V2 Phenomena in Kashmiri

Hiroshi TERADA

0   Introduction

The phenomena of Verb Second (V2) as in Germanic languages have been one of major topics of interest for the last decade in generative grammar. Kashmiri, a Dardic language spoken in Jammu and Kashmir state of India, is known as a V2-language outside the Germanic family. Like other V2-languages, it displays a variety of word order, including verb-first (V1), verb-third (V3), and verb-final (VF) order under certain contexts, which has been studied within classical generative frameworks (cf. Hook 1976 and Subbarao 1984 among many others). The purpose of this article is to claim that this different order actually results from a conspiracy of some language-particular properties of this language.

The article is organized as follows: Section 1 is allotted to a descriptive overview of verb positions in Kashmiri and recapitulates a typology of fixed verb positions in Germanic, Scandinavian and Kru languages and some of previous standard approaches to the phenomena. Section 2 proposes a theory of V2 phenomena in Kashmiri, with recourse to a few assumptions including some parameters and morphological properties.

1   Verb Positions in Kashmiri

There is a complementary relationship among V1, V2, V3 and VF in Kashmiri. Section 1.1 describes several facts concerning V2 order. Then, the sub-

sequent sections discuss VF, V3 and V1 clauses.

1.1 V2

Finite verbs in declarative root sentences usually occupy the second position preceded by some sentence-initial elements. The bulk of V2-sentences contains a subject in the sentence-initial positions. This is the reason why Kashmiri has been often counted as an SVO language in the literature (cf. Hook 1976).

Consider the following sentences which apparently exhibit familiar SVO order:

(1) b chus maasTar.

'I am a teacher.'   (Koul 1977: 39)

(2) tse   chuy makaan.

you OBL is   a house 'You have a house.'   (Ibid.: 40)

(3) asi par kitaab.

'We read a book.'   (Ibid.: 47)

(4) laRkan   dits maaji ciTh'.

boy ERG gave mother letter

'The boy gave a letter to his mother.'   (Ibid.: 48)

In each of these examples the verb coming second is immediately preceded by the subject. Note that the classical view of Kashmiri as an SVO language is falsified, given such sentences as (5) − (6), where a verb, coming second, is followed by a non-subject NP:

(5) tamis wana   ki, "hee maali,..."

to-him I-will-say that Oh father

(6) tawa-pata   hetsoov timau   wotsav siwun

from-that-after began   they ERG festival to celebrate

'Thereafter they began a festival to celebrate.'

(7) raath   pyauv seThaah ruud

     yesterday fell   much   rain

(8) akh insaan vuch me   tati

     a   person saw   I ERG there   'I saw a person there.'

When a sentence contains a periphrastic predicate consisting of a finite auxil-
iary and a perfect/imperfect participle, the auxiliary is located in the second
position. And the participle can be either left in a sentence-final position (as
in (9) − (11) below) or accompanied by a raised auxiliary (as in (12) − (13)
below, where an auxiliary precedes the participle):[1]

(9) raamⁱ oos palav chalaan.   (Koul 1977: 34)

     Ram   was   clothes   washing   'Ram was washing clothes.'

(10) me   h'ok makaan banaavith.   (Ibid.: 37)

      I ERG could house   construct   'I could construct a house.'

(11) tse   aasiheeth akhbaar onmut.   (Ibid.: 38)

      you ERG would-have newspaper brought

      'You would have brought the newspaper.'

(12) me   chu onmut   meez.   (Ibid.: 31)

      I ERG am   brought   table   'I have brought a table.'

(13) tse   aas'th par'm't' mazmuun.   (Ibid.: 32)

      you ERG were   read   essays   'You have read essays.'

1.2 VF

According to Hook (1976), verb-final order (i.e. a finite verb stays in a
clause-final position) is restricted to adverbial or relative clauses. The fol-
lowing sentence (14) is an instance containing an adverbial clause, and (15),
relative clauses:

(14) yeli tamⁱ soru-y dana   khor°ch^u, tath-diishes   woTh^u

      when he ERG all   wealth spent   to-that-country   arose

kaThyunᵘ draag.

a-hard famine

(15) a. yiicⁱ kitabʲ me pari, tiicʲ pari nⁱ beyi kaansi.

   as-many books I ERG read so-many read not else any

   'Nobody has read as many books as I have read.'

   b. tse yus me wakhunᵘ dyututh, suh... (Hook 1976: 133)

   you ERG which me lesson gave it

   'the lesson which you gave me (hard or easy)...'

By contrast, a complement clause, although it is a subordinate clause, dem-
onstrates V2 order, exactly like its matrix counterpart. Compare $(16) - (17)$
with $(1) - (13)$:

(16) me chu yaad (ki/zi) su yiyi az.

   me is memory that he will-come today

   'I remember (that) he will come today.'

(17) yih chhuna bananii zi tsᵃh waatakh az totᵘ.

   it is-not possible that you arrive today there

1.3 V3

In a wh-question, a finite verb stands in position three (cf. Hook 1984).
This V3 order is observed either in a root sentence (cf. $(18) - (20)$) or in an
embedded complement (cf. $(21) - (22)$)[2].

(18) paansⁱ kus chu divaan?

   money who is paying 'Who is paying money?'

