1 The Basic Facts of \textit{wh}-in-situ in Hindi

1.1 \textit{wh}-phrases in Matrix Clauses

\textit{wh}-phrases in matrix clauses can appear in-situ and produce ordinary question interpretations (cf. Mahajan (1990), Dayal (1996), i.a.).

(1) Questioned element: Object
   
   \begin{itemize}
   \item a. Base: S O V:
     \begin{verbatim}
     Ram-ne [yeh ciiz] khaa-ii
     Ram-Erg this thing.f eat-Pfv.f
     \end{verbatim}
     \textquoteleft Ram ate this thing.\textquoteright
   \item b. S \textit{wh}-O V, most natural:
     \begin{verbatim}
     Ram-ne [kyaa ciiz] khaa-ii
     Ram-Erg what thing.f eat-Pfv.f
     \end{verbatim}
     \textquoteleft What thing did Ram eat?\textquoteright
   \item c. \textit{wh}-O S V:
     \begin{verbatim}
     [kyaa ciiz] Ram-ne khaa-ii
     Ram-Erg what thing.f eat-Pfv.f
     \end{verbatim}
     \textquoteleft What thing did Ram eat?\textquoteright
   \end{itemize}

(2) Questioned element: Subject
   
   \begin{itemize}
   \item a. Base: S O V:
     \begin{verbatim}
     Ram-ne Billu-ko maar-aa
     Ram-Erg Billu-Acc hit-Pfv
     \end{verbatim}
     \textquoteleft Ram hit Billu.\textquoteright
   \item b. \textit{wh}-S O V:
     \begin{verbatim}
     kis-ne Billu-ko maar-aa
     who-Erg Billu-Acc hit-Pfv
     \end{verbatim}
     \textquoteleft Who hit Billu?\textquoteright
   \end{itemize}

1.2 \textit{wh}-phrases in Finite Complement Clauses

\textit{wh}-phrases in finite complement clauses in Hindi cannot take matrix scope if they stay inside the complement clause in overt syntax.

Verbs that can take both interrogative and propositional complements:

(4) \textit{jaan} \textquoteleft know\textquoteright

\begin{verbatim}
Wajahat jaan-taa hai [ki Rima kis-ko pasand kar-tii
Wajahat.m know-Hab.MSG be.Prs.Sg that Rima.f who-Acc like do-Hab.f
hain]
be.Prs.Sg
\end{verbatim}

Embedded Question: \textquoteleft Wajahat knows who Rima likes.\textquoteright
\textquoteleft Matrix Question: \textquoteleft Who does Wajahat know Rima likes?\textquoteright
Verbs that can only take propositional complements:

(5) *maan 'believe'
    [ki Rima kis-ko pasand kar-tii
    Wajahat.m believe-Hab.MSG be.Prs.Sg that Rima.f who-Acc like
    do-Hab.f hai]
    be.Prs.Sg

*Embedded Question: ‘Wajahat believes who Rima likes.’
*Matrix Question: ‘Who does Wajahat believe Rima likes?’

Verbs that can only take interrogative complements:

(6) *puuch 'ask'
    Wajahat puuch rahaah hai [ki Rima kis-ko pasand kar-tii
    Wajahat.m ask Prog.MSG be.Prs.Sg that Rima.f who-Acc like
    do-Hab.f hai]
    be.Prs.Sg

Embedded Question: ‘Wajahat is asking who Rima likes.’
*Matrix Question: ‘Who is Wajahat asking Rima likes?’

