Questions and the vP Phase in Hindi-Urdu
Veneeta Dayal
Rutgers University

Abstract: Manetta (2010) argues for the existence of a vP Phase in Hindi-Urdu on the basis of question formation strategies in the language. This paper does not argue against the existence of the vP phase but rather against the evidence used to make that claim. It first probes some hidden assumptions in Manetta’s account. It then recalls crucial facts from the literature and introduces new data on long distance wh displacement and scope marking. It shows that a proper account of these two constructions undercuts the premises on which Manetta bases her arguments for a vP phase in Hindi-Urdu.
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I. Introduction

1.1 Questioning in Hindi-Urdu

Hindi-Urdu (henceforth H-U) is an SOV language with relatively free word order. Finite complements come to the right, often associated with an overt pronominial expression in the preverbal position (Davison 1984, 1988, Gurtu 1985, Mahajan 1990, Srivastav 1991/Dayal 1996, among others). The core facts are illustrated below:

1a. Asha-ne kalam/kyaa khariidaa
A-ERG pen/what bought
“Asha bought a pen” / “What did Asha buy?”

b. Asha gaaRii/kyaa chalaanaa jaantii hai
A car what drive-INF knows
“Asha knows (how) to drive a car.” / “What does Asha know how to drive?”

c. Anu (yeh) jaantii hai ki ravi-ne kaam/kyaa kiyaa
A this knows that Ravi work/what did
“A knows that R had worked/ what Ravi had done.”

A point worth noting in the above examples is the scope of the wh expressions, specially with respect to finite complements. The wh expression in (1c) cannot be interpreted with matrix scope, leading to the view that the finite clause is an island for covert scope taking. For present purposes, the specific accounts that have been proposed for these facts are not as important as the empirical generalizations they are based on.

Given the core facts in (1), there are two questions that arise. If word order is relatively free, to what extent can H-U be classified a wh in-situ language? And if the scope of wh expressions in finite complements is confined to the local domain, how does H-U express long-distance wh dependencies?
With regard to the first question, while wh expressions tend to be in the preverbal position, this is not a hard constraint, as shown below for questions over subject and indirect object, respectively. Wh expressions in their base positions are acceptable, as shown in (2a) and (3a). One might even argue that (3a) is more natural than (3b):

2a. **kis-ne** yeh kavitaa likhii?
   who-ERG this poem wrote
   “Who wrote this poem?”

   b. yeh kavitaa **kis-ne** likhii?

3a. tum-ne **kis-ko** paisaa diyaa
   You-ERG who-DAT money gave
   “Who did you give the money to?”

   b. tum-ne paisaa **kis-ko** diyaa

It has been claimed by Kidwai (2000), and following her Manetta (2010), that the preverbal position is a focus position to which the wh expression moves, the alternative orders being derived through scrambling. In fact, Manetta also notes the possibility of non-wh focused phrases appearing in other positions in the sentence. Absent a fully controlled study of the discourse conditions under which variations arise, it seems a reasonable working hypothesis to take wh phrases to preferentially appear in the preverbal position.

With regard to the second question, there are two ways to form long-distance wh dependencies, the first of which involves overt displacement of a wh expression:

4a. sita **kaun** soctii hai [ki __ ayegaa]
   Sita who thinks that will-come
   “Who does Sita think will come?”

   b. **kaun** Sita soctii hai [ki __ ayegaa]

Note that in (4a) the extracted wh is in the matrix preverbal position, while in (4b) it is in clause-initial position. A point to keep in mind is that this is only possible when there is no pronoun yeh “this” in the matrix object position associated with the finite clause.

The second long-distance strategy is what has been variously called “scope marking”, “partial wh movement” and “wh expletive strategy” and has by now been attested in a large number of languages. Its hallmark is that there is an invariant wh expression corresponding to what in the matrix clause, but the question seems to be about a wh expression in the embedded clause:

5. sita **kyaa** soctii hai [ki **kaun** ayegaa]
   Sita what thinks that who will come
   “Who does Sita think will come?”