(19) shuri k'aazi chi shor karaan?

   children why are noise making

   'Why are the children making noise?'

(20) toh' k'aa chiv kh'aavan?

   you what is eating 'What are you eating?'

(21) toh' vaniv su k'aazi aav.

you say he why came 'You say why he came.'

(22) tsᵃh chhukha zaanaan zi manuush ketha-pöThⁱ chhih tas zaanaan.

you are knowing that people how-like are him knowing

'Do you know what people think of him?'

By contrast, in a yes-or-no question a finite verb comes second. Note that an interrogative suffix -*aa* is attached to the finite verb. In a wh-question, as is clear from (18) − (22), this marker -*aa* is not attached to a finite verb. Consider the following yes-or-no questions illustrating this point:

(23) shurⁱ os-*aa* asaan?

child was-Q laughing 'Was the child laughing?'

(24) raamⁱ yiy-*aa* az?

Ram come-Q today 'Will Ram come today?'

(25) tse chuth-*aa* akhbaar pormut?

you are-Q newspaper read 'Have you read the newspaper?'

1.4 V1

Hook (1976) reports that the bulk of "VSO order" is only found in *Hatim's Tales*, giving the following description in his footnote 9:

"In the first three sections of Tale X, there are 17 instances of verb-initial non-imperative sentences as against 57 where the verb is not initial and 6 verb-initial imperative sentences..."

He cites the following sentence from the tales:

(26) sombarowᵘ paatashehan zyunᵘ be-shumaar.

collected king ERG firewood countless

In an imperative sentence, a verb stands in position two. No instances are found where a verb appears in a sentence-initial position:

(27) darvaaz^i kar   band.

　　door 　　 do 　　 shut   'Close the door.'

(28) kitaab   par.

　　book 　　 read   'Read the book.'

(29) me di 　　 paans^i...

　　me give money   'Give me money.'

Next turn to coordinate structures. When two clauses are conjoined, the verb of the second conjunct occupies a sentence-initial position with its subject dropped. The following examples illustrate this point:

(30) sohnan 　　　　 buuz 　　　　 reeDiyo ti leechan z^i 　 ciThi.

　　Sohan ERG listened-to redio 　 and wrote 　 two letters

(31) tsuuras laj 　　 guul' 　　　 ti muud.

　　the thief was-hit by-a-bullet and died

So far we have outlined V1, V2, V3 and VF order. In the remainder of this section, we recapitulate a typology of lauguages in which finite verbs are located in fixed slots.

1.5 The Typology of Fixed Verb Positions

In this section, we will discuss fixed positions of verbs in such languages as Germanic, Scandinavian and Kru.

In Germanic languages except Modern English, a declarative main clause has V2 order (cf. (32)), while a yes-or-no question, V1 order (cf. (33)):

(32) Dutch

　　a. Marie heeft gisteren een boek aan Jan gegeven.

　　　 Mary has   yesterday a   book to John given

　　b. dat Marie gisteren een boek aan Jan gegeven heeft.

　　　 that Mary yesterday a   book to   John given 　 has

'Mary has given a book to John yesterday.'

(33) German

Köpte John boken?

bought John the book 'Did John buy the book?'

Furthermore, when a topicalized constituent is located in a sentence-initial position, the sentence maintains V2 order. Consider (34a-c):

(34) a. John hade troligen köpt boken.

John had probably bought the book

b. * Troligen John hade köpt boken.

c. Troligen hade John köpt boken.

In Scandinavian languages except Icelandic (i. e. Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish), a finite verb stands in slot three in a subordinate clause when a subject occupies a sentence-initial position and an adverb, if any, precedes the verb. In Icelandic an embedded verb comes second, regardless of whether the sentence includes an adverb.[3] In declarative main clauses, both Scandinavian and Germanic display V2 order. Consider the following sentences (35) − (36):

(35) Swedish

a.* ...att John hade sannolikt köpt   boken.

that John had probably bought the book

b. ...att John sannolikt hade köpt boken.

(36) Icelandic

a. ...ad Jon hefdi trúlega   keypt   bókina.

that John had   probably bought   the book

b. *ad Jon trúlega hefdi keypt bókina.

Another difference between Scandinavian and Germanic is that an infinite verb immediately follows the finite verb in the former while an infinite verb appears in a clause-final position in the latter. This is, as is well-known, due

to the fact that underlying word order within VP is VO in Scandinavian, and
OV in Germanic.

Koopman (1984) attempts an account of V-movement phenomena in two
Kru languages, Vata and Gbadi. In these languages like other V2 languages,
a finite verb stands in a pre-object position, deriving either SVO or S-AUX-
O-V order as a result. Unlike Germanic, Vata and Gbadi do not demonstrate
any root⁄non-root asymmetries in that a finite verb coherently follows the
subject. Consider the following examples cited from Koopman (1984: 27−28):

(37) ǹ lè bǏ   sàká.

    I eat now rice   'I am eating rice right now.'

(38) wà là   mÓ dlá.

    they PERF-A him kill   'They have killed him.'

(39) ǹ gblǏ nā Ó lè sàká.

    I know NA s/he eat rice   'I know that s/he is eating rice.'

