

1 The Indo-Aryan Languages: a tour

- sub-branch of the Indo-European family, spoken mainly in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and the Maldivian Islands by at least 640 million people (according to the 1981 census). (Masica (1991)).
- Together with the Iranian languages to the west (Persian, Kurdish, Dari, Pashto, Baluchi, Ormuri etc.) , the Indo-Aryan languages form the Indo-Iranian subgroup of the Indo-European family.
- Most of the subcontinent can be looked at as a dialect continuum. There seem to be no major geographical barriers to the movement of people in the subcontinent.

1.1 The Hindi Belt

According to the Ethnologue, in 1999, there were 491 million people who reported Hindi as their first language, and 58 million people who reported Urdu as their first language.

• Hindi-Urdu or Hindi and Urdu

The Hindi Belt involves a vast area that stretches across most of Northern India. Despite Hindi being the official language for this entire area, this area is home to many languages that are clearly distinct from Hindi.

Grierson (1883), Grierson (1969) divided the Hindi dialect area into the following sub-groups:

- ‘Western Hindi’: Braj, Kannauji, Haryana
- ‘Eastern Hindi’: Awadhi, Bagheli, Chhattisgarhi
- ‘Bihari’: Bhojpuri, Magahi, Maithili
- ‘Central Pahari’: Kumauni, Garhwali
- ‘Rajasthani’: Marwari, Mewari, Harauti, Malvi

1.2 East of the Hindi Belt

The following languages are quite closely related:

- Assamese (Assam)
- Bengali (West Bengal, Tripura, Bangladesh)
- Oriya (Orissa)
- Bishnupriya Manipuri

This group of languages is also quite closely related to the ‘Bihari’ languages that are part of the Hindi belt: Bhojpuri, Magahi, Maithili.

1.3 Central Indo-Aryan

- Eastern Punjabi
- ‘Rajasthani’: Marwari, Mewari, Harauti, Malvi etc.
- Bhil Languages: Bhili, Garasia, Rathawi, Wagdi etc.
- Gujarati, Saurashtra

The Bhil languages occupy an area that abuts ‘Rajasthani’, Gujarati, and Marathi. They have several properties in common with the surrounding languages.

Central Indo-Aryan is also where Modern Standard Hindi fits in.

Some central Indo-Aryan languages are spoken far from the subcontinent. These include the various forms of Romani, and Parya, spoken by about 1,000 people in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

1.4 Northern and Northwestern Indo-Aryan

The Pahari (Hill) languages:

- Eastern: Nepali (spoken in Nepal, adjoining parts of India (West Bengal, Sikkim), and Bhutan)
- Central: Garhwali, Kumauni
- Western: Dogri/Kangri, Jaunsari, Bilaspuri

Northwestern Indo-Aryan:

- Dardic
- Sindhi: Sindhi (Sindh¹, Pakistan), Kachchhi (Gujarat)

¹Peccavi! (I have Sindh/sinned!) British general Sir Charles James Napier sent this one word message to his commanding officer, Lord Ellenborough, after he had captured Sindh, in modern Pakistan.

- Lahnda: Hindko, Western Punjabi, Saraiki/Siraiki

Dardic:

- Chitral: Khowar, Kalasha
- Kashmiri
- Kohistani: Tirahi, Torwali
- Kunar: Gawar-Bati, Shumashti
- Shina: Brokskat/Brokpa, Domaki, Savi, Shina

Dardic languages used to be grouped together with the Nuristani (Kafiri) languages. But since Strand (1973), the Nuristani languages (Ashkun, Kati/Bashgali, Prasuni², Tregami, Waigali) have been analyzed as sisters of the Indo-Aryan and the Iranian language families.

1.5 Southern Indo-Aryan and Further

Southern Indo-Aryan

- Marathi (Maharashtra)
- Konkani (Goa, Mangalore, coastal areas of Maharashtra)

Further:

- Sinhala/Sinhalese (Sri Lanka)
- Vedda (Sri Lanka)
- Maldivian/Divehi (Maldives)

These languages have been separated from the rest of the Indo-Aryan languages since around the 5th century B.C. They are heavily influenced by the surrounding Dravidian languages.

