CHAPTER FIVE
RAISING TO SUBJECT

5.0 Introduction

Hindi has the following sentences:

(1)  
a. siitaa acchii lagtii hai
    Sita good-fem. sem-fem. be-pr.3p.sg.
    "Sita seems good"

b. siitaa lagtii hai ki acchii hai
    Sita seem-fem. be-pr. that good- be-pr.
    3p.sg. fem. 3p.sg.
    "Sita seems to be good"

c. siitaa lagtaa hai ki acchii hai
    Sita seem-mas. be-pr.that good- be-pr.
    3p.sg. fem. 3p.sg.
    "Sita, it seems is good"

The verb lagtaa is semantically equivalent to the English verb "seem". It is an unaccusative verb which does not assign an external theta-role to the subject position and does not assign Case to its object because it belongs to the intransitive class of verbs. Like other unaccusative verbs, it can enter into the "dative-subject" construction (see section 2.3.3).
In (1a), (1b) and (2), the matrix verb shows agreement with *siitaa*, which is feminine, singular. In (1c), the matrix verb shows neutral or "default" agreement, namely masculine, singular. (The embedded predicate agrees with *siitaa* in all these sentences.)

5.1 Analysis

Since the subject position of the verb *lagnaa* is a non-theta position, it is easy to explain (2), as also (1a), in terms of movement. It can be said that the verb *lagnaa* takes a small clause complement [siitaa acchii] and *siitaa* moves to the subject position and is assigned nominative Case. Thus, the S-structure representation of (1a) on the movement-to-Subject analysis will be as in (3a).

(3) a. siitaa \(_i\) [VP \(_i\) [SC \(t_i\) acchii] lagti\(_i\)] [I hai]

For deriving (2), *mujhko* is generated as an optional oblique argument in the VP (Jayaseelan (1989)); it is then scrambled and adjoined to the left of the matrix IP. This is shown below:
We can give an alternative analysis of (1a) and (2) in terms of non-movement. As we said in section 2.3.3, Hindi can have a pleonastic pro in the subject position; if this pleonastic pro is co-superscripted with siitaa, it will pass on the nominative Case to siitaa, allowing it to stay in its D-structure position.

Thus, (1a) and (2) can be explained in both movement and non-movement terms.

Coming to (1b), we can superficially argue that siitaa has been "raised" to the matrix subject position from the embedded subject position, as shown below:

(5) $[IP [IP siitaa_i [VP t_j [SC t_i acchii] lagtii]] [I hai]] [CP_j ki [IP t_i acchii hai]]$
As evidence that there is movement involved in (1b) (as shown in (5)), we can advance all those arguments which we did while considering the so-called "raising to object" phenomenon in Hindi (cf. section 4.2.1; chapter 4), viz., word-order, thematic role of the NP sititaa, agreement of the embedded verb with sititaa and so on. Since the matrix subject position is not theta-marked this movement is sanctioned by the Theta Criterion.

But there are two problems for such a "raising" analysis. The first has to do with the Binding Theory. Since the landing site of the movement is an A-position, the trace in the embedded subject position is an NP-movement trace, which is an anaphor. But this anaphor is not bound in its governing category, namely the embedded clause. Therefore there is a violation of a binding principle. Now, this is the well-known argument given for disallowing raising from a tensed clause in English:

(6) *John$_i$ seems [ t$_i$ is clever]

One might explore the possibility of redefining "governing category" for Hindi, such that the raising in (5) becomes possible. But such a solution misses a point. There are some other languages (besides Hindi) where raising from a tensed clause is attested. All these languages are pro-drop languages. It would be nice if -- instead of fiddling with the governing category -- we could come up with a
solution which crucially involved pro-drop.

The second problem has to do with extraposition of the tensed embedded CP. As we have already discussed (see section 4.3.5, chapter 4), a tensed CP complement is invariably extraposed and adjoined to the IP (in Hindi). Now, if siitaa is extracted out of the embedded CP, it will leave a trace which, after the extraposition of the CP, will not be c-commanded by the antecedent. This is shown in (7).

(7)

In view of these difficulties for a raising analysis, we might wish to explore the same type of analysis as we proposed for "raising to object". That is, we can posit
a Topic Phrase as a complement of the verb. A pro in the embedded subject position will be coindexed with the Topic. The D-structure will be the following:

(8)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{T tense} \\
\text{AGR} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{siitaa}_i \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{ki pro}_i \text{ acchii hai}
\end{array}
\]

After extraposition of the embedded CP, pro will no longer be c-commanded by siitaa; but this will not matter, since pronominal coreference does not require c-command by the antecedent. To explain (1b), in which the matrix verb agrees with siitaa, we could say that a pleonastic pro inserted in the matrix subject position is optionally coindexed with the Topic.
This analysis, which is along the same lines as our account of "raising-to-object", unfortunately flounders on one fact. We demonstrated (in the last chapter) that Hindi does not allow a variable to be replaced by a resumptive pronoun; whereas a pro (naturally) can be replaced by a lexical pronoun. Now the gap in the embedded clause in the "raising-to-subject" construction (as contrasted with the same gap in the "raising-to-object" construction) cannot be replaced by a pronoun; cf.

(9) *siita:i lagti hai [ki wah:i acchii hai]

This argues that there is a trace in the embedded subject position, and not a pro. That is, "raising-to-subject" does involve a movement.

This appears to be an impasse. But a careful consideration will show us that we can get around the problem if the movement is to a position which c-commands both the matrix IP and the extraposed CP. Topicalization on the matrix IP is such a movement.

We shall now argue that "raising-to-subject" in Hindi is a case of Topicalization. As we said in the last chapter, Topicalization has been reanalyzed as S-adjunction by Lasnik and Saito (1991), who stipulate that in long-distance topicalization the topicalized element can (and must) pass
through the intermediate COMPs. Therefore the trace of Topicalization is a variable, subject to the Island Constraints.

In (1b) and (1c), the embedded CP is first extraposed and adjoined to the matrix IP. Subsequently, the embedded subject is topicalized to the matrix IP. This is perhaps done in three movements: the NP is first adjoined to the embedded IP, then moved into the embedded COMP (specifically, into the SPEC of this CP), and then it is adjoined to the matrix IP. The resulting S-structure is shown below:

(10)
To generate (1b), in which the matrix verb agrees with sitaa, we can say that the pleonastic pro subject of the matrix IP is optionally coindexed with the Topic.

A question arises here: since English also has Topicalization, can English also have a similar "raising" from a tensed complement of seem? Yes, it can; cf.

(11) Mary it seems \[ CP [ IP t \mathrm{likes} \; Bill] ]

The crucial difference is that English is not a pro-drop language; therefore the matrix subject position is occupied by a pleonastic it. Hindi being a pro-drop language, the matrix subject can be a pleonastic pro. This gives the superficial effect that the "raised" NP is in the matrix subject position.

...
NOTES

1 Sentences (1b) and (1c) are examples of Hindi as spoken in Bihar.

2 Lasnik and Saito (1991) adopt a framework in which COMP has only one position; hence in a Barriers-type analysis of CP, it is not clear which position (exactly) the topicalized NP is supposed to move into. We have tentatively assumed that it moves into SPEC, CP.
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