CHAPTER THREE

PASSIVE WITHIN THE "GAP" RELATIVE CLAUSE

3.0 Introduction

Hindi allows such passive constructions within noun phrases as in (1).

(1) [\text{NP merii likhii huyii kitaab}]
   \text{I gen. written part(icle) book}

(1) is two-ways ambiguous -- (i) "my book that is written" and (ii) "the book written by me". In both interpretations, the verb has a passive meaning; but \text{merii} ('I-gen.') has an agentive interpretation (like the English \text{by}-phrase) in (ii), and a "possessor" interpretation in (i) (the agent of the action being left unspecified). It is the semantic interpretation (ii) and the corresponding structure which pose some problems. Since \text{merii likhii huyii} modifies \text{kitaab}, we can assume an overall structure like (2) (which is the structure of the English relative clause and its head):

(2)
```
NP
   XP
   \text{merii likhii huyii}
                       NP
                              \text{kitaab}
```

The first questions we have to answer are: What is the category of XP? What is its internal structure?
3.1 The Category of the XP [merii likhi huyii]

Let us begin by noting that likhi can take all those adverbial adjuncts which a verb takes.

(3) a. [XP [pp haathō se] [xp merii likhi huyii]] kitaab
hand by my written part. book
"The book written by me by hand"

b. [XP [pp jon ke liye] [xp merii likhi huyii]] kitaab
John for part.
"The book written by me for John"

c. [XP [cp Tebul par bāTh kar][xp merii likhi huyii]]
table on sitting part.
Kitaab
"The book written by me sitting on the table"

d. [XP [cp Tebul par bāTh kar] [xp [pp haathō se]
table on sitting hand by
[XP [pp jon ke liye] [xp merii likhi huyii]
John for my written part. book
huyii]]] kitaab
"The book written by me for John by hand while sitting at the table"
And if likhil is replaced by a ditransitive verb such as de 'to give', we get a dative complement also.

(3) e. \([X_P [NP \text{jon ko}] [X_P \text{merii dii huii}]] \text{kitaab}\)

John to my given part. book

"The book given to John by me"

From this, we are led to the conclusion that likhil in (3a-d) or dii in (3e), is a verb.

But is XP (then) simply a VP? Since a subject seems to be absent in XP, one might be tempted to think so. But a closer examination shows that this is not the case. In a "gap" relative in Hindi, it is the subject which is relativized:

(4) a. jon roTii khaataa hai

John bread eat be-pr.3p.sg.

"John eats bread"

b. roTii khaataa huyaa jon acchaa lagtaa hai

bread eat part. John good appear be-pr. 3p.sg.

"John eating bread appears good"

c. *jon. khaataa huyaa roTii kacchii hai

uncooked

Lit. "The bread John eating is uncooked"

(5) a. jon bil ko maartaa hai

John Bill acc. beat be-pr.3p.sg.

"John beats Bill"
b. bil ko maartaa huyaa jon bahut gandaab hai
Bill acc. beat part. John very bad be-pr. 3p.sg. 
"John beating Bill is very bad"

c. *john maartaa huyaa bill acchaab hai
good
Lit. "Bill John beating is good"

(6) a. bacce saDak par doDte hai
children road on run be-pr. 3p.pl.
"The children run on the road"

b. saDak par doDte huye bacce bahut naTkhaab hai
road on run part. children very naughty be-p 3p.pl
"The children running on the road are very naughty"

c. *bacce doDte huye saDak kharaab hai
bad
Lit. "The road children running is bad"

(7) a. jon bimaarii se martaa hai
John disease by die be-pr. 3p.sg.
"John dies of a disease"

b. bimaarii se martaa huyaa jon dukhii hai
disease by die part. John unhappy be-pr. 3p.sg.
"John dying of a disease is unhappy"

c. *jon martaa huyaa bimaarii ghaatak hai
fatal
Lit. "The disease John dying is fatal"
As the sentences in (4-7b) and (4-7c) show, only a subject can yield a gap relative. The non-subjects in (4-6) can be relativized only when the sentences are passivized and they are made subjects.

(8) a. jon kii khaayii huyii roTii kacchi thii
  John gen. eaten part. bread unbaked be-past.3p.sg.
  "The bread eaten by John was unbaked"

b. jon kaa maaraa huyaa bil acchaa hai
  John gen. killed part. Bill good be-pr.3p.sg.
  "Bill killed by John is good"

c. bacco kaa doDaa huyaa saDak kharaab hai
  children gen. run part. road bad be-pr.3p.sg.
  "The road run on by the children is bad"

(7a) does not yield a passive as it happens to be an unaccusative verb which cannot be passivized. Hence, it cannot yield a "gap" relative with the non-subject bimaarii.

(8) d. *jon kaa martaa huyaa bimaarii

These are the only "gap" relatives possible in Hindi. (See also Subbarao (1984) for a discussion on participial modifiers of Nouns.)
Another point that should be stressed is that "gap" relatives are always infinitival. They cannot take tense, modals etc.

(9)  a. *[roti khaataa huyaa thaa] jon acchaa lagtaa hai

    b. *[bil ko maartaa huyaa thaa]
    Bill acc. beat part. be-past.3p.sg.
    jon bahut gandaa hai
    John very bad be-pr.3p.sg.

    c. *[jon kii khaayii huyii thii]
    John gen. eaten part. be-past.3p.sg.
    rotii kacchii thii
    bread unbaked be-past.3p.sg.

Crucially, in "gap" relatives, the tense of the relative clause is interpreted as that of the main clause. Thus, it is present tense in (10a) and past tense in (10b).