1.6 The Non-Indo-Aryan Neighbourhood

The primary language family with which the Indo-Aryan languages came into contact with was Dravidian (Tamil, Kannada, Telugu, Malayalam). There are reasons to believe that Dravidian languages were spoken in parts of North India where Indo-Aryan languages are now spoken. Brahui, an isolated Dravidian language, is still spoken in parts of Pakistan. The influence of Dravidian languages is particularly clear on those Indo-Aryan that currently abut the Dravidian area (Marathi, Oriya) and on those which have been argued to abut the Dravidian area at some point in the relatively recent past (Gujarati). The other language families in the area are:

²The most aberrant of the Nuristani languages cf. www.ethnologue.com and Richard Strand's detailed Nuristan site: <http://users.sedona.net/~strand/>.

- Iranian: Pashto, Dari, Persian, Baluchi,Ormuri
- Language Isolate: Burushaski
- Austroasiatic 1: Mon-Khmer: Amwi, Khasi, Pnar/Jaintia
- Austroasiatic 2: Munda: Mundari, Juang, Khariya, Gorum, Ho
- Tibeto-Burman: Kiranti, Newari, Meithei, Lepcha, Tangkhul, Hmar

2 Major Syntactic Phenomena

2.1 Case-Marking

Case-marking in Indo-Aryan languages is typically postpositional in nature. Subjects of finite intransitive clauses typically receive nominative case, which is usually unmarked.

- Leela kal aa-ii
Leela.f yesterday come-Pfv.f
'Leela came yesterday.'
 - Kalpna bahadur thii
Kalpna.f brave be.Pst.F
'Kalpna was brave.'

Nominative case (on subjects) seems to be licensed by finite Tense in many Indo-Aryan languages.

- [Shiraz*(-kaa) Ruta-se baat kar-naa] zaroorii hai
Shiraz-Gen Ruta-Instr talk do-Inf necessary be.Prs
'It is necessary that Shiraz talk to Ruta.'

An nominative subject cannot appear in a non-finite clause in Hindi. Genitive marking is an option that is generally available. In certain ECM-like environments, an accusative or dative case can also be licensed.

The conditions on the licensing of Nominative vary throughout Indo-Aryan. In particular, in Marathi, we find that nominative subjects can appear in what appear to be non-finite clauses.

2.1.1 Ergativity

The case on the subject of a finite transitive clause in the Western Indo-Aryan languages (Standard Hindi-Urdu, Marathi, Gujarati, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Sindhi but not Bengali, Oriya, Bhojpuri etc.) depends upon the aspect.

In perfective tenses, the subject receives Ergative case. In all other tenses the case on the subject is nominative. Ergative case in Hindi-Urdu is marked by the case-clitic *-ne*.

- Perfective Tenses:

- a. Simple Past: perfective participle by itself:

Lataa-ji-ne kai gaane gaa-ye
Lataa-Hon-Erg many song.MPl sing-Pfv.MPl

'Lataa-ji sang several songs.'

- b. Present/Past Perfect: perfective participle plus tense auxiliary

Lataa-ji-ne kai gaane gaa-ye hĒ/the
Lataa-Hon-Erg many song.MPl sing-Pfv.MPl be.Prs.Pl/be.Pst.MPl

'Lataa-ji has/had sung several songs.'

- (4) Non-Perfective Tenses:

- a. Habituals: imperfective/habitual participle plus tense auxiliary

Lataa-ji gaane gaa-tii hĒ/thī:
Lataa.f-Hon song.Pl sing-Hab.f be.Prs.Pl/be.Pst.FPl

'Lataa-ji sings/used to sing songs.'

- b. Progressive: formed periphrastically

Lataa-ji gaanaa gaa rahī: hĒ/thī:
Lataa.f-Hon song.m sing Pro.FPl be.Prs.Pl/be.Pst.FPl

'Lataa-ji is/was singing (a song).'

- c. Subjunctive

Shaayad Lataa-ji gaanaa gaa-ē
Maybe Lataa.f-Hon song.m sing-Sbjv.Pl

'Maybe Lataa-ji will sing (a song).'

- d. Future: subjunctive ending plus a participial ending

Lataa-ji gaanaa gaa-ē-gii
Lataa.f-Hon song.m sing-Fut.FPl

'Lataa-ji will sing a song.'

In Hindi-Urdu, the same perfective auxiliary appears in the simple past and the perfect. This is not the case in Kashmiri. However, the ergativity patterns are the same as in Hindi-Urdu.

- (5) (Kashmiri from Wali and Koul (1997))

- a. Simple Past:

Aslam-an por akhba:r
Aslam-Erg read-MSg newspaper.MSG

'Aslam read the newspaper.'

