

Direct Object Raising in Ukrainian: A or \bar{A} movement?

Roksolana Mykhaylyk
Department of Linguistics
SUNY at Stony Brook, NY
rmykhayl@ic.sunysb.edu

1. Introduction

Direct object (DO) movement from the base VP argument position to the higher situated landing site has been observed and examined in different languages (Mahajan 1991, Saito 1989, Holmberg 1999, Miyagawa 2001 among others).

UKRAINIAN:

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| (1) | Taras | ne | bude | čytaty | knyžku | |
| | Taras | not | be-FUT | read-INF | book-ACC | |
| (2) | Taras | ne | bude | knyžku_i | čytaty | <i>t_i</i> |
| | Taras | not | be-FUT | book-ACC | read-INF | |
| (3) | Taras | | knyžku_i | ne bude | čytaty | <i>t_i</i> |
| | Taras | | book-ACC | not be-FUT | read-INF | |
| (4) | Knyžku_i | Taras | ne bude | čytaty | | <i>t_i</i> |
| | book-ACC | Taras | not be-FUT | read-INF | | |
- 'Taras is not going to read a/the book'.*

This empirical observation poses immediate questions:

- what are the syntactic properties of the DO movement?
- how does it change semantic interpretation of the sentence?

My goal:

- To suggest a possible solution to the problem by applying syntactic tests to relevant Ukrainian data
- To indicate directions to follow in investigation of the problem of DO raising in a 'free-word-order' language.

My proposal:

I argue that

- In fact three different movements are employed in the above sentences: (2) is an example of a short [vP-internal] A-movement, (3) is an instance of long A-movement outside of vP, and only (4) can be considered an \bar{A} -movement case (see Mahajan 1991).
- Derived structures differ from the basic SVO structure and from each other in the [\pm specific] feature interpretation on the direct object DP.

Theoretical Assumptions

- Ukrainian is an SVO language (Shevelov 1993): the subject precedes the verb; the verb precedes its objects; the attributive adjective precedes its head noun, etc.
- I mostly use a neutral term - *Direct Object Raising* (and not *Scrambling* as in Ross 1967 or Saito 1989; *Object Shift* as in Thrainsson 2001; or *Object Movement* as in Diesing's 1997)

2. Syntactic Analysis

2.1. DO Landing Sites

Adverbial Tests:

1. The high adverb *NAPEVNO* 'certainly' is situated outside of vP, as the following ellipsis test shows:

- (5) Taras napevno ne bude čytaty **knyžku**, a Ivan napevno bude
 Taras certainly not be-FUT read-INF book-ACC, but Ivan certainly will
 'Taras is certainly not going to read a book, but Ivan certainly will [read a book]'

Therefore, in (7), the DO *book* is raised to a landing position between vP and TP; while in (8), it is adjoined to TP.

- (6) Taras napevno ne bude **knyžku_i** čytaty *t_i*
 Taras certainly not be-FUT book-ACC read-INF

- (7) Taras **knyžku_i** napevno ne bude čytaty *t_i*
 Taras book-ACC certainly not be-FUT read-INF

- (8) **Knyžku_i** Taras napevno ne bude čytaty *t_i*
 book-ACC Taras certainly not be-FUT read-INF
 'Taras is certainly not going to read a book'.

2. The low adverb *ŠVYDKO* 'quickly' is a vP edge marker (Adger 2003) and its addition to the structure shows that the DO landing site in (9) is inside of vP (see the following discussion in 3.2 for the alternative OAdvV order):

- (9) Taras ne bude švydko **knyžku_i** čytaty *t_i*
 Taras not be-FUT quickly book-ACC read-INF
 'Taras is not going to read a book quickly'

2.2. A and \bar{A} properties: Contrastive Analysis of (3) and (4)

A. Binding Principles Diagnostics

Principle A:

Anaphors (reflexive or reciprocal) have to be locally bound:

- a. Mary_i has always liked herself_i.
- b. *Mary_i's friends have always liked herself_i.

