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Deriving A/A’-Effects in Topic Fronting: Intervention of Focus and Binding

ANGELO J. JIMÉNEZ-FERNÁNDEZ AND SELÇUK İSSEVER

In this work we explore the A/A’-effects exhibited in topic fronting constructions in Spanish and Turkish. Although typologically quite distinct, these languages show similar properties when topics are preposed, especially as regards the binding interpretation of the fronted constituent. Anaphors may either display argumental or non-argumental properties: binding improvement and reconstruction. To explain the two effects we propose an analysis of fronted topics based on movement to Spec-TP, as a consequence of feature inheritance. The different binding effects are accounted for in terms of adjunction of anaphoric/pronominal features to functional heads, namely \( \delta \) and \( \phi \). We also argue that the interaction of information focus and binding is crucial to predict the interpretive properties of displaced elements both in Turkish and Spanish. This analysis dispenses with the traditional distinction between \( A \) and \( A’ \)-positions.

Keywords: topic fronting, focus, binding, anaphoric features, feature inheritance

1 Introduction

In line with Chomsky (2008), Richards (2007), and Miyagawa (2005, 2010), Jiménez-Fernández (2010, 2011) argues for the three-fold classification of languages shown in (1), based on feature inheritance. In this typology, languages are parameterized as to which features of \( C_0 \), agreement- (\( \phi \)) and/or discourse-features (\( \delta \)), are inherited by \( T^0 \).

(1) Feature Inheritance (adopted from Jiménez-Fernández 2010, after Miyagawa 2005)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad C_0^\phi \rightarrow T_0^\delta \ldots \quad \text{(disc-prominent: e.g., Japanese, Korean)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad C_0^\delta \rightarrow T_0^\phi \ldots \quad \text{(agr-prominent: e.g., English and most Indo-European languages)} \\
\text{c.} & \quad C_0^\phi, \delta \rightarrow T_0^\phi, \delta \ldots \quad \text{(disc-prominent, agr-oriented: e.g., Spanish, Turkish, Greek)}
\end{align*} \]

A language is discourse-prominent if \( T^0 \) inherits \( \delta \)-features (1a), whereas inheritance of \( \phi \)-features makes a language agreement-prominent (1b). On the border line, languages such as Spanish and Turkish are both discourse-prominent and agreement-oriented (1c). Assuming a movement analysis of topic fronting (Belletti 2005, Cecchetto 2000, through our paper. On the other hand, this element can simply be pronominal and it is interpreted as a free pronoun.

2 Earlier versions of this paper have been presented at the Mediterranean Syntax Meeting 3 in Athens in October 2010, the LAGB Meeting in Manchester in September 2011 and the GLiP 7 in Wrocław in December 2011. We thank the audience there for their insightful comments. We are especially grateful to David Adger, Hans van de Koot, Gary Thoms, Liliane Haegeman and Ad Neeleman for their discussion of some theoretical points arisen in this work. Needless to say, any remaining errors and inadequacies are our own responsibility.

3 The possessive pronoun \( su \) has an ambiguous interpretation. On the one hand, it can be interpreted as bound, in which case it is a reflexive anaphor and must obey Principle A of the Binding Theory. This is the intended reading throughout our paper. On the other hand, this element can simply be pronominal and it is interpreted as a free pronoun. Therefore, its occurrence is subject to Principle B of the Binding theory. We thank Andrew Radford for bringing out this double reading to us. See Burzio (forthcoming) for the intricacies of anaphoric and pronominal interpretations across languages.

Haegeman 2006, López 2009, Rizzi 1997), in discourse-prominent languages, topics are preposed to Spec-TP once \( \delta \)-features are inherited by \( T^0 \). As Spec-TP is traditionally described as an A-position (Lasnik 1999, 2003), this is predicted to give rise to A-effects, such as binding improvement. Consider the examples below, where topic fronting of an antecedent can save the sentences in Spanish and Turkish, respectively:

(2) a. *Su vecino vio a Susanai ayer. (Spanish) self neighbor see-PST.3S to Susanai
b. [A Susanai] la vio su vecino \( \iota \).

‘Susanai was seen by her neighbour.’

(3) a. *Kendi komşusu İşık’ı gördü. (Turkish) self neighbour-poss İşık-ACC see-PST.3S
b. [İşık’ı] kendii komşusu \( \iota \) gördü.

‘İşık was seen by her neighbour.’