According to Koopman, the word order of particular constituents is completely
fixed in these languages. And they do not allow the free word order of non-
verbal elements. Other constituents are allowed to change their positions only
in Adv and X''^* positions, as shown in (40):

(40) NP-V-ADV-X''^* -V$[-$Tns$]$-S'

Hence, as Koopman notes, it is inappropriate to take Vata and Gbadi as V2
languages.

Before closing this section, let us recapitulate standard accounts of V2-phe-
nomena in Germanic and verb-movement in Vata and Gbadi. Dutch and Ger-
man are assumed to be head-final languages, where heads such as V, I, etc.
(but not C) follow their complements. The V2 order is taken to be derived
as a result of movement of V (via I) to C. Since the C head is exceptionally
head-initial, a complex form [V-I] that moves into C precedes other IP-internal

elements. The Spec of CP counts as a position into which a topicalized element substitutes. Thus, V-movement and topicalization derive the V2 order as in (32a), whose structure in the overt syntax would be (41):[4]

(41)   [$_{CP}$ Marie$_i$ [$_{C'}$ [$_C$ heeft$_j$] [$_{IP}$ t$_i$ gisteren [$_{VP}$ een boek aan Jan gegeven] t$_j$]]]

Although the subject *Marie* is topicalized into the Spec of CP by substitution in (41), topics are not necessarily restricted to subjects. The perfect participle, remaining within VP, occupies a clause-final position. Thus, this derivation leads to the V2 order.

When a C head is already occupied by an overt complementizer as in (32b), V-to-C movement is blocked and thus the finite verb stays in a clause-final I⁰ position. That is why an embedded clause has VF order in German and Dutch. (32b) is given the following surface structure:

(42)   [$_{CP}$ [$_{C'}$ [$_C$ dat] [$_{IP}$ Marie gisteren [$_{VP}$ een boek aan Jan gegeven]
       [$_I$ heeft]]]]

Koopman (1984) discusses the fixed verb position in Kru languages, assuming that V is head-final and VP follows Infl in Vata and Gbadi. SVO order is derived in the following manner: a finite verb raises to Infl [+ Tns] and an infinite verb stays in V. Thus (37) and (38) would be given the following structures (43) and (44), respectively:

(43)   [$_S$ ñ [$_{Infl}$ lè] [$_{VP}$ bǏ sàká t$_V$]]
(44)   [$_S$ wà [$_{Infl}$ là] [$_{VP}$ mÓ dlá]]

Although these standard solutions to the word order in Germanic, Scandinavian and Kru languages are successful in many respects, they will not be extended to V2 phenomena in Kashmiri without revisions. In the next section we will propose some revisions of the standard V2 theory.

2 The Syntax of Verbs in Kashmiri

2.1 The Structure of IP

Kashmiri, like German and Dutch, is more or less a head-final language, whose underlying order within VP is OV.[5] Suppose that C is exceptional within the X-bar system in Kashmiri in that it is head-initial, as in German and Dutch (cf. section 1.5). According to Chomsky's (1986) extended X-bar theory, Kashmiri has the following configuration:

(45) [$_{CP}$ Spec [$_{C'}$ C [$_{IP}$ Spec [$_{I'}$ [$_{VP}$... V] I]]]]

Before we undertake an account of V-movement, let us turn to verb-agreement and Case-assignment in Kashmiri. When a subject is marked with either dative or ergative Case, verb-agreement takes place with both the subject and the object. Consider the following examples that illustrate this point:

(46) a. me   chu   kalam.

          me DAT is 1/M SG pen M SG   'I have a pen.'

      b. asi   cha   kitaab'.

          us DAT are 1/F PL books F PL   'We have books.'

      c. me   oos   akh kamr'.

          me DAT was 1/M SG one room M SG   'I have a room.'

(47) a. me   chi   an'm't'   meez.

          I ERG am 1/M PL brought M PL table M PL

          'I have brought tables.'

      b. tse   chath   khem'ts   tseer.

          you ERG are 2 SG/F SG eaten F SG appricot F SG

          'You have eaten an appricot.'

      c. me   aas'   liikh'm't'   savaal.

          I ERG was 1F SG written M PL questions M PL

          'I had written questions.'

As is clear from (46) − (47), an auxiliary verb such as *chu* agrees with the dative/ergative subject in person (and in number when the subject is the second person) and, at the same time, with the object NP in number and gender. In (47), the perfect participle as a main verb agrees with the object NP in number and gender. Both agreement and Case-assignment are triggered by an Agr(eement) node. Elsewhere, I propose variants of Agr that assign non-nominative Case, i.e. absolutive, ergative, and terminal allative Case, under agreement (cf. Terada 1989; 1991). I will attempt a further extension of my (1989; 1991) proposal to accommodate verb-agreement and V2 order in Kashmiri, discussing its consequences.

