

Chapter 1 - Introduction: Peripheries in Kashmiri and Hindi-Urdu

1. The Kashmiri Language and Its Speakers

This dissertation is primarily concerned with certain aspects of the syntax of the Indic language Kashmiri. Kashmiri is a lesser-studied language, addressed in a relatively small body of both descriptive work and formal linguistic research. For this reason, I will take this opportunity to establish the context for current work on Kashmiri, by describing the language and its situation as well as the body of research on the language upon which the present piece of work builds.

Kashmiri, or [kʰ:s&ur] as it is called by native speakers, is an Indic language spoken in the greater region known as Kashmir, which includes the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, as well as other territory administered by Pakistan but under dispute between the two governments. There are between 3 and 4 million speakers of this language, primarily in India, but also in significant numbers in Pakistan, the United Kingdom, and the United States (Wali and Koul 1997, Ethnologue 2006). Speakers of both Indic and Tibeto-Burman languages surround the mountainous area in which Kashmiri is spoken.

A number of dialects of the Kashmiri language have been identified, although the terms used to refer to these dialects tend to vary. The novel data in this thesis comes from speakers of the *yamra:z* variety, spoken in and around Srinagar, which is regarded as standard (Bhatt 1999). Among those studying Kashmiri over the past one

hundred years, a dispute arose concerning the family affiliation of the language. Some of the earliest thorough work in the language (Grierson 1919, Chatterji 1963) contended that there existed a separate branch of Indic called Dardic, and that Kashmiri should be grouped as a Dardic language alongside languages like Pashai and Shina. More recently, however, researchers (Fussman 1972, Koul and Schmidt 1983, Zakharyin 1984, Wali and Koul 1997) have cautioned that the Dardic designation is a geographic one, not a linguistic one, and there is now a consensus that Kashmiri clearly belongs to the hill language family of the Indic group.

Kashmiri has been described in only a few grammars, most incomplete or relatively unavailable. It is relevant to note that, although Kashmiri has a revered literary tradition originating in the 14th century, it has never adopted a standardized writing system. For this reason descriptions of the Kashmiri language have been written in Devanagari, Arabic, or Roman scripts, using widely varying transcription systems. Edgeworth (1841) and Leech (1844) provided skeleton grammars and vocabularies of the language, while Kaula (1898) published a Paninian-style grammar in Sanskrit. Grierson included Kashmiri in the *Linguistic Survey of India* published in 1919, following a smaller phrase book and dictionary published in 1911. Kachru (1969) contributed a more recent reference grammar for the language, but this was unfortunately not published. The definitive modern grammar is that of Wali and Koul (1997), to which this dissertation will frequently refer.

A Note on Data from Kashmiri

The greater region of Kashmir has been disputed between the governments of India and Pakistan since before partition in 1947. It has been the site of wars between the two nations (in 1947 and in 1965) as well as smaller-scale militancy on the part of a wide range of factions that has driven many residents of the region permanently from their homes. These painful histories often intrude on and affect the work that the linguist does with speakers. Fortunately, recent events have spurred some warming in relations between India and Pakistan, and a subsequent easing of tensions in Kashmir. To the extent possible I have attempted to avoid any appearance of bias or sympathy of attitude toward any of the political groups.

The Kashmiri data in this work comes from several sources. First, I have incorporated many observations from the only published modern grammar of the language (Wali and Koul 1997), and have indicated this with citation. Second, I have conducted linguistic fieldwork, interviewing native-speaker informants speaking the Srinagar variety. The following are my primary informants:

Figure 1

| <u>Initials</u> | <u>Gender</u> | <u>Age</u> | <u>Languages spoken (in order of acquisition)</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|---|
| PK | M | 56 | Kashmiri, Hindi-Urdu, English |
| JC | F | 51 | Kashmiri, Hindi-Urdu, English |
| BC | F | 80+ | Kashmiri only |
| VC | M | 59 | Kashmiri, Hindi-Urdu, English |

