Abstract
Assuming the cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997, 2004; Cinque 1999), this study attempts to map four Chinese neutral question markers onto the left periphery, including ke/shifou/A-not-A in Mandarin Chinese and kam in Taiwan Southern Min. It is found that while these four markers all represent yes-no questions, they are not exactly alike on syntactic grounds. The syntactic behavior of ke is particularly different in that it is not able to lead an embedded null-subject question whereas ke/shifou/A-not-A are able to. Also, ke in its own right cannot license the focus interpretation of its following NP or clause whereas ke/shifou/A-not-A(MEpi-not-MEpi) can. Given these differences, this study proposes a topography and shows that they are due to different projections in the fine structure of split CPs, where ke is merged in Fin0 and raised to Int0, while kam/shifou/A-not-A(MEpi-not-MEpi) are merged in SpecFocP and raised to SpecIntP. VP-not-VP forms, however, are not base-generated in CP, but forced to raise in LF to SpecIntP for checking the feature [+Q].
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1. Introduction
This paper compares the syntax of four kinds of yes-no questions in the Chinese language, including ke questions in Mandarin Chinese (henceforth MC), kam questions in Taiwan Southern Min (henceforth TSM), shifou questions in MC, and A-not-A questions in MC. They all can be used as either matrix or embedded questions, as illustrated below.

(1) a. Ni ke yao qu Taibei? (MC)  
    you Q want go Taipei
  b. Li kam beh khi Taipak? (TSM)   
    you Q want go Taipei
  c. Ni shifou yao qu Taibei? (MC)   
    you Q want go Taipei
  d. Ni yao-bu-yao qu Taibe? (MC)   
    you want-not-want go Taipei

‘Do you want to go to Taipei?’

(2) a. Wo xiang zhidaq ni ke yao qu Taibe. (MC)   
    I want know you Q want go Taipei
  b. Gua siunnbeh tsaiiann li kam beh khi Taipak. (TSM)    
    I want know you Q want go Taipei
  c. Wo xiang zhidaq ni shifou yao qu Taibe. (MC)   

1 Though Huang (1991:324) points out that ke is a question form in Early Mandarin, my survey of the Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Modern Chinese shows that ke questions are still available nowadays. Also, nearly all of my informants accept ke questions.
2 The abbreviations used in this paper are glossed as follows: CL=classifier; DE: possessive/prenominal marker de; Exp: experiential aspect marker; Part=cleft particle de in MC or e in TSM; Perf=perfective aspect marker; Q=question marker.
3 The transcription of TSM in this paper is based on the Taiwan Romanization System, which was officially published by the Ministry of Education of the R.O.C. in 2006.
I want to know if you want to go to Taipei.

Wo xiang zhida ni yao-bu-yao qu Taibei. (MC)

'I wonder if/whether you want to go to Taipei.'

A syntactic characteristic shared by all the above four kinds of questions is that the question markers as in bold face appear preverbally, in contrast with the following kinds of questions whose question markers appear sentence-finally.

(3) a. Ni yao qu Taibei ma? (MC)
   you want go Taipei Q
   ‘Do you want to go to Taipei?’

b. Li beh khi Taipak bo? (TSM)
   you want go Taipei not Q
   ‘Do you want to go to Taipei?’

A question like (3a) is a typical yes-no question in Chinese, and a question like (3b) is termed as “VP-neg questions” by Zhang (1990) and Zhu (1991), or as “negative particle questions” by Cheng, Huang & Tang (1996). According to Cheng, Huang & Tang (1996), T.-C. Tang (1999), Wei (2007), and He (2011:473-474), the sentence-final negative morpheme in Chinese VP-neg questions has become a question particle.

Yue (1988, 2006) uses the term zhongxing wenju ‘neutral questions’ to refer to three types of questions: “FVP questions” (Zhu 1985) or “K-VP questions” (Zhu 1991) as in (1a, b),4 A-not-A questions as in (1d), and VP-neg questions as in (3b). By zhongxing ‘neutral’,5 Yue (2006:205 fn. 6) means that “the aim of the question is simply to solicit information without pre-judgment”. This amounts to saying that a speaker who asks questions like (1a, b, d) and (3b) has no assumption as to whether the hearer will go or not. In the present study, I include shifou questions as the fourth type of neutral question since the question marker shifou, just like ke/kam and A-not-A, is also preverbal, and the question reading is also neutral.