There are two possible approaches to this phenomenon, dubbed *direct* and *indirect dependency* approaches by Dayal (1994). Very briefly, the direct dependency approach
aligns scope marking with overt extraction of the kind seen in English, whereby the embedded wh expression comes to have matrix scope. It is predicated on the view that the matrix wh expression has no semantic role beyond marking scope. In the indirect wh dependency approach, on the other hand, the matrix wh expression plays the same role that it does in a simple question: “What does Bill think?”, marking quantification over propositional variables. The question denoted by the CP associate of what is the restriction on this variable, telling us which set of propositions this variable should draw its value from. Under this view, the closest English correlates of (5) are as in (6), rather than the translations given in (5):

6a. What did Sita say about who will come?
   b. What does Sita think? Who will come?

In both (6a) and (6b) it is hard to argue that where takes scope out of a PP or a syntactically separate clause. For such structures, it seems relatively uncontroversial that the indirect dependency approach has to be adopted. The question is whether the same should not also apply to the standard cases of scope marking seen in (5).

1.2. The Case for a vP Phase

Manetta (2010), building on Rackwoski and Richards (2005), takes as her starting point the view that the preverbal position in H-U which hosts wh expressions is Spec, vP. Her account, in brief, posits the derivations in (7) and (8) for simple monoclausal questions. (7) and (8) illustrate questioning over subject and object positions, respectively:

7a. hamid-ko kis-ne maaraa
    Hamid-ACC who-ERG hit
    “Who hit Hamid?”
   b. [CP C… Hamid-Acc [vP who-Nom [vP v _ _ hit]]]
      iQ       uQ       uwh
      uwh      iwh       EPP

The v head probes its domain, which includes its specifier position, values its uninterpretable [wh] feature as well as its EPP feature by interacting with the wh expression in Spec via Move. The C head then probes its domain and values its uninterpretable [wh] feature by interacting with the wh phrase at the left edge of the vP through Agree. This also values the uninterpretable Q feature on the wh phrase, leading to an LF that can be interpreted as a direct question. Subsequent scrambling of the object results in the observed word order, allowing the wh expression to surface in the preverbal position.

Questions over objects follow the same path but for the fact that it is the subject, originally merged into Spec, vP, that must be scrambled to yield the right word order:
8a. Hamid-ne kyaa ciiz dekhii
   Hamid-ERG what thing saw
   “What thing did Hamid see?”
   b. [CP C… Hamid-ERG [vP what thing [vP v ___ ___ saw]]]
      iQ             uQ             uwh
      uwh            iwh             EPP

   Generalizing to the long-distance cases, Manetta gives the following derivations for
   “extraction” and “wh expletive” strategies. We will probe the appropriateness of these
descriptive labels in section 2. For now, let us see how the observed effects are derived:

9a. sita-ne kis-ko socaa ki ravi-ne ___ dekhaa
    Sita-ERG who-ACC thought that Ravi-ERG saw
    “Who did Sita think Ravi saw?”
   b. [CP C… [vP wh-XP [v… ___] [CP C… [vP [v… ___]]]]]
      uwh           uQ             uwh
      iQ             iwh             EPP

   Here again, the full wh expression who-ACC has an uninterpretable Q feature and an
   interpretable [wh] feature. The probe v in the embedded clause interacts with it through
   Move, raising it to the embedded Spec, vP, simultaneously valuing its uninterpretable [wh]
   feature and satisfying its EPP feature. Since the wh is now at the phase edge, the
   embedded CP becomes transparent for the matrix v probe, which can now value its
   uninterpretable [wh] feature and its EPP feature, by moving the wh to Spec of matrix vP.
The wh phrase gets its Q feature valued by matrix C and ends up with matrix scope.
   The expletive strategy follows along the same lines up to the embedded clause:

10a. raam-ne kyaa socaa ki ravi-ne kisko dekhaaa
    Ram-ERG what thought that ravi0ERG who-ACC saw
    “Who did Ram think Ravi saw?”
   b. [CP C… [vP wh-expl [v …___] [CP C… [vP wh-XP [v… ___]]]]]
      uwh           uQ             uwh
      iQ             iwh             EPP

   The main difference is that the matrix v’s EPP feature is satisfied by a wh-expletive in the
   numeration. Since it has to get accusative case, the expletive is generated in Spec, AspP
   where it is assigned case by transitive v and moves into Spec vP to satisfy the EPP feature
   on v. Being an expletive it has no wh feature. This requires the matrix C head to have its
   uninterpretable [wh] feature valued by a wh phrase in some accessible position within its
   domain, its own phase or the edge of the immediately lower phase. It first probes the vP
   phase in the matrix clause and finds the expletive with no wh feature at the edge and
   continues to probe. Since the [wh] feature on the matrix v is still unvalued, matrix v
probes into its domain and gets its feature valued by the wh phrase at the edge of the lower vP. Matrix v values the wh feature of matrix C, giving the embedded wh matrix scope.