All were born in Kashmir and left the region during cycles of significant violence and civil disruption. I have worked with these informants, and with other Kashmiri-speaking individuals and families, since the Spring of 2004. In each case, I have pursued a combination of techniques, including elicitation of narrative, elicitation/translation of specific example types, and requests for grammaticality judgments. Interviews were typically conducted in English, with the use of Hindi-Urdu where required. Interviews with BC were conducted through a translator. In this dissertation, Kashmiri data attributed to any of these informants is marked with the speaker's initials and the date of the recording. A third source of Kashmiri data in this thesis is edited stories and poems, and a limited selection of naturally occurring data online, including discussion group postings and news items. These examples are cited with the source and date obtained where applicable.

2. A Grammatical Overview of Kashmiri

In this section I will present a brief overview of the basic features of the Kashmiri language, which differ significantly from the better-known Indic languages such as Hindi-Urdu. The various chapters of this dissertation deal in detail with a range of issues in the syntax of the language. To situate those discussions and to make them easier to follow, I offer here a snapshot of the language itself, including a number of phenomena that will not be subsequently addressed. This will serve to facilitate comprehension of examples in future chapters, and permit the reader to focus on the important constructions at hand.

2.1 Nouns

Kashmiri has a rich system of nominal case declensions, including nominative/absolutive, dative, ablative, ergative, and genitive. Nominative/absolutive is unmarked, and is the case given to subjects of all intransitive clauses, and the subjects of all transitive clauses except for those in the perfective aspect. In the perfective aspect it is the direct object of the transitive clause that is unmarked. Case is marked with suffixes that vary according to number and gender. These are displayed in Figure 2.

Figure 2

| Case | Masculine | | Feminine | |
|----------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|
| | Singular | Plural | Singular | Plural |
| Nom/Abs | ∅ | ∅ | ∅ | ∅ |
| Ergative | an | av | i | av |
| Dative | is/as | an | i | an |
| Ablative | I/I | av | i | av |

Case stacking (dual case marking) is possible in Kashmiri, in particular with the genitive and another oblique case (Wali and Koul 1997). This occurs, for instance, when an object of comparison is also the complement of a postposition or comparative postpositional phrase.

(1) ... farid-ni-s muka:balas manz ...

Farid-gen-dat comparison-dat in

‘... in comparison with Farid ... ‘ (Wali and Koul: 157)

Both animate and inanimate nouns in Kashmiri are gendered (either Masculine or Feminine), and the gender of many nouns can be discerned by the morphological form of the word. Feminine nouns typically have endings such as *-en*, *-In*, *-:n*, *-Ir*, and *-ba:y*, as shown in Figure 3. There are, of course, many exceptions (Wali and Koul).

Figure 3

| <u>Masculine</u> | <u>Feminine</u> |
|------------------|------------------------|
| marId ‘man’ | zana:n ‘woman’ |
| o:luv ‘potato’ | gagIr ‘rat’ |
| ma:star ‘teach’ | ma:star-ba:y ‘teacher’ |
| ph’ok ‘shoulder’ | d’:r ‘window’ |

Suffixation and stem vowel changes typically mark the plural form of nouns, as depicted in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4

| <u>Noun</u> | <u>Singular</u> | <u>Plural</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 'window' | d':r | da:ri |
| 'shoulder' | ph'ok | phek' |
| 'potato' | o:luv | o:lav |
| 'rat' | gagIr | gagri |

2.2 Verbs

Kashmiri finite verbs and auxiliaries display inflection for number, person, and gender, such as in (2).

(2) a. ba ch-u-s skuul gatsha:n

I aux-m-1sg school go-perf

'I go to school.' (Wali and Koul 1997: 152)

b. mohn-an ch'1' palav.

Mohan-erg washed-mpl clothes.

