

NP MOVEMENT IN ORIYA

SMITA - SINHA

Lecturer in Linguistics

Berhampur University, Orissa, India-760007.

C/o G.P.Das, ORICOM, Co-Housing Building, Janpath,
Bhubaneswar-751001, Orissa, India

NP Movement in Oriya

- 0.1 The G.B theory has reduced the vast number of transformational rules into a single rule system 'MOVE α ' which consists of two major movements.
- (a) NP - Movement
 - (b) WH - Movement
- 0.2 The present paper deals with the NP Movement in Oriya. Oriya belongs to the Indo-Aryan family of languages spoken by 2.2 million people in the State of Orissa. Orissa is situated in the eastern part of Indian Sub-continent, i.e. on the coastal region of Bay of Bengal. Oriya is an SOV Language.
- 0.3 Passivization, Extraposition, Raising are the commonest examples of NP movement. The present paper aims
- (i) To look into the various optional and obligatory NP Movement in Oriya.
 - (ii) To see whether the NP Movement is in accordance with the case theory and θ theory and is guided by various constraints and conditions on movement.
- 1.0 Let us now look into the various types of movements.
- 1.1 Passivization - In English passivization involves obligatory NP movement such as in (2)
- 1. Ram killed Ravan.
 - 2. Ravan was killed by Ram.
- (2) is the passive counterpart of (1) where the object NP 'Ravan' is moved to the subject position.
- However in Oriya NP Movement is optional such as in (4)
- 3. Ram Ravan Ku Marila.
Ram Ravan to killed.
 - 4. Ram dwara Ravan mōla.
Ram by Ravan was killed.
Ravan was killed by Ram.
 - 5. Ravan Ram dwara mōla.
Ravan Ram by was killed.
Ravan was killed by Ram.

1.1.1 Agentless Passive :- In case of agentless passive, the NP movement is obligatory both in English and Oriya. Example such as

6. The book was read.
Similarly in Oriya
7. bōhi pādha hela.
The book read was.
"The book was read".
- 8.* bōhi pādihila.
'The book read'
'read book'

The ungrammaticality of (8) shows that the NP movement is obligatory as the sentence is derived from (9)

9. Δ bōhi pādihilla
book read

Here the agent NP is Δ and the sentence is obligatorily passivised and bōhi is moved to Δ position. Otherwise we will get ungrammatical sentence like (8)

1.1.2 Passivization of Intransitive Verbs:- Kachru, Y. names such passive as abilitative passives. Oriya Shows such kind of passive as in (10)

10. Mo dwara soi heuni
Me by sleep not possible
'I cant sleep'
(10) is derived from (11)
11. Mō soi paruni
I sleep cannot.
'I cannot sleep'

Such passives don't involve obligatory NP movement , but optionally the NP can be moved to the end of the sentence as in the following.

12. Soi heuni modwara.
Sleep not me by possible

1.2 Extraposition :- Extra-position involves the movement of an embedded clause to the end of the immediatley superordinate clause

- 13.* [Ram murkhū ūte] laguchi
Ram fool is seems
14. Laguchi je Ram Murkhū ūte
It seems that Ram fool is.
'It seems that Ram is a fool'

The ugrammaticality of (13) shows that Extraposition is obligatory.

1.3 Raising :- postal (1974) mentioned that in case of raising, the subject of the embedded clause is moved either to the subject position of the main clause (i.e. in case of Subj - Raising) or to the object, position of the main clause (in

case of object raising or obj - Raising). The verb of the embedded clause loses its tense and takes an infinitival form. Chomsky (1981) accepts only S - Raising and views in O - Raising , the entire infinitival clause as the object of the main clause - hence no movement, Oriya shows obligatory NP movement in case of S - raising.

15. Ram Ravan ku maribaku chahuchi

Ram Ravan to kill wants

Ram wants to kill Ravan.