Crucial in Manetta’s account in (9) and (10) is the transparency of the embedded C in allowing matrix v to probe into embedded vP. Here Manetta departs from Rackowski and Richards (2005). For them, the embedded CP is assigned accusative case by matrix v, which then makes it transparent and allows the v to continue probing down to the lower phase, the embedded vP. Manetta’s assumptions about H-U phrase structure are a bit different. As (10b) shows, the wh expletive is generated inside the domain of transitive v, in Spec, AspP where it is assigned accusative case and satisfies the EPP feature on v by Move. This, then, raises the question of the CP associate, which Manetta takes to be the true complement of V: [vP Subject [ [vP CP V] v]]. Putting the two together, we get:

11. 

```
  vP
 / \         /\  
Subject AspP  v
     /\     /\  
  Wh-expletive Asp
```

Although the CP is the complement of matrix V, Manetta argues that it occurs at the right edge of the clause due to a post-syntactic linearization rule. The reason for its transparency for the purposes of wh scope is that it does not have a wh feature on it. Note that this is also the case in (9) where there is no expletive in the structure but matrix v can probe through CP to the domain of embedded v to satisfy its [wh] and EPP features.

1.3 Probing Some Assumptions

We have seen the role that the vP phase plays in the analysis of H-U question formation proposed by Manetta. In this section we will examine the assumptions, some explicit and some implicit, on which the account rests.

1.3.1 Free Word Order and the Preverbal Focus Position

Consider first of all, the fact that the goal is to explain the adjacency of the wh expression and the verb. As Manetta herself notes, positing a vP phase with the EPP feature does not
guarantee this. A theory of obligatory scrambling is needed. Kidwai (2000; pp. 120-124) proposes the principles in (12) in order to meet the challenge of correlating a fixed focus (preverbal) focus position with obligatory scrambling. The crucial steps are given in (13):

12a. Dormancy. A functional head is dormant iff its D-feature is not licensed in the numeration.

b. Numeration: Merger of Free Features. A free feature must be merged with a host for convergence, where $\alpha$ is a free feature if it is not intrinsically related to any lexical category.

c. Head Activation. A dormant head $\alpha$ may be activated by feature transmission.

d. Feature Transmission. A feature $f$ may be transmitted to a functional head $FH$ if $f$ is in the checking domain of $FH$.

13a. The Structure at the Base.

\[ [TP \ [FP \ [dormant \ [VP_1 \ Subject \ [AGR-oP \ [VP_2 \ Direct-Object_{[PFocus]} \ V^\theta] \ ]]]]] \]

b. Head Activation.

\[ [TP \ [FP \ Direct-Object_{[PFocus]} \ [FP \ [FOC \ [FOCUS] \ [VP_1 \ …]\ ]]]] \]

c. SU-Raising to $F^\theta$ and $DO_{[PFOCUS]}$ to TP.

The causal link between scrambling and focus is illustrated in (13), where we have the structure of the base, followed by activation of a Focus Phrase. Once the head of FocusP is activated, the $DO_{[PFOCUS]}$, after checking its Case and agreement features in [Spec, AGR-oP] raises to adjoin to FP. This activates the D-feature of $F^\theta$ which can then host a DP in its DPEC. The derivation in (13c) shows the adjunction of $DO_{[PFOCUS]}$ to TP and the transmission of the [FOCUS] feature to TNS.

Although Kidwai’s assumptions are substantively different from Manetta’s, seeing the details of her proposal is instructive. Without a similarly explicit elaboration of the details by which scrambling would be ensured, an explanation for the preverbal position of wh expressions in terms of a vP phase in H-U remains incomplete. It is only after the details are spelt out that the role of the vP phase in the explanation can be determined.