Mohan washed the clothes. (Wali and Koul: 153)

c. haa manshi, k'a:zI chu-kh vuth:an sekhi lavar

O man, why aux-2sg twist sand rope

O man, why do you twist a rope of sand? (Lal Ded, 14th century)

The types of inflection that appear on the verb are of two broad categories. Core agreement is obligatory, and is controlled by the argument in nominative/absolutive

case. This agreement encodes number and person features, and gender features in all non-future tenses.

(3) bI go-s

I-nom go-past-msg-1ps

‘I went.’ (Bhatt 1999)

(4) Aslam-an vuch-u-kh tsI.

Aslam-erg see-msg-2ps you-abs-msg

‘Aslam saw you.’ (Wali and Koul 1997: 248)

The second type of agreement involves sets of pronominal suffixes. These clitics may be doubled by their associated arguments, though not in all cases. First and third person ergative arguments need not be marked unless subjects are null. Second-person arguments must be marked, whether the pronoun is null or overt. A person hierarchy conditions the appearance of suffixes marking nominative objects in the nonperfective aspects and dative arguments. Examples of verbs with pronominal suffixes are supplied below (Wali and Koul 1997).

(5) a. tse vIchi-th-as bI

You-erg saw-2sg-1sg me-abs

‘You saw me.’ (Wali and Koul: 253)

b. bI chu-s-an-ay su tse hava:lI kara:n

I-nom aux-1sg-3sg-2sg he-acc you-dat hand over doing

‘I am handing him over to you.’ (Wali and Koul: 253)

These inflectional elements on the verb are strictly ordered. Core gender-number agreement must precede all pronominal suffixes, and the pronominal suffixes follow a hierarchical order determined by the grammatical function of the argument; specifically, suffixes referring to the subject precede those referring to the object, which in turn precede those referring to the indirect object.

2.3 Basic syntax

Much like Hindi-Urdu, Kashmiri is a split-ergative language. That is, the system of case-marking is nominative-accusative in all nonperfective aspects, and ergative-absolutive in the perfective aspect. In the perfective aspect the subjects of intransitive predicates and the direct objects of transitive predicates bear the same (unmarked) case.

Kashmiri is generally claimed to be a language with underlying verb-final word order (SOV) in which tensed clauses surface as verb-second. Non-finite clauses, as well as relative clauses, are verb-final.

(6) Su l'ɾʔkɪ [yus dili chu ro:za:n] chu m'o:n bo:y

cor boy rel Delhi aux live is my brother

'The boy who lives in Delhi is my brother' (Wali and Koul 1997: 54)

(7) s'lim chu yatsha:n [me ba:ga:s manz vuch-un]

Selim aux wanting [I-dat garden in see-inf-neuter]

Selim wants to see me in the garden. (Wali and Koul: 46)

All other tensed clauses, including complement clauses, exhibit verb-second. We will examine this property of Kashmiri in detail in Chapter 2.

In general, Kashmiri is a head final language. In NPs, specifiers, genitives, and complements precede the head ((8)). Adpositions follow their complements ((9)).

(8) TuurisTan-hund maka:n

Tourists-gen house

‘Tourist’s house’ (Bhatt, 1999)

(9) a. Tem an zana:n [ma:l-is kha:tr]

He-erg brought wife father-obl for

‘He brought (his) wife for (the sake of his) father.’ (Bhatt, 1999)

b. ... yath forum-as manz

this forum-obl in

in this forum (3/27/06, GreaterKashmir Forum)¹

Complement clauses in Kashmiri appear uniformly to the right of the matrix clause, unlike in some other Indic languages (for Bengali, see Bayer 1996). And unlike in some Germanic languages, verb-second order prevails. Finite complement clauses in Kashmiri are optionally introduced by the element *ki*, which does not “count” in determining second position.

(10) laṛk-as chI khabar [ki swa yi:-na]

¹ http://greaterkashmir.com/forum/topic.asp?whichpage=1&TOPIC_ID=84&REPLY_ID=661

boy-dat aux knowledge that she come-fut-neg

‘The boy knows that she will not come.’ (Bhatt, 1999)

The internal structure of complement clauses, and in particular the left edge of these clauses, will be crucial to the discussions that follow.

