CHAPTER ONE
OVERVIEW

In the principles-and-parameters approach to grammar, outlined in Chomsky (1981), movement is effected by a rule Move-οC. Move-οC is a general rule and can move any category anywhere. However, general principles of grammar interact to put conditions on movement. Thus, the theta theory requires that the landing site of a moved element can only be a non-theta position. This entails that in the X-bar theoretic structure, a maximal phrase can move to a specifier position alone, the complement position being a theta-position. The Empty Category Principle (ECP) requires that the trace created by the moved phrase must be properly governed. Binding principles put their own conditions on the trace.

Move-οC, being free, can move a category either to an A-position or a non-A (A-) position. An A-position is defined as a position in which an argument can be generated at D-structure. E.g. the subject position and the complement positions of V, N, A and P are A-positions. Examples of A-positions are the COMP position (more specifically, the Specifier position of CP) and new positions created by adjunction. A typical instance of movement to an A-position is wh-movement in English: a wh-element is moved to SPEC, CP (i.e., the Specifier position of CP). A more
common instantiation of movement to an A-position in oriental languages is Scrambling, which is currently analyzed as adjunction to IP (=S). The paradigm example of movement to an A-position is the object-to-subject movement in the Passive. Movement to an A-position is known in the literature as "NP-movement", for the reason that in this type of movement, typically, an NP moves into another NP position. (In the generation of a sentence like That Bill is a genius is widely believed, it is possible to argue that it is a CP (=S) which is moved; but this too is an instance of "NP-movement"!)

Movement, from another point of view, is of two kinds: substitution and adjunction. In substitution a phrase of category C moves from its D-structure position to another C position of D-structure, which is empty. (That the target position is empty will be ensured by the following consideration: movement into a "filled" position will result in the obliteration of the elements already there, which will be a Case of non-recoverable deletion.) Adjunction creates a new structure: if Y is adjoined to X, a new X-node is created, of which Y and the old X are daughters:

(1) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
Y \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
X
\end{array}
\] (left-adjunction)  

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
Y
\end{array}
\] (right-adjunction)
All NP-movements are instances of substitution; whereas in the case of movements to A-positions, some are substitutions and some are adjunctions. For example, wh-movement is a substitution movement, since it moves a wh-element into a SPEC position which is already there; but Scrambling is a case of adjunction.

Move-∞ is optional. But independent principles may prevent, or "force", movement. Thus, movement from a non-properly governed position is prevented by the ECP. On the other hand in the D-structure of a Passive sentence, it is now claimed that the direct object is not Case-marked by the passivized V and is therefore forced to move into the subject position by the Case Filter (which is a requirement that lexical NPs must have Case).

The purview of this thesis is NP-movement in Hindi vis-a-vis English. In Hindi, there are three possible candidates for NP-movement: passive, raising-to-object and raising-to-subject. We will take each in turn and look into the problems that the grammar faces in the analysis of it.

In Lectures on Government and Binding (LGB), Chomsky (1981) proposes an analysis of the English passive along the following lines. He claims that the passive morpheme absorbs the verb's external theta-role (which is normally assigned to SPEC, IP), and it also absorbs the Case-assigning property of the verb. As a result, the complement of the passive verb
does not get Case; and the Case-filter triggers its movement to any appropriate landing-site where it can get Case. Since SPEC, IP is a non-theta position (because the VP in a passive sentence cannot assign it an external theta-role), it is a valid landing site for the moved NP, where the NP gets nominative Case from the INFL. Chomsky's claims about the passive verb have been generalized by Burzio (1981) in the form of a maxim (known as "Burzio's generalization"), which says that a verb that assigns Case to its object assigns an external theta-role.

This theory of the passive, so far as it goes, runs into problems when we come to examine passives in Hindi. In a passive sentence in Hindi the object NP can surface with or without an accusative Case. To account for this, two theories of passives have been proposed for Hindi. One says that the passive morpheme in Hindi optionally absorbs Case. Hence, the object NP can surface with the accusative Case (and stay in the VP) or without the accusative Case (in the subject position). The second theory proposes that the Hindi passive morpheme does not absorb Case at all. To account now for the permitted non-appearance of the accusative Case on the object NP, this second theory appeals to a process which is operative in Hindi active sentences. In active sentences too, (under certain conditions) an object NP may surface without an overt Case. The same process (it is claimed) is operative in passive sentences.
The first theory is theoretically a weak claim, in that it is an "easy" explanation in terms of a parametric variation: the passive morphology absorbs Case optionally in Hindi and obligatorily in English. It does not try to relate the difference to any other part of the grammars of the two languages. The second theory also appeals to a parametric variation: the passive morphology absorbs Case in English but not in Hindi; but it at least tries to relate the permitted non-appearance of objective Case in the Hindi passive to another phenomenon in the grammar of Hindi. For this reason, it is a somewhat stronger theory. At the same time, one would be happiest with an explanation of the surface differences of Hindi and English passives as reflexes of the interaction of completely general principles and universal syntactic processes. In this thesis we hope to have taken a step in that direction. We begin our account of the Hindi passive by a careful articulation of the conditions under which, in active sentences, a verb can "absorb" or "delete" the overt Case of its direct object. We then argue that this process is an instance of Incorporation, a universal morphosyntactic process which is currently being investigated (Baker 1985). We further claim that the deletion of the object's Case in the Hindi passive (which is optional, being preferred although not
obligatory) is an instance of the same process.