1.3.2. The Status of the Embedded CP

Turning to long-distance dependencies, let us focus on the status of the embedded CP, a much discussed topic in the syntax of H-U. As we saw in (11), Manetta considers it to be a true complement of V but one that is not assigned case by transitive v. When the wh expletive is present in the structure, v assigns accusative case to it and also values its EPP. I take it that a sentence like (1c), repeated below as (14a), would have a derivation along the lines of (14b). I’m assuming that the non wh expletive has no features and merely satisfies the EPP features of the matrix transitive v. In this case, the embedded CP is interpreted as an ordinary root question and an indirect question interpretation obtained:

14a. sita (yeh) jaantii hai ki ravi-ne kisko dekhaa
   Sita this knows that ravi-ERG who-ACC saw
   “Sita knows who Ravi saw.”
An issue that remains unaddressed is what blocks the possibility of a direct question interpretation in such cases. Suppose there is no overt expletive in the sentence, yeh or kya, but matrix C has an interpretable Q feature. Should we assume, as in (15a), a null expletive to satisfy the EPP feature of matrix v or would the subject do that? In either case, we would need a principled reason for preventing matrix C from probing through the transparent embedded CP into the embedded vP phase, simultaneously satisfying its own and the wh-XP’s wh/Q features. Or should we assume, as in (15b), that the embedded CP itself satisfies the EPP feature of matrix v and moves into Spec, matrix vP? If so, something more would be needed to block matrix C from probing into the embedded vP phase:

15a. * [CP C… [vP Subject / ∅ expl [v …]] [CP C… [vP wh-XP [v… ___]]]]
   uwh  EPP  uQ    uwh
   iQ

15b. * [CP C… [vP [CP C… [vP wh-XP [v… ___]]]] [v …]]
   uwh  EPP  uQ    uwh
   iQ

I should emphasize that I do not think these issues are insurmountable, merely that they have not been articulated in sufficient detail to merit proper evaluation of Manetta’s central claims. I believe the real gap in the account is in nailing down the relationship of the accusative marked expletives and the CP associate. In sum, it seems to me, that while Manetta’s account of question formation strategies in H-U is consistent with the existence of a vP phase, it may not ultimately require it. Since much depends on details the paper does not provide, it would probably be unfair to take this discussion any further.

II. Reconsidering Long-distance Dependencies

Let us turn now to long-distance wh dependencies in H-U that Manetta argues involve extraction and an expletive wh strategy. We will see that these accounts are not tenable when the full range of facts, new as well as old, is taken into consideration.

2.1. Long-distance Scrambling

Gurtu (1985), and following her Mahajan (1990), brought into the public discussion examples of overt wh movement in H-U of the kind discussed in section 1 under the term
“extraction”. As noted in Srivastav (1991) and Dayal (1996), such questions had not initially been accepted by many speakers. It was also noted, however, that the sentences become fully acceptable under certain intonational contours. Interestingly, Manetta herself notes a similar problem with Kashmiri in ft 11 but does not mention this fact for H-U. At any rate, the conclusion proffered in Srivastav/Dayal for the resistance to these data was that the cases under discussion were not the neutral/primary strategy for long-distance dependencies in the language, as we might expect them to be if they represented extraction of the kind seen in English. Instead they represented cases of long-distance scrambling.

Briefly, there are two pieces of evidence that support the analysis of long-distance wh displacement as scrambling. First, such questions are not neutral requests for information but show the kind of discourse sensitivity typically associated with scrambling. The question in (16a), read with stress on the matrix subject, makes the question acceptable but also infuses it with a contrastive reading where the information sought is about the thoughts of the addressee as opposed to someone else:

16a. **kaun** tum socte ho ki ____ ayegaa
   **Who** you think **that** will-come
   “Who do YOU think will come?”

b. anu kyaa kar rahii hai
   Anu what is-doing
   “What is Anu doing?”

   **kaun** anu soc rahii hai ki ____ ayegaa
   **who** Anu thinking **that** will-come
   “Anu is wondering who will come.”

The second piece of evidence, also discussed in Dayal (1996), has to do with the fact that while a direct question interpretation is possible for structures of this kind, it is not required. Thus, in the context of people wondering what Anu is doing as in (16b), an indirect question interpretation becomes possible. This is a well-attested fact about scrambling (Saito 1992) but would be inconsistent with an extraction analysis.