Suppose that Agr$_{-x}$ agrees with and assigns Case X to an NP under a Spec-head relation. A clause contains at least two Agrs: dative/ergative-assigning Agr (call it Agr$_{-DAT/ERG}$) on one hand and accusative/absolutive-assigning Agr (call it Agr$_{-ACC/ABS}$) on the other. A nominative-assigning Agr (= Agr$_{-NOM}$) occurs in a nominative-accusative construction.[6]

Moreover, on the basis of Chomsky's (1991) and Pollock's (1989) proposals, let us revise the structure of a sentence as in (48) rather than (45):

(48)   [$_{CP}$ Spec [C [$_{AgrP-X}$ Spec [[$_{TP}$ [[$_{AgrP-Y}$ [[$_{NegP}$ [[$_{VP}$...V] Neg]]
       Agr$_{-Y}$]] T]] Agr$_{-X}$]]]]

Here, C in a tensed clause bears a [+Tns] feature, Agr$_{-Y}$ and Neg are not generated unless they are necessary. According to Chomsky (1986), only a zero-level category can move to a head-position (p. 4 (4b)), and it must obey the Head Movement Constraint (HMC), as defined in (49):

(49)   Head Movement Constraint
       Movement of a zero-level category β is restricted to the position of a head α that governs the maximal projection γ of β, where α θ-governs γ if $\alpha \neq$ C.   (Cf. ibid.: 71)

The definition of θ-government is given in (50):

(50) α θ-governs β iff α is a zero-level category that θ-marks β, and α, β are sisters.   (Ibid.: 15)

Thus, illicit movement of Z to X as in (51a) is barred under (49). On the other hand, movement deriving (51b) meets this constraint only if X θ-governs YP and t_Y θ-governs ZP, where neither X nor Y is C^0:

(51) a. $^*[_{XP} [_X Z\text{-}X] [_{YP} Y [_{ZP} t_Z]]]$
      b. $[_{XP} [_X [_Y Z\text{-}Y]\text{-}X] [_{YP} t_Y [_{ZP} t_Z]]]$

Let us return to $(46) - (47)$. In (46a), since the auxiliary *chu* is devoid of accusative-assigning ability, the object is not Case-marked within the VP. The auxiliary adjoins to and is amalgamated with the Agr_{-ABS} head, θ-governing the VP. This movement meets the HMC. The object *kalam* is now able to raise to the Spec of Agr_{-ABS} to be structurally assigned absolutive Case and then agrees with the verb in number and gender under a Spec-head relation. Furthermore, the amalgamated verb $[V\text{-}Agr_{-ABS}]$ raises from Agr_{-ABS}, via T, to Agr_{-DAT} to agree with the subject in the Spec of Agr_{-DAT} and assign structural dative Case under a Spec-head relation. Then the complex category $[[V\text{-}Agr_{-ABS}]\text{-}Agr_{-DAT}]$ raises to C, checked by a $[+Tns]$ feature there. The subject NP moves to the Spec of CP via topicalization. This yields the following configuration in the overt syntax:

(52) $[_{CP}$ me $[[_C$ chu$] [_{AgrP-DAT}$ e$_{SUB} [[_{TP} [[_{AgrP-ABS}$ kalam $[[_{VP}$ e$_{OBJ}$ t$_V]$
      me DAT is 1/M SG   pen M SG
      t$_{Agr}]] $ t$_T]] $ t$_{Agr}]]]]$

Next turn to (47). In (47a), for instance, the perfect participle *an'm't'* immediately follows the auxiliary *chi* that appears in position two. It also exhibits the agreement with the object, which is the same pattern of agreement as

(46). Recall that in (9) − (10), the perfect participle can be left in a sentence-final position (see footnote 1). The sentences (9) − (10) contain no Agr-ABS and hence the object NP, remaining within VP, is Case-marked by the main verb. Hence only the auxiliary undergoes successive V-to-C movement. Consider (53), the configuration given to (9):

(53) $[_{CP}$ raam^i $[_C$ oos$]$ $[_{eSUB}$ $[_{VP}$ $[_{VP}$ palav chalaan$]$ $t_V]$ $t_T]$ $t_{Agr}]]]$
        Ram   was   clothes washing

On the other hand, in (47) both the auxiliary and the perfect participle undergo successive V-to-C movement. Thus, (47a) would be given the structure as in (54):[7]

(54) $[_{CP}$ me $[_C$ chi-an'm^{i}t'$]$ $[_{eSUB}$ $[[_{AgrP-ABS}$ meez $[_{VP}$ e$_{OBJ}$ $t_V]$ $t_{Agr}]$ $t_T]$ $t_{Agr}]]]$
        I ERG am 1/M PL-brought M PL table M PL

2.2   Other Consequences of Head Movement

Our analysis in section 2.1, based on the structure of a sentence as in (48), takes agreement and Case-assignment to be a result of head-movement. It will prove to be consistent with some other empirical phases observed in this section.

2.2.1   Neg-Movement and Negative Sentences

In Kashmiri, a negative sentence includes the negative morpheme *-n^i* which is attached to a finite verb. Consider the following examples:

(55)   shur   oos-n^i asaan.
        the boy   was-not   laughing
(56)   tse   chuy-n^i ken   taakath.
        you DAT is-not   any   strength   'You do not have any strength.'