(10)  a. [bil ko maartaa huyaa] jon acchaa aadmii hai
    Bill acc. beat part. John good man be-pr. 3p.sg.

    "John beating Bill is a good man"
b. [bil ko maartaa huyaa] jon acchaa aadmi thaa
   Bill acc. beat part. John good man be-past. 3p.sg.

"John beating Bill was a good man"

These facts of "gap" relatives in Hindi are parallel to the -ing relatives in English. Thus, only a subject can be relativized in an -ing relative.

(11) a. the man [-beating John]
   b. the man [-being beaten by John]
   c. *the man [John beating -]

These infinitival relatives do not take any tense or modals.

(12) a. *the man [- was beating John]
   b. *the man [- could be beating John]
   c. *the man [- could be being beaten by John]

And, as in Hindi, the tense of the infinitival relative clause is interpreted as that of the main clause. For example, in (13a) it is present tense and in (13b) it is past tense.

(13) a. The man beating John is a good man
   b. The man beating John was a good man.
Concluding this discussion, the "gap" relatives in Hindi are possible only with subjects. They are infinitivals i.e., do not take tense or modals and their tense is interpreted as that of the main clause. This way they are exactly parallel to the infinitival -ing relatives in English.

An infinitival -ing relative in English can be analyzed as a control structure. Thus the NP [the man beating John] can have the structure shown below:

(14)

That is, the relative phrase is an IP (not a CP) with a PRO subject controlled by the head NP. The "Tense dependence" argues that it is not a CP (cf. "Exceptional Case marking" context). If it is a control structure (and not a Case of wh-movement), we can explain why only the subject can be relativized. The subject position is ungoverned and uncased-marked; so a lexical NP is not possible there, as is clear from (11c), repeated here.

(11) c. *The man [John beating -]

Only a PRO is possible in the subject position. Besides, PRO cannot occur in other non-subject positions because these positions are governed positions.
We can extend this analysis to the "gap" relatives in Hindi and thus arrive at the correct structure of \([xp \text{ merii likhii huyii}] \text{kitaab}\). XP in (2) is an IP, its subject is a PRO which is controlled by the head of the relative. (See also Davison (1988). She suggests a similar structure for such relative clauses.)
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From the point of view of NP-movement, the interest of "gap" relatives (for us) is that it provides positive evidence of movement in the passive. In (15) (for example) the "internal" argument of likh ('write') has moved to the subject position in order to be relativized.³
1. The agent phrase merii must, somehow, stay near likhii to get an agent phrase interpretation. If an adjunct of likhii intervenes between merii and likhii, merii will get a possessor interpretation.

   (i) *merii hathō se likhii huyii kitaab

   The example here is wrong in the sense of "the book written by me with hands". However, it is correct if we mean to say "my book that is written by hands".

   In Hindi, a pronominal with a Case marker has a suppletive form. E.g. merii is underlying maɪ (1p.sg.)+kii. huyii has been derived from the verb honaa.

2. The base form of kii is in fact kaa or may be ka which surfaces as kaa, ke and kii depending on the masculine/feminine and singular/plural features of the head noun. Thus we get

   (i) unkaa toDaa khilonaas

   his broken toy-mas.sg.

   "The toy broken by him"
An interesting riddle about "gap" relatives is how the agentive NP in the VP — merii in (15) — is assigned a genitive Case. The peculiarity is that while normally the genitive Case is assigned in SPEC position by N or subject position by gerund, in this instance, it is assigned to an NP which is not in the subject position (as shown by the fact that the "gap" is in the subject position).

A possible solution is the following. In Hindi, many postpositions govern a genitive Case in their complements, cf.

(i) mere liyee ('I-gen for', i.e. for me)
    mere paas ('I-gen near', i.e. near me)
    mere saath ('I-gen. with', i.e. with me)
If we can postulate an empty postposition, which carries an agentive meaning like that of English by, and which governs a genitive Case in its complement, we can explain both the interpretation and the case of merii in (15).

But there is a puzzling fact which is not explained by the above solution. The genitive Case on the agentive NP can co-occur only with the auxiliary verb honaa ('be') and not with jaanaa ('go'), cf.

(ii) a. meeri likhii huii kitaab
    b. *meeri likhii gayii kitaab

There is no such cooccurrence restriction on an agentive NP with the postposition dwaara or se:

(iii) a. meere dwaaraa likhii huii/gayii kitaab
     "The book written by me"
     b. mujh se likhii huii/gayii kitaab
     I-gen. by
     "The book written by me"

This suggests another solution. Suppose we say that in likhii huii, likhii is adjectival; and that in
Likhii gayii, likhii is verbal. We can now postulate that an adjective can Case-mark a complement genitive (cf. proud of John), but a verb cannot. This solution lies in with the fact that in tensed passive clauses, the agentive NP is never genitive:

(iv) a. *raavan raam-ka maaraa gayaa
   Ravan Ram-gen. killed jaa-perf.

b. raavan raam-se/raam-ke dwaaraa maara gayaa
   Ravan Ram by/Ram-gen. by killed jaa-perf
   "Ravan was killed by Ram"

Incidentally, English of, which is a realization of the genitive Case, has historically been used with an agentive meaning, cf.

(v) a. I have been told so of many
   (1600 Shakespeare, A.Y.L. iii. ii. 361)

b. Being warned of God in a dreame
   (1611 Bible, St. Matthew ii, 12)

c. A wretched stranger, and of all unknown!
   (1725 POPE, Odyss. VII.34)

d. A wretch forsaken of God and man
   (1869 FREEMAN, Norman Conquest III, xii, 222).