The other properties of Kashmiri syntax that will be relevant to our discussion principally concern movement to A-bar positions. Detailed discussion of these facts will be provided in the chapters below.

3. Previous Research on Kashmiri

Just as there are few grammars of Kashmiri, there has been comparatively little formal syntactic research on the language. This is particularly surprising considering the significant attention given to other Indic languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Marathi, and Bengali. Most of the previous work on Kashmiri has been concentrated in three areas: the complex case system, the system of agreement and cliticization, and the verb-second phenomenon. Overall, it is the word order and the syntactic and morphological intricacies of the A-system of Kashmiri that have to this point interested linguists.

Many of the early formal observations of Kashmiri, particularly concerning word order, were made by Peter Hook (see Hook 1976, Hook 1984, Hook and Manaster-Ramer 1985). Bhatt (1999) attributes to Hook first mention of verb-second word order in Kashmiri. Other general work on word order in Kashmiri appeared in the volume edited by Hook and Koul (1994), such as Subbarao (1984).

A number of researchers have undertaken shorter explorations of the Kashmiri system of case and agreement. Bhatt (1993a, 1993b) has investigated a range of case-related issues in Kashmiri, particularly with respect to ergative-nominative structures. Kachru, Kachru, and Bhatia (1976) made comparative observations about subjecthood in a range of languages including Kashmiri. Linked research on Kashmiri agreement and cliticization includes work by Wali and Koul (1992), Subbarao (2001), and Subbarao and Mushi (2000). Hook and Koul (2004) represents a fairly recent contribution to this line of research, comparing case and agreement in Kashmiri with that in Shina, Poguli, and Gujarati.

Larger scale work on Kashmiri beyond the grammars mentioned above is comparatively rare. Raina (1991), in her dissertation, investigated word order and argument structure of the language. Her central claim, disputed by subsequent researchers (see Bhatt 1999), was that Kashmiri is a nonconfigurational language in which the subject and the object mutually c-command one another.

Most recently Bhatt (1999) has published a significant study of the verb-second phenomenon in Kashmiri, featuring detailed comparisons with Germanic verb-second. This work builds on earlier research by Bhatt and Yoon (1992), in which they proposed a functional Mood projection on the left edge of the clause. The second-position verb ordering was attributed to the fact that the verb appeared as a reflex of Mood marking in the head of MoodP. This proposal was extended to the range of Germanic verb-second as well in Bhatt (1999). Because Kashmiri and a few related varieties are unique among the Indic languages in featuring verb-second, this

aspect of the language has rightfully attracted research attention. The second chapter of this dissertation will build in part on the work of Bhatt (1999), analyzing the syntax of verb-second structures, but attempting also to understand the phenomenon in the context of a broader theory of movement to the left edge.

4. Theoretical Orientation

At the level of linguistic theory, the thesis aims to make two linked contributions. The first centers on the nature and structure of the phase, and in particular on the crucial role of the phase-defining heads in determining crosslinguistic variation. In this section I will review previous and current work on the phase in order to set the stage for an understanding of phase as periphery.

The second contribution is concerned with the system of movement for case and agreement (the A-system) and the system of movement to non-argument positions (the A-bar system). Much work over the past fifty years has drawn a distinction between these two classes of syntactic processes. Recent work in the Minimalist Program holds out the promise of unification of the A and A-bar systems, though many (including Chomsky) are skeptical that such a unification is possible. In this thesis I will explore symmetries between these two systems, particularly with respect to the behavior of expletives. On this basis, I will argue for a unification of the mechanisms underlying the A and A-bar systems. Here I will review some current thinking on this topic, and preview why a study of wh-expletives can give us new insights into the inner workings of A-bar movement.

4.1 A Brief Introduction to the Minimalist Program

This section serves to describe the set of assumptions in which most of the theoretical developments in this dissertation are grounded. I will outline the basic underpinnings of what has come to be called the Minimalist Program. Components of this theory will be explored in some detail in subsequent chapters, so this introduction will ground the more sophisticated work to follow as well as to establish a common set of terminologies.