Hence, the movement of a finite verb from within VP to Agr/T across Neg[0]

violates the HMC, since it crosses a Minimality barrier NegP, as in (57):

(57) *[$_{XP}$ [$_X$ V-X] [$_{NegP}$ [$_{VP}$ e$_V$] [$_{Neg}$ -n^i]]]

Then, the verb is forced to adjoin to and amalgamate with the Neg head, θ-governing the VP so that the derivation can be immune from an HMC violation. The verb further undergoes successive Neg-to-C movement. This is why the negative morpheme -n^i is suffixed to the verb in a negative sentence.

2.2.2 Yes-or-No Questions and Negative Questions

Consider (23) − (25) again. In Kashmiri yes-or-no questions, a verb is marked with a suffix -aa. It is generated under a C^0 head with a [+wh] feature and attracts a verb. This is not inconsistent with the fact that the yes-or-no question has V2 order. Topicalization to the Spec of CP is also involved here.

Moreover, note that in a negative question an interrogative suffix -aa is added to a verb which a negative suffix -n^i has been already attached to. The following example illustrates this point:

(58) bagavaan   chu-n-aa   poz?

God   is-not-Q   true 'Isn't God true?'

The fact that a verb permits suffixation of both -n^i and -aa meets our claim in section 2.2.1 that Neg is amalgamated with V, and the complex category [V-Neg] further raises to C. The Spec of CP is occupied with a topicalized constituent. Thus, we have V2 order even in negative questions. Since the verb first amalgamates with -n^i, this suffix -n^i can never follow the suffix -aa.

2.3 Kashmiri as a Pure V2 Language

So far we have argued that V2 order is derived as a result of a conspiracy of successive V-to-C movement and topicalization of some IP-internal element to the Spec of CP. At the same time, we have exhibited that our analysis of

V2-phenomena is consistent with Case-assignment, agreement and the formation of negative and interrogative sentences. In this section, we will deal with residual problems: how V1, V3 and VF sentences are derived.

2.3.1 V1 Problems

We take the V1 order as in (26) to be exceptional, assuming that Kashmiri allows insertion of a null expletive into the Spec of CP possibly for stylistic reasons in limited contexts. The fact that a verb comes first in conjuncts as in $(30) - (31)$ may be traced to the presence of a null pronominal subject *pro* in the Spec of IP. Kashmiri is a pro-drop language with rich verbal inflections, as seen in (59):[8]

(59) khem[i]   'I-will-eat'   khemav 'we-will-eat'

    kh'akh   'you (SG)-will-eat' kheyiv 'you (PL)-will-eat'

    kheyi   'he-will-eat'   kh'an   'they-will-eat'

We assume that even if the empty category, i.e. *pro*, is not topicalized to the Spec of CP, the position is occupied with an empty expletive. The second conjunct in the sentence (30) would be given the following configuration:[9]

(60) $[_{CP}$ *e* $[_C$ leechan] $[_{AgrP}$ pro $[[_{AgrP}$ z^i ciThi $[_{VP}$ e$_{OBJ}$ t$_V$] t$_{Agr}$] t$_T$] t$_{Agr}$]]

       wrote   two letters

We claim that in (60) *pro*, occupying the subject position, is not necessarily topicalized to the Spec of CP. We then predict that when an object NP is topicalized (hence it moves to the Spec of CP), the resultant structure has V2 order, since the verb occupies the C position and the subject *pro* can remain in the Spec of AgrP. This prediction is actually borne out, as in (61):

(61) yih nor'jiil   phuT"raav ta   amich[u] guuj[i] kheh.

    this coconut break   and its   meat   eat

2.3.2 V3 Problems

We have argued that a wh-question displays V3 order, where a verb follows an interrogative pronoun (cf. Wali 1988). Recall that this V3 order is not affected by the root/non-root distinction. Hook attempts to accommodate this phenomenon in his (1976: 139; 1984: 146 − 147) work. It has been observed that South Asian languages have a tendency for a wh-interrogative pronoun to stand immediately before a verb in wh-questions. Strictly speaking, the most natural position that wh-words occupy is a pre-verbal position.

Cardona (1965: 172) reports the fact that Gujarati restricts the occurrence of a wh-phrase to a pre-verbal position. Moreover, Klaiman (1976) observes that the pre-verbal position in Hindi-Urdu is a focus position. Some native speakers of Hindi-Urdu shows a strong preference for such an interrogative adjunct as *kyõ* 'why' to appear immediately before a verb.

(62) a. áp   kyõ   rote-haĩ?

you   why   crying-are 'Why are you crying?'

b. (?)kyõ áp rote-haĩ?

Horvath (1986) and Kiss (1987) report that a Hungarian wh-phrase only occurs in a pre-verb position (a focus position). Consider the following sentences cited from Horvath (1986: 44):

(63) a. Mari *kinek_i*   vett   egy könyvet t_i ajándékba?