As has been argued in Saito 1989 and maintained for Russian in Bailyn 2004, \bar{A} movement reconstructs, while A movement does not reconstruct for binding purposes. The Ukrainian facts support this distinction:

- (10) a. Ivanenky_i pokazaly Petrenkam_j **fotografiji** **odyn odnoho**_{i/j}
Ivanenky showed Petrenky-DAT pictures-ACC each other-GEN
- b. Ivanenky_i **fotografiji** **odyn odnoho**_{i/*j} pokazaly Petrenkam_j.
Ivanenky pictures-ACC each other-GEN showed Petrenky-DAT
- c. **Fotografiji** **odyn odnoho**_{i/j} Ivanenky_i pokazaly Petrenkam_j.
Pictures-ACC each other-GEN Ivanenky showed Petrenky-DAT
'The Ivanenkos showed the Petrenkos pictures of each other'
- d. **Fotografiji** **odyn odnoho**_{i/j} ja xoču ščob Ivanenky_i pokazaly Petrenkam_j.
Pictures-ACC each other-GEN I want that Ivanenky showed Petrenko-DAT
'Pictures of each other, I want the Ivanenkos to show the Petrenkos.'

B. Scope diagnostics also predict change of the scopal status according to the type of movement (see E. Kiss 1991 for Hungarian and Saito 2006 for Japanese). In Ukrainian, surface scope reading of (11a) and (11c) contrasts with two possible readings in (11b):

- (11) a. Xtos' švydko čytaje **kožnu knyžku** (someone >every; *every>someone)
Someone quickly reads every book
- b. Xtos' **kožnu knyžku**_i švydko čytaje t_i(someone >every; every>someone)
Someone every book quickly reads
- c. **Kožnu knyžku**_i xtos' švydko čytaje t_i(every>someone; *someone>every)
Every book someone quickly reads
'Someone reads every book quickly'

A unified account for binding and scope effects in DO raising in terms of reconstructability is yet to be proposed, but crucially for this analysis, both tests show a clear contrast between different DO landing sites in Ukrainian.

Thus, binding effects and scope diagnostics provide evidence for the proposed argument: there are at least two DO raising types in Ukrainian, and they show either A or \bar{A} syntactic properties.

3. Semantic Interpretation
3.1. Dutch/Ukrainian Parallels

Properties of DO raising in Dutch:

- It is an instance of A-movement: creates new binding possibilities, blocks other binding possibilities and does not yield weak crossover effects (Zwart 1993).
- In Dutch, DO scrambled over a high adverb (and/or negation) always receives a specific for the speaker interpretation (12b) (Schaeffer 2000).

“The condition on **specificity** is satisfied when the speaker refers to a unique individual in the set denoted by the NP and considers this individual to possess some noteworthy property” (Ionin et al 2004)

DUTCH

(12) a. Dat Marieke gisteren **een (of ander) boek** gekocht heeft
 That Marieke yesterday a/one or other book bought has
 ‘That Marieke bought some book or other yesterday’

b. Dat Marieke **een boek** gisteren gekocht heeft
 That Marieke one book yesterday bought has
 ‘That Marieke bought a certain book yesterday’

UKRAINIAN

(13) a. Marija včora kupyla knyžky
 Maria yesterday bought book-ACC
 ‘Maria bought a/the book yesterday’

b. Marija knyžku včora kupyla
 Maria book-ACC yesterday bought
 ‘Maria bought a certain book yesterday’

3.2. Ukrainian evidence

A. Pronouns *CJA* ‘this’ and *BUD’-YAKA* ‘any’ Reconstruction (see Cummins 1998 for Czech).

The basic structure (14) has the following readings:

- a) there is a certain book that will be read by Taras *or*
 b) there will be some event of reading [of any book].

(14) a. Taras bude čytaty [cju] **knyžku**
 Taras be-FUT read-INF [this] book

b. Taras bude čytaty [bud’-jaku] **knyžku**
 Taras be-FUT read-INF [any] book

After the DO raising:

(15) – the sentence is acceptable

(16) - the DO raises to a vP-external position, and the sentence is unacceptable.

(17) – the sentence is acceptable.