On the other hand, non-neutral questions as listed below are associated with the speaker’s pre-judgment.

(4) a. Ni bu qu ma? (Yue 2006:205 fn. 6)
   you not go Q
   ‘Are you not going?’

b. M khi kam m si? (Cheng 1977)
   not go Q not be
   ‘S/he does not want to go, does s/he?’

c. Gua kam khuann bue tshut? (Lien 2011:274)
   I Q see not out
   ‘Am I really not able to see it through?’

The MC example in (4a) is a negative particle question. The speaker of this question assumes that the hearer would go; nevertheless, things seem to go against this assumption and therefore the speaker asks the question to confirm. The TSM example in (4b) is an “assertive question” (Cheng 1977), and the speaker of this question assumes that the subject would not go. The TSM example in (4c) is a “rhetorical question” which expresses the opposite of the fact represented by the sentence (Lien 2011). Thus, by uttering (4c), the speaker assumes that s/he him/herself is actually able to see it through. As shown above, a question marker like kam can be used either neutrally or non-neutrally. In this study, I only focus on the neutral use of kam/ke and put aside the non-neutral use.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 finds out syntactic differences among the four kinds of neutral questions. Section 3 relates one of the syntactic differences to the

4 The letter F of FVP questions represents the term fuci ‘adverb’ in MC, and the letter K of K-VP questions represents the velar stop consonant /k/.

5 The cover term zhongxing ‘neutral’ is borrowed from Lü (1942).
finite vs. nonfinite distinction. Section 4 pins down the four neutral question markers to the left periphery (Rizzi 1997, 2004). Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Syntactic Differences

I observe that the question marker *ke* differs syntactically from the other three in two ways. First, while *kam*, *shifou* and A-not-A are able to lead an embedded null-subject question, *ke* is not. This difference is demonstrated below.

(5) a. *Wo bu zhidao ke yao qu Taibei.*
   I not know Q want go Taipei
b. Gua m tsaiiann kam beh khi Taipak.
   I not know Q want go Taipei
c. Wo bu zhidao shifou yao qu Taibei.
   I not know Q want go Taipei
d. Wo bu zhidao yao-bu-yao qu Taibei.
   I not know want-not-want go Taipei
   ‘I do not know whether to go to Taipei.’

Second, *kam*, *shifou* and A-not-A may license the focus reading of its following NP or clause without the help of focus markers *si/shi* ‘be’; in contrast, *ke* in its own right may not license the focus interpretation unless the focus marker *shi* ‘be’ comes to help. The relevant data are illustrated below.

(6) a. *Ke *(shi) A-Ming yao lai?*
   Q be A-Ming want come
b. Kam (si) A-Bing beh lai?
   Q be A-Bing want come
c. Shifou (shi) A-Ming yao lai?
   Q be A-Ming want come
d. Hui-bu-hui (shi) A-Ming yao lai?
   will-not-will be A-Ming want come
   i. ‘Is it the case that A-Ming/A-Bing wants to come?’
   ii. ‘Is it A-Ming/A-Bing who wants to come?’

I propose that the above syntactic differences result from different projections of the question markers in the left periphery. This proposal will be elaborated in Section 4.

Before ending this section, I point out one more observation that the contrast between (5a) and (5b-d) is reminiscent of the following contrast in English between *if* and *whether* (Haegeman 1994:274).

(7) a. *John doesn’t know if to leave.*
   b. John doesn’t know whether to leave.

Given the above contrast, one might easily make a parallel analysis and conclude that what causes the English contrast in (7) may also cause the Chinese contrast in (5). However, this conclusion is too hasty. As we can see in (7), both *if* and *whether* take an infinitival clause involving the infinitive marker *to*. This infinitive marker, nevertheless, has no corresponding morpheme in the Chinese

---

6 If we replace *ke* with *kefou* in (5a), the sentence will become acceptable and sound similar to (5c), which has *shifou*. For historical and dialectal research on the modal-*fou*-VP/NP structure, see Wei (2010).
language, and therefore it is not clear whether the embedded questions in (5) are finite or nonfinite. If it turns out that they are finite clauses, the parallel analysis will be problematic. To solve this problem, in the next section I adopt several tests for the finite vs. nonfinite distinction in the Chinese language.

3. Finite vs. Nonfinite

Several tests are brought up in this section to examine (non-)finiteness of the embedded null-subject clauses in (5a-d). The aim is to determine whether these clauses fall under the configuration in (8a) or that in (8b).