Mary who-to bought 3 SG a   book-ACC present-into

'Who did Mary buy a book as a present?'

b. *Kinek_i*   vett   Mari egy könyvet t_i ajándékba?

who-to bought 3 SG Mary a   book-ACC present-into

We count V3 order in Kashmiri as one of V2 phenomena. We have two ways to solve this matter. One possibility is to propose that a wh-phrase is adjoined to a C′ node. This C′-adjunction is an operation that is open only

to wh-phrases, either in the overt syntax or at LF (see Terada 1993b). Thus, the sentence (18) would have the following structure in the overt syntax:

(64)   [$_{CP}$ paans^j [$_{C'}$ kus [$_C$ [$_C$ chu] [$_{AgrP}$ e$_{SUB}$ e$_{OBJ}$ edivaan t$_V$]]]]
       money   who   is   paying

Another possibility is to propose, partially following Horvath (1986), that a wh-phrase is incorporated into V, which raises to C. Thus, the sentence (18) would have the following configuration:[10]

(65)   [$_{CP}$ paans^j [$_C$ [$_V$ kus chu]] [$_{AgrP}$ e$_{SUB}$ e$_{OBJ}$ edivaan t$_V$]]
       money   who is   paying

The embedded questions as in (21) − (22) would have configurations similar to (64) − (65).

To sum up, although a verb comes third within a wh-question, it actually occupies C as in usual V2 sentences.

2.3.3   Verb Final Order

As we have seen, VF (verb-final) order in a subordinate clause is complex and is not accommodated in previous approaches to V2 in Germanic. Recall that in Kashmiri, adverbial and relative clauses have the VF order, while sentential complements, the V2 order. This is illustrated in the constrast between (14) − (15) and (16) − (17).

In this section I will attempt a purely syntactic account for the VF order.[11] Let us first see the V2 order in a complement clause as in (16) − (17). We claim that the embedded V2 order can be derived in the same manner as its matrix counterpart. That is, the finite verb moves to the embedded C position with its specifier occupied by a moved topic. To make this story more explicit, we suggest that a complementizer *ki/zi* is cliticized onto some element in the higher clause. This is partially schematized in (66), where *ki* is cliticized onto the matrix V (For further discussion, the reader is referred to Pesetsky (1991:

chapter 10) and Shlonsky (1988) among others):

(66)   ... [$_{VP}$ V-ki_i [$_{CP}$ [$_C$ t$_i$] AgrP]]

After cliticization of ki/zi, the finite verb raises to C by substitution and at the same time a topicalized element moves into the Spec of CP, giving rise to the V2 order. The configuration of (16) would be schematized as in (67):

(67)   [$_{CP}$ me [$_{C'}$ chu [$_{AgrP}$ yaad-ki [$_{CP}$ su [$_{C'}$ yiyi [$_{AgrP}$ ...   az   ...]]]]]]

me   is   memory that   he   will-come   today

Note that this cliticization is susceptible to the HMC. In (67), the embedded CP is θ-governed by (the trace of) the matrix verb. Hence movement of ki is permitted under the HMC.

If this reasoning is correct, VF order within adverbial and relative clauses is derived in a natural way under our account. Note that since these types of clauses are not complements selected by any matrix element, they are not θ-governed. Therefore, when a complementizer in such clauses is cliticized onto some matrix element, this derivation violates the HMC. Then, cliticization of a complementizer out of adverbial/relative clauses is blocked as an HMC violation, and hence the complementizer is forced to remain within the embedded C position. The illicit cliticization of a complementizer is shown in the following partial schematic structure:

(68)   ... [$_{VP}$ V-C ... [$_{CP}$ t$_C$ AgrP]]

It is not implausible to assume that those elements that head adverbial/relative clauses, i.e. *yeli* 'when' and *yus* 'which', etc. are not maximal projections, but X^0-categories. (Both *yeli* and *yus* are originally relative pronouns.) Thus, (15b) would have the following configuration:

(69)   [$_{CP}$ tse   [$_{C'}$ [$_C$ yus] [$_{AgrP}$ me [$_{VP}$ wakhunu] [$_{Agr-ERG}$ dyututh]]]],...

you ERG   which   me   lesson   gave

The head of the relative clause CP, as we assume, is occupied with a relative pronoun *yus*, which is an X⁰-category. The relative pronoun within C binds its AgrP-internal trace. The Spec of CP may be occupied with a topicalized element *tse*. When the Spec of CP is empty, a relative pronoun stands sentence-initially, as in (14) and (15a).

Since the complementizer *yus* as in (69) is not permitted to cliticize onto any matrix elements under the HMC, the finite verb *dyututh* cannot raise to the C head, remaining in Agr$_{-ERG}$. Since every head except C is fead-final in Kashmiri, the finite verb in Agr$_{-ERG}$ apparently appear in a clause-final posit ion in a relative clause. The same account holds of the VF order in adverbial clauses as in (14). If a finite verb raises to a C position, the C head must not be doubly filled with phonetic elements, and then a complementizer (i.e. a relative pronoun, etc.) must cliticize onto a matrix element. This cliticization, however, is blocked under the HMC, since relative/adverbial clauses are not θ-governed by a matrix element. Thus, VF order in Kashmiri is derived, by assuming that a relative pronoun is an X⁰-category that substitutes into a C position.

Notes

*This article is a revised version of my unpublished manuscript written in Japanese in 1990. That is why the basic assumptions which our analysis is based on are adopted from Chomsky's (1986; 1991) framework (cf. Terada 1993a) and are radically different from those in such current frameworks as Chomsky's (1992) Minimalist program. An elaboration of V2 theory based on Minimalistic syntax has to be relegated to my future research.