Each language possesses a lexicon L . The lexical items in L have sets of features, interpretable and uninterpretable. The derivation of a sentence begins with a selection of lexical items from L , called the numeration. The lexical items in the numeration can then be composed into a syntactic object via the operation Merge, which combines two syntactic objects to form a new one. Uninterpretable features must be valued during the course of the syntactic derivation – they cannot be shipped to the interfaces of phonological form (PF) and logical form (LF). Uninterpretable features receive values via the operation Agree. In this operation, a head with uninterpretable features, here called the Probe, searches its c-command domain. When it encounters a lexical item with matching features, here called the Goal, Agree causes the features to mutually value one another. The complex operation Move, which is comprised of Agree followed by Merge, is also available in this context. A Probe can interact with a Goal and can cause that Goal to Merge into an additional specifier of the Probe (beyond those required by semantic selection). The feature

which prompts the more complex operation Move is called the EPP. Through the operations Merge, Agree, and Move, all of the uninterpretable features on the lexical items in the derivation must be valued. A syntactic object with uninterpretable features remaining is illicit, and cannot be sent to the interpretive interfaces (this is, in essence, the principle of Full interpretation) (Chomsky 2004).

Of course, the operations described above are limited by a notion of locality, called the phase. Our understanding of the phase will be fleshed out in the immediately following section, as well as in subsequent chapters. However, it is important to point out that the numeration from which a specific sentence is derived may be divided into sub-arrays of lexical items. The operations constructing each of these sub-sections of the whole derivation may be performed in parallel (Chomsky 2000, 2004). In this way, some sense of locality is built-in, since a Probe can only potentially interact with Goals in a domain thus delimited.

What is inherently minimal about this approach to syntactic derivations? We must first note that there is no room, in this theoretic view, to add any features to the derivation once it is in progress. The Inclusiveness Condition dictates that all features that participate in syntax, whether interpretable or uninterpretable, come into the derivation as a component of a lexical item from the syntax (Chomsky 2000). No additional features, such as indices or chains, may be introduced during the course of the derivation. There also can be no language specific operations in the syntax; the syntactic processes are limited to Merge, Agree, and the composite operation Move. We will see that this basic principle of derivation in this framework will play a large

role in the analyses developed below, and we will explore what can be gained by limiting language-specific information to the lexicon.

There are a number of more nuanced choices to be made concerning the theoretical framework described here. I will leave it to the remainder of the introduction and subsequent chapters to flesh out these important details.

4.2 Phases: An Overview

Although introduced explicitly only in Chomsky (2000, 2004), the theory of phases is the latest instantiation of a very old idea in generative syntax – the notion of the cycle. This idea holds that derivation of a sentence proceeds in stages (cycles, phases) that are relatively independent and self-contained. Chomsky (2000) defines the phase as a ‘propositional’ object: a verb phrase (*vP*) in which all theta-roles have been assigned, or a clause (*CP*) including tense and force. After all Merge, Move, and Agree operations have taken place in each phase, the output is sent to the interfaces of LF and PF. In some sense, the notion of phase is a way of encoding locality restrictions on operations, because Goals within a phase are inaccessible to Probes in subsequent phases.

Goals on the edge of a phase, on the other hand, are accessible to higher Probes. The notion of phase edge will be crucial to the discussion of *wh*-movement in this paper, and so I will define it here. According to Chomsky (2000, 2004), the phase edge consists of the phase-defining head, any specifier of that head, or anything

adjoined to that head. This is fleshed out in the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) as follows:

Phase Impenetrability Condition – “In a phase α with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside α , only H and its edge are accessible to such operations” where the edge includes specifiers and adjuncts to H (Chomsky 2000:108).

