MERGER VERSUS CONTRAST SLUICING IN HINDI-URDU

INTRODUCTION   This paper compares the behaviour of merger sluicing and contrast sluicing with respect to islands and intervention effects. We observe that while contrast sluicing behaves like wh-in situ in Hindi-Urdu, merger sluicing unexpectedly differs in its island sensitivity. Further, we demonstrate that this differential behaviour cannot be reduced to properties of wh-scrambling.

HINDI-URDU SHOWS ISLAND EFFECTS   Hindi-Urdu is a language that does not have English-like obligatory wh-fronting (1), but allows wh-scrambling (2). Additionally, constructions which block wh-movement in English, e.g. complex NP islands, block both matrix wh-interpretation (3) and overt wh-scrambling (4) in Hindi-Urdu (Dayal 1996).

(1)   vo   miThaaii   kis-ne   banaayii   thii?
        that   sweet   who-ERG   make.PFV   be.PST
        'Who made that sweet?'
(2)   kis-ne$_i$ vo   miThaaii   t$_i$ banaayii   thii?

(3)   *giita-ko   vo   miThaaii   [jo   kis-ne   banaayii   thii]   pasand hai
        Gita-DAT   that   sweet   [REL.PRON   who-ERG   make.PFV be.PST]   like   be.PRES
        INTENDED: 'Gita likes a sweet that was made by who?'
(4)   *kis-ne$_i$ giita-ko vo   miThaaii   [jo   t$_i$ banaayii   thii   ]   pasand hai

Merger sluicing and contrast sluicing are both available in the language (5), but show differential behaviour with respect to islands. While merger sluicing does not show island effects, contrast sluicing does (6). Under the reading shown, trying to create a contrast sluice out of an island causes ungrammaticality.

(5)   giita-ne   {koi miThaai | *halwa*} khaayii lekin mujhe   nahi pata {kaunsii| *aur kyaa*}
        Gita-ERG   {some sweet | *halwa*}eat.PFV but   I-DAT   NEG know {which| *else what*}
        MERGER SLUICE: 'Gita ate some sweet but I don't know which.'
        CONTRAST SLUICE: '*Gita ate halwa but I don't know what else.*'

(6)   giita-ne   vo   miThaaii khaayii jo   {kisi-ne | *jon-ne*}   banaayii
        Gita-ERG   that   sweet   eat.PFV   REL.PRON {someone-ERG|John-ERG} make.PFV
        thi,   par   mujhe   nahi pata   {kis-ne | *aur   kis-ne*}
        be.PST but   I-DAT   NEG know {who-ERG | *else who-ERG*}
        MERGER SLUICE: 'Gita ate a dish that was made by someone, but I don't know who ~~Gita ate a dish that was made by~~.'
        CONTRAST SLUICE: '*Gita ate a dish that was made by John, but I don't know who else ~~Gita ate a dish that was made by~~.*'

INTERVENTION EFFECTS IN SLUICING   HU shows intervention effects, as exemplified by (7), where focus marking is ungrammatical in a question. As has been shown for other languages (e.g. Japanese), intervention effects in HU are ameliorated by wh-scrambling (8).

(7)   *[sirf giita-ne-hi]   kis-ko   tohfaa   diyaa?
        only Gita-ERG-FOC who-DAT gift   give.PFV
        INTENDED: 'Who did only Gita give a gift to?'

(8)   kis-ko$_i$ [sirf giita-ne-hi]   t$_i$ tohfaa   diyaa?

In a minimally different sentence, but with merger sluicing (9), there is no amelioration of the intervention effect. This is surprising under a wh-movement analysis of the sluice (Bhattacharya & Simpson 2012). Such an analysis would predict the structure in (10), which should ameliorate the intervention effect just as in (8) above. The fact that there is no amelioration in (9) shows that there is no movement in merger sluicing in Hindi-Urdu.

(9)   *sirf giita-ne-hi   kisi-ko   tohfaa diyaa, par mujhe nahi pata kis-ko
        only Gita-ERG-FOC someone-DAT gift   give.PFV but I-DAT   NEG know who-DAT
        INTENDED: 'Only Gita gave a gift to someone, but I don't know to who.'

(10)   *sirf giita-ne-hi kisi-ko tohfaa diyaa, par mujhe nahi pata
        [kis-ko$_i$ ~~sirf   giita-ne-hi~~ t$_i$ ~~tohfaa   diyaa~~]

In the contrast sluicing construction (11) we observe the same lack of amelioration, showing the impossibility of a wh-movement structure (12), parallel to (10).

(11)   *sirf giita-ne-hi   jon-ko   tohfaa diyaa, par mujhe nahi pata aur kis-ko
        only Gita-ERG-FOC John-DAT   gift   give.PFV but I-DAT NEG know else who-DAT
        INTENDED: 'Only Gita gave a gift to someone, but I don't know to who else.'

(12)   *sirf giita-ne-hi   jon-ko   tohfaa diyaa, par mujhe nahi pata aur kis-ko
        ~~sirf   giita ne hi   t$_i$ tohfaa diyaa~~

The full sentence version of (12), with wh-scrambling, is perfectly grammatical. This is further evidence of the type in (8) that shows that in general, wh-scrambling in Hindi-Urdu can ameliorate intervention effects. The absence of amelioration in merger and contrast sluicing therefore shows that these constructions do not involve wh-movement.

	ESCAPES ISLANDS	AMELIORATES INTERVENTION EFFECTS
WH-SCRAMBLING	NO	YES
WIDE SCOPE WH-INTERPRETATION (NO OVERT MOVEMENT)	**NO**	**NO**
CONTRAST SLUICING	**NO**	**NO**
MERGER SLUICING	YES	NO

CONCLUSION   With respect to both islands and intervention effects, contrast sluicing behaves the same as wide-scope wh-interpretation. While Hindi-Urdu merger sluicing patterns with contrast sluicing and wh-interpretation with respect to amelioration of intervention, it is unique in its ability to escape islands. Since wh-movement in this language cannot escape islands, the ability of merger sluicing to do so must arise from some independent property of merger sluicing itself.