## On Topic A-movement and Unvalued Interpretable Features

Chao-Ting Tim Chou University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

GOAL The goal of this paper is three-fold: (i) I argue that topic A-movement exists in Chinese, contra

[5]. Specifically, argument displacement in Chinese raising verb constructions (RVC) is A-movement to Spec-TP, yet semantically exhibits topicality; (ii) building upon [7]'s observation, I show a general undergeneration problem of object A-movement under a probe-driven system of movement based on feature inheritance; (iii) in view of (ii), I argue that, following [1] & [6], Chomsky's (1) should be abandoned to derive object topic A-movement based on a fine-grained featural characterization of topic A-movement. **DATA** Chinese raising verbs like epistemic modal *yinggai* 'should' take a TP complement as in (2) (see [4]). Interestingly, either the subject or the object can raise over the modal, as exemplified by (3a) & (3b). Building upon [4]'s analysis of subject raising in (3a) as A-movement, I argue that the pre-modal object in (3b) appears in its surface position via A-movement as well, rather than via A'-movement or basegeneration. Supporting evidence comes from (i) the lack of reconstruction in (4), (ii) the raising of idiom chunks like kai-dao (lit. open-knife) 'do surgery' in (5), and (iii) the feeding of Binding Condition A in (6). Curiously, A-movement in RVC exhibits topicality, which is usually a property associated with A'movement. For example, Chinese indefinite NPs are ambiguous in specificity, as shown in (7a); when it is topicalized as in (7b), only the specific reading is available. As (8) shows, A-movement of indefinite NPs in RVC patterns together with topicalization - the raised indefinite NP exhibits only a specific interpretation. Other supporting evidence (not shown here) includes the raising of strong/weak quantifier NPs, and the raised argument's inability to function as an information focus to reply to wh-questions.

**PROBLEM** The topicality of A-movement in RVC seems to lend support to [5]'s extension of feature-inheritance to [+topic] feature to derive topic A-movement. However, the inheritance of [+topic] from C to T is too late for T to attract the object bearing [+topic] in the embedded VP. Specifically, [7] observes an incompatibility between [3]'s PIC and the feature inheritance hypothesis due to the simultaneity of the Transfer of VP and the introduction of C into the derivation, as in (9a). T can probe only <u>after</u> inheriting [+topic] from C, but by this 'time', the VP containing the object is already Transferred, as in (9b). Thus, I conclude that object A-movement in RVC is underivable under [5]'s <u>probe-driven system</u> of movement based on feature inheritance. To derive object A-movement in RVC, the object needs to start moving <u>before</u> the probe(i.e. [+topic] on matrix C/T) enters the structure, but the implementation of this local step crucially depends on lookahead into <u>subsequent as yet non-existant</u> derivational steps external to the v\*P phase. Thus we confront the same lookahead problem observed by [2] concerning [3]'s analysis of successive-cyclic movement of Y to W across phase XP in (10) in terms of X's EPP feature whose assignment fully relies on whether W would enter the structure later, which is unknown at stage (10b).