If topics undergo movement to Spec-TP in languages like Turkish and Spanish, A’-effects such as reconstruction are expected not to be displayed, contrary to facts:

(4) a. Adam Kendi ne kitap al-di. (Turkish) man self-dat book buy-PST.3S
b. [Kendi-ne] adam \( \iota \) kitap al-di.

‘For himself, the man bought a book.’

(5) A su vecino Susanai lo vio ayer. (Spanish) to self neighbour Susanai CL see-PST.3S yesterday

‘Susanai saw her neighbour yesterday.’

Thus, in Turkish/Spanish-type discourse-prominent languages topic fronting displays both A- and A’-effects with respect to anaphor binding as seen in (2) through (5). Although the classical approach to this phenomenon suggests that topic fronting/scrambling can target both Spec-TP and Spec-CP in the same language (Mahajan 1990, Miyagawa 2003, among others), A- and A’-positions respectively, there are also studies proposing a unified approach to A/A’-distinction. Saito (2003) argues for a unitary A-movement based on the derivational selection of lexical features. Takahashi (2006), on the other hand, claims that the A/A’-distinction can be captured if A-movement optionally leaves a copy, whereas copies left by A’-movement are obligatory. Bearing on the same issue, Miyagawa (2010) proposes a phase-based approach, the Phase-Based Characterization of Chains (PBCC), according to which a full copy of a moved item must be available for interpretation if the movement crosses a transfer domain, whereas movement within the
same transfer domain leaves optional copies.

Drawing on uniform approaches to the A/A’-distinction in topic fronting, we account for the A- and A’-effects in Turkish and Spanish and propose that in general, topics move to Spec,TP. Yet, differing from Takahashi/Miyagawa-style approaches that rely on copy identification, and limiting our discussion basically to anaphora binding environments, we claim that a simpler account is possible; one which is based on (LF-) adjunction of anaphoric/pronominal features to functional heads, namely v and T∗ (see Avrutin 1994, Chomsky 1995, Hestvik 1992, Lebeaux 1983, Pica 1987, Reinhart and Reuland 1991, among others). Revealing the inaccuracy of the PBCC, we also show that the interaction of focus and binding is crucial to predict the interpretive properties of displaced elements both in Turkish and Spanish, which are traditionally accounted for by making a distinction between A-position and A’-position.

As we discuss in section 4, binding interacts with information focus (IF) both in Turkish and Spanish (İsSever 2007, Kural 1992, Suher 2000, Zubizarreta 1998) – see Lahousse (2009) for a similar claim based on French data. Hence, it is necessary to take IF into account when we consider binding relations in the two languages. In both languages primary sentential stress, which marks IF, is assigned to the most deeply embedded category by the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR) (Cinque 1993), which we indicate by using capitals throughout the paper.

The outline of this chapter is as follows: in section 1, some preliminary remarks concerning feature inheritance and the A-A’ distinction are addressed; in section 2, we discuss the data and the A-A’ distinction in topic preposing in Spanish and Turkish, especially as far as binding ameliorations vs. reconstruction is concerned; section 3 shows the inaccuracy of Miyagawa’s PBCC; section 4 develops our proposal that anaphors have a [+anaphor] feature adjoining to the immediately higher functional category: T∗ or v∗; binding improvement and reconstruction are explained by the relative position of the binder and the bindee’s [+anaphor] feature in narrow syntax; finally, section 5 summarises our findings.

2 The data and the A-A’ distinction

2.1 A-movement effects

Both in Turkish and Spanish the binding relation between an antecedent subject and an anaphoric object is satisfactorily established if the former precedes the latter (see Case 1 in (6)), which is a totally expected scenario for binding relations to hold. In this scenario, we also expect that moving the anaphoric object in front of the antecedent subject will cause ungrammaticality. The examples given in (7) (Case 2) show that this expectation is borne out (capitals indicate IF here and throughout the paper).

(6) Case 1: antecedent subject > anaphoric object
   a. *Su vecino lo vio a SUSANA. ‘*Su vecino saw her neighbour.’
   b. *Su vecino a SUSANA lo vio. ‘*Su vecino saw her neighbour.’

(7) Case 2: *reordered anaphoric object > antecedent subject
   a. *[A vecino] lo vio a SUSANA. ‘*A vecino saw her neighbour.’
   b. *[A vecino] a SUSANA lo vio. ‘*A vecino saw her neighbour.’

In contrast to Case 2 in (7), an antecedent object undergoing movement in front of an anaphoric subject can save the binding relation between the two elements (see Case 4 in (9)), which cannot be established before the movement takes place (see Case 3 in (8)).