● wh-in-situ in an embedded finite clause → no wide-scope question interpretation

1.2.2 Giving wide scope to wh-phrases in Finite Complement Clauses

Two Strategies:

Overt Movement of wh-phrase:

(7) a. *jaan 'know':
    Wajahat jaan-taa hai [ki Rima t pasand kar-tii
    who-Acc Wajahat.m know-Hab.MSG be.Prs.Sg that Rima.f like
    do-Hab.f hai]
    be.Prs.Sg

Embedded Question: ‘Wajahat knows who Rima likes.’
Matrix Question: ‘Who does Wajahat know Rima likes?’

b. *maan 'believe'
    Wajahat maan-taa hai [ki Rima t pasand
    who-Acc Wajahat.m believe-Hab.MSG be.Prs.Sg that Rima.f like
    kar-tii hai]
    do-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg

*Embedded Question: ‘Wajahat believes who Rima likes.’
Matrix Question: ‘Who does Wajahat believe Rima likes?’

All Indo-Aryan languages allow for the scope marking option, but for many Indo-Aryan
language the overt movement is strongly dispreferred or restricted - Punjabi (cf. Bhattacharia (1993)), Kashmiri, Marathi (cf. Wali (1988)).
1.3 *wh*-phrases in Infinitival Complement Clauses

In-situ *wh*-phrases in infinitival complement clauses can take matrix scope.

(9) in-situ argument (from Mahajan (1990):160)
   a. Base: S \[\text{Infinitive}_{\text{V}} \ O \ V_{2} \ V_{1}\]
      Ram-ne [PRO Sita-ko dekh-naa] chaah-aa
      Ram-Erg Sita-Acc see-Inf want-Pfv
      ‘Ram wanted to see Sita.’
   b. S \[\text{Infinitive}_{\text{V}} \ O \ V_{2} \ V_{1}\]
      Ram-ne [PRO kis-ko dekh-naa] chaah-aa
      Ram-Erg who-Acc see-Inf want-Pfv
      ‘Who did Ram want to see?’

In fact, infinitival clauses in Hindi do not constitute a domain for a question formation. There are no infinitival questions in Hindi.

(10) in-situ adjunct (from Dayal (1996):29)
   tum [PRO bartan kaise dho-naa] chaah-te ho
   you.Pl dishes how wash-Inf want-Hab.MPl be.Prs.2Pl
   ‘How do you want to wash the dishes?’

Dayal (1996), following Butt (1993), proposes that infinitival clauses in Hindi are nominal IP’s i.e. a kind of gerund. Lacking a CP, they cannot be a domain for question formation.

Overt fronting of the *wh*-phrase is also an option though the in-situ option is preferred:

(12) kis-ko, Ram-ne [PRO t. dekh-naa] chaah-aa
   who-Acc Ram-Erg see-Inf want-Pfv
   ‘Who did Ram want to see?’

1.4 *wh*-phrases in Non-Finite Adjunct Clauses

In-situ *wh*-phrases in non-finite adjuncts can take matrix scope.

Argument *wh*-phrase in a non-finite adjunct

(13) (from Dayal (1996):33)
   a. Base:
      vo [Ram-ko dekh-ne ke-baad] ghar ga-yii
      she Ram-Acc see-Inf.Obl after home go-Pfv.f
      ‘She went home after seeing Ram.’
   b. vo [kis-ko dekh-ne ke-baad] ghar ga-yii
      she who-Acc see-Inf.Obl after home go-Pfv.f
      ‘Who did she go home after seeing?’

Adjunct *wh*-phrase in an Infinitival Adjunct

(15) (from Dayal (1996):33)
   a. Base:
      us-ne [bas-se jaa-te samay] us-ko dekh-aa
      she-Erg bus-Instr go-Impfv.Obl time she-Acc see-Pfv
      ‘She saw her while going by bus.’
   b. us-ne [kaise jaa-te samay] us-ko dekh-aa
      she-Erg how go-Impfv.Obl time she-Acc see-Pfv
      ‘For what, she saw her while going in manner x?’