In addition, there are further facts that dispute the claim that long-distance movement is to the matrix Spec, vP position. Consider (17). It may be somewhat marginal, but it is still possible to scramble a wh phrase out of an embedded CP of a ditransitive verb like **bataa**naa “tell”. Notably, this is only possible if the wh expression moves to clause-initial position, not if it immediately precedes the matrix verb (or even the indirect object and the matrix verb). Note that a pause after the wh phrase helps the acceptability of (17a), but no such modulation redeems (17b) or (17c):

17a. ?**kaun**, anu-ne uma-ko bataayaa ki ____ yehaaN rahtaa hai
   **Who** Anu-ERG Uma-DAT told **that** here lives
   “Who did Anu tell Uma lives here?”

b. *anu-ne uma-ko **kaun** bataayaa ki ____ yehaaN rahtaa hai
   Anu-ERG Uma-DAT **Who** thinking **that** here lives

  c. * anu-ne **kaun** uma-ko bataayaa ki ____ yehaaN rahtaa hai

Similarly telling examples are given in (18)-(19). The embedded agentive subject with the same case as the matrix subject can be scrambled to the clause-initial position, as shown in the (a) cases, but not to the matrix preverbal position, as shown in the (b) cases:

18a. **kis-ne** sita-ne socaa ki __ ravi-ko dekhaa
   
   Who-ERG Sita-ERG thought that Ravi-ACC saw
   
   “Who did Sita think saw Ravi?”

   b. * sita-ne **kis-ne** socaa ki __ ravi-ko dekhaa

19a. **kaun** sita soctii hai ki __ yehaaN rahtaa hai
   
   Who Sita thinks that here lives
   
   “Who does Sita think lives here?”

   b.* sita **kaun** soctii hai ki __ yehaaN rahtaa hai

   The preference for scrambling to clause-initial position is further corroborated by the pairs of sentences in (20) and (21), due to Rajesh Bhatt (p.c.). In (20) the matrix subject and the scrambled embedded object are both marked with –ko, though the matrix wh involves dative case and the wh the homophonous accusative case. By varying the form of the dative subject from tum-ko to tum-heN in (21) we eliminate the possibility that the contrast in (20) is a low-level surface OCP type effect:

20a. **kis-ko** Mina-ko lagtaa hai ki Ramesh ___ pasand kartaa hai
   
   Who-ACC Mina-DAT seems that Ramesh likes
   
   “Who does it seem to Mina that Ramesh likes?”

   b. ???Mina-ko **kis-ko** lagtaa hai ki Ramesh ___ pasand kartaa hai

21a. **kis-ko** tumheN lagtaa hai ki Ramesh ___ pasand kartaa hai
   
   Who-ACC you-DAT seems that Ramesh likes
   
   “Who does it seem to you that Ramesh likes?”

   b. (?)tumheN **kis-ko** lagtaa hai ki Ramesh ___ pasand kartaa hai?

   While (21b) is much improved, it remains somewhat marginal. The important point, though, is that in every case the order in which the extracted phrase is clause-initial is perfect, modulo intonation, while the one in which it is in preverbal matrix position is either completely unacceptable or degraded to some extent. It appears that the default position for long wh movement is to clause-initial, not preverbal, position.

   Given what we have seen here, long-distance wh movement in H-U is clearly not analogous to extraction in English. As such, arguments for the vP phase based on this assumption will have to be reconsidered keeping the facts of H-U long movement in mind.

2.2. Indirect Dependency in Scope Marking

The primary strategy for long-distance wh dependency in H-U is generally acknowledged to be the scope marking strategy, also known as the wh expletive strategy or
partial wh movement strategy. The type of wh dependency involved in this structure has been extensively debated in the literature and the current consensus seems to be in favor of indirect dependency (see, for example, Stepanov 2001, Klepp 2002, Legate 2002, Felser 2004, Bruening 2006, as well as surveys of scope marking in Fanselow 2005 and Dayal 2013). Since Manetta’s argument for the vP phase is tied to a direct dependency account of scope marking, however, this issue has to be reopened. I will proceed in two steps. In this sub-section I will cull out a few of the many arguments from the literature that show the need for an indirect dependency account. In the next sub-section I will address the specific objections raised by Manetta to an indirect dependency account for H-U.