(8) Case 3: *anaphoric subject > antecedent object
   a. *Su vecino a SUSANA lo vio. ‘*Su vecino saw her neighbour.’
   b. *KENDİ KOMŞU-SU-NU gör-dü. ‘*Her neighbour was seen by Susana/Işık.’

(9) Case 4: preposed antecedent object > anaphoric subject
   a. *[A vecino] a SUSANA lo vio. ‘*A vecino saw her neighbour.’

4 It is standardly assumed that Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) involves the CP domain in Romance, either via Merge (Cinque 1990, Frascarelli 2007) or via Movement (Cecchetto 2000, Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2009, Hugeman 2006, et subseq.) (see also Kochovska 2010 for a merge-based analysis of CLLD in Slavic languages). In our work, we explore another possibility, namely CLLD-ed topics are located in the TP area. Within a merge-based framework, many proposals point to the fact that CLLD is identified with the TP/IP region (Barbosa 2001), whereas CLLD-ed topics moving to Spec,TP is the analysis pursued by Zubizarreta (1998), Hilli-Motapanyane (2002), Cornislescu (2004), Jiménez-Fernández (2010, 2011), et al. It is this last type of analysis that we favour in our work. We claim that in Spanish at least some types of CLLD-ed topics move to Spec,TP. In the typology of topics proposed by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), the type of topics that we focus on is the Familiar topic. Familiar topics are identified as “a given or accessible (cf. Chafe 1987) constituent, which is typically destressed and realized in a pronominal form (Pestansky 1987); when a familiar topic is textually given and d-linked with a pre-established aboutness topic, it is defined as a continuing topic (cf. Givón 1983)” (Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007: 87).

5 Lahousse (2009) holds that in the left periphery there is an overt binding which binds the relevant element in some position internal to the clause. This topic can also be covert (in the sense of Zibbi-Hertz 2003). In this case, it is coreferential with some other element in the clause, but it is the covert topic (not the explicit coreferent constituent) that counts for any binding relation to be established in the IP. Hence, regardless of the explicit syntactic position occupied by the binder and the bindee, what matters is that the bindee is c-commanded by a suitable topic in the left periphery.

6 Roughly speaking, reference is possible in these sentences, in which case binding relations have been established before in the context. We do not consider this possibility here.
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fronting in Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) constructions in Spanish and in multiple both languages. This aspect of the languages at issue is a result of (i) the interplay between IF and binding in topic fronting constructions. In all the ungrammatical examples in (7) and (8) the binding relation between the anaphor and its antecedent can be saved if the antecedent is defocused. Consider the examples given below, where IF falls upon the adverbs ayer and dün [yesterday] in (11)–(12), and upon the bare object kitap [book] in (13):

As shown in (6)–(10), topic fronting in Turkish and Spanish can affect the binding relation between an anaphor and its antecedent, which is an A-movement effect.

2.2 A'-movement effects

As we have seen in (4) and (5), topic fronting can also display A'-movement effects in both languages. This aspect of the languages at issue is a result of (i) the interplay between IF and binding in topic fronting, and (ii) multiple topic fronting in Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) constructions in Spanish and in multiple topics in Turkish.

First, let us see how IF interacts with binding in topic fronting constructions. In all the ungrammatical examples in (7) and (8) the binding relation between the anaphor and its antecedent can be saved if the antecedent is defocused. Consider the examples given below, where IF falls upon the adverbs ayer and dün [yesterday] in (11)–(12), and upon the bare object kitap [book] in (13):

As shown in (6)–(10), topic fronting in Turkish and Spanish can affect the binding relation between an anaphor and its antecedent, which is an A-movement effect.

2.2 A'-movement effects

As we have seen in (4) and (5), topic fronting can also display A'-movement effects in both languages. This aspect of the languages at issue is a result of (i) the interplay between IF and binding in topic fronting, and (ii) multiple topic fronting in Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) constructions in Spanish and in multiple topics in Turkish.

First, let us see how IF interacts with binding in topic fronting constructions. In all the ungrammatical examples in (7) and (8) the binding relation between the anaphor and its antecedent can be saved if the antecedent is defocused. Consider the examples given below, where IF falls upon the adverbs ayer and dün [yesterday] in (11)–(12), and upon the bare object kitap [book] in (13):

As shown in (6)–(10), topic fronting in Turkish and Spanish can affect the binding relation between an anaphor and its antecedent, which is an A-movement effect.