This condition suggests that Goals on the phase edge are accessible to Probes in subsequent phases, and are therefore available to Agree with these heads or to undergo Move into higher structure. Chomsky (2004) adopts the principle that the interpretation and evaluation of each phase takes place at the level of the next higher phase. In this way, phase edges and the material they contain play a central role in knitting together the links of the A-bar chains in apparently unbounded dependencies.

According to Chomsky (2000), building on Fox (2000) and Nissenbaum (2000), the phase-defining heads are C and v , due to their ‘propositional’ nature. The case for DP as a phase has also been made, however here we will be primarily concerned with the characteristics of the phase-defining heads C and v , and how the nature of these heads determines the properties of the A-bar systems of languages like Kashmiri and Hindi-Urdu.

In recent work, the phase-defining heads themselves have taken on a role of even greater importance. Chomsky (2005) suggests that crosslinguistic variation may be in large part attributable to properties of the phase-defining heads themselves. That

is, the featural makeup of the phase-defining heads in a language determines much of its syntactic character. This idea will come into play in two important ways.

I will propose here that A-bar movement, much like A-movement, is controlled by sets of interpretable and uninterpretable features. Though the idea that such features are present on the C head is relatively familiar, I will show here that we should consider ν as a location for wh-features as well (see Rackowski and Richards 2005). Further, Chapter 4 of this thesis will show that certain systematic contrasts brought out in a micro-comparison of Kashmiri and Hindi-Urdu can be understood given the assumption that certain structures are associated with the phase-defining head C in Kashmiri, but with the lower phase-defining head ν in Hindi-Urdu. This portion of the thesis tests a specific prediction of this proposed equivalence between the phase-defining heads – if there are wh-expletives which appear at the edge of CP, there should also be wh-expletives which appear at the edge of ν P. I argue that Hindi-Urdu is a language in which this prediction is borne out, and furthermore that we can understand the contrast between Hindi-Urdu and Kashmiri in terms of properties of the phase-defining vocabulary (C and ν) in the two languages.

We will also be concerned with the specific form features must take when located on the phase-defining functional heads. In particular, we will examine the complex left periphery of Kashmiri, and the way in which the language organizes the CP domain in particular. Insofar as we entertain the proposal that many language-specific properties can be attributed to the features present on these phase-defining functional heads, we must recognize that the question of how these features are

organized on the head itself becomes a crucial one. The analysis we will propose is an attempt to capture the insights of the cartographic investigations, which require a hierarchy of projections on the left edge of the clause, within the terms of a more spartan phrase structural system. Structuring features on a single C head, and thereby allowing the presence of multiple specifiers to a single head, provides an account of the complex left periphery of Kashmiri that is also more in line with current theoretical understanding. We will also show that this system can be extended to the v head, emphasizing again the equivalence of the phase-defining categories.

Overall, this thesis will then advance current research developments concerning the phase by taking seriously the hypothesis that intra-language variation is in large part determined by the featural properties of the phase-defining heads. Ultimately we are able to offer strong empirical support for this view, based on data involving long-distance wh-dependencies in Kashmiri and Hindi-Urdu.

4.3 A and A-bar Movement

A primary focus of this thesis is the nature of A-bar movement, or movement to non-argument positions. From an empirical standpoint, we will examine not only wh-movement and wh-expletive constructions, but also other types of A-bar movement, including non-interrogative focus movement and topicalization. The position we will arrive at is that the A-bar system can be best understood in the current theoretical framework as driven by the same basic mechanisms as the A-system.

These two systems have historically been understood as distinct by definition and as responding quite differently to a variety of tests. Movement in the A-system is typically movement of a DP argument for the purposes of licensing case assignment and/or agreement morphology, to a case-position such as the specifier of IP/TP. On the other hand, a wider variety of phrases (DP, PP, etc.) can undergo A-bar movement, and these phrases need not be arguments. A-bar movement is not driven by a need for case, but instead by some (less clearly-defined) need to satisfy a wh-related or discourse-related property of the language. This movement takes place typically not to a case position, but instead to a non-argument position like the specifier of CP. It has at least the appearance of being unbounded, with dependencies spanning an unlimited number of clauses.