(16) a. Base:
      Ram [Billu-ko kal dhaar-a ne ke-liye] aaj chaaku laa-ya
      Ram Billu-Acc tomorrow scare-Inf.Obl for today knife bring-Pfv.MSg
      hai be.Prs.Sg
      ‘Ram has brought a knife today [to scare Billu tomorrow].’
b. ???Ram [Billu-ko \textbf{kab}  \textipa{daraa-ne} \textipa{ke-liye}] aaj chaaku laa-yaa
    Ram Billu-Acc when scare-Inf.Obl for today knife bring-Pfv.MSg hai
    be.Prs.Sg
    ‘For what time \textipa{t} Ram has brought a knife today [to scare Billu at \textipa{t}]?’

Overt fronting of the \textit{wh}-phrase out of the non-finite adjunct is also an option, as long as the \textit{wh}-phrase is an argument.

(17) Fronting of an Argument:

a. \textit{kis-ko}, vo [\textipa{ti} dekh-ne ke-baad] ghar ga-yii
    who-Acc she see-Inf.Obl after home go-Pfv.f
    ‘Who did she go home after seeing?’

b. \textit{kis-ko}, Ram [\textipa{t}, \textipa{daraa-ne} ke-liye] chaku laa-yaa hai
    who-Acc Ram.m scare-Inf.Obl for knife bring-Pfv.MSg be.Prs.MSg
    ‘For which \textipa{r}, Ram has brought a knife [to scare \textipa{r}]?’

c. \textit{kyaa}, Ram [\textipa{t} khaa-te hue] ghar ga-yaa
    what Ram.m eating-while home go-Pfv.MSg
    ‘What did Ram go home while eating?’

(18) Fronting of an Adjunct:

a. \textit*{kaise}, us-ne [\textipa{t}, \textipa{ja-te} samay] us-ko dekh-aa
    how she-Erg go-Impfv.Obl time she-Acc see-Pfv
    ‘For what \textipa{r}, she saw her while going in manner \textipa{r}?’

b. ???\textit{kaab}, Ram [Billu-ko \textipa{t}, \textipa{daraa-ne} ke-liye] aaj chaaku laa-yaa
    when Ram Billu-Acc scare-Inf.Obl for today knife bring-Pfv.MSg hai
    be.Prs.Sg
    ‘For what time \textipa{t} Ram has brought a knife today [to scare Billu at \textipa{t}]?’

1.5 \textit{wh}-phrases in Finite Adjunct Clauses

\textit{wh}-phrases in finite adjunct clauses are ungrammatical.

(19) a. base:

[\textipa{jab Mala aa jaa-egii}] [tab m\textipa{E} tum-ko call kar-\textipa{uga}]
    when Mala come GO-Fut.3FSg then I you-Acc call do-Fut.1MSg
    ‘When Mala comes, I’ll call you.’

b. in-situ:

‘[\textipa{jab kaun aa jaa-egii}] [tab m\textipa{E} tum-ko call kar-\textipa{uga}]
    when who come GO-Fut.3FSg then I you-Acc call do-Fut.1MSg
    ‘When who comes, I’ll call you.’

c. fronted:

‘[\textipa{kaun}, \textipa{jab t aa jaa-egii}] [tab m\textipa{E} tum-ko call kar-\textipa{uga}]
    who when come GO-Fut.3FSg then I you-Acc call do-Fut.1MSg
    ‘Who, when comes, I’ll call you.’

2 The Role of Directionality

- Wide-scope possible: \textit{wh}-XP in non-finite clause, to the left of the verb

- Wide-scope not possible: \textit{wh}-XP in finite clause, to the right of the verb

\textbf{Question:} what is blocking wide-scope?

Option 1: Finiteness of the clause.

Option 2: Location of the clause (right of the verb = extraposed).

2.1 Location of Infinitival Clauses

Infinitival Clauses typically appear to the left of the matrix verb, but can also appear on the right.