Briefly, the opposition between the direct and the indirect dependency approaches rests on the status of the matrix wh expression and the role of the CP associate. The direct dependency approach treats the matrix wh in examples like (5) as an expletive with no semantic content beyond marking scope, that is, as having only $uQ$. The content of the question is fixed by the wh expression inside the CP associate that carries the $iwh$ feature. In the indirect dependency approach, on the other hand, the matrix question is a full question in its own right: what do you think? The wh is a standard wh quantifier, with $uQ$ and $iwh$ features, but it is a quantifier over propositional rather than individual variables. The embedded wh expression is interpreted locally in the embedded clause, giving rise to a standard question interpretation for the CP as a set of propositions. This can then form the restriction on the propositional variable in the matrix. This is shown below for the English sequential scope marking structure in (22). In general, the arguments for indirect dependency fall into two categories. The first is a parsimony argument. If there are structures for which a direct dependency cannot be posited, the need for indirect dependency for those structures might be expected to also apply in cases where a direct dependency could be posited. The second type of argument is stronger, in that it shows the direct dependency approach to make incorrect predictions.

Consider the following examples of scope marking in English, where it is hard to posit a direct dependency: (22a) is from Dayal (1996) and is similar in relevant respects to German examples discussed independently by Reis (2000); (23a) is from Dayal (2000), fashioned after German examples in Hohle (2000); (23b) is from Rawlins (2013):

(22a) What do you think? Where should we go?
   b. [CP [CP What do you think?] [CP Where should we go]]
   c. $\lambda p \exists p' [T(p) \land p = \text{think}(you, p')]$
      $\lambda q \exists x [q = \text{should-go-to}(we, x)]$
   d. $\lambda T \lambda p \exists p' [T(p) \land p = \text{think}(you, p')] (\lambda q \exists x [q = \text{should-go-to}(we, x)]) \Rightarrow$
      $\lambda p \exists p' [\lambda q \exists x [q = \text{should-go-to}(we, x)] (p) \land p = \text{think}(you, p')]$

(23a) What do you think? When will Mary come and what will she bring?
   b. What do you think [PP about where we should go]?
The crucial steps in the semantic interpretation are given in (22c)-(22d) and should be easy enough to see intuitively. The point is simply that the grammar of natural language needs to recognize indirect dependency in cases such as (22) and (23). If we posit indirect dependency in these cases, it would make sense that the same should apply generally.

To see that it is not just an issue of parsimony but of necessity that we interpret scope marking in the way shown above, consider the following arguments due to Reis (2000) and Lahiri (2002), respectively. Again, I use sequential scope marking from English to illustrate their points:

24a. Who does Bill think is taller than he is?
   b. What does Bill think? Who is taller than he is?

While (24a) has a consistent reading (Bill has an incorrect view of someone’s height and the speaker wants to know the identity of that person) and an inconsistent reading (Bill thinks of someone, “He is taller than he is” and the speaker wants to know the identity of that person), (24b) has only the inconsistent reading. Note that the second question, on its own, has only the inconsistent reading. This difference follows straightforwardly from standard accounts of the interpretation of extraction structures vs. the interpretation of scope marking given above. Similarly, (25a) has a referential reading (what is the size of the books that Bill said John read?) as well as an amount reading (what is the number such that Bill said John read that many books?), as pointed out originally by Kroch (1989). Crucially, the scope marking structure only has the amount reading:

25a. How many books did Bill say John read?
   b. What did Bill say? How many books did John read?

Finally, experimental data supports the distinction between extraction and scope marking that an indirect dependency approach to the latter suggests. Thornton and Crain (1994) report an acquisition study in which they show that English-speaking children initially manifest the scope marking and a wh copying construction in which the wh expression is repeated in the embedded as well as the matrix clause (Who did Bill say who John saw?). With the acquisition of extraction, the copying construction is lost while scope marking is retained. With the discovery of sequential scope marking, we have reason to believe that scope marking is available in adult English grammar and may well be available universally. It follows, then, that there is no reason to expect children to lose the scope marking construction since there is no competition between it and extraction.

These are, then, among the many arguments that have led researchers to the view that scope marking involves indirect dependency. We are now ready to address the specific objections Manetta raises against indirect dependency for scope marking in H-U.