(8) a. NPi V [ CP Q [ TP/IP proi  VP] ] (embedded clause: finite)
b. NPi V [ CP Q [ TP/IP PROi VP] ] (embedded clause: nonfinite)

One might wonder why the question markers (except VP-not-VP forms) are placed in CP, as represented by Q in the above structures. I will return to this question in section 4. Regarding VP-not-VP forms, I show immediately below that they are base-generated within TP/IP.

3.1 A-not-A test

One of the criteria for determining whether a sentence or clause is finite or non-finite in Chinese, as suggested by T.-C. Tang (2000), has to do with whether the sentence or clause is able to form an A-not-A question. Consider the following contrast.

(9) a. Ni [finite xiang-bu-xiangyao xue yingyu]?
you want-not-want learn English
‘Do you want to learn English?’
b. *Ni xiangyao [nonfinite xue-bu-xue yingyu]?
you want learn-not-learn English

In T.-C. Tang’s analysis, if a sentence or clause is able to form an A-not-A question as in (9a), the sentence or clause is finite; otherwise, it is nonfinite, as in (8b).

Following T.-C. Tang, I suggest that the embedded null-subject A-not-A question in (5d) is finite. Its structure is represented below.

(10) NP V [ CP [ TP/IP proi VP-not-VP .. ]]

According to Huang (1991), Chinese A-not-A forms are base-generated within IP. He divides A-not-A questions into two subtypes: A-not-AB and AB-not-A. The former subtype is derived by a reduplication rule which applies to INFL and VP (including modals), and the latter subtype is derived by a deletion rule which applies to the VP-coordinated base: [[AB] [not AB]]. In the present study, I assume Huang’s IP analysis of Chinese A-not-A forms.

Given the A-not-A test, one may apply it to (5a) and (5c) to see whether the embedded null-subject clauses are finite or nonfinite, as illustrated below.8

7 In MC, only verbal elements such as bare verbs, modals or adjectival predicates may enter into the A-not-A formation. In TSM, the use of A-not-A questions is less common while the use of VP-neg questions is more predominant (Wang & Lien 2001).
8 I exclude the application of the A-not-A test to the predicate beh khi Taipak ‘want to go to Taipei’ in (5b) because the use of A-not-A questions in TSM is not common, and there is no A-not-A form for the verb beh ‘want’. It is not acceptable to say beh-m khi Taipak ‘will-not-will go to Taipei’ (the negative counterpart of beh is m; see Li 1971) in
Since the embedded null-subject clauses in the above cases are not able to have the A-not-A form, this result indicates that these clauses are nonfinite. In other words, (11a, b) are unacceptable because *ke* and *shifou* in the above structures illegitimately take finite A-not-A forms. However, I argue that this conclusion is unreliable. In fact, the unacceptability of (11a, b) may be due to other factors. For instance, I observe a constraint that a sentence cannot have more than one question marker of the same function. Otherwise, some kind of redundancy or a competition effect would arise. If my observed constraint is valid, we predict that *shifou* and *ke* cannot co-occur since they function similarly. This prediction is borne out, as shown below.

Furthermore, if we change (11a, b) to direct questions, the sentences are still unacceptable, as demonstrated below. Again, the constraint pointed out above is supported.

To conclude, whether the unacceptability of (11a, b) must be related to (non-)finiteness is still far from settled. For this reason, I put the A-not-A test aside and seek others.

3.2 Modal test

T.-C. Tang (1988:330-331) points out that Chinese factitive verbs such as *jiao* ‘ask’, *quan* ‘persuade’, *qiangpo* ‘force’, etc. cannot take a complement clause which involves modals such as *hui* ‘will’, *neng* ‘can’, *keyi* ‘can’ and *yinggai* ‘should’, as shown below.

---

TSM. Even if a TSM constituent has the acceptable A-not-A form, this A-not-A form is still unable to co-occur with the question marker *kam*. The following examples are taken from Huang (1991:327).

(i) a. Li  bat-m-bat chit-e lang?
you know-not-know this-CL person
‘Do you know this person?’

b. *Li kam bat-m-bat chit-e lang?*
you Q know-not-know this-CL person

9 The majority of my informants do not find (11b) as natural as (5c) or (5d). The latter two have only one question marker in the sentence.
s/he ask you  write one-CL report
‘S/he asked you to write a report.’
b. *Ta jiao ni [hui xie yi-fen baogao].
s/he ask you  will write one-CL report
‘S/he asked you to be going to write a report.’