1. An infinite verb together with its auxiliary may come second in such sentences as (9)－(11). Consider for example (i)－(ii) below. The finite verb is always preceded by the auxiliary in (i)－(ii) in exactly the same way, as we have seen in (12)－(13):

(i) raam' chu cavaan caay.

'Ram is drinking tea.'

(ii) raam' heki kh'ath bat'.

'Ram can eat food.' (Hook 1976: 135)

2. Note, however, that in the following sentence, V2 order is permitted:

(i) tamis chu yaad kam' kar kaam. (Koul 1977: chapter 4)

him is memory who did work 'He remembers who did the work.'

This fact remains unsolved in this article.

Diesing (1990) observes that Yiddish allows V3 order only in embedded questions.

3. Thrainsson (1986) observes that Icelandic exceptionally permits V3 (i.e. subject-adverb-verb) order.

4. We assume that V-to-C movement is triggered by some morphological property: a finite verb must be "checked" by $[+\text{Tns}]$ C. We will not pursue this matter here.

One might wonder why topicalization into the Spec of CP is necessary in V2 languages. We have no satisfactory solution to this issue. Nomura (1986) attempts to attribute the obligatory nature of this movement to the Empty Category Principle (ECP). For the definition of the ECP, see Chomsky (1986; 1991).

5. We do not have enough empirical evidence in favor of the claim that Kashmiri is configurational, i.e. it has a VP node. Nevertheless, there is one piece of evidence. In a coordinate structure, VP-deletion is possible, as is illustrated in (i):

(i) raajan por akhbaar ti shilan-ti

'Raj read the newspaper and Shiela did too.' (Koul 1977: 59)

6. These Agrs are characterized with specifications of agreement features, as in (i):

(i) $\text{Agr}_{\text{DAT/ERG}}$ $[\alpha\text{Person}, \beta\text{Number}, \gamma\#]$ Agr_{ABS} $[\alpha\#, \beta\text{Number}, \gamma\text{Gender}]$

Agr_{NOM} $[\alpha\text{Person}, \beta\text{Number}, \gamma\text{Gender}]$ Agr_{ACC} $[\alpha\#, \beta\#, \gamma\#]$

$[\alpha]$ is a ternary Person feature with the values First/Second/Third person. $[\beta]$ is a binary number feature with the values Singular/Plural. $[\gamma]$ is a binary Gender feature with the values Masculine/Feminine. Agr_{ACC} has none of these features.

7. In (11), the perfect participle, remaining in Agr_{ABS}, undergoes agreement

and Case-assignment. The proposed structure (48) in Kashmiri correctly explains the position of the verb in this sentence.

8. Other paradigms (e.g. the past tense) lack rich inflections. We will not pursue this matter here.

9. This empty expletive (emex) is governed by the verb moved to C, satisfying the Emex Condition, a licensing condition proposed by Safir (1985). For details, see Safir (1985).

10. Actually, Horvath assumes that an interrogative pronoun is base-generated in a pre-V position immediately dominated by V'.

11. Hook attempts to account for this constrast by assuming that word order in Kashmiri is conditioned by such semantic factors as new/old information. His account is problematic in that it cannot extend to Germanic and Scandinavian. For a detailed discussion, see Terada 1990.

For a previous account of VF order in Kashmiri, the reader is referred to Bhatt and Yoon (1991).

Abbreviations

ABS= absolutive case; ACC= accusative case; DAT= dative case;
ERG= ergative case; NOM= nominative case; Q= question marker.

Bibliography

Bhatt, Rakesh and James Yoon. 1991. "On the Composition of COMP and Parameters of V2," *The Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 10, 41−52.

Bhat, Roopkrishen. 1987. *A Descriptive Study of Kashmiri*, Shree Durga, Delhi.

Cardona, George. 1965. *A Gujarati Reference Grammar*, The University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, Noam. 1991. "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation", in R. Freidin. ed., *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, Noam. 1992. "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory", *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 1, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Diesing, Molly. 1990. Verb Movement and the Subject Position in Yiddish," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8, 41 − 79.

Haider, Hubert and Prinzhorn, Martin. 1986. *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Hook, Peter. 1976. "Is Kashmiri an SVO Language?" *Indian Linguistics* 37, 133 − 142.

Hook, Peter. 1984. "Some Further Observations on Kashmiri Word Order," in O. Koul and P. Hook. eds., 1984, 145 − 153.

Horvath, Julia. 1986. *FOCUS in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Kiss, Katalin. 1986. *Configurationality in Hungarian*, Reidel, Dordrecht.

Klaiman, M. 1976. "Topicalization and Relativization in Hindi," *Indian Linguistics* 37, 315 − 333.

Koopman, Hilda. 1984. *The Syntax of Verbs*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Koul, Omkar. 1977. *Linguistic Studies in Kashmiri*, Bahri, New Delhi.

Koul, Omkar. 1985. *An Intensive Course in Kashmiri*, Central Institute of Indian Languages. Mysore.

Koul, Omker and Peter Hook. 1984. *Aspects of Kashmiri Linguistics*, Bahri, New Delhi.

Mizokami, Tomio. 1988. "Kashmir-go no Bunpou-Kouzou," *Asian and African Linguistics* 17, 33 − 57.