2.3. Addressing Objections to Indirect Dependency

Manetta’s account of scope marking, as we saw in section 1.2, is a direct dependency account. However, it bears mentioning that the argument for a vP phase is not
in and of itself antithetical to an indirect dependency approach, as evident in Rackowski and Richards (2005) on which Manetta’s analysis of the vP phase is based. Manetta’s objections, I believe, stem from a basic misunderstanding about the connection between the semantics of indirect dependency and its syntactic manifestation. Although the indirect dependency approach originally assumed a syntax in which there was no subordination in Dayal (1994), this position was modified in later versions of the theory. Dayal (2000) specifically argues that that semantics of indirect dependency is compatible with a range of syntactic options. The derivations take into account covert as well as overt movement of wh in Spec, CP but they can be adjusted to mirror current ways of encoding these dependencies. I reproduce the two that are relevant to our concerns:

26a. \([\text{CP} [\text{CP-1} \text{what}, [\text{you think } t]], [\text{CP-2}]]\) sequential scope marking – no subordination  
   b. \([\text{CP} [\text{DP} \text{what } t\text{CP-2}]; [\text{IP} [\text{you think } [ t\text{DP } [\text{CP-2}]]]]\)  
      \([\text{what } [\text{CP-2}]]\) as complement of matrix V with “extraposition” of CP2

In (26a), we have the kind of structure that we saw is needed to interpret English scope marking. In (26b), we have the structure that would be appropriate for H-U, where CP-2 is merged as the complement of the matrix wh \([\text{DP} \text{what } [\text{CP-2} \text{where he should go}]\) and obligatorily moved to the right edge of the clause. This structure was proposed for German by Herburger (1994), who also pointed out a significant semantic/pragmatic difference between extraction and scope marking. The crucial difference between (26a) and (26b) for us is in scope relations among the arguments of the first and the second question. In fact, this was one of the motivations in Dayal (2000) for moving to a richer set of syntactic options. Subordinated scope marking does, but sequential scope marking does not, allow variable binding. One can appeal to syntactic or semantic principles to derive this difference. For example, it is well known that variable binding in H-U is sensitive to the base order of arguments, as shown in (27a). There is every reason to expect then that variable binding in a structure like (27b) will also be sensitive to the base position where the appropriate c-command relationship is satisfied:

27a. \(\text{apne-bace ko ravi ne maaraa}\)  
   \(\text{Self-s child-ACC Ravi-ERG hit}\)  
   “Ravi hit his (own) child.”

b. \(\text{har aurat \text{kyaa} soctii hai ki \text{us-ko} \text{kahaaN jaanaa caahiye}\)  
   every woman what thinks that she-DAT where should-go  
   “For every woman x, where does x think x should go?”

c. \(\lambda p \forall x \exists f [\forall x [Q_x(f(x))] \land p = \forall x [\text{woman}(x) \rightarrow \text{think}(x, f(x))]\)

Lahiri (2002) appeals to the use of skolem functions, as given in (27c), to interpret these structures. Manetta is, of course, aware of Lahiri’s solution but classifies it a semantic workaround. It seems to me that this assessment is based on an inadequate appreciation of the interaction between the semantics of scope marking, which is invariant across languages, and its syntax, which varies not just across languages but even within single languages. Similarly, her view that the need for a scope marking structure to have a wh
complement as the associate is mysterious under the indirect dependency approach simply ignores fundamental principles of semantic composition:

28a. What does John think? We are going there.
   b. \( \lambda p \exists q [ T_{<S,p>} (q) \wedge \text{think}(j,q)] \)

The restriction on the propositional variable has to be a set of propositions, while a simple declarative is a proposition (Dayal 1994). The reason these solutions cannot be classified as workarounds is that they rest on principles independently motivated in the semantics of natural language, not just designed to serve an analysis of scope marking in terms of indirect dependency.

But let me now turn to an empirical argument given by Manetta that requires an answer that is not already in the literature. She presents the paradigm in (29) to show that something along the lines of (26b) is not a possible derivation for H-U scope marking. (29a)-(29b) are the non-wh counterparts of scope marking. The CP complement can occur inside the noun phrase in preverbal position, as in (29a), or at the right edge of the clause, as in (29b). The scope marking construction in (29c) is ungrammatical with the CP complement inside the noun phrase. Since the base form is missing, so the argument goes, there is no source for the attested form where the CP occurs at the right edge:

29a. mujhe [yah khabar \( [ki \text{ ve } \text{ log } \text{nahiiN } aayeNge]\)] kal milii
   I-DAT this news that those people not will come yesterday got
   “I got this news that those people won’t come yesterday.”