- b. Past Perfect (same facts obtain for the Present/Future Perfects):

me/tEm' o:s akhba:r por-mut
I-Erg/he-Erg be.Pst-MSg newspaper.MSG read-pp-msg

'I/he had read the newspaper.'

In the case of compound tenses, the lowest/most local aspectual marking seems to be the one relevant for licensing ergative case. We have seen that the future does not allow for ergative subjects (cf. 4). However, the future perfect requires an ergative subject.

- (6) Future Perfect/'Presumptive': Perfective Participle + be-Fut

Lataa-ji-ne yeh gaanaa gaa-yaa ho-gaa
Lataa-Hon-Erg this song.m sing-Pfv.MSG be-Fut.MSG

'Lataa-ji must have sung this song.'³

A similar point is made by past counterfactuals which involve habitual morphology on top of a perfective participle.

- (7) a. Past Counterfactual: Perfective Participle + Habitual: Ergative Subject

agar Lataa-jii-ne yeh gaanaa gaa-yaa ho-taa,
if Lataa-ji-Erg this song.m sing-Pfv.MPl be-Hab.MSG

'If Lataa-ji had sung this song...'

- b. Unspecified Counterfactual: Habitual: Nominative Subject

agar Lataa-ji yeh gaanaa gaa-ti:
if Lataa.f-Hon this song.m sing-Hab.FPl

'If Lataa-ji sang this song...'

There seems to be no optionality with respect to ergative marking on subjects of transitive verbs. However, some optionality seems to emerge with respect to unergatives.

- (8) (Kashmiri, from Wali and Koul (1997), pg. 153)

bI nots-us/ me nots
I.Nom danced-1sgps I.Erg danced

'I danced.'

This optionality has been related to notions of volitionality, with the version with ergative marking being more volitional.

Hindi and Kashmiri make a surface distinction between Ergative and Nominative case in all person-number combinations. Many of the other Ergative Indo-Aryan languages collapse the distinction between Ergative and Nominative in several person-number combinations (typically 1st and 2nd person, and plurals) (e.g. Gujarati (cf. Cardona (1965)),

³In isolation, a future perfect reading is hard to get. Adding an additional compound verb that indicates completion such as *le* 'take' and suitable adverbs facilitates the future perfect reading.

- i. kal 5-baje Lataa-ji yeh gaanaa gaa li-yaa ho-gaa
tomorrow 5-o'clock Lataa.g-Hon this song sing TAKE-Pfv.MSG be-Fut.MSG
'Tomorrow at 5 o'clock, Lataa-ji will have sung this song.'

Marathi (cf. Pandharipande (1997)), Punjabi (cf. Bhatia (1993)). This apparently surface fact has interesting implications for questions pertaining to markedness and the directionality of syntactic change as discussed in Deo and Sharma (2002).

It was noted in the discussion on the licensing of nominative on the subject that in many Indo-Aryan languages, nominative subjects cannot appear in non-finite environments. Somewhat curiously, in these languages this also seems to be true of Ergative subjects. Further the Indo-Aryan languages where nominative subjects can appear in non-finite environments also seem to allow Ergative subjects in certain non-finite environments.

2.1.2 Specificity Marking on Direct Objects

Direct Objects in most Indo-Aryan languages (with exception of Kashmiri and Sinhalese) use the following strategy:

1. Animate proper names must be marked by the postposition *ko*:

(9) a. Animate Proper Name:

Madhukar-ne Tara*(-ko) dekh-aa
 Madhukar-Erg Tara-Acc see-Pfv.3MSg
 'Madhukar saw Tara.'

b. Inanimate Proper Name:

Madhukar-ne 'Titanic' dekh-ii hai
 Madhukar-Erg Titanic.f see-Pfv.F be.Prs
 'Madhukar has seen 'Titanic'.'

If the *ko* is omitted, *Tara* cannot be interpreted as an animate object, only as 'the blob 'Tara'.

2. With most other potentially referential objects, *ko*-marking is an option that correlates with a 'specific' reading (cf. Butt (1993), Singh (1994), among many others).

(10) a. Rahul akhbaar-ko phaar rahaa hai
 Rahul.m newspaper-Acc tear Prog.MSg be.Prs.Sg

'Rahul is tearing the newspaper.'

b. Rahul akhbaar phaar rahaa hai
 Rahul.m newspaper tear Prog.MSg be.Prs.Sg

'Rahul is tearing newspapers.' / 'Rahul is tearing the newspaper.'