(20) a. Extraposed infinitival complement, complement:

\begin{verbatim}
Ram-ne chaah-aa [PRO Sita-ko dekh-naa]
Ram-Erg want-Pfv Sita-Acc see-Inf
\end{verbatim}
    ‘Ram wanted to see Sita.’

b. Extraposed infinitival adjunct:

\begin{verbatim}
vo ghar ga-yii [Ram-ko dekh-ne ke-baad]
\end{verbatim}
    she home go-Pfv.f Ram-Acc see-Inf.Obl after
    ‘She went home after seeing Ram.’

In-situ \textit{wh}-XP’s in extraposed infinitival complements cannot take wide-scope. Since narrow scope is not an option for \textit{wh}-XP’s in infinitival clauses this leads to ungrammaticality.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{wh}-in-situ:
\begin{enumerate}
\item Extraposited infinitival complement, complement \textit{wh}-XP:
\begin{itemize}
\item *Ram-ne chaah-aa [PRO \textit{kis-ko} dekh-naa] \\
Ram-Erg want-Pfv who-Acc see-Inf
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Ram wanted to see who.’
\end{itemize}
\item Extraposited infinitival complement, adjunct \textit{wh}-XP:
\begin{itemize}
\item *Ram-ne chaah-aa [PRO gaarit \textit{kaise} thiik kar-naa] \\
Ram-Erg want-Pfv car.f how correct do-Inf
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Ram wanted to fix the car how.’
\end{itemize}
\item Extraposited infinitival adjunct:
\begin{itemize}
\item *vo ghar ga-yii [\textit{kis-ko} dekh-ne ke-baad] she home go-Pfv who-Acc see-Inf.Obl after
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘She went home after seeing who.’
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\item Overt fronting of the \textit{wh}-XP makes the above acceptable:
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Fronting of \textit{wh}-XP}:
\begin{enumerate}
\item Extraposited infinitival complement, complement \textit{wh}-XP:
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{kis-ko}, Ram-ne chaah-aa [PRO \textit{t} dekh-naa]? \\
who-Acc Ram-Erg want-Pfv see-Inf
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Who had Ram wanted to see?’
\end{itemize}
\item Extraposited infinitival complement, adjunct \textit{wh}-XP:
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{kaise}, Ram-ne chaah-aa [PRO gaarit \textit{t} thiik kar-naa] how Ram-Erg want-Pfv car.f how correct do-Inf
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘How had Ram wanted to fix the car?’
\end{itemize}
\item Extraposited infinitival adjunct:
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{kis-ko}, vo ghar ga-yii [t dekh-ne ke-baad] who-Acc she home go-Pfv who-Acc see-Inf.Obl after
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Who did she go home after seeing?’
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{2.2 Interpretation of Postverbal \textit{wh}-Phrases}

Arguments and adjuncts can typically appear in postverbal position.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Subj DO V IO} \\
Ram-ne kitaab di-i Sita-ko \\
Ram-Erg book.f give-Pfv.f Sita-Dat
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Ram gave a book to Sita.’
\end{itemize}
\item \textbf{Echo Question}:
\begin{itemize}
\item Ram-ne kitaab di-i \textit{kis-ko} \\
Ram-Erg book.f give-Pfv.f who-Dat
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Ram gave a book to \textit{WHO}?’
\end{itemize}
\item \textbf{Normal Question}:
\begin{itemize}
\item S IO \textit{wh}-DO V: Normal Question:
\begin{itemize}
\item us-ne tumh\textit{e} \textit{kyaa} di-yaan he-Erg you.Dat what give-Pfv.MSg
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘What did he give you?’
\end{itemize}
\item S IO \textit{wh}-DO: Rhetorical Question:
\begin{itemize}
\item us-ne tumh\textit{e} di-yaan \textit{kyaa} he-Erg you.Dat give-Pfv.MSg what
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘What did he ever give you?’
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\item \textbf{Parallel data are noted for Bengali in Bayer (1996):284-289.}
\end{itemize}