Beyond these intrinsic differences lie a host of correlational properties. A number of tests have been devised in the large body of work on this subject that distinguish between these two kinds of movement. These tests include the triggering of weak crossover, the ability to strand quantifiers, the ability to reconstruct, and the licensing of parasitic gaps. The tests are categorical enough that they can be applied to some unclassified form of movement such as scrambling (Mahajan 1990, Kidwai 2000) or QR (Hornstein 1995) to determine which category it falls into.

The distinct properties of A and A-bar movement have led to divergent analyses for the dependencies formed by A and A-bar movement in the Government and Binding/Principles and Parameters framework. While I will not spend a great deal of time addressing these approaches here, I will briefly review this body of work

based primarily on Chomsky (1981) and Chomsky (1986). Under this view, A and A-bar movement are characterized by the formation of a chain comprised of syntactic objects including the moved item and its traces. A chain formed by A-movement is a set of linked syntactic elements (a_1, \dots, a_n) in which the head a_1 is in an A-position. The head of an A-chain is in a position to which Case is assigned, satisfying the case filter requiring each NP to be associated with a Case position. The tail of an A-chain (a_n) must be in a position to which a theta-role is assigned. In an A-bar chain, the head a_1 is in an A-bar (non-argument) position. The lowest position in a DP chain must be Case-marked, and can either be theta-marked or associated (via an A-chain) with a theta-marked position. A-bar movement operations obey a set of locality conditions, characterized under Subjacency (Chomsky 1981).

This approach to A and A-bar movement served to highlight the divergent purposes and endpoints for each type of displacement, as well as the distinct locality constraints that seemed to govern them. Both the inherent and correlational properties of the two types of movements found explanation in these sets of conditions.

However, as the Minimalist framework developed, so too did the hypothesis that the feature-checking mechanisms that drive A-movement could potentially underlie all movement operations (Chomsky 1995). Chomsky (2000, 2004) briefly considers the notion that wh-movement specifically could be understood as motivated by sets of features on the head C. He establishes that A-bar movement in this case would be point by point analogous to A-movement, and suggests how successive cyclicity, the wh-island constraint, and wh-*in-situ* effects might be derived. At this point, however,

Chomsky (2000) did not extend these processes to A-bar displacement such as topicalization, claiming that this was not feature-driven movement. Though I will not adopt precisely the account sketched in this work, the proposal I will make in Chapter 3 will build on these basic ideas. Even at this point in the development of the Minimalist framework, it was already clear that feature-checking mechanisms presented an opportunity to approach A and A-bar movement in a unified way (see also Kuroda 1988).

One of the claims I defend here is that the phenomenon of wh-expletives provides us with a uniquely valuable probe as we investigate these questions. By “wh-expletives”, I mean minimal wh-words, with no independent interpretation of their own, which appear in the position at which a more deeply embedded full wh-phrase is interpreted. Wh-expletives, also sometimes called scope-markers, have been addressed by a body of previous research which I will discuss in detail in the chapters to follow (McDaniel 1989, Mahajan 1990, Dayal 1996, among others). Wh-expletive constructions in German, Romani, Hungarian, and Kashmiri are exemplified below, with the wh-expletive itself in bold and glossed “expl”.

(11) **was** glaubst du, wenn sie gekommen ist [German]

expl think you, when she come aux

‘When do you think she came?’ (McDaniel 1989)

(12) **so** misline savo filmi o Demiri dikhla [Romani]

expl think which film the Demir saw

‘Which film do you think Demir saw?’ (McDaniel 1989)

(13) **mit** mondtak hogy kit hiévott rel Mari [Hungarian]

expl said that who called up Mari

‘Who did they say that Mary had called up?’ (Horvath 1997)

(14) tse **k'a:** chu-y ba:sa:n ki mohn-as kem' dits kita:b [Kashmiri]

you expl aux think that Mohan who gave book

‘Who do you think gave Mohan the book?’ (Wali and Koul: 18)

Here we will develop an account that analyzes wh-expletives as playing the same role in the A-bar system as DP-expletives play in the A-system. In my view, this comparison serves to reveal a fundamental symmetry of design between the two systems themselves.