T.-C. Tang concludes that verbs which occur in complement clauses of Chinese factitive verbs are very much like nonfinite ones. Along this line, (14b) is unacceptable because a modal like hui ‘will’ cannot occur in nonfinite clauses.

Now let us see whether the modal hui ‘will’ is able to occur in the null-subject complement clauses led by the four neutral question markers. Consider the following data.

(15)  
a. *Wo bu zhidao [ke hui qu Taibei]. (MC)
I not know Q will go Taipei
b. Gua m tsaiann [kam e khi Taipak]. (TSM)
I not know Q will go Taipei
c. Wo bu zhidao [shifou hui qu Taibei]. (MC)
I not know will-not-will go Taipei
d. Wo bu zhidao [hui-bu-hui qu Taibei]. (MC)
I do not know whether I will go to Taipei.’

Given that the modal hui ‘will’ cannot occur in nonfinite clauses, we draw a conclusion from the above data that the embedded null-subject clause led by ke is nonfinite, while those led by kam/shifou/A-not-A are finite.

3.3 ‘Yijing’ test

C.-C. Tang (2001:232) gives the following data and suggests that the embedded clause in (16a) is tensed while that in (16b) is tenseless.

(16)  
a. Ta zhidao [ni yijing lai-le].
s/he know you already come-Perf
‘S/he knows that you have already come.’
b. *Ta shefa [yijing tongzhi wo].
s/he try already inform me
‘S/he tried to have already informed me.’

In C.-C. Tang’s analysis, (16b) is unacceptable because the adverbial yijing ‘already’ should be licensed by T when it is marked with the feature [+tensed]. In other words, yijing ‘already’ cannot occur in tenseless/nonfinite clauses.

Given that the adverbial yijing ‘already’ can be used as a test for the finite vs. nonfinite distinction, I apply it to the embedded null-subject clauses led by the four neutral question markers.

(17)  
a. *Wo bu jide [ke yijing fu qian le]. (MC)
I not remember Q already pay money Perf
b. Gua bue kitsit [kam iking lap tsinn a]. (TSM)
I not remember Q already pay money Perf
c. Wo bu jide [shifou yijing fu qian le]. (MC)
I not remember Q already pay money Perf
d. *Wo bu jide      [yijing you-mei-you fu qian le].$^{10}$ (MC)
   I  not remember  already have-not-have pay money Perf
   ‘I do not remember whether I have already paid.’

The above contrast between (17a) and (17b, c) indicates that ke should lead a nonfinite embedded clause while kam/shifou should lead finite ones.

How about (17d)? Is the sentence unacceptable because the embedded A-not-A clause is nonfinite and thus incompatible with finite yijing ‘already’? I suggest that this is not true. Ernst (1994) and Law (2006) have observed that frequency, manner, degree, epistemic, ordinal, agent-oriented, aspectual and reason adverbs cannot precede A-not-A forms, whereas temporal, locative and domain adverbs can. The contrast is exemplified below.

(18)  a. *Zhangsan changchang tiao-bu-tiaowu?  (frequency)
        Zhangsan often             dan-not-dance
        ‘Does Zhangsan often dance?’
   b. *Ta luan pao-bu-pao?          (manner)
        s/he chaotically run-not-run
        ‘Is s/he running all over the place?’
   c. *Ta hen congming-bu-congming?  (degree)
        s/he very smart-not-smart
        ‘Is s/he very smart?’
   d. *Ta xianran qu-bu-qu?          (epistemic)
        s/he obviously go-not-go
        ‘Is s/he obviously going?’
   e. *Xiaolan xian zou-bu-zou?      (ordinal)
        Xiaolan first  leave-not-leave
        ‘Is Xiaolan leaving first?’
   f. *Laoban yanlde ze-bu-zebei ta? (agent-oriented)
        boss      sternly  accu-not-accuse him/her
        ‘Does the boss sternly accuse him/her?’
   g. *Ta turan you-mei-you xinglai? (aspectual)
        s/he suddenly have-not-have wake.up
        ‘Did s/he wake up suddenly?’
   h. *Ni yinwei ni-de pengyou-de yaoqiu qu-bu-qu?  (reason)
        you because you-DE friend-DE     demand go-not-go
        ‘Are you going because of your friend’s demands?’