Phrases marked by emphatic clitics such as -o ‘also, too’ and -i, which is a focus marker, also do not like to be postverbal position in Bengali.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Subj DO V} \\
\begin{itemize}
\item kriSno ta-ke-o bhalabaS-e \\
Krisha (s)he-Acc-too loves-3
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Krishna loves him/her too.’
\end{itemize}
\item \textbf{Normal Question}:
\begin{itemize}
\item S V O-Cl \\
\begin{itemize}
\item krishna ta-ke-o bhalobaS-e \\
Krisha loves-3 (s)he-Acc-too
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Krishna loves him/her too.’
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
2.3 Preverbal Finite Clauses

In Hindi, finite clause complements can only appear verb finally.

(27) a. Postverbal finite complement:
   Mona jaan-tii hai [(ki) Rohit chant hai]  
   Mona.f know-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg that Rohit.m cunning be.Prs.Sg  
   ‘Mona knows that Rohit is cunning.’

b. *Preverbal finite complement:
   *Mona [(ki) Rohit chant hai] jaan-tii hai  
   Mona.f that Rohit.m cunning be.Prs.Sg know-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg

Bengali allows for finite clauses to appear both pre- and post-verbally, but with different complementizers.

(28) (Bengali, from Bayer (1995), Bayer (1996))

a. Preverbal finite complement, clause-final complementizer  
   chele-Ta [[or baba aS-be] bole] Sune-che  
   boy-CL his father come-Fut Comp1 hear-Pst  
   ‘The boy has heard that his father will come.’

b. Postverbal finite complement, clause-initial complementizer  
   chele-Ta Sune-che [je [or baba aS-be]]  
   boy-CL hear-Pst Comp2 his father come-Fut  
   ‘The boy has heard that his father will come.’

Preverbal finite clauses allow wh-in-situ to have wide scope.

Postverbal finite clauses do not allow wh-in-situ to have wide scope.1

(29) (Bengali, from Bayer (1996):272-275)

a. Preverbal Complement Clause: wide scope possible  
   ora [ke aS-be] (bole) Sune-che  
   they who come-Fut.3 COMP hear-PTS3

2.4 Some Patterns

2.4.1 Wh In-situ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wide-Scope</th>
<th>Wide-Scope</th>
<th>Narrow-Scope</th>
<th>Narrow-Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal FC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal FC</td>
<td>Yes₂/NA₂</td>
<td>Yes₂/NA₂</td>
<td>Yes₂/NA₂</td>
<td>Yes₂/NA₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal NFC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal NFC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal NFA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal NFA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FC = Finite Complement  
NFC = Non-Finite Complement  
NFA = Non-Finite Adjunct

---

1 Postverbal wh-clause with wh-in-situ do not allow for an overt complementizer.

i. (Bengali, from Bayer (1996):306)
   ami jani na [je bill kal ka-ke dokhe-che]  
   I know not COMP Bill yesterday who saw

‘I don’t know who Bill saw yesterday.’

Similar facts obtain for Marathi (cf. Wali (1988)).
2.4.2 Fronted *wh*-Phrase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wide-Scope</th>
<th>Wide-Scope</th>
<th>Narrow-Scope</th>
<th>Narrow-Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal FC</td>
<td>Yes/NA</td>
<td>Yes/NA</td>
<td>Yes/NA/NA</td>
<td>Yes/NA/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal FC</td>
<td>Yes/NA</td>
<td>Yes/NA</td>
<td>Yes/NA/NA</td>
<td>Yes/NA/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal NFC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal NFC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal NFA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 *Wh*-Fronting

(30) a. (Bengali, from Bayer (1996):297)

\[\text{tumi [ki OSukh-e] bhab-cho [(r) je ram t] mara ge-che]? you which illness-Loc think-2 Comp Ram die GO-Pts3\]

‘Of which illness do you think that Ram died?’

b. (Hindi, from Srivastav (1991))

\[\text{kaun, tum soch-te ho [r t aa-egaal]? who you.Pl think-Hab.MPl be.Prs.2Pl that come-Fut.3MSg}\]

‘Who do you think will come?’

