

## **On Subjacency and A' movement in Hindi/Urdu**

One of the long-term debates in the modular approach concerns the level at which Subjacency applies. The locus of the issue is the fact that languages like English, which involve overt displacement of the Wh-phrase (1), show subjacency effects while Wh in-situ languages like Chinese do not (2).

A dominant view on this is championed by Huang (1982) suggesting that Subjacency only constraints overt movements. More recent works by Merchant (1999), and Fox and Lasnik (2003) have further shown that island effects (violations of Subjacency) are PF violations and PF operations like ellipsis can recover the derivations. This approach has thus reduced subjacency to a constraint on overt movement only.

A strong challenge to this proposal however is posited by languages like Hindi/Urdu, which are considered to be Wh in-situ, i.e. the Wh-phrase appears to remain in its base position, but still show subjacency effects (3). To account for such phenomenon in Hindi/Urdu, Dayal (1996)<sup>1</sup> came up with a parametric view and suggested that in Hindi/Urdu, Subjacency is a constraint at LF. The basic idea is that Wh-phrases move at LF (and not in overt syntax) in Hindi/Urdu and island effects if any are a result of subjacency violation at LF.

This account has two serious problems. First it makes wrong predictions about other instances of LF movement (quantifier raising), which are not constrained by Subjacency (4) and second it fails to explain why overt instances of A' movement in Hindi/Urdu (5) are island sensitive and more interestingly when these violations can be repaired under sluicing (6). These facts suggest that subjacency is a constraint operating in overt syntax and not LF in Hindi/Urdu. So why do we see subjacency effects when Wh-phrases appear in-situ?

My idea is that contrary to appearances, Hindi/Urdu is in fact a Wh-fronting language. I propose an alternative analysis of Wh-movement in Hindi/Urdu, assuming a structure (7) where the wh-phrase moves overtly. However contra to many other languages, the lower copy is pronounced. This derives the absence of any phonetic impact of movement while preserving the constraints on movement typical of fronting. Further support for this overt movement analysis comes from parasitic gaps (8), where a Wh-word can bind a parasitic gap.

---

<sup>1</sup> In line with Nishigauchi (1986) and Pesetsky (1987), who argued for LF subjacency.

- (1) \* What did you wonder why Lisi bought?
- (2) Ni xiang-xhidao [Lisi weisheme mai-le sheme]?  
 You wonder Lisi why bought what  
 “What did you wonder why Lisi bought?”
- (3) \*raam udaas hai kyunki siita kis-se pyaar karti hai  
 Ram upset be because Sita who-with loves does be  
 “\*Who is Ram upset because Sita loves?”
- (4) Bill kisi-ko jaanta hai jo har afriki desh ghuma hai  
 Bill someone-Acc knows be who every African country visit be  
 “Bill knows someone who visited every African country.”
- (a) There is some x, such that for every African country y, x visited y and Bill knows x. (someone >everyone)  
 (b) For every African country x, there is some y, such that y visited x and Bill knows y. (everyone >someone)
- (5)\*kis-se, raam udaas hai kynuki siitaa pyaar karti hai  
 who-with, Ram upset be because Sita love does be  
 “\*Who is Ram upset because Sita loves?”
- (6) raam udaas hai kyunki siita kisi-se pyaar karti hai , par mai nahi jaanta kis-se  
 Ram upset be because Sita someone-with love does be but I not know who-with  
 “Ram is upset because Sita loves someone but I didn’t know who”
- (7) [kis-se [raam udaas hai kyunki [siita kis-se pyaar karti hai]]]  
 wh0-with Ram upset be because Sita who-with love does be
- (8) raam-ne kaunsi kitaab bina paRhe rakh di  
 Ram-Erg which book without reading kept gave  
 “Which book did Ram keep back without reading?”
- Reading: For which book x, Ram kept back x without reading x.

## References

- Dayal, V.: 1996, “Scope marking: in defence of indirect dependency,” in U. Lutz & G. Müller (eds.), Papers on Wh-Scope Marking, Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340, 76.
- Fox, Danny and Howard Lasnik. 2001. Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. Ms. Harvard University and University of Connecticut.
- Huang, C.-T. J.: 1982, Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. University Press: Oxford.
- Nishigauchi, T.: 1986, Quantification in Syntax, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts. Amherst.
- Pesetsky, D.: 1987, "WH-in-situ: movement and unselective binding," in Reuland and ter Meulen (eds.).