Second, multiple topic fronting in CLLD constructions in Spanish displays a very puzzling A'-effect if both the anaphor and the antecedent move to multiple Specs of T’ (Jiménez-Fernández 2011). This is shown in the examples given below. Surprisingly, the relative ordering between the anaphor and the antecedent does not affect the binding relation between them, which is unexpected, considering the A-status of Specs of T’.

In Turkish, multiple topics also display A'-properties provided that IF does not intervene. (17b–c) are grammatical because no intervention effect of IF is observed between the phrases involved in the binding relation.

In Turkish, multiple topics also display A'-properties provided that IF does not intervene. (17b–c) are grammatical because no intervention effect of IF is observed between the phrases involved in the binding relation.

2.3 Overview of the data

So far our data have basically shown that both IF and topic fronting have a crucial impact on binding relations between an anaphor and its antecedent. In section 2.1 we submitted that A-movement effects are displayed when an antecedent undergoes topic fronting to Spec,TP, thereby crossing a co-indexed anaphor or vice versa, provided that the crossed category has IF interpretation. Namely, this operation may feed or bleed binding relations. This is schematically shown in (18), where bold-faced characters indicate IF-marking.
On the other hand, the data in 2.2 have shown that A'-movement effects are also at stake. We saw in that section that (i) both configurations in (18) can be rendered grammatical if the crossed category is not IF-marked (see (19a)), and (ii) both the binder and the bindee occupy multiple Specifiers of T\(^\text{0}\), regardless of the relative order between them (see (19b–c)).

(19) A'-movement effects
a. \([x_\alpha \text{Spec,TP} \beta_\text{NP} \cdots \alpha \cdots] \]\ (see (11), (13b))
b. \([x_\alpha \text{Spec,TP} \beta_\text{NP} \cdots \alpha \cdots] \]\ (see (14a), (15a), (16b), (17c))
c. \([x_\alpha \text{Spec,TP} \beta_\text{NP} \cdots \alpha \cdots] \]\ (see (14b), (15b), (16a), (17b))

The pictures sketched in (18) and (19) raise the following questions:

[A] If Spec,TP is an A-position, why should its syntactic status be affected by
i. the interaction between topic fronting and IF?
ii. multiple fronting of the binder and bindee?

[B] Why does IF interact with binding?

In the next sections we discuss the issues surrounding these questions and present our proposal accounting for the puzzling A/A'-movement effects in topic fronting environments in Turkish and Spanish.

3 The inaccuracy of the PBCC

As mentioned in the introductory section, to account for binding relations in topic fronting and/or scrambling, some studies have relied on optionality of copies under movement. For example, Takahashi (2006) suggests that A- and A'-movement differ in that copies left by the former are optional while those of the latter are obligatory. Miyagawa (2010), on the other hand, argues for a derivational account, the PBCC, based on the idea of whether movement crosses a transfer domain or not. In this section we will focus on the PBCC and show that it cannot predict the topic fronting data in Turkish and Spanish. In addition, we suggest that it is conceptually weak.

The main trait of the PBCC, given in (20), is that the classical A/A'-distinction is reduced to grammatical effects, so no reference is made to A-positions vs. A'-positions. Reconstruction effects are accounted for in terms of whether the moving category crosses a transfer domain (i.e. VP, TP) or not. Consequently, the distinction between A-movement and A'-movement can be dispensed with.

(20) Phase-based characterization of chains

"A full copy of a moved item must be available for interpretation if the movement crosses a transfer domain boundary." (Miyagawa 2010: 115)

The two possibilities stated in the PBCC are illustrated in (21), which are taken from (Miyagawa 2010: 115–116):

(21a)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{XP} & \quad \text{No copy needed} \\
\text{Transfer domain} & \quad \text{Transfer domain}
\end{align*}
\]

In (21b), the copy of XP crossing a transfer domain is obligatory because the chain created by this movement must be totally recovered when the phases are put back together at LF. In contrast, the movement in (21a) "... occurs within the same transfer domain, [hence] the chain as a whole is transferred intact, so there is no need for a fully specified copy to occur at the point where the movement originated, although there is nothing wrong with leaving such a copy" (Miyagawa 2010: 116). Therefore, "... any movement that does not cross a transfer domain boundary is free to not leave a copy (although it can) ..." (Miyagawa 2010: 117).