3.1 The Role of Clausal Expletives

(31) (from Mahajan (1990):144)

\[\text{Ram-ne (yah) soch-aa [ki Mohan chor hai] Ram-Erg this think-Pfv that Mohan thief be.Prs.Sg}\]

‘Ram thought that Mohan is a thief.’

3.1.1 Clausal Expletives in English

(32) Subject Expletives:

a. It seems [that we are all going to be late].

b. It was widely believed [that the earth was flat].

(33) Object Expletives:

a. I regretted (it) [that he was late].

b. They never mentioned (it) to the candidate [that the job was poorly paid].

(34) Presuppositional Effects:

a. John and Mary have announced [that they have got married].

   (news could be old or new)

b. John and Mary have announced it [that they have got married].

   (news has to be old)

(35) Extraction is blocked/degraded:

a. Who, don’t you believe Jane will marry t?

b. ‘Who, don’t you believe it that Jane will marry t?’

(36) NPI-Licensing across a finite CP is blocked:

a. I don’t believe (that) [John has been here in weeks].

b. ‘I don’t believe it that [John has been here in weeks].’

3.1.2 Clausal Expletives in Hindi

The presence of a clausal expletive makes *wh*-fronting of complements degraded, and the *wh*-fronting of adjuncts ungrammatical:

(37) (from Mahajan (1990):146)

a. no expletive: extraction of complement ok


‘Who did Ram think that Mohan hit?’

b. expletive: extraction of complement degraded

\[??\text{kis-ko, Ram-ne yeh soch-aa [ki Mohan-ne t] maar-aa] who-Acc Ram-Erg this think-Pfv Comp Mohan-Erg hit-Pfv}\]

‘??Who did Ram think it that Mohan hit?’

(38) (from Mahajan (1990):146)

a. no expletive: extraction of adjunct ok

\[?\text{kaise, Ram-ne soch-aa [ki Mohan-ne t, gaarii \text{\textit{\$}}iik k-ii]} how Ram-Erg think-Pfv Comp Mohan-Erg car.f correct do-Pfv.f}\]

‘How did Ram think that Mohan fixed the car?’

b. expletive: extraction of adjunct ungrammatical
Clausal Expletives also block interclausal NPI-licensing:

(39) a. no expletive: NPI licensed across finite CP boundary

mujhe [ki koi-bhii aa-egaa] me.Dat seem-Hab that someone-PSI come-Fut.3MSg 

‘I don’t think anyone will come.’

b. expletive: NPI not licensed across finite CP boundary

*mujhe [ki koi-bhii aa-egaa] me.Dat seem-Hab that someone-PSI come-Fut.3MSg

‘I don’t think it that anyone will come.’

3.2 Island Effects

*wh*-fronting is subject to island effects such as the Complex NP constraints:

(40) (from Mahajan (1990):148)

‘kis-ko, Ram-ne [ki [yeh baat [ki Mohan-ne [ki [kah-aa Sita-se [ki ]]]]] galat

who-Acc Ram-Erg think-Pfv that this ‘talk’ that Mohan-Erg hit-Pfv wrong

be.Prs.3Sg

‘Who, does Ram think [that the fact that Mohan hit ] is wrong?]’

3.3 Scrambling or *wh*-movement?


*wh*-Movement: Simpson and Bhattacharya (2003)

Something else, similar to scope-marking: Bayer (1996)

Arguments for treating *wh*-fronting as scrambling:

1. The same fronting options are available to non-*wh*-phrases and are formally indistinguishable from the options available to *wh*-phrases.