The 'Rahul is tearing newspapers' reading can be given a plausible paraphrase as 'Rahul is newspaper-tearing'. For this and other reasons, object incorporation of a non-standard sort has been proposed for them in Mohanan (1995b). There is also much work on this topic by Veneeta Dayal (cf. Dayal (1992), Dayal (1999), Dayal (2002a), Dayal (2002b)).

3. Nominals that are clearly non-referential cannot take *ko*.

(11) Atul mehnat(*-ko) kar rahaa hai
 Atul.m hardwork-Acc do Prog.MSg be.Prs.Sg
 'Atul is working hard.'

• Agreement and Specificity

• An issue of terminology:

the *ko* that appears on some Direct Objects also appears on Indirect Objects and certain Experiencer Subjects. The unmarked option is also used by Subjects. For this reason, occasionally certain authors will refer to the unmarked case on the object as 'Nominative' and the *ko*-marked option as 'Dative'.

I will be using the following labeling strategy:

1. If *ko* cannot appear: nominative
2. If *ko* may (but not must) appear: accusative
3. If *ko* must appear: dative

This strategy is based on the source for case as opposed to the surface form of the case. Nominative is licensed higher in the tree, above vP. Accusative and Dative are licensed lower.

2.1.3 Non-nominative Subjects

In addition to Ergative subjects, the Indo-Aryan languages display a wide-range of constructions where what seems to be the subject receives a non-nominative case (cf. Mohanan (1995a)). The relevant argument has been called a subject because it meets a subset of subjecthood tests.

One of the concerns that we will be concerned with is the very notion of 'subject'. Is a unitary notion of subject necessary/desirable? Does every sentence have to have a subject?

The most well-discussed of the non-nominative subjects is the Dative/Experiencer subject construction (cf. Verma and Mohanan (1990)).

(12) a. Gajaanan-ko yeh tathya maalum the
 Gajaanan-Dat this fact.M known be.Pst.Pl
 'Lit. to Gajaanan, these facts were known.'

b. Naim-ko Rina pasand hai
 Naim-Dat Rina pleasing be.Prs
 'Naim likes Rina'. (Lit. To Naim, Rina is pleasing.)

The others are:

(13) a. Instrumental Subject:

Ram-se per nahī: kaṭ-aa
 Ram-Instr tree.m Neg cut_{Instr}-Pfv.MSg

'Ram was not able to cut the tree.' (Lit. By Ram, the tree did not cut.)

b. Locative Subject:

Ravi-par bahut bojh hai
 Ravi-on much burden.f be.Prs.Sg

'Ravi has a big burden.' (Lit. On Ravi is a big burden.)

c. Genitive Subject:

Anwar-kii ek beṭii hai
Anwar-Gen.f one daughter.f be.Prs.Sg

'Anwar has a daughter.' (Lit. Anwar's one daughter is.)

2.2 Agreement

Many Indo-Aryan languages display object agreement and default agreement. One common pattern is the one displayed by Hindi. Most prominent non-overtly case-marked argument triggers agreement:

(14) a. Nominative subject, Accusative object, both non-overtly case-marked

Rahul kitaab parh-taa thaa
Rahul.M book.F read-Hab.MSg be.Pst.MSg

'Rahul used to read (a/the) book.'

b. Ergative subject, Accusative object, only object is non-overtly case-marked

Rahul-ne kitaab parh-ii thii
Rahul-Erg book.F read-Pfv.F be.Pst.FSg

'Rahul had read the book.'

c. Ergative Subject, Overtly marked accusative object

Rahul-ne kitaab-ko parh-aa thaa
Rahul-Erg book-Acc read-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

'Rahul had read the book.'

Long Distance Agreement (LDA):

(15) Vivek-ne [kitaab parh-nii] chaah-ii
Vivek-Erg book.f read-Inf.f want-Pfv.f

'Vivek wanted to read the book.'

LDA (as well as the Hindi-Urdu case system) is analyzed in Mahajan (1989), Butt (1995), and Bhatt (2003) among others.

There is much variation with respect to the particulars of agreement in the Indo-Aryan languages and some of this is addressed in Subbarao (2001) and Deo and Sharma (2002).

2.3 Passives

Passives in Modern Indo-Aryan tend to be analytical and are composed of the following elements:

(i) Ablative or Locative form of the infinitive + the verb *come* (Marathi, Gujarati, Kashmiri)

(ii) Infinitive + the verb *receive* (Sinhalese)

(iii) Perfective Participle + the verb *go* (Punjabi, Hindi, Assamese, Bengali, Oriya)

Gujarati, Kumaoni, Nepali, Lahnda, Marwari, and Sindhi have a morphological passive.

