ABSTRACT

There are three possible instantiations of NP-movement in Hindi -- passive, raising-to-object and raising-to-subject. But each poses some problems for the version of the principles-and-parameters approach to grammar currently known as the Government and Binding theory.

Passives present two problems. One, the object argument may optionally surface with an overt accusative Case and stay in the VP. (Alternatively of course, it may move into the subject position and be marked nominative.) Two, intransitive verbs of the unergative class may passivize.

We approach the first problem via the fact that in Hindi active sentences, the direct object's overt Case may be "deleted" under certain conditions. We investigate these conditions. What emerges is that the "deletion" is triggered by the verb. We group verbs into verb-classes, which are ranged on a cline of "strength" as regards the ability to "delete" the object's Case. We then argue that what appears like deletion is an instance of Incorporation: the verb incorporates the direct object's Case. (The Case fails to surface on the verb too, for reasons that we discuss.)

Passive morphology (we argue) strengthens a verb, so that a verb of even the weakest class can (when passivized)
incorporate the Case of any NP. The claim is that the same incorporation process is at work in the Hindi passive as in the Hindi active. One reason for saying this is that both in the active and the passive, Case-incorporation is a preference rule: that is, in an environment where the rule can apply, its non-application results in a sentence which is unidiomatic but not ungrammatical.

Incorporation does not leave the direct object Case-less; this is because the incorporated Case (on the verb) continues to govern its trace in the Case-position. So, the Case Filter does not force the direct object to move. When it does not move to the subject position, the latter position is filled by a pleonastic pro, Hindi being a pro-drop language. When it does move to the subject position, it is marked nominative. (We argue against the notion of Case Conflict.)

Following Baker (1985), we claim that passive morphology is an argument, and that it absorbs the verb's external theta-role. Since unergative intransitive verbs have external theta-roles, they are eligible for passivization. (In these passives, too, the empty subject position is filled by a pleonastic pro.)
In raising-to-object sentences, an NP appears in what is, prima facie, a complement position of the matrix verb with an overt accusative Case, but gets an interpretation from a theta-marked position within the embedded finite clause. Speaking (for convenience) in terms of "raising", the following points may be noted. The raising is out of a tensed Clause. Not only a subject, but any NP can be raised. When a non-subject is raised, the trace must be replaced by a resumptive pronoun.

The problems are: Movement into a complement position is illicit in a theory which contains the Projection Principle and the Theta Criterion. Also, if the trace is an NP-trace (and therefore an anaphor), it is not bound within its governing category. If (instead) the trace is a variable, there are two problems. Hindi has no resumptive pronoun strategy; i.e., a variable normally cannot be replaced by a resumptive pronoun in Hindi. More seriously, all tensed clausal complements are extraposed and right-adjointed to IP in Hindi; in the resulting configuration, the variable will not be c-commanded by its antecedent.

In view of these considerations, we reject a movement analysis. Our solution claims that Hindi allows a Left Dislocation structure in embedded clauses. The relation between the NP generated in the left-dislocated position
(a Topic position) and the pronoun in the theta-position in the embedded clause is simply that of pronominal coreference.

In raising-to-subject sentences, an NP, which is interpreted as the subject of the extraposed embedded finite clause, appears preverbally in the matrix clause. In one case the matrix verb agrees with the "raised" NP. In another case the verb is not marked for agreement. The gap left in the embedded subject position cannot be replaced by a lexical pronoun -- a fact which is in contrast to raising-to-object.

If we assume an NP-movement analysis, there is a violation of the binding principle: the NP-trace is not bound within the embedded finite clause which is its governing category. Besides, the antecedent, whether it lands in the subject or in any other position in the matrix clause, will not c-command its trace in the embedded clause if the latter is extraposed and adjoined to the matrix IP.

We claim that what looks like raising-to-subject is a topicalization phenomenon involving movement (as contrasted with the Left Dislocation structure of raising-to-object involving no movement). Since the trace is a variable, it cannot be replaced by a lexical pronoun, as is normal in Hindi. The alternating agreement pattern is explained as the result of optional verb agreement with a Topic.