2. Movement seems to be to position below the C°.

More generally, there is no V-C adjacency requirement:

(42) a. Rightward Scrambling of Matrix Material:

Ram-ne [ki [kah-aa Sita-se [ki ]]]

Ram-Erg say-Pfv Sita-Instr that

‘Ram told Sita that....’

b. Movement of the Relative Phrase:

vo larkii [lo [ki ] lambii hai] ....

the girl who that standing be.Prs.3Sg

‘The girl who is standing....’

3.4 The Puzzle

(43) Covert Movement

a. *WH-XP, .... V [c_r ... WH-XP, ]

b. *WH-XP, .. EXPL, V [c_r ... WH-XP, ]

WH-XP - covert, WH-XP - overt

(44) Overt Movement

a. WH-XP, .... V [c_r ... WH-XP, ]

b. ??/*WH-XP, .. EXPL, V [c_r ... WH-XP, ]

WH-XP - covert, WH-XP - overt
4 Overt wh-Movement

4.1 Background Assumptions
Assumptions made by Simpson and Bhattacharya (2003):
(45) a. Bengali has obligatory overt wh-movement.
b. Bengali is an SVO language.
c. The target for wh-movement is the specifier of a Focus(-like) functional projection that is below the Topic projection.

Basic Architecture of the Bengali Clause:
(but what about ‘rightward scrambled’ DP/Infinitival Clauses)
Finite CPs do not need case so they stay in a postverbal position.

However, finite CPs can also appear preverbally in Bengali. Perhaps a dual characterization as in Bayer (1999) is needed.

4.2 Deriving the Basic Puzzle

(47) (Bengali, from Bayer (1996):272-275)

- Preverbal Complement Clause: wide scope possible
a. ‘who came’ generated in a Post-VP position.
ora [ke a5-be] [bole] Sune-che
they who come-Fut.3 COMP hear-PTS3
Narrow Scope: ‘They have heard who will come.’
Wide Scope: ‘Who have they heard will come?’

- Postverbal Complement: wide scope impossible
b. ‘who’ undergoes clause-internal wh-movement, checking its [+wh] features against the embedded C.
c. The entire CP undergoes wh-movement to the matrix [Spec,CP]. (Pied-Piping)
d. The entire CP undergoes wh-movement to the matrix [Spec,IP]. (Pied-Piping)
e. The matrix subject is topicalized from [Spec,IP] to [Spec,TopP].
(49) Derivation of narrow scope reading of (47a,b)
a. ‘who came’ generated in a Post-VP position.
b. Embedded C is [+wh].
c. who undergoes clause-internal wh-movement, checking its [+wh] features against the embedded C.
d. If we stop here, we have (the narrow scope reading of) (47b).
e. The entire CP undergoes topicalization to the matrix [Spec,C/FocP].
f. The matrix subject is topicalized from [Spec,IP] to [Spec,TopP].
g. We now have (47a) with the narrow scope reading.

(47b) lacks a wide scope reading because the [+wh] feature of the embedded wh-phrase which can only be checked by overt wh-movement remains unchecked.

The impossibility of wide scope in (47b) is reduced to the unavailability of normal question interpretation for postverbal wh-phrases.

(50) (bengali, from Bayer (1996):285)

- ‘Who does Krishna love?’
  a. kriSno ka-ke bhalobaS-e
     Krishna who-Acc love-3
  b. ??/*kriSno bhalobaS-e ka-ke
     Krishna love-3 who-Acc

Supporting Arguments:

- Long wh-CP Movement
(51) You [who left], think [Mary said t]? (=Who, do you think Mary said [t, left]?)

- Overt Movement of the wh-XP by itself is also possible:
(52) a. John who, said [t, left]?
    (=Who, did John say [t, left]?)
b. John [who, left], said t?
    (=Who, did John say [t, left]?)
Similar in most aspects to fronting of focussed material.

- Constraints on Topics (= Pre-wh-XP Material)

Beck & Kim style effects - indefinites, NPI's, only-phrases cannot happily appear before the wh-phrase.
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