Raising-to-Object in Amis
Tingchun Chen, National University of Singapore

This paper investigates raising-to-object (RtO) in Amis (Formosan, Austronesian; VSO). Descriptively, RtO refers to a construction in which a DP (*raised DP* hereafter) that is thematically linked to the embedded predicate nevertheless exhibits behavior typical of matrix objects, such as accusative on *toya tamdaw* in (1a), as opposed to nominative on the embedded subject in (1b).

(1)   a.   Ma-fana' kako   **to-ya**   **tamdaw** mi-liyas-to   inacila.
                AV-know NOM.1SG ACC-that person   AV-leave-ASP yesterday

        b.   Ma-fana' kako   mi-liyas-to   **ko-ya**   **tamdaw** inacila.
                AV-know NOM.1SG AV-leave-ASP NOM-that person   yesterday
                'I know that that person left yesterday.'

A recurring question on RtO across languages concerns whether the raised DP originates in the embedded clause or in the matrix clause (e.g. Chomsky 1973, Postal 1974, a.o.). I show that both derivations are attested in Amis. Specifically, RtO in Amis may be derived by either (i) topicalization to the edge of the embedded clause or (ii) base-generating a DP in the matrix clause that is coindexed with an embedded silent *pro*. These are illustrated schematically in (2). In neither is the raised DP moved out of the embedded clause.

(2)   (i)   Topicalization: $[_{CP} \ldots [_{CP}$ **Raised DP** $[_{C'} \ldots$ <Raised DP> $\ldots]]]$
        (ii)   Base-generation: $[_{CP} \ldots$ **Raised DP**$_7 \ldots [_{CP} \ldots pro_7 \ldots]]$

Below I present novel data on reconstruction and show how (i)-(ii) may be teased apart. I also give evidence for the presence of a silent *pro* in (ii) and illustrate how the raised DP in (i) exhibit properties typical of topics. The proposal argues against previous works which claim either only some form of (i) or (ii) exists in Amis but not both (Chen 2008, Liu 2011, Chen & Fukuda 2016).

Connectivity: (i) and (ii) crucially differs in whether the raised DP is part of the embedded clause. The raised DP is unambiguously inside the matrix clause when the DP precedes a matrix adjunct or when it is scrambled over the matrix subject. In both situations, the raised DP cannot reconstruct. First, as (3a)-(3b) show, when the raised DP precedes the matrix temporal adjunct *anini*, it cannot reconstruct into the embedded clause for idiomatic interpretation. Similarly, when the raised DP is scrambled across the matrix subject, as in (3c), reconstruction is also ruled out.

(3)   a.   Ma-fana' kako | anini | **to sowal no-ra**   **tamdaw** o   fali   inacila.
                AV-know NOM.1SG today   ACC word   GEN-that person   PRED wind yesterday

        b.   #Mafana' kako **to sowal nora tamdaw** | anini | o fali inacila.

        c.   #Mafana' **to sowal nora tamdaw** | kako | o fali inacila.
                'I know (today) that that person's words yesterday were baseless (lit. wind).'

Second, wh-words in Amis may be interpreted as existential wh-indefinites when they scope under negation. As (4a) shows, when the raised DP is a wh-word and follows the matrix adjunct, it can still be interpreted as an existential wh-indefinite, even though it linearly precedes the embedded negation. However, when the raised DP precedes the matrix adjunct or subject, as in (4b)-(4c), this reading is not possible. (3)-(4) both suggest that the raised DP in (i) originates inside the embedded clause. Note that the ill-formed examples in (3)-(4) are ruled out only for the intended reading (cf. (7b) below). The raised DP can otherwise appear in these positions. That is, the structure in (ii) is not fundamentally ungrammatical in Amis.

(4) a. Ma-fana' kako 〔anini〕**to cimaan** caay pi-liyas inacila.
   AV-know NOM.1SG today ACC who.ACC NEG AV-leave yesterday

b. *Mafana' kako **to cimaan** 〔anini〕 caay piliyas inacila.

c. *Mafana' **to cimaan** 〔kako〕 caay piliyas inacila.
   'I know (today) that no one left yesterday.'

Embedded *pro*: (ii) contains an embedded *pro* coindexed with the raised DP. That the *pro* in (ii) may be silent is not surprising, given that Amis is a *pro*-drop language. Presence of a silent *pro* is also supported by reflexive binding. When the raised DP follows the matrix adjunct, as in (5a), it can still bind the embedded reflexive. This is expected given (3a) and (4a) above. What is notable is, when the raised DP precedes the matrix adjunct or subject, as in (5b)-(5c), it can also bind the embedded reflexive, even though long-distance binding is otherwise impossible in Amis. This is explained by the presence of a silent coreferential *pro* in the embedded clause.

(5) a. Ma-fana' kako 〔anini〕**ci Mayawan** mi-komimit cingraan-to inacila.
   AV-know NOM.1SG today ACC PN.ACC AV-pinch ACC.3SG-REFL yesterday

b. Mafana' kako **ci Mayawan** 〔anini〕 mikomimit cingraanto inacila.

c. Mafana' **ci Mayawan** 〔kako〕 mikomimit cingraanto inacila.
   'I know (today) that Mayaw pinched himself yesterday.'

Topichood: The raised DP in (i) shows properties common to topics. As (6a) shows, when the raised DP follows the matrix adjunct, it can be marked by the topic marker *i*. In the same position, the raised DP cannot be interpreted as an interrogative wh-word, as in (7a). These contrast with the raised DP in (ii), as (6b) and (7b) show. In addition, the raised DP in (i) must be referential and cannot be modified by a downward entailing quantifier (e.g. *mamang* 'few'; data omitted). These are all typical behavior of topics (Reinhart 1981, Constant 2014, a.o.).

(6) a. Ma-fana' kako 〔anini〕**to-ya waco i**, mi-limek inacila.
   AV-know NOM.1SG today ACC-that dog TOP AV-hide yesterday

b. *Mafana' kako **toya waco i** 〔anini〕 milimek inacila.
   'I know today that that dog, (it) hid yesterday.'

(7) a. *Ma-fana' kiso 〔anini〕**to cimaan** mi-liyas-to inacila?
   AV-know NOM.2SG today ACC who.ACC AV-leave-ASP yesterday

b. Mafana' kiso **to cimaan** 〔anini〕 miliyasto inacila?
   'Who do you know today that left yesterday?'

Proposal and implication: Based on the discussion above, I propose that RtO in Amis can be derived by either topicalization, as in (i), or matrix base-generation, as in (ii). Moreover, given that the raised DP in (i) receives case in the matrix clause, even though it originates in the embedded finite clause, the data support that a DP may receive case more than once (Baker & Vinokurova 2010, Levin 2017, a.o.). Specifically, assuming that CP is phasal in Amis, the data suggest that movement of a DP out of the local phase domain forces an additional case assignment.

Selected references: Chen, V. & S. Fukuda. 2016. Raising to object out of CP as embedded left dislocations: evidence from three Formosan languages. *Proceedings of WCCFL33* 88-98. Chen, Y. 2008. A minimalist approach to Amis structure and complementation. PhD thesis, Arizona State University. Levin, T. 2017. Successive-cyclic case assignment: Korean nominative-nominative case-stacking. *Natural Languages & Linguistic Theory* 35:447-498.