(15)	Taras	bude	[bud'-jaku]	knyžku_i	čytaty	<i>t_i</i>
	Taras	be-FUT	[any]	book	read-INF	
(16)	*Taras	[bud'-jaku]	knyžku_i	bude	čytaty	<i>t_i</i>
	Taras	[any]	book	be-FUT	read-INF	
(17)	[bud'-jaku]	Knyžku_i	Taras	bude	čytaty	<i>t_i</i>
	[any]	book	Taras	be-FUT	read-INF	
	<i>'Taras is going to read a book'.</i>					

B. Diesing's (1992) Mapping Hypothesis:

VP maps into the Nuclear Scope (the domain of existential closure),
while IP (functional projections above VP) maps into Restriction

Going back to (2) (which corresponds to the sentences in (9) and (15)): if the sentence structure does not contain a low adverbial, it can be ambiguous. Some speakers would raise the DO *book* to a vP adjunction position and get only its specific interpretation judging (18b) unacceptable, while for others the DO remains inside of vP as in (18a):

(18)	a.	Taras	bude	[švydko]	[bud'-jaku]	knyžku_i	čytaty	<i>t_i</i>
		Taras	be-FUT	quickly	[any]	book-ACC	read-INF	
	b.	* Taras	bude	[bud'-jaku]	knyžku_i	[švydko]	čytaty	<i>t_i</i>
		Taras	be-FUT	[any]	book-ACC	quickly	read-INF	
		<i>'Taras is going to read a/the book quickly'</i>						

The above data shows that the two types of DO raising are related to different semantic interpretations of the moved NP:

- A-Movement of the object is employed in order to disambiguate semantic readings of unmarked DO and license it for [+specific] interpretation.
- Ā-Movement has a different motivation: to place a DO constituent in focus preserving its basic semantic properties.

4. Conclusion

Both syntactic and semantic analyses indicate that

- there is no single process of scrambling in Ukrainian;
- instead, there are several distinct DO raising construction types, with different landing sites and different syntactic properties; and

- changes from the basic SVO to SOV order are not totally free – they are restricted syntactically and semantically, as binding, scope, and specificity tests suggest.
- On the other hand, OSV structure analysis suggests discourse related nature of the DO raising to an \bar{A} position.

Beyond facts specific to Ukrainian, this analysis implies syntactic and semantic distinction between \bar{A} movement as a focus movement and clause-internal DO Raising (the properties and mechanism of which are still to be defined) that can be further extended and verified on other ‘free-word-order’ Slavic languages.

References

- Adger David. 2003. *Core Syntax. A Minimalist Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bailyn, John. 2004. Generalized inversion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22: 1-49
- Cummins, George. 1998. Indefiniteness in Czech. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 6(2).
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- E.Kiss, K. 1991. The logical structure of Hungarian. In C-T J Huang, ed., *Logical Representation in Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Ionin, Tania, Heejeong Ko and Kenneth Wexler. 2004. Article semantics in L2 Acquisition: The role of specificity. *Language Acquisition*, 12(1): 3-69.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1999. Remarks on Holmberg’s Generalization. *Studia Linguistica* 53(1), 1-39.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1991. *The A/A’ distinction and movement theory*. PhD Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Miyagava, Shigeru. 2001. The EPP, Scrambling, and Wh-in-Situ. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, edited by Michael Kenstowicz, 293-338. Cambridge MA/ London: MIT Press.
- Ross, J. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1989. Scrambling as Semantically Vacuous A’-movement. In Mark R. Baltin and Anthony S. Kroch (eds.), *Alternative Concepts of Phrase Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 182-200.
- Saito, Mamoru. 2006. *A-Scrambling and the EPP in Complex Predicate Sentences*. Presentation Handout. SUNY at Stony Brook, May 3.
- Schaeffer, Jeannette. 2000. Object Scrambling and Specificity in Dutch Child Language. *The Acquisition of Scrambling and Cliticization*. Susan M. Powers and Cornelia Hamann (eds). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Shevelov, George. 1993. The Ukrainian language. In *The Slavonic Languages*, Ed. By Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London / New York: Routledge.
- Thrainsson, Hoskuldur. 2001. Object shift and scrambling. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Ed. By Mark Baltin and Chris Collins. Blackwell Publishing.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1993. *Dutch Syntax. A Minimalist View*. PhD Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit, Groningen.