29b. mujhe [yah khabar kal milii [ki ve log nahiiN aayeNge]]

29c. *sita-ne [kyaa [ki ravi-ne kisko dekhaa]] socaa
   Sita-ERG what that Ravi-ERG who-ACC saw thought

To assess this argument we need to complete the paradigm and include sentences in which the non-wh expression is a pronoun, rather than a full DP. Once we do this, we see that it is not possible to have the CP complement in the canonical preverbal position (30a), but it is possible to have it at the right edge:

30a. *maiN [yah [ki ve log nahiiN aayeNge]] jaantii thii
   I this those people not will come knew

30b. maiN [yah\_] jaantii thii [ki ve log nahiiN aayeNge]

Turning to scope marking, the true generalization is revealed. A full noun-complement structure is not possible with the wh counterpart of (29a), as shown in (31a)-(31b):

31a. *sita-ne [kyaa khabar [ki ravi-ne kisko dekhaa]] socaa
   Sita-ERG what news that Ravi-ERG who-ACC saw thought

31b. *sita-ne [kyaa baat] socaa [ki ravi-ne kisko dekhaa]
We might speculate on the reasons for this, but for present purposes it suffices to show that the data in (29) does not establish what it is supposed to establish. 2

Let me turn finally to a suggestion that Manetta makes to argue for the scope freezing effect demonstrated in (24)-(25) in section 2.2 under the direct dependency account. She adopts Reinhart’s (1998) choice functional analysis of long-distance dependencies, where the wh expression stays inside the embedded clause. She suggests that overt extraction allows for ambiguity while covert scope taking does not. While this seems, on the surface, a plausible explanation it does not hold up under closer scrutiny. Consider a language like Japanese, which mirrors precisely the type of LF that Manetta posits for H-U scope marking, one where the wh expression remains in the embedded clause and is bound at a distance by an unselective Q-binder in matrix Spec, CP. 3

32a. [John-ga [Bill-ga nan-satsu-no hon-o yonda to] omotteiru-ka]
      J-Nom B-Nom how many book-Acc read C think Q
      (watashi-wa siritai)
      (I - Top want to know.)
      "How many books does John think Bill read?"
b. Ken-wa [Sato-sensei-ga kinoo nannin-no kanja-o shinsatsu-shita]-to
      Ken-top Sato-Dr. yesterday how many-Gen patient-acc see-did-comp
      omotteiru-no?
      think-Q
      “How many patients does Ken think that Dr. Sato saw yesterday?”

The crucial point about these examples is that they do not display the relevant scope freezing effect. (32a) and (32b) are ambiguous in exactly the way that the corresponding English extraction questions are. Therefore, we must rely on the indirect dependency account of scope marking to get the relevant facts when a language, H-U for example, displays such scope freezing in scope marking.

III. Conclusion

In this paper I have tried to address several problems in the argument for a vP phase in H-U in Manetta (2010). In the first part, I have suggested that a more explicit account of the correlation between obligatory scrambling and preverbal focus position in H-U is needed. I have also indicated that the picture of questioning out of embedded clauses in H-U needs to be expanded. A proper evaluation of the claim that vP is a phase in H-U must therefore await these elaborations. In the second part, I addressed specific claims about long-distance wh movement and the scope marking construction in H-U. I showed these claims to be untenable based on what is already known about these structures as well as on the basis of new facts. To conclude, let us return to the question of whether the vP is a phase in H-U. The answer, at this point, is that it may well be but it remains to be shown that it is.
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1 It bears emphasizing that these data are uncontroversial and hold across dialects of H-U. The same holds for other facts discussed in this paper.
We do get questions like (i) with a genitive possessive:

(i) tumhaaraa kyaa khyaal hai ki kaun ayegaa
    your    what thought is that who will come
    “What are your thoughts about who will come?”

Thanks to Kunio Kinjo, Yohei Oseki and Satoshi Tomioka for help with these data. Note that to get the relevant ambiguity the embedded wh must not be of the form nan-satsu hon-o which has a floated numeral quantifier, because they tend to be non-specific and narrow scope, though Satoshi Tomioka points out that this is just a tendency, not a hard fact. The data in (32) does not pose such problems. (32b) can mean “What is the size of the group of patients that Ken said Dr. Sato saw?” or “What is the number such that Ken said Dr Sato saw that many patients?”