2.3.1 Exceptions to Burzio's Generalization

Passives in several Indo-Aryan languages present a potential counterexample for Burzio's generalization. They seem to involve suppression of the external argument without promotion of an internal argument. (cf. Pandharipande (1982)).

(16) a. Active:

Rashmi-ne Nupur-ko bazaar-mē dekh-aa
Rashmi-Erg Nupur-Acc market-in see-Pfv

'Rashmi saw Nupur in the market.'

b. Passive, without promotion:

Nupur-ko (Rashmi-dwaaraa) bazaar-mē dekh-aa gayaa
Nupur-Acc Rashmi-by market-in see-Pfv Pass-Pfv

'Nupur was seen in the market by Rashmi.'

c. Passive, with promotion:

Nupur (Rashmi-dwaaraa) bazaar-mē dekh-ii gayii
Nupur Rashmi-by market-in see-Pfv.f Pass-Pfv.f

'Nupur was seen in the market by Rashmi.'

Passives in the Modern Indo-Aryan languages are distinctive in that they can apply quite freely to (non-unaccusative) intransitives as well as transitives.

2.3.2 Inabilitative Passives

Passive constructions with the demoted external argument realized by a *-se* (instrumental) phrase behave like polarity items. For most speakers, they can only appear in affective environments. They have a special modal meaning indicating (in)ability.

(17) a. Vikram-se sirf ek peṛ kaat-aa gayaa
Vikram-Instr only one tree cut-Pfv Pass.Pfv

'Vikram could only cut one tree.'

b. Saira-se peṛ ukhaar-e nahī: jaa-te
Saira-Instr tree.m uproot.Pfv.MPI Neg Pass-Hab.MPI

'Saira is unable (to bring herself) to uproot trees.'

c. mujh-se Dilli nahī: jaa-yaa gayaa
I-Instr Delhi Neg go-Pfv Pass.Pfv

'I couldn't (bring myself to) go to Delhi.'

2.4 Causatives

The Indo-Aryan languages have a complex system of causative formation where we can distinguish at least three distinct processes.

2.5 'Intransitivization'

In this class of verbs, there is no overt causative affix. The phonological form of the intransitive is derived from the phonological form of the transitive via shortening.

- (18) a. Jaayzaad bāt rahii hai.
property divide PROG-FEM be-PRES
'The property is dividing.'
b. Ram-ne jaayzad bāāt dii.
Ram-ERG property divide GIVE-PERF
'Ram divided the property.'
- (19) a. Madhu peṛ kaṭ rahii hai
Madhu.f tree.m cut_{tr} Prog.F be.Prs.Sg
'Madhu is cutting a/the tree(s).'
b. peṛ kaṭ rahe hĒ
tree.m cut<sub>in Prog.MPI be.Prs.PI
'The trees are cutting.'</sub>

These intransitives differ from passives in that they do not involve any agentivity in their semantics.

2.6 Direct Causatives

In this class, an intransitive with no overt affix is paired with a transitive showing the suffix *-aa*.

- (20) a. Makan jal raha hai.
house.M burn PROG.M be.Prs
'The house is burning.'
b. Ḍakaitō-ne makaan jal-aa diyaa.
bandits-ERG house.M burn-CAUS GIVE-PERF.M
'Dacoits⁴ burned the house.'

2.7 Indirect Causatives

In addition to these two types of derivation, which involve a lower or so-called 'lexical' causativization, there are causatives with the affix *-vaa*, which have an *indirect causative* interpretation.

⁴*Dacoit*, a term used in India for a robber belonging to an armed gang. The word is derived from the Hindustani *dakait*, and being current in Bengal got into the Indian penal code. By law, to constitute dacoity, there must be five or more in the gang committing the crime. (from <http://21.1911encyclopedia.org/D/DA/DACOIT.htm>)

- (21) zamiindaar-ne (Ḍakaitō-se) makaan jal-vaa diyaa.
landlord-Erg bandits-Instr house.M burn-CAUS GIVE-PERF.M
'The landlord had the house burned (by the dacoits).'

In some Indo-Aryan languages, the same exponent is used to mark direct and indirect causation. Whether we get direct or indirect causation depends upon the predicate the causative exponent appears on.