(19)  a. Ni jintian qu-bu-qu?
        you today   go-not-go
        ‘Are you going today?’
   b. Ni zai nar chi-bu-chi rou?
        you at there eat-not-eat meat
        ‘Do you eat meat over there?’

$^{10}$ Note that the adverbial yijing ‘already’ must precede the existential modal you ‘have’, as evidenced in the following contrast.

(i) a. Wo yijing you fu qian le.
       I  already have pay money Perf
       ‘I have already paid.’
   b. *Wo you yijing fu qian le.
       I have already pay money Perf
To account for the above contrast, Law (2006) proposes that the sentences in (18) fall under the configuration below in (20), which, however, violates a locality constraint called the MBR, as stated in (21).

(20) \[ \ldots \text{XP}(\text{A-not-A}); \ldots \text{YP} \ldots \text{ti} \ldots \] (LF)

(21) The Minimal Binding Requirement (MBR)
Variables must be bound by the most local potential antecedent.

In Law’s analysis, the adverbs in (18) are related to the predicate with respect to inference or entailment while those in (19) are “related to the independently motivated world and time coordinates of the formal interpretive model in the Montague tradition (Montague 1970)” (Law 2006:122). This distinction is alternatively interpreted in the way that the former are more adjunct-like whereas the latter are more argument-like. As potential A-bar binders, the adverbs in (18), as represented by YP in (20), intervene in the movement dependency between the A-not-A operator and its trace.11 As a result, this intervention causes the A-not-A trace not to be bound by the nearest potential binder, namely, YP in (20). Due to the violation of the MBR, the sentences in (18) are thus ruled out.12

Along the above lines, I suggest that the same state of affairs occurs in (17d). The adverb \textit{yijing} ‘already’, as a potential A-bar binder, induces an MBR violation. This analysis is supported by the following examples in (22) and their derivations in (23).

(22) a. *Na-ke shu yijing weishenme si-le?
   that-CL tree already why die-Perf
   ‘Why has the tree already been dead?’

   b. Na-ke shu weishenme yijing si-le?
   that-CL tree why already die-Perf
   ‘Why has the tree already been dead?’

(23) a. *[CP \ldots weishenme; \ldots [TP/IP \ldots yijing \ldots ti; \ldots ]] (LF)
   b. [CP \ldots weishenme; \ldots [TP/IP \ldots ti; \ldots yijing \ldots ]] (LF)

If we assume Tsai’s (1994, 1999) treatment of Chinese \textit{wh}-adverbs like \textit{weishenme} ‘why’ as operators which undergo LF movement, the above contrast directly follows. That is, the A-bar trace in (23a) is not bound by its closest potential A-bar binder \textit{yijing} ‘already’, and this does not conform to the MBR. In contrast, the A-bar trace in (23b) is bound by its closest potential binder \textit{weishenme} ‘why’, obeying the MBR.

On the other hand, the adverbs in (19) are not potential A-bar binders and thus unable to intervene in the A-bar dependency. If this analysis is on the right track, we predict that the A-bar dependency in (17d) should not be intervened by a temporal adverbial such as \textit{zuotian} ‘yesterday’. This prediction is borne out, as evidenced below.

(24) Wo bu jide [zuotian you-mei-you fu qian].
   I not remember yesterday have-not-have pay money

\[11\] For the (LF) movement property of A-not-A constituents, see Huang (1982, 1991).
\[12\] See Z. Zhang (1997) for an alternative, pragmatic analysis of unacceptable sentences like (18).
‘I do not remember whether I have already paid yesterday.’

In brief, the unacceptability of (17d) does not suggest that the embedded A-not-A clause is nonfinite in contradiction to finite *yijing* ‘already’, but that the A-not-A trace fails to be locally bound by *yijing* ‘already’.

### 3.4 Object shift test

The final test for the finite vs. nonfinite distinction in Chinese concerns object shift. Consider the following data (taken from Lin 2011:60), which show that in (25b) and (26b), the object NP has been preposed to the preverbal position between the subject and the verb in the embedded clause.

(25) a. Zhangsan renwei [finite Lisi chi-le hanbao].  
Zhangsan think Lisi eat Perf burger  
‘Zhangsan thinks that Lisi ate the burger.’

b. Zhangsan renwei [finite Lisi hanbao chi-le].  
Zhangsan think Lisi burger eat Perf  
‘Zhangsan thinks that the burger, Lisi ate (it).’