This is inconsistent with our topic fronting data in several respects. First, it cannot predict the ungrammaticality of sentences such as (7a–b), repeated in (22):

(22a) a. *[A su  vecino] lo vio SUSANA, \(t\) \\
to self neighbour cl see-pst.3s Susana
b. *[Kendi komşu-su-mu] İŞIK \(t\) gör-dü. \\
self neighbour-poss-acc İşık see-pst.3s

"Her neighbour was seen by Susana/Işık."

In the first step of the derivation of (22a–b), the fronted objects move to Spec,vP in the vP phase. So they need to leave a copy in their original positions in VP, which must receive a bound interpretation according to the PBCC, contrary to facts. Therefore, to capture the ungrammaticality in such cases where the subject has an IF reading, (21b) has to be revised to the effect that the obligatory "Copy" must be replaced with "No copy needed." This would make no difference between (21a) and (21b), yielding an undesirable outcome.

The examples in (9a–b), repeated in (23), raise the same issue. To predict the grammaticality of these sentences, the obligatory "Copy" in the configuration illustrated in (21b) must be replaced with "No copy needed."

(23a)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[A Susana,] la vio} & \quad \text{SU, VECINO,} \(t\), \\
to Susana cl see-pst.3s self neighbour-nom
b. \quad &[Işık \(j\)] KENDI, KOMŞU-SU \(t\) gör-dü. \\
İşik-acc self neighbour-poss see-pst.3s

'Susana/Işık was seen by her neighbour.'
\]

The pictures sketched in (18) and (19) raise the following questions:

[A] If Spec,TP is an A-position, why should its syntactic status be affected by
i. the interaction between topic fronting and IF?
ii. multiple fronting of the binder and bindee?

[B] Why does IF interact with binding?

In the next sections we discuss the issues surrounding these questions and present our proposal accounting for the puzzling A/A'-movement effects in topic fronting environments in Turkish and Spanish.
In the framework of the PBCC, “No copy needed” means that there is an optional copy which may or may not be used for binding interpretation by the semantic component. However, to make a correct prediction of the grammaticality of the examples in (22) and (23), we need “no copy” to be left in the original positions of the fronted objects. This option, however, is not included in the PBCC.

Speaking of the conceptual weaknesses of the PBCC, it is also hard to understand what an “optional” copy exactly is. If something is optional, this means that it may or may not be omitted. In other words, its use is obligatory when needed and illicit when it is not. However, this conception does not seem to conform to the Minimalist framework. Note that to explain (14b), repeated below in (24a), the PBCC must use several optional copies (shown in angle brackets), as illustrated in (24b):

(24a) \[[Sui chaqueta], [Ángela] la puso en el armario AYER.\]

’self jacket Angela cl.put-PST.3SG in the closet yesterday

‘Angela put her jacket in the closet yesterday.’

b. \[[\text{TP}<\text{Kendii chaqueta}>, <Ángela> la puso \[\text{TP}<\text{chaqueta}> \text{en el armario ayer}]]\]

Here, except for the lowest copy of the object in VP (which is obligatory according to the PBCC), all instances of the subject and object copies are optional. This means that in the second cycle of the derivation (i.e., the CP phase) some combinations of the copies of the binder and bindee produce ungrammatical binding configurations, whereas some of them yield correct results. This would be acceptable if there were a way to discriminate between combinations producing correct and incorrect binding configurations, but according to the PBCC framework they all exist at the same time in the same derivation. Then, how can the semantic component be sure about the combinations yielding grammatical structures? Even if the semantic component could discriminate, then why couldn’t it use the same information for (22a–b), repeated in (25), which are ungrammatical?

(25a) \[[Sui su vecino] lo vio \[<\text{a su vecino}> \text{SUSANA}, \langle<\text{a su vecino}>\rangle]]\]

b. \[[\text{TP}<\text{Kendii komşusunu}>, <\text{kendii komşusunu}> ISIK, \[\langle<\text{kendii komşusunu}> \text{gör-dü}]]\]

The conclusion we draw from the preceding discussion is that, for anaphora binding, the PBCC cannot account for the topic fronting data both in Turkish and Spanish and it is both empirically and conceptually inaccurate. Crucially, all these shortcomings will be explained in our system.