Let us first discuss our understanding of DP-expletives in this framework.

Chomsky (2000, 2004) claims that the EPP on T can be satisfied by Merge of some nominal from within the command-domain of T, with which it agrees, or alternatively by Merge of an expletive, such as English *there*.

Since by definition, an expletive has no interpretable features of its own, it cannot value the set of features on the head with which it merges (“Expl cannot delete the probe of nondefective T” (Chomsky 2000: 125)). Therefore these features remain active following the merge of the expletive, and must enter into an agreement relation with an element in their domain.

The account of wh-expletives developed here offers a treatment which closely parallels this approach to DP-expletives. In this approach, wh-expletives have only

uninterpretable features. A *wh*-expletive undergoes Merge into the specifier of the criterial head for *wh*-movement (in the case of Kashmiri, C). This merge satisfies the EPP requirement on C, and permits C to interact with some other un-raised *wh*-phrase in its domain. This analysis accounts for the fact that it is the *wh*-expletive, not the full *wh*-phrase, which occupies the highest *wh*-position in the clause (in these cases, the specifier of matrix CP).

This approach to DP-expletives and *wh*-expletives suggests that there are some heads in the functional vocabulary of a language that require additional material in their specifiers. This purely syntactic requirement can be satisfied by the associate of the head, or by an expletive of some kind. The fact that both the A and A-bar systems have expletives that are amenable to this analysis seems to reveal a deeper symmetry between the two.

5. Overview of the Thesis

Previous work on Kashmiri has focused predominantly on the system of agreement and argument realization of the language (i.e. with the so-called ‘A-system’). From the rich case system to split-ergativity to the complex system of verbal inflection and cliticization, this aspect of Kashmiri has much to tell us about syntax more generally. However, this dissertation will turn to a lesser-studied aspect of Kashmiri, the intricacies of the A-bar system.

From the previous body of formal linguistic research on Kashmiri, I will build most significantly on studies of verb-second and word order. My interest is not

specifically in the head movement processes that create verb second order, but instead in the principles that form the rich left periphery of the Kashmiri clause. Chapter 2 will address A-bar movement to the left edge in Kashmiri, which includes focus movement, wh-movement, and topicalization. From an empirical point of view, this chapter will attempt to map in a detailed way the left periphery of the clause in Kashmiri, and develop a theory of what principles organize it. The goal is to develop an understanding which meshes well with comparative work on these questions and which is also well-integrated with current theory.

The third chapter is centered on long-distance wh-dependencies in Kashmiri. To the best of my knowledge, this phenomenon has not yet been a primary topic of investigation in work on the language. In this section, I will develop an account of wh-movement and of wh-expletive constructions in Kashmiri in a way which suggests that the A and A-bar systems can be understood as governed by the same set of basic mechanisms. At the empirical level, this chapter presents a wide range of data dealing with Kashmiri question formation, including the three-clause wh-dependencies, which have been revealing for other languages with wh-expletive constructions (see McDaniel 1989).

Chapter 4 provides a detailed micro-comparison of the syntax of long-distance wh-dependencies in Kashmiri and in the related and more widely-researched language, Hindi-Urdu. The goal of this section is to provide an account of the very different facts in Hindi-Urdu along the lines of the account provided for Kashmiri in Chapter 3. Crucial to this chapter is a series of systematic contrasts between the two

languages, which are afforded an explanation in terms of the characteristics of the phase-defining heads C and v. From an empirical perspective this chapter offers a side-by-side comparison of a number of constructions in the two languages.

Importantly, the chapter contains new data on sluicing in Kashmiri as yet unaddressed in the literature. These observations are important both for what they contribute to the central project of the dissertation, and for what they reveal about sluicing in general.