- (22) (Kashmiri, from Hook and Koul (1984), pg. 102)
- a. *do* + Caus = Indirect Causation:
su čhu no:kraś athi kE:m kar-Ina:v-a:n
he is servant.Dat by work do-Caus-Impfv
'He is having the work done by the servant.'
- b. *laugh* + Caus = Direct Causation:
mohnI chu aslam-as as-Ina:v-a:n
Mohan is Aslam-Dat laugh-Caus-Impfv
'Mohan is making Aslam laugh.'

3 Selected 'Higher in the tree' Phenomena

3.1 Scrambling and *wh*-movement

All Indo-Aryan have scrambling. Scrambling in Hindi-Urdu has been analyzed in some detail in Mahajan (1990), Mahajan (1994), and Kidwai (2000). There seems to be some variation in the degree to which long scrambling (i.e. out of finite clauses) is deemed acceptable.

Most Indo-Aryan languages seem to be *wh*-in-situ. (but see Bhattacharya and Simpson (2000) who argue that Bengali should be treated as involving overt *wh*-movement despite apparent *wh*-in-situ behavior).

- (23) a. Yunus-ne kyaa paṛh-aa
Yunus-ne what read-Pfv
'What did Yunus read?'
- b. Fronting is dispreferred:
??Kyaa Yunus-ne paṛh-aa
what Yunus-Erg read-Pfv
'What did Yunus read?'
- c. (?kis-ne Mona-se baat kii thii
who-Erg Mona-with talk.f do-Pfv.F be.Pst.F
'Who had talked to Mona?'

- d. Mona-se kis-ne baat kii thii
 Mona-with who-Erg talk.f do-Pfv.F be.Pst.F
 'Who had talked to Mona?'

With the exception of Kashmiri, they have been all claimed to be *wh*-in-situ.

- (24) Kashmiri
- a. yi kitaab kem' che pArmlts
 this book who is read
 'Who has read this book?'
- b. *yi kitaab che kem' pArmlts
 this book is who read
- c. kem' che yi kitaab pArmlts
 who is this book read
 'Who has read this books?'
- d. *kem' yi kitaab che pArmlts
 who this book is read

The *wh*-in-situ nature disappears once we consider extraction out of finite clauses. Then one of two strategies needs to be used:

- (25) a. Long Movement:
 kis-ko_i Ram soch-taa hai [ki Sita t_i pasand kar-tii
 who-Acc Ram.m think-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg that Sita.f like do-Hab.f
 hai]
 be.Prs.Sg
 'Who does Ram think that Sita likes?'
- b. Scope Marking:
 Ram kyaa soch-taa hai [ki Sita kis-ko pasand kar-tii
 Ram.m what think-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg that Sita who-Acc like do-Hab.f
 hai]
 be.Prs.Sg
 'What does Ram think who does Sita like?'

It is reported that question formation via long movement is unavailable in Kashmiri and Punjabi.

3.2 Correlatives

Correlative clauses are one of the most distinctive features of the Modern Indo-Aryan languages. (cf. Srivastav (1991), Dayal (1996)).

- (26) a. [jo laṛkii kharīi hai] [vo lambii hai]
 Rel girl.f standing.f be.Prs.Sg Dem tall.f be.Prs.Sg
 'The girl who is standing is tall.' (Lit. which girl is standing, she is tall.)
- b. [jo CD sale-par hai] [mujhe vo CD chaahiye]
 Rel CD sale-on be.Prs.Sg me.Dat Dem CD want
 'I want the CD which is on sale.' (Lit. which CD is on sale, I want that CD.)

In addition to relativization, correlatives are also used to form conditionals, *when*-clauses, *until*-clauses, and comparatives.

- (27) conditional
- a. If he studies, he will pass.
- b. [dzar tyāne abhyās kelā] [tar to pās hoil]
 if he-Erg studying do-Pst-3MSg then he pass be-Fut-3Sg
 'If he studies, then he will pass.' Marathi
- (28) *when*-clauses
- a. When Harry met Sally, she was living in Montreal.
- b. [jab Harry Sally-se mil-aa] [tab vo Montreal-me rah rahii thii]
 when Harry Sally-with met then she Montreal-in live Prog was
 'When Harry met Sally, she was living in Montreal.'
- (29) *until* clauses
- a. I will stay here until John arrives.
- b. [jab tak John nahii aa jaa-taa] [tab tak mĒ yahī: rahūgaa]
 when till John Neg come Hab then till I here stay-will
 'I will stay here until John arrives.'
 (Literally: [Till when John hasn't come], [I will stay here till then])
- (30) Comparatives
- a. Michael Jordan has more scoring titles than Dennis Rodman has tattoos. (*Chicago Tribune*, 7/17/98, Kennedy (2000))
- b. [Rodman ke jitne tattoo hĒ] [Jordan ke-paas us-se jyaadaa
 Rodman Gen how-many tattoo are Jordan near that-than more
 khitaab hĒ]
 title are
 'Michael Jordan has more scoring titles than Dennis Rodman has tattoos.' (Literally: [How many tattoos Dennis Rodman has],
 [Michael Jordan has more scoring titles than *that*])