(26) a. Zhangsan jiao [nonfinite Lisi chi hanbao].  
Zhangsan ask Lisi eat burger  
‘Zhangsan asked Lisi to eat the burger.’

b. *Zhangsan jiao [nonfinite Lisi hanbao chi].  
Zhangsan ask Lisi burger eat  
Intended: ‘Zhangsan asked that the burger, Lisi eat (it).’

Lin, following Fu (1994) and Paul (2002), attributes the above contrast between (25b) and (26b) to the fact that finite clauses in MC permit object shift while nonfinite ones do not.

I now examine whether object shift is permitted in the embedded null-subject clauses led by the four neutral question markers. The data are illustrated below.

(27) a. *Wo1 bu jide [e₁ Meiguo ke qu-guo].  (MC)  
I not remember US Q go-Exp

b. Gua, bue kitsit [e₁ Bikok kam (u) khi-kue].  (TSM)  
I not remember US Q have go-Exp

c. *Wo1 bu jide [e₁ Meiguo shifou qu-guo].  (MC)  
I not remember US Q go-Exp

d. *Wo1 bu jide [e₁ Meiguo you-mei-you qu-guo].  (MC)  
I not remember US have-not-have go-Exp  
‘I do not remember whether I have been to the US.’

The object shift test suggests that only the embedded clause where *ke* occurs is nonfinite, while the other three are finite.

### 3.5 Interim summary

To summarize the results of the above tests, I draw the following structures for the embedded null-subject clauses led by *ke, kam, shifou* and VP-not-VP.

(28) a. NP₁ V [CP ke [TP/IP PRO₁ VP]]  
(embedded clause: nonfinite)
It is concluded that the embedded null-subject clause led by *ke* is nonfinite, while those led by *kam/shifou/VP-not-VP* are finite.

### 4. Mapping in Left Periphery

In this section, I not only map the neutral question markers onto the left periphery but also show that the two syntactic differences observed in section 2 may receive satisfactory explanations from the topography I propose.

#### 4.1 Proposed topography

Assuming Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) Split CP Hypothesis as shown in (29), I propose the topography in (30) to locate *ke/kam/shifou* in the left periphery.

(29) \[[CP \text{Force} \ Top^* \ \text{Int} \ Top^* \ \text{Focus} \ Mod^* \ Top^* \ \text{Fin}] \ \text{IP}\]

(30) \[
\text{IntP} \\
\text{Int'} \\
\text{Int} \quad \ldots \ldots \\
\text{FocP} \\
\text{ke} \quad \text{si/shi} \\
\text{Foc'} \quad \text{FinP} \\
\text{Foc} \quad \text{Fin'} \\
\text{Fin} \quad \text{TP/IP} \\
\ldots \ \text{VP-not-VP} \ldots
\]

Under my proposal, *kam* and *shifou* are merged (i.e., base-generated) in SpecFocP, whereas *ke* is merged in Fin^0_. In the following subsections, I will provide evidence and explain why these three question markers are taken as CP elements, and why *kam/shifou* are analyzed as being merged in SpecFocP while *ke* in Fin^0_.

#### 4.2 ‘Kam/shifou’ as CP elements

Huang (1991) analyzes *kam* as being merged in Infl^0_ while Lau (2010) argues that it is a CP element. In view of the following data associated with predicate focus, I concur with Lau’s view.

(31) \begin{align*}
a. \ A-Bing & \textbf{kam} \ \text{si} \ \text{kahi} \ A-Bi? \\
& \text{be like A-Bi?} \\
\end{align*}  \quad \text{(kam > Foc)}
'Does A-Bing really like A-Bi?'

b. *A-Bing si kam kahi A-Bi?  (*Foc > kam)

    A-Ming Q be like A-Mei
    'Does A-Ming really like A-Mei?'

If we follow Lee (2005), among many others, assuming that focus markers occupy Foc\(^0\) under Rizzi's (1997, 2004) Split CP architecture,\(^{13}\) we may draw a conclusion from the above data that kam/shifou fall under CP since both are higher than focus markers in Foc\(^0\). In addition, the initial NPs in (31a) and (32a) no longer stay in SpecIP (or SpecTP); instead, they have raised to Topic slots in CP.

More empirical evidence is given below in support of the CP analysis of kam/shifou. The following data involve subject focus in cleft constructions.

(33)  a. Kam si A-Bing phah A-Bi e?  (kam > Foc)
        Q be A-Bing beat A-Bi Part
    'Was it A-Bing who beat A-Bi?'