4 A feature-based account of binding in topic fronting

4.1 The framework

In the relevant literature on binding it has been claimed that anaphors (as well as pro-
4.2 Derivation of binding relations in topic fronting

Both in Spanish and Turkish IF is licensed in the vP domain (see İşsever 2006 for Turkish; Sufer 2000 and Zubizarreta 1998 for Spanish). By application of the NSR, focal stress is assigned to the most deeply embedded in situ category, which has been assigned a [+foc] feature in the Numeration (Aboh 2010). In line with Jiménez-Fernández (forthcoming) and Jiménez-Fernández and Spyropoulos (2010), we assume a strict parallelism among phase heads v and C: as in the case with C0 (see (1)), discourse features and agreement features are inherited from v to C0. The only exception to this is the case where the external argument (subject) bears a [+foc] feature, and hence needs an IF interpretation. In that case the focus feature of v is retained so that the matching feature on the external argument can be checked. This explains the assignment of information focus in the vP phase.

Zubizarreta (1998) suggests that NSR requires all constituents lacking a [+foc] feature below the focus-marked one to undergo p-movement (prosodically motivated movement) to a higher position than IF (see İşsever 2006 for the application of p-movement in Turkish; see also Parafita-Couto 2009 for a view of p-movement as a post-syntactic operation). Following Holmberg (1999), displaced constituents target outer Specs of v, where they satisfy its EPP feature (Chomsky 2001). After p-movement of the required constituents, the domain of v is Spelled-Out.

The cooperation between the NSR and p-movement allows for an explanation of A-movement effects in our topic fronting data schematized in (18), and repeated below in (28).

(28) A-movement effects

a. *[TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

b. *(TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

Let us first look at how the structure in (28a) is derived. The derivational steps of this structure are shown in (29).

(29) Derivation of (28a)

Step 1: *(TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

Step 2: *[TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

Step 3: *(TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

Step 4: *[TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

In Step 1, the anaphor in the bindee (β), i.e., the anaphoric subject, c-commands its DP binder (α) from its merged position, yielding an ungrammatical binding configuration. In the next step, NSR requires the DP binder to undergo p-movement to outer Spec,vP because the subject has IF interpretation (i.e., [+foc] feature). Thus, when vP is Spelled-Out, the binder is in a good position to bind the anaphor in the bindee. This would explain the A-movement effects but anaphoric features of the subject need to adjoin to the next higher functional head, which is T0 (Step 3). This adjunction operation prevents the binding relation between the DP and the anaphor to be established in the vP domain. However, as the DP binder needs to check its [+top] feature against δ-features of T, it undergoes movement to Spec,TP, entering the binding domain of the anaphor (Step 4). Hence, the c-command requirement of binding is fulfilled in the TP area.

As we have seen in (29), the derivation of the structure in (28a) produces three copies of the fronted element: the lowest copy in the Merge position in vP, the intermediate copy in Spec,vP, and the highest copy in Spec,TP. The question is whether each copy is interpreted in terms of binding relations. According to copy identification accounts like the PBCC, the lowest copy must obligatorily be available for interpretation, while the other two are optional in this respect. In fact, this means that all copies are potentially available to be interpreted in a binding relation. However, this is far from clear since, as we have discussed in section 3, if all copies could enter into binding relation freely, this would mean that ungrammatical combinations of the copies of the binder and bindee (such as the one in Step 1 in (29)) obtained in the course of the derivation would also be interpreted correctly at times, causing an unsuccessful binding relation to arise as well. However, it is not the case that there are some speakers who find the configuration in (28a) ungrammatical in terms of binding. This predicts that there is no binding ambiguity in this structure (namely, the only binding relation present in (28a) is interpreted by all speakers in the same way), which suggests that those copies leading to incorrect binding relations must not be interpreted. Note that, in terms of anaphora binding, our system predicts that copies of anaphoric constituents themselves are not relevant in binding; rather it is the anaphoric feature that counts for the binding relation which takes place in this process. This leaves open the question of whether they are actually deleted or not, a question which does not necessarily concern our analysis of anaphora binding in this study.

Turning to (28b), its derivation, shown in (30), proceeds in the same way as (28a) but the result is an ungrammatical structure.

(30) Derivation of (28b)

Step 1: *[TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

Step 2: *(TP Spec,TP α [vP [v P δ [vP v P β [vP v P γ [vP v α β γ]]]]]]]

In this derivation, the anaphoric feature in the bindee must adjoin to vP since it is the...
next higher functional head for the anaphor in the VP domain (Step 1). In the next step, the bindee undergoes p-movement and lands in outer Spec,vP, where it can c-command its binder, yielding an incorrect binding configuration. Again, this would explain the ungrammaticality, but recall that in our framework it is the c-command relation between the DP binder and the anaphoric features in functional heads that makes possible the binding relation between the binder and the bindee. As the DP binder (subject) in Spec,vP is now in the binding domain of the anaphor and c-commands the anaphoric features adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0}, the binding relation would be established as required. We suggest that it is. Then how can we explain the ungrammaticality? (As further steps of this derivation in the next phase will not change the binding relations we omit them here.)