3.3 Peculiar Extrapositions

In addition to the usual kinds of finite complement clause and relative clause extraposition, the Indo-Aryan languages permit systematic violations of the Right Roof/Upward Bounded Constraint of Ross (1967). This constraint is illustrated in (31).

- (31) a. [That the girl [who John likes] is tall] is obvious.
 b. [That the girl is tall [who John likes]] is obvious.
 c. *[That the girl is tall] is obvious [who John likes].

The fact that the Indo-Aryan (and Dravidian) languages violate this constraint was noted by Subbarao (1984).

- (32) a. [un jhuuthō-ko [jo Ram-ne mujhe bataa-ye the] dohraa-naa]
 those lies-Acc Rel Ram-Erg me.Dat tell-Pfv.MPI be.Pst.MPI repeat-Inf
 galat hai
 wrong be.Prs.Sg
 'To repeat the lies that Ram had told me] is wrong.'
 b. [un jhuuthō-ko t_i dohraa-naa] galat hai [jo Ram-ne mujhe
 those lies-Acc repeat-Inf wrong be.Prs.Sg Rel Ram-Erg me.Dat
 bataa-ye the]_i
 tell-Pfv.MPI be.Pst.MPI
 'To repeat the lies that Ram had told me] is wrong.'
 (Lit. *[To repeat the lies] is wrong [that John had told me].)

3.4 Compound Verbs

Compound Verbs are not as much an Indo-Aryan feature as they are an areal feature of the South Asian *sprachbund* (cf. Masica (1976)). Given locutions like *aa jaa* (Lit. come go, actually: Come in!), they are also initially quite puzzling.

Compound verbs are drawn from a small class of verbs such as *jaa* 'go', *le* 'take', *daal* 'put', *de* 'give', *baith* 'sit' and a few others.

- (33) (from Hook (1979), pg. 63)
 a. *jaa* 'go':
 ham steshan pahūch gaye
 we station reach GO-Pfv.MPI
 'We got to the station.'
 b. *le* 'take':
 mĒ kabaab khaa lū:gaa
 I kabab eat TAKE-Fut.1MSg
 'I'll eat up the kababs.'
 c. *de* 'give':

is-ne sabkuchh bataa di-yaa
 s/he-Erg everything tell GIVE-Pfv
 'S/he told all.'

When used in the compound verb construction, the above verbs do not contribute their lexical meaning. Instead the semantic contribution concerns aspect, manner, and for *le* 'take', modality.

Complex verb construction behave like positive polarity items. They cannot co-occur with a surface negation, unless that negation is in some sense (that needs to be made precise) cancelled.

- (34) (from Hook (1974), pg. 221)
 a. lagaan ghaṭaa di-yaa gayaa
 land-tax.m reduce GIVE-Pfv.MSG Pass-Pfv.MSG
 'The land tax was reduced.'
 b. #lagaan ghaṭaa nahī: di-yaa gayaa
 land-tax.m reduce Neg GIVE-Pfv.MSG Pass-Pfv.MSG
 c. 'Double Negation':
 koi vajah nahī: ki lagaan ghaṭaa nahī: di-yaa jaa-e
 some reason Neg that land-tax.m reduce Neg GIVE-Pfv.MSG Pass-Sbjv.MSG
 'There is no reason that the land tax should not be reduced.'