(34)  a. Shifou shi A-Ming da A-Mei de?  (shifou > Foc)
        Q be A-Ming beat A-Mei Part
    'Was it A-Ming who beat A-Mei?'

Again, it is seen above that kam/shifou should be in a CP position higher than focus markers in Foc\(^0\).

In the next subsection, I turn to discuss the status of ke and propose that it is merged in Fin\(^0\), being a CP element as well.

4.3 ‘Ke’ and PRO Theorem

Recall that in section 2 I raised a question regarding whether we may make a parallel analysis of the contrast in (5), reproduced below as (35), and that in (7), reproduced below as (36).

(35)  a. *Wo bu zhidao ke yao qu Taibei. (MC)
        I not know Q want go Taipei
    b. Gua m tsaiann kam beh khi Taipak. (TSM)
        I not know Q want go Taipei
    c. Wo bu zhidao shifou yao qu Taibei. (MC)
        I not know Q want go Taipei
    d. Wo bu zhidao yao-bu-yao qu Taibei. (MC)
        I not know want-not-want go Taipei
    'I do not know whether to go to Taipei.'

(36)  a. *John doesn’t know if to leave.
    b. John doesn’t know whether to leave.

\(^{13}\) Lee’s Foc\(^0\) analysis is made only for the MC focus marker shi ‘be’. Given that the focus marker si ‘be’ in TSM is the counterpart of shi ‘be’ in MC, I assume that si ‘be’ also occupies Foc\(^0\).
My answer to the above question is that the parallel analysis cannot be possible for (35b-d) and (36b). This is because I have shown in section 3 that the embedded null-subject clauses led by kam/shifou/VP-not-VP are finite, in contrast with the nonfinite one in (36b). As for (35a) and (36a), I suggest that the parallel analysis is possible because the embedded null-subject clause led by ke and that led by if are both nonfinite. Details are spelt out below.

According to Haegeman (1994), the English contrast in (36) is explained in terms of the spec-head distinction (see also Adger & Quer 2001). If is proposed to be a head in C⁰ while whether is proposed to be a maximal projection in SpecCP. This proposed distinction is schematized below.

(37)

```
CP
  Spec
    C' IP
      C NP I'
        whether if PRO to leave
```

A consequence arising from the above configuration is that if governs PRO, violating the PRO Theorem and resulting in the ungrammaticality of (36a).

(38) PRO Theorem

PRO must be ungoverned.

In contrast, whether does not govern PRO. In the Government and Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981, 1986), governors are defined as the lexical heads (V, N, P, A) and tensed I (T). This definition, however, does not apply to whether since it is neither a lexical head nor I. Without inducing a violation of the PRO Theorem, (36b) is thus grammatical.

Given the C⁰ analysis of if, I then make a parallel analysis for ke, as illustrated below.

(39)

```
FinP
  Spec
    Fin' TP/IP
      Fin NP I'
        ke PRO
```

The unacceptability of (35a) follows from the structure proposed above. That is, ke governs PRO, and this government relation leads to a violation of the PRO Theorem. In (36b-d), on the other hand, PRO does not occur in the embedded null-subject clauses of these sentences, and the PRO Theorem is irrelevant here.

---

14 One more reason for not making a parallel analysis of (35d) and (36d) is that Chinese VP-not-VP forms are assumed in this study to be merged within TP/IP along the lines of Huang (1991), whereas whether in English is generally regarded as a CP element.
4.4 Licensing of focus interpretation

A question that remains from the above discussion concerns why *ke* and *kam/shifou* are proposed to be merged in different CP layers. I suggest that this difference is based on the following data we already saw in section 2, reproduced from (6).

(40) a. *Ke*(shi) A-Ming yao lai? (MC)
    Q be A-Ming want come
b. *Kam*(si) A-Bing beh lai? (TSM)
    Q be A-Bing want come
    Q be A-Ming want come
   i. ‘Is it the case that A-Ming/A-Bing wants to come?’
   ii. ‘Is it A-Ming/A-Bing who wants to come?’

The above contrast shows that *ke* in its own right is not able to license the focus interpretation while *kam/shifou* in their own right are able to. This difference implies that *kam/shifou* have the inborn focus function whereas *ke* does not. To capture this difference, I therefore propose to merge *kam/shifou* in the FocP domain and exclude *ke* from the same domain. Furthermore, when the focus interpretation is available in (40) with the occurrence of *shi* ‘be’, I assume that overt raising of *ke* has taken place.