ANALYSIS I advance a solution to this under-generation problem based on a fine-grained featural characterization of topic A-movement that is made possible if (1) is abandoned (see [1] & [6]). Two types of new features are predicted to exist under [1]'s & [6]'s system, as shown in (11). I argue that both of these two new features are necessary in the establishment of topic A-movement. First, I advance that the topic feature on the moving DP should be recast as an interpretable vet unvalued feature (= (11d)). Specifically, even though φ-features and a topic feature on DP are both interpretable, their interpretation differs in one crucial aspect – the former are inherently interpretable at the CI interface, given their lexical valuation; the interpretation of the latter by contrast is configurational, requiring a syntactic relation between a DP and another syntactic category. Consequently, the DP's topic feature, though potentially interpretable, cannot be intrinsically valued. In addition, I assume that the topic feature on matrix T inherited from C assumed by [5] should be valued yet uninterpretable (= (11c)). It is uninterpretable since a syntactic position is not what is interpreted as "topic" at the CI interface; on the other hand, it is valued because an argument agreeing with T and moving to Spec-TP in RVC is always interpreted as the topic. This novel understanding of topic feature and topic A-movement can be combined with [2]'s movingelement-driven approach to syntactic movement to derive object topic A-movement in RVC as depicted in (12). I will also (i) explain why object topic A-movement is not possible in Chinese mono-clausal structures, but generally allowed in languages like Finnish, and (ii) discuss whether an unvalued interpretable feature causes CI crash when entering CI without being syntactically valued.

```
(1) Valuation/Interpretability Biconditional: A feature F is uninterpretable iff F is unvalued. (Chomsky 2001: 5)
(2) Yinggai [TP Akiu zhunbei.hao wancan le]
     should
                 Akiu prepare.done dinner PERF
     'It should be the case that Akiu has prepared the dinner.'
(3) a.[TP Akiui yinggai [TP ti zhunbei.hao wancan le]
                                                               b. [TP Wancan; yinggai [TP Akiu zhunbei.hao t; le]
       'Akiu should have prepared the dinner.'
                                                                  'The dinner should have been prepared by Akiu.'
     *[TP [Taziji-de
                         pengyouli yinggai [TP Akiui bu hui beipan ti]]
          himself-MOD friend
                                     should
                                                Akiu not will betray
      Intended: 'It should be the case that Akiu, will not betray his own, friend.'
                                                                                     [Against A'-movement analysis]
(5) Zhe-tai tao yinggai [TP hui shi Chen Yishi
                                                      lai kai ]
     this-CL knife should
                               will FOC Chen Doctor come open
     'It should be the case that this surgery will be done by Dr. Chen.'
                                                                                           [Against base-generation]
(6) [TP Akiu; yinggai [TP [zhiyou [tazijii-de
                                                  laopuol shodeliao t<sub>i</sub>]]
         Akiu should
                            only
                                     himself-MOD wife
                                                           tolerate
     'It should be the case that only his own, wife can tolerate Akiu,.'
                                                                             [Supporting evidence for A-movement]
(7) a. You yi-ge Meiguoren yinde le guanjun
        have one-CL American win ASP championship
       'An (specific or not) American won the championship.'
     b. You yi-ge Meiguoren a, yinde le guanjun
        have one-CL American TOP win ASP championship
       'A specific American won the championship.'
(8) a. You yi-ge Meiguoren<sub>i</sub> yinggai [TP t<sub>i</sub> yinde le guanjun]
        have one-CL American should
                                              win ASP championship
       'A specific American should have won the championship.'
     b. You yi-dao cai, yinggai [TP Akiu zhunbei ti]
       have one-CL dish should
                                     Akiu prepare
       'There is one specific dish that should be prepared by Akiu.'
                       - VP Trasnferred -
                        [vP yinggai [TP T [v*P Akiu [VP zhunbei.hao wancan[+topic] le]]]]]]
(9) a. [CP C [TP T
     b. [CP \ C \ [TP \ T_{[+topic]} \ [vP \ yinggai \ [TP \ T \ [v*P \ Akiu \ [vP - TRANSFERRED -]]]]]]
                 C-to-T [+topic] inheritance
(10) a.W_{[uF, iK, EPP]}...[_{XP}...X...Y_{[iF, uK]}]
                                            (XP a phase)
                                            (XP a phase)
     b.[XPY_{IiF. uK1}...X_{EPP}...t_v]
(11) a. uF[] (uninterpretable unvalued, e.g., \varphi on T, Case on NPs)
     b. iF[val]
                 (interpretable valued, e.g., φ on NPs)
     c. uF[val] (uninterpretablevalued)
                                              New features under [1]'s and [6]'s system
                 (interpretable unvalued)
     d. iF[ ]
(12) a. [v^*P \ \mathbf{OBJECT}_{interpretable.topic[]} \ \mathbf{SUBJECT} \ [vP \ \mathbf{VERB} \ t]]
     (The unvalued interpretable topic feature triggers object movement to phase edge to avoid being Spelled-out)
     (Chomsky's [2000] PIC is adopted here since there is no reason to delay Transfer under the proposed system)
     b. [CP C [TP Tuninterpretable.+topic [VP yinggai [TP [v*P OBJECT_i.topic]] SUBJECT [VP - TRANSFERRED -]]]]]]
     (Matrix C passes down the valued uninterpetable topic feature to T, á la [5])
     c. [CP C [TP Object_{i,topic} T_{u,topic} [VP yinggai [TP [v*P t SUBJECT [VP - TRANSFERRED -]]]]]]]
     (Object bearing unvalued topic feature moves as a probe to matrix Spec-TP to c-command the valued
     counterpart on T to obtain a value, following [2]'s moving-element-driven approach to syntactic movement)
```

## **References:**

[1] Bošković, Ž. To appear. On valued uninterpretable features. In *Proceeding of NELS* 39. [2] Bošković, Ž. 2007. On the locality and motivation of Move and Agree: an even more minimal theory. *LI* 38. [3] Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: a life in language*. MIT Press. [4] Lin, J. T.-H. 2011. Finiteness of clauses and raising of arguments in Mandarin Chinese. *Syntax* 14. [5] Miyagawa, S. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move?* MIT Press. [6] Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In *Phrasal and clausal architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation*. John Benjamins. [7] Richards, M. 2011. Deriving the edge: what's in a phase. *Syntax* 14.