Nomura, Yasuyuki. 1987. "Gozyun no Ziyudo to V2 Mondai no Ichi-Kaiketsu," *Gaikokugo Kenkyu to Gengo Zyoho Shori*, 59 − 81, Osaka University of Foreign Studies.

Pesetsky, David. 1991. *Zero Syntax*, ms., MIT.

Platzack, Christer. 1986. "COMP, INFL, and Germanic Word Order," in L. Hellan and K. K. Kristensen. eds., *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*, 185 − 234, Reidel, Dordrecht.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP," *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365 − 424.

Safir, Kenneth. 1985. *Syntactic Chains*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1988. "Complementizer-Cliticization in Hebrew and the Empty Category Principle," *Natural Language and Linguistic* Theory 6, 191 − 205.

Subbarao, Karumuri V. 1984. "Word Order in Kashmiri: Some Further Evidence," in O. Koul and P. Hook. eds., 1984, 136−144.

Syed Mohammad Yousuf Bukhari. 1982. *Kashmiri aur Urdu Zaban ka Taqabli Mutala'ah*, Central Urdu Board, Lahore.

Terada, Hiroshi. 1989. "Multiple Agr," *Nebulae* 14, 53−79, Osaka Gaidai Linguistic Circle.

Terada, Hiroshi. 1990. "Kashmiri-go no V2 Gensho," ms., Nagoya University.

Terada, Hiroshi. 1991. *Split Ergativity: A Principles-and-Parameters Approach to Hindi-Urdu Syntax*. M. A. Thesis. Nagoya University.

Terada, Hiroshi. 1993a. "On the Status of the Trace of Agr," *English Linguistics: Journal of the English Linguistic Society of Japan* 10, 211−218.

Terada, Hiroshi. 1993b. "Superiority and Condition C," ms., Nagoya University (in Japanese).

Thrainsson, Höskuldur. 1986. "V1, V2, V3 in Icelandic," in H. Haider and M. Prinzhorn. eds., 1986, 169−194.

Wali, Kashi. 1988. "A Note on Wh-Questions in Marathi and Kashmiri," in V. Srivastav, J. W. Gair, and K. Wali. eds., *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 8, 161−180.

Weerman, Fred. 1989. *The V2 Conspiracy*, Foris, Dordrecht.

カシュミーリー語におけるＶ２現象

寺　田　　寛

Abstract

　ダルド諸語に属するカシュミーリー語は，ヨーロッパ以外の言語で動詞第２位（Verb Second, V2）の語順をもつ言語である。カシュミーリー語の動詞は，Ｖ２以外にも第１位（Ｖ１），第３位（Ｖ３）及び文末（ＶＦ）の位置に置かれ，その位置は互いに相補分布をなす。Ｖ２語順は平叙文の主節と補文及び yes-no 疑問文内で見られる。この場合，定形動詞の前に現れるのは話題化された要素であり，主語に限定されずいかなる構成素でもよいという点がＳＶＯ語順とは異なる。一方，ＶＦつまり動詞が文末に現れる語順は，従属節それも副詞節と関係節に限定される。Ｖ３語順は wh 疑問文内で動詞が，話題要素及び疑問詞に続いて第３位に現れる場合であり，この語順には主節・従属節の区別による差はない。Ｖ１語順は等位接続構造において見られ，等位接続文の結合部に文が置かれた場合，２つめの文の主語が空となって動詞が文頭に現れる。このようなＶ１，Ｖ２，Ｖ３，ＶＦの語順に対して生成文法の原理・媒介変数理論の枠組みから，以下のような説明を本稿で提案した。Ｖ２語順は，従来のＶ２理論において考えられているように，動詞がＣへ移動し，話題要素がＣＰ指定辞へ移動することで得られる。（Ｃ以外の節点はその補部に後続する。）さらに，Ｖ１，Ｖ３，ＶＦ語順もＶ２と同様の派生を通じて生成され，Ｖ２現象の１つであると主張する。Ｖ１は，主語位置に空の代名詞類 pro が占めていることによる，表層での動詞第１位の語順に他ならない。Ｖ３語順は，話題要素がＣＰ指定辞に移動して，動詞がＣ位置にあり，これら両者の間に現れる wh 疑問詞が C' 付加しているかあるいは動詞に編入された位置にあるとして説明される。wh 句はフォーカスを与えられるので，これらの位置がフォーカス位置であるとする。ＶＦ語順は，副詞節や関係節で動詞が節の最後の位置に現れるものである。これは同じ従属節ながら，補文内はＶ２語順になることと対比をなしている。補文標識は主節の要素に接語化するものと見なすと，この接語化は主要部移動制約（HMC）に従う。主節の要素に選択された補文は主題（θ）統率されるので，この場合，補文標識は主節へ接語化できる。しかし副詞節や関係節は主節の要素に選択されないので，主題統率されず，これらの節の補文標識（ここでは副詞節を導く接続詞や関係詞に当たるものとする）は主節へ接語化されない。この補文標識はこれらの節のＣ位置に残り，この位置への動詞の移動が阻止されるため，動詞は Agr 節点内に位置する。こうしてＶＦ語順が導かれる。

（てらだ　ひろし　　言語学）