From the discussion immediately above, we learned that *kam/shifou* should fall under FocP, and from the discussion in subsection 4.2, we also learned that *kam/shifou* should be higher than Foc0. As a consequence, the remaining possible slot for *kam/shifou* to stay will be SpecFocP.

Alternatively, one might wonder if *ke* can be merged in Int0. I argue that this alternative analysis is not desirable. The reason is that if *ke* is merged in Int0, it will not govern PRO, given that CP barriers (FocP and FinP) occur between Int0 and SpecTP/SpecIP. Without violating the PRO Theorem, the sentence in (35a) will be wrongly predicted to be well-formed.

I finally discuss the CP status of *hui-bu-hui* ‘will-not-will’ under my proposed topography in (30). This A-not-A form is proposed to fall under CP because, following Tsai’s (2010:220) topographic analysis of Chinese modals as illustrated below in (41), I assume that irrealis/epistemic *hui* ‘will’ is in the complementizer layer, contrary to dynamic *hui* ‘be able to’ in the lexical layer.

(41) [complementizer layer MP^Epi [inflectional layer TP MP^Deo [lexical layer vP MP^Dyn VP]]]

The non-uniform analysis of irrealis/epistemic *hui* ‘will’ and dynamic *hui* ‘be able to’ is supported by the following example.

(42) **Hui-bu-hui** shi xiaohai yijing **hui** zoulu le?
    will-not-will be kid already can walk Perf
    ‘Would it be the case that the kid is already able to walk?’

As shown above, the two kinds of *hui* have no problem to co-occur, and they also stay in different positions. This suggests that a non-uniform analysis is necessary. Also, since *hui-bu-hui* ‘will-not-will’ in the above example stays in a position higher than the focus marker *shi* ‘be’, it follows that *hui-bu-hui* ‘will-not-will’ should be a CP element.
Given that *hui-bu-hui* ‘will-not-will’ is a CP element, one might further ask under which CP layer it falls. Recall from (6) that *hui-bu-hui* ‘will-not-will’ behaves on a par with *kam* and *shifou*. For this reason, I merge these three question forms in the same position: SpecFocP.  

4.5 Deriving interrogative interpretation

One thing that has still been unknown from the discussion so far is how the interrogative interpretation of neutral questions is derived. Assuming that both Int$^0$ and the neutral question markers have the feature [+Q], it follows that the neutral question markers will be forced to move to IntP to check the feature [+Q]. For the derivation, consider the following LF representation.

In my analysis, the head-to-head movement of *ke* straightforwardly checks the feature [+Q] of *ke* and that of Int$^0$. On the other hand, the feature checking between *kam/shifou*/A-not-A in SpecIntP and Int$^0$ is carried out via spec-head agreement.  

5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I have compared four Chinese neutral question markers and found that *ke* differs syntactically from *kam/shifou*/A-not-A in two ways. First, *ke* cannot lead an embedded null-subject question whereas the other three markers can. I have related this difference to the finite vs. nonfinite distinction of embedded null-subject clauses. Second, *ke* itself cannot license the focus interpretation of its following NP or clause, as opposed to *kam/shifou*/M$^{Ep}$-not-M$^{Ep}$. To account for these two findings, I have proposed a left-peripheral topography for the neutral question markers and shown that the two observed syntactic differences follow from my proposed structure.

This study has both empirical and theoretical contributions. Empirically, though *kam* in TSM is generally regarded as being equivalent to *ke* in MC (see, e.g., Huang 1991), this study has discovered that they actually do not behave exactly alike. Theoretically, this study has demonstrated the feasibility of the PRO Theorem as well as the strength of the fine structure of left periphery in

---

15 See N. Zhang (1997:116) for her claim that A-not-A forms can be taken to be focus markers.
16 An alternative analysis of the MC question marker *shifou* appears in Tsai (2008:108), where *shifou* is assumed to occupy the Int position. I leave this alternative analysis open and do not evaluate it here.
accounting for the syntactic differences among the four neutral question markers in the Chinese language.

As a final remark, while the present study adopts a traditional G&B approach to the ill-formedness of \textit{ke} questions like (35a), the recent minimalist approach has argued to eliminate the mechanism of government as well as the PRO Theorem. Given this, we immediately face a question as to how the ill-formedness of \textit{ke} questions like (35a) can be explained under the minimalist approach. Without a satisfactory answer at the present stage, I leave this question for future research.
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