The adequacy of the characterization of the passive given in Chomsky (1981) is questionable for other reasons also. It does not account for all the variations among languages as regards the passive. Hindi is one of a class of languages -- of which German, Dutch and Icelandic are members -- which allow intransitive verbs to passivize. By contrast, English rules out passives of intransitive verbs and allows only transitive verbs to passivize. Again, in Italian and Spanish an object NP in a passive sentence can appear in the VP, and be assigned (supposedly) nominative Case within the VP. This is, however, disallowed in English. There are other variations (too) among passives in the world's languages. Jaeggli (1986) addresses himself to these problems. His ideas are pushed forward by Baker (1985) who argues that the passive morpheme is an argument of the category INFL. This will explain why the passive morpheme requires a theta-role and gets an external theta-role. Other variations across languages, Baker proposes to account for in terms of variations in the Case requirement of the passive morpheme. We shall build on Baker's analysis, but try to show that his stipulations regarding the Case requirement of the passive morpheme can be dispensed with, in favour of more well-understood parametric variations such as the pro-drop parameter.
The issues related to Hindi passives, in particular, and to different languages, in general, are extensively discussed in Chapter II. The theory of passive as outlined in this chapter will also account for variations among languages.

A related issue is the optional application of Move-α to the object NP in Hindi passive constructions. In Hindi, which is a pro-drop language, the object NP can move to SPEC, IP or stay in the VP. In the second case, the SPEC, IP will be filled by a pleonastic pro. But there is a structure, namely passive within "gap" relative, which exhibits the obligatory movement of the object NP. This has been shown in Chapter III.

One instantiation of NP-movement in Hindi seems to be the appearance of an NP in the matrix object position in what we have termed raising-to-object sentences. This NP apparently is in the complement position of the matrix verb and is assigned an accusative Case. But it gets its theta-role from a theta-position within the embedded clause. There are the following differences from the "raising-to-object" configuration in English. The embedded clause is finite. Any Case-marked NP from the embedded clause can be raised. (Irrespective of its original Case-marking it surfaces with an accusative Case.) When a non-subject is raised, the
resulting trace (assuming movement) must be replaced by a resumptive pronoun. (When a nominative NP is raised, the sentence is fine with or without a resumptive pronoun.) Raising happens with a question-word, too, and the raising of the question-word, in addition, widens its scope making the sentence a matrix (i.e., direct) question.

The theory prohibits such a movement i.e., raising an NP from the embedded clause to the matrix object position. The projection principle and the theta theory reject movement into a complement position. Besides, a finite clause is supposed to be an opaque domain for the Binding Theory, and so is the c-command domain of a subject. Therefore, if the trace of raising is an NP-movement trace, it should violate the Binding Principles. On the other hand, if the trace is a variable, there are other problems (which we discuss). Then, how do we account for the Hindi data on raising? In Chapter IV we consider this question from both movement and non-movement perspectives. We seek help from various analyses of similar facts in different languages, e.g. Cuzco Quechua, Italian, Spanish and Romanian. We review these analyses and find them inadequate to handle the data on raising in Hindi. Our own final analysis claims that there is no movement involved in Hindi raising; also, that the "raised" NP is not in a complement position of the matrix verb.
A similar phenomenon, viz. raising-to-subject, also occurs in Hindi. The verb lagnaa is a counterpart of the verb seem. It takes either a finite or a small clause as its complement. But while the verb seem can trigger movement of the embedded subject from a non-finite clause only, lagnaa triggers this movement from a finite clause. (Both verbs trigger movement of the subject of their small clause complement.) This raising-to-subject is different from raising-to-object in Hindi in one respect. While the theta-position to which the "raised" NP is related in the raising-to-object structure can be (and in the case of non-subjects, must be) occupied by a lexical pronoun, the embedded subject position in raising-to-subject cannot be occupied by a resumptive pronoun. In fact, a resumptive pronoun in that position makes the sentence ungrammatical. Another fact to note is that raising-to-subject has two outputs: in one, the matrix verb agrees with the raised NP, in another the verb is unmarked for agreement. An analysis has been proposed for these facts in Chapter V.