We propose that in the derivation of (28b) the [+anaphor] feature adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0} creates an intervention effect. Note that in this structure the DP binder (subject) has [+foc] feature, so according to the NSR it needs to be the closest category to v\textsuperscript{0} because in this structure it is the head which is responsible for licensing IF. However, the categorial feature of the anaphor has already adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0}. Thus, from the viewpoint of the NSR, the most deeply embedded ‘category’ is the anaphor although the [+foc] feature belongs to the subject DP, which is above it. (This also implies that the NSR operates on both focus and categorial features.) This results in a PF-crash because the NSR cannot function properly. Note that, as shown in (31) below, this structure is perfectly acceptable both in Turkish (İşsever 2007, Öztürk 2005) and Spanish (Suñer 2000) when the subject has a contrastive, rather than an information focus interpretation since NSR has nothing to do with contrastive focus (see Zubizarreta 1998 for the procedural distinction in assigning information focus and contrastive focus; see also É. Kiss 1998 for the distinct properties of both types of foci). Our feature-based analysis of binding also gives support to the idea that binding relations must be reduced to narrow syntax, especially when taking into consideration the fact that NSR feeds syntax (Suñer 2000, Zubizarreta 1998, Zubizarreta and Vergnaud 2005, though see Parafita-Couto 2009 for a different view), a conclusion which is also strengthened by our findings in this study.

(31a) [Los unos a los otros,] se telefonearon LOS CHICOS, τ/la chicas, no.

‘The boys telephoned each other, not the girls.’


‘The men called each other, not the women.’ (Öztürk 2005: 172)

As to A’-movement effects in topic fronting, schematized in (19) and repeated in (32), we have seen that the binding relation between a DP (binder) and an anaphor (bindee) can be established if the binder has no [+foc] feature (i.e., information focus). In our data, this is observed in two configurations given in (32a), and (32b–c).

(32) A’-movement effects

a. [TP α\textsubscript{bindee}[+top]]j β\textsubscript{binder}[+top] [α ... α ...]j
b. [TP α\textsubscript{bindee}[+top]]j β\textsubscript{binder}[+top] [α ... ]j

c. [TP α\textsubscript{bindee}[+top]]j β\textsubscript{binder}[+top] [α ... ]j

As regards (32a), we have suggested above that there is nothing wrong with the binding relation between the binder and the bindee, but the ungrammaticality stems from the intervention of [+anaphor] feature adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0}, causing the NSR not to function properly (see (28b) and (30)). This predicts that with a DP subject without a [+foc] feature the structure would be grammatical. (32a) shows that this expectation is perfectly borne out. Hence, in this configuration, although the bindee in Spec,TP c-commands its binder, the structure is perfectly acceptable because the binding relation between them has already been established in the vP area. Recall that in our framework what is required for the binding relation to hold is the c-command relation between the DP binder and the [+anaphor] feature and not between the lexical anaphor and the DP. In this configuration this is exactly what we have: the DP subject (binder) in Spec,vP c-commands the [+anaphor] feature adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0}.

Having dealt with topicalization of a single item in binding configuration and the role of IF in this process, let us consider the case of multiple topic fronting. As shown in (32b–c), both orderings of the binder and bindee result in successful binding, which is surprising, considering the well accepted A-status of Spec,TP in the literature. However, the ordering possibilities between the binder and the bindee in Spec,TP receive a natural explanation in our analysis. First, let us consider a situation where the bindee is the subject and the binder is the object. As shown in (33), in the vP phase of such a structure the DP binder undergoes p-movement to the outer Spec,vP, where it can c-command the anaphor in the bindee.

(33) [TP α\textsubscript{binder}[+top]]j β\textsubscript{bindee}[+top] [α ... α ... ]j

In this step the binding configuration cannot be established because the [+anaphor] feature of the subject has to adjoin to the next higher functional head, which is T\textsuperscript{0} in this case. On the other hand, both the object and subject DPs need to move to multiple Specs of T\textsuperscript{0} since both have [+top]-features to check against the δ-feature of T\textsuperscript{0}. Since both in Turkish and Spanish they are allowed to move to the TP area in any order, we get either (32b) or (32c) (Jiménez-Fernández 2011). Thus, once the DP binder lands in a Spec,TP, be it either the inner or outer Spec, it enters the binding domain of the anaphor and can c-command the [+anaphor] feature previously adjoined to T\textsuperscript{0}.

