C. Binding: To test the subjecthood of the raised NP, we can show that it can bind a subject oriented anaphor (SOA) in the theme position of a ditransitive verb in the embedded clause (cf. Poole 2016).

- (9) *Oroni_i mon-e hO-y [meera-ke nijer_i boi-Ta diy-ech-il-o]*
 oroni.NOM mind-LOC be-HAB.3 meera-ACC his book-CLF
 give-PFV-PST-3
 ‘Oroni seems to have given his own book to Meera.’

D. Conjunction reduction: Only a subject can be ellided in the second conjoint of a conjoined structure, not a topic phrase.

- (10) *Oroni_i mon-e hO-y [t_i mach bhalobaS-e [ar t_i dim opochondo kOr-e]]*
 oroni.NOM mind-LOC be-HAB.3 fish love-HAB.3 and
 egg dislike do-HAB.3
 ‘Oroni seems to like fish and dislike eggs.’

E. Prosody: A topicalized NP would be followed by a prosodic boundary (before the raising predicate), which is not seen in the sentences discussed as hyper-raising in Bangla (see example (1)).

Analysis: The idea of movement across finite clauses raises questions about the strict cyclicity in PIC (Chomsky 2000, 2001) and Activity Condition (Chomsky 2001). To give answers to these issues, people have proposed several solutions- (i) non-phase or defective phase (Ferreira 2000, 2004, 2009; Zeller 2006; a.o.) (ii) phase deactivation (Halpert 2019), (iii) movement to the phase edge (Tanaka 2002; Zymann 2017; Fong 2019; a.o.), (iv) \emptyset -criterion (Greeson 2024). According to the non-phase or defective phase analysis, the subject is allowed to move out of the embedded clause due to the embedded CP lacking in some properties (finiteness, or agreement, or in some other categorial feature and so on (cf. Zymann 2023)). We adopt a modified version of this in Bangla, where the embedded subject in example (1) can undergo A-to-A movement due to the lack of an overt C head in the finite embedded clause. We argue that only a fully phasal C head (which the embedded C head is not in virtue of being non-overt) can transfer the EPP feature to the T (via *feature inheritance* (cf. Chomsky 2008)) which in turn, can satisfy the EPP feature on the subject. Thus, the absence of this IC *je* in example (1) weakens the phase boundary by making it defective due to which the embedded NP can move out to the matrix [Spec, TP] to satisfy its EPP feature by the matrix T probe.

- (11) [TP Oroni_i [EPP] [T_{[uEPP*]] mone hoy [CP_{def} [C_{def} (*je) [t_i [T...]]]]]}

This can be put in direct contrast with sentences containing embedded clauses which have both IC *je* and are finite- raising out of these clauses is ungrammatical as the presence of *je* (which has all the necessary features on it, including EPP) strengthens the phase boundary, making the embedded clause opaque for further A-movement.

Conclusion: This paper shows that Bangla does have hyper-raising which is non-agreeing in nature due to the default agreement on the matrix verb. The raised subject can move out of the finite embedded

clause due to the lack of an overt C head (IC *je*) whose absence make the phase boundary weaker, thus allowing movement to happen.

Sel Refs: **1.** Bhattacharya, T. 2001. The puzzle of Bangla QC-internal clauses. *Snippets* 3:6-7. **2.** Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **3.** Ura, H. 1994. *Varieties of Raising and the Feature-Based Bare Phrase Structure Theory*. MIT Occas. Pap. Linguist., Vol.7. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.