References

- Bhatia, T. K. (1993) *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.
 Bhatt, R. (2003) "Long Distance Agreement in Hindi-Urdu," university of Texas Manuscript.
 Bhattacharya, T., and A. Simpson (2000) "Wh-CP raising in Bangla," in M. Hirotani, A. Coetzee, N. Hall, and J. yung Kim, eds., *Proceedings of NELS 30*, Amherst, Massachusetts, GLSA, 583-596.
 Butt, M. (1993) "Object specificity and agreement in Hindi/Urdu," in *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, Chicago Linguistics Society, Chicago.
 Butt, M. (1995) *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*, Dissertations in Linguistics, CSLI Publications, Stanford, California. Doctoral thesis at Stanford University 1994.
 Cardona, G. (1965) *A Gujarati Reference Grammar*, The University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
 Dayal, V. (1996) *Locality in Wh-quantification: Questions and Relative Clauses in Hindi*, Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 62, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
 Dayal, V. (1999) "Bare NP's, Reference to Kinds, and Incorporation," in *Proceedings of SALT IX*, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, Cornell Linguistics Club.
 Dayal, V. (2002a) "Bare Nominals: Non-specific and Contrastive Readings under Scrambling," in S. Karimi, ed., *Word Order and Scrambling*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
 Dayal, V. (2002b) "Number Marking and (In)definiteness in Kind Terms," manuscript, Rutgers, on website.
 Dayal, V. S. (1992) "The Singular-Plural Distinction in Hindi Generics," in C. Barker and D. Dowty, eds., *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Semantics and Linguistics Theory*, OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 40, Dept. of Linguistics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 39-58.

Deo, A., and D. Sharma (2002) "Typological Variation in the Ergative Morphology of Indo-Aryana Languages," manuscript, Stanford.

Grierson, G. A. (1883) *Seven Grammars of the Dialects and Subdialects of the Bihari Language*, Bharatiya Publishing House, Delhi, India.

Grierson, G. A. (1969) *Linguistic Survey of India: Vols. I-XI*, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, India. Reprint of originals published between 1903-1928.

Hook, P. E. (1974) *The Compound Verb in Hindi*, Michigan series in South and Southeast Asian languages and linguistics 1, University of Michigan, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Hook, P. E. (1979) *Hindi Structures: Intermediate Level*, Michigan Papers on South and South-East Asia 16, Center for South and South-East Asian Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Hook, P. E., and O. N. Koul (1984) "On the Grammar of Derived Transitives and Causatives in Kashmiri," in O. N. Koul and P. E. Hook, eds., *Aspects of Kashmiri Linguistics*, Series in Indian Languages and Linguistics 12, Bahri Publications, New Delhi, 90-122.

Kennedy, C. (2000) "Comparative (Sub)deletion and Ranked, Violable Constraints in Syntax," in *Proceedings of NELS 30*, Amherst, Massachusetts, GLSA.

Kidwai, A. (2000) *XP-adjunction in universal grammar: scrambling and binding in Hindi-Urdu*, Oxford studies in comparative syntax, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Mahajan, A. K. (1989) "Agreement and Agreement Phrases," in I. Laka and A. K. Mahajan, eds., *Functional Heads and Clause Structure*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 10, MITWPL, Cambridge, MA, 217-252.

Mahajan, A. K. (1990) *The A/A-bar distinction and Movement Theory*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Mahajan, A. K. (1994) "Toward a Unified Theory of Scrambling," in N. Corver and H. C. van Riemsdijk, eds., *Studies on Scrambling: Movement and Non-movement approaches to Free Word-Order Phenomena*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 301-330.

Masica, C. (1976) *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Masica, C. (1991) *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, Cambridge Language Surveys, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

Mohanan, T. (1995a) *Argument structure in Hindi*, Dissertations in Linguistics, CSLI Publications, Stanford, California. Doctoral thesis at Stanford University 1990.

Mohanan, T. (1995b) "Wordhood and Lexicality: Noun Incorporation in Hindi," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13:1, 75-134.

Pandharipande, R. V. (1982) *Syntax and Semantics of the Passive Construction in Selected South Asian Languages*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois-Urbana, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

Pandharipande, R. V. (1997) *Marathi: a descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.

Ross, J. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Singh, M. (1994) *Perfectivity, definiteness, and specificity: a classification of verbal predicates in Hindi*, Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Srivastav, V. (1991) "The syntax and semantics of correlatives," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 637-686.

Strand, R. F. (1973) "Notes on the Nuristani and Dardic languages," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93, 297-305.

Subbarao, K. V. (1984) *Complementation in Hindi Syntax*, Academic Publications, Delhi.

Subbarao, K. V. (2001) "Agreement in South Asian Languages and Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," in P. Bhaskararao and K. V. Subbarao, eds., *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages 2001*, Sage Publications/Thousand Oaks, London/New Delhi.

Verma, M. K., and K. P. Mohanan, eds. (1990) *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian Languages*, CSLI, Stanford, CA.

Wali, K., and O. N. Koul (1997) *Kashmiri: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.