Now assume that the binder is the subject and the bindee is the object. This makes the reversed ordering between them in the vP-phase:

(34) [TP α\textsubscript{binder}[+top]]j β\textsubscript{bindee}[+top] [α ... α ... ]j

As to A'-movement effects in topic fronting, schematized in (19) and repeated in (32), we have seen that there is nothing wrong with the binding relation between the binder and the bindee, but the ungrammaticality stems from the intervention of [+anaphor] feature adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0}, causing the NSR not to function properly (see (28b) and (30)). This predicts that with a DP subject without a [+foc] feature the structure would be grammatical. (32a) shows that this expectation is perfectly borne out. Hence, in this configuration, although the bindee in Spec,TP c-commands its binder, the structure is perfectly acceptable because the binding relation between them has already been established in the vP area. Recall that in our framework what is required for the binding relation to hold is the c-command relation between the DP binder and the [+anaphor] feature and not between the lexical anaphor and the DP. In this configuration this is exactly what we have: the DP subject (binder) in Spec,vP c-commands the [+anaphor] feature adjoined to v\textsuperscript{0}.

Having dealt with topicalization of a single item in binding configuration and the role of IF in this process, let us consider the case of multiple topic fronting. As shown in (32b–c), both orderings of the binder and bindee result in successful binding, which is surprising, considering the well accepted A-status of Spec,TP in the literature. However, the ordering possibilities between the binder and the bindee in Spec,TP receive a natural explanation in our analysis. First, let us consider a situation where the bindee is the subject and the binder is the object. As shown in (33), in the vP phase of such a structure the DP binder undergoes p-movement to the outer Spec,vP, where it can c-command the anaphor in the bindee.

(33) [TP α\textsubscript{binder}[+top]]j β\textsubscript{bindee}[+top] [α ... α ... ]j

In this step the binding configuration cannot be established because the [+anaphor] feature of the subject has to adjoin to the next higher functional head, which is T\textsuperscript{0} in this case. On the other hand, both the object and subject DPs need to move to multiple Specs of T\textsuperscript{0} since both have [+top]-features to check against the δ-feature of T\textsuperscript{0}. Since both in Turkish and Spanish they are allowed to move to the TP area in any order, we get either (32b) or (32c) (Jiménez-Fernández 2011). Thus, once the DP binder lands in a Spec,TP, be it either the inner or outer Spec, it enters the binding domain of the anaphor and can c-command the [+anaphor] feature previously adjoined to T\textsuperscript{0}.

Now assume that the binder is the subject and the bindee is the object. This makes the reversed ordering between them in the vP-phase:
Note that the Merge position of the bindee, including the anaphor, is in the domain of VP. Thus, $v^0$ is the next higher functional head for the anaphoric feature to adjoint to. After adjunction takes place, the DP subject (bindee) c-commands the [+anaphor] feature in $v^0$, hence the binding configuration is successfully formed in the $vP$ area. Further movements of both the subject and the object to Spec,TP to check their [+top] features will not change the binding relation between them already established in the $vP$-phase. As in the case of (33), the resulting order between them can be either (32b) or (32c), which are both correct. In a sense, as far as binding is concerned, movements of both the binder and the bindee to Spec,TP has just a PF reflex in (32). Hence, our analysis also has the advantage of capturing the insight of PF-movement analyses proposed in the literature for similar contexts.

5 Conclusion

In this work we have looked at anaphora binding contexts in two typologically different discourse-prominent languages, namely Spanish and Turkish. We have claimed that fronted topics in discourse-prominent languages are attracted by the multiple attractor T0 to check/value its δ-features inherited from C0. This explains the A-effects detected in (multiple) topic fronting. The apparent exceptions regarding the A'-effects have been argued to be caused by different grammatical principles such as adjunction of anaphoric features to functional heads as well as the NSR, which interacts with movement. A phase-based approach to topic fronting in the framework of anaphoric feature adjunction has been shown to solve the classical paradox between A- and A'-properties. Interaction with focus assignment and the interpretive features of the moving category have been argued to play a crucial role in our proposal, thereby reducing the A/A'-distinction in topic fronting to other properties of narrow syntax.
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