

Question and Scope Marking in Urdu/Hindi

Miriam Butt, University of Konstanz

Han and Romero (2004) present an analysis of alternative questions (alt-q) that combines insights from previous approaches. As part of their argumentation, they adduce data from Hindi. While I have no argument with Han and Romero's overall take on alternative questions (modulo differences with respect to framework particular implementation), their analysis of the Hindi data is flawed because they fail to distinguish between two types of *kya* 'what': the scope marker *kya* and the question/interrogative marker *kya*. The former has been the subject of intensive analysis (Dayal 1994, 1996, 2000), the latter has not yet received attention within formal linguistics, though its existence is noted in grammars (e.g., Platts 1884). In this paper, I provide evidence that there are indeed two different *kya* at play in Urdu/Hindi and propose an alternative approach to understanding *kya* in Urdu/Hindi than that advanced by Han and Romero. Rather than assuming a non-overt Q that marks the scope of a question, I suggest that the scope marking *kya* serves as an overt marker of the scope of interrogativity. The question marking *kya*, on the other hand, is used to partition a clause into which parts are accessible for questioning and which are not. This is a phenomenon that has so far not been observed in the literature. I develop an account within LFG that adopts Dayal's (1996) indirect dependency account for the scope marker *kya*, but builds on an interaction between i(nformation)-structure and word order with respect to questions advanced by Mycock (2006) and Butt (2102).

Basic Data: It is well known that Urdu/Hindi does not allow embedded *wh*-elements to take matrix scope unless they have been overtly extracted or when something that has come to be called a scope marking construction is used. As illustrated in (1), in a scope marking construction, a *kya* 'what' is introduced in the matrix clause while the embedded *wh*-element remains in situ. The result is matrix scope of an embedded *wh*-element. Dayal (1996) has argued for an indirect dependency account by which the embedded that-clause is anaphorically related to the *kya* in the matrix clause, which in turn is not seen as an expletive of any kind, but as a "thematic" 'what', i.e., a full *wh*-element. The matrix interpretation of the embedded *wh*-element is facilitated via the indirect dependency.

- (1) sita **kya** soc-ti hai [ki kon ja-ye-ga]?
Sita.F.Nom what think-Impf.F.Sg is that who go-3.Sg-Fut-M.Sg
Who does Sita think will go? (Lit.: What does Sita think, that who will go?) **Scope Marking *kya***

The question marker is generally optional in simple sentences, as in (2). It also does not necessarily have to be in initial position. When it is absent, the question interpretation is signaled only via rising (question) intonation. (3) illustrates the question marker with an embedded clause. Note that unlike the scope marker, this *kya* does not trigger a question reading on the embedded clause. The interrogative pertains only to the matrix clause, which is interpreted as a yes-no question.

- (2) (**kya**) ram (**kya**) ja-ye-ga?
what Ram.M.Nom what go-3.Sg-Fut.M.Sg
'Will Ram go?' (Lit.: What — Ram will go?) **Question Marking *kya***

- (3) **kya** sita ye soc-ti hai [ki ram ja-ye-ga]?
what Sita.F.Nom this think-Impf.F.Sg is that Ram.M.Nom go-3.Sg-Fut-M.Sg
Does Sita think that Ram will go? (Lit.: What — Sita thinks that Ram will go?) **Question Marking *kya***

Note that the *kya* in (3) cannot be the scope marker *kya* since the object of the verb 'think' is filled by *ye* 'this'. This is the scope marking element of the declarative versions of the scope marking construction.

Alternative Questions: Han and Romero use Hindi data to add further crosslinguistic evidence to their analysis of alternative questions. Their basic approach is to combine insights from Larson (1985) and Schwarz (1999). Larson argued that alternative questions can be understood as essentially being *whether*-questions that are structurally parallel to *either-or* clauses. Schwarz further showed that the syntax of *either-or* clauses were best accounted for in terms of gapping. Schwarz was not able to extend his account to *whether* questions since they do not function absolutely parallel to *either-or* clauses. Han and Romero point out that this can be accounted for by assuming

References

- Butt, Miriam. 2102. Questions in Urdu/Hindi: Moving beyond Movement. In *Proceedings of the LFG12 Conference*.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1994. Scope Marking as Indirect wh-dependency. *Natural Language Semantics* 2(2), 137–170.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1996. *Locality in WH Quantification*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2000. Scope Marking: Cross-linguistic Variation in Indirect Dependency. In Uli Lutz, Gereon Müller and Arnim von Stechow (eds.), *Wh-Scope Marking*, pages 157–193, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, volume 37 of *Linguistics Today*.
- Han, Chung-Hye and Romero, Maribel. 2004. The Syntax of WHETHER/Q ... OR Questions: Ellipsis combined with movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 527–564.
- Larson, Richard. 1985. On the syntax of disjunction scope. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 217–264.
- Mycock, Louise. 2006. *The Typology of Constituent Questions: A Lexical-Functional Grammar Analysis of wh-questions*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Manchester.
- Platts, John T. 1884. *A dictionary of Urdu, classical Hindi, and English*. W. H. Allen and Co.
- Schwarz, Bernhard. 1999. On the Syntax of *either ... or*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17(2), 339–370.