16.*[Ram Chahuchi] Ravan mōru

Ram wants Ravan die

(15) is derived from (16) which is an ungrammatical sentence as a surface structure, In (15), subject of the embedded clause i.e., 'Ravan' becomes the object of the main clause. The attachment of 'Ku' i.e. the accusative marker to the object 'Ravan', justifies the claim that the embedded subject has been raised and moved.

Now considering the second point, let us now see whether the NP movement is in accordance with the case theory and θ theory.

2.1 Case theory :- The case theory in GB framework entails that

a - Every lexically headed NP must receive a case from a case assigner.

b - Case assigner governs the NP to which it assigns case.

c - The NP retains its case throughout

d - Case is assigned at the level of S. structure

Case is assigned to NPs in particular syntactic environments. For example, the D.O gets case from Vb. The I.O from the preposition or post position that governs it. The subject of a tensed clause gets nominative case by inflection (INFL). The tense morpheme has been identified as the case assigner for nominative case, Subject of a tenseless clause does not receive any case.

17.* Δ Bōhi Padhila

book read

Δ read book

18. Bōhi padha hela.

The book read was

'The book was read'

As the subj position in (17) is empty, it does not receive any case. Hence 'Bōhi' is obligatorily passivized where it receives case as in (18).

In

19. Ram Ravanku maribaku chahuchi

Ram Ravan to kill wants.

- (due to) Ram wants to kill Ravan.

20) Ram Ravan ku maribaku chahuchi

Here 'Ram' being the subject of the tensed clause receives nominative case & 'Ravan' get the accusative case by post position Ku.

The above examples show that NP movement in Oriya does not violate case theory.

- 2.2 θ - theory :- The projection principle says that the θ criterion holds at D - structure, S - structure and L.F. It also prohibits the movement of an argument from a non-theta to a theta position, in which case the θ role will be different at S - structure and D - structure. There is no such examples in Oriya which violates the principle.

- 3.0 Constraints and Conditions on Movement :- The NP movement in Oriya obeys the various conditions and constraints posited by Chomsky.

The most relevant conditions are

- i - Nominative Island Condition
- ii - Specified Subject Condition
- iii - Subjacency Condition.

- 3.1 Nominative Island Condition (NIC) :- As per this condition any anaphoric dependency originating in a position with nominative case as in the subject of a tensed clause be resolved before the next S boundary prohibiting the nominative terms from being anaphoric.

20. Ram dekhila [je [Sita ta ghərṛḍku
Ram saw that Sita his house to
jauchi]]
go - cont. pst
'Ram saw that Sita was going to his house'

21. Ram Sita ku [t1 ta ghərṛḍku
Ram Sita to his house
jiba] dekhila
go-inf saw
Ram saw sita going to his house.
22.* Ram Sita Ku [ta ghərṛḍ ku jauchi]
Ram Sita to his house to going was

comparing (20) with (21) we find that 'Sita' in (20) with nominative case is raised to obj position in (21) and receives accusative case and embedded sentence becomes infinitive form. As anaphora can not be free in $\bar{S}$ (i.e. it can not be in the subj position of a tensed sentence where it can be assigned a nominative case). Sentence (22) becomes ungrammatical. This confirms that Oriya is in accordance with this condition.

- 3.2 Specified subject Cond:-(SSC) This condition says that no rule can move a non subject constituent not in COMP out of a clause ($\bar{S}$) or an NP with a specified subject.

2.3 E kətha sətə [je[Ram' ghərṛḍku jibə]]

this news true that Ram home to will go.

'It is true that Ram will go home'

24.*ghōrō ku E Kōtha sōtō [Comp je [Ram - jibō]
home to this news true that Ram - go

25. [Ramōrō ghōrō jibā] kōtha sōtō

Ram's home going news true

'Rams's going home is true'

The ungrammaticality of (24) is due to violation, of SSC. In (25) 'Ram' takes genitive case and the whole embedded sentence is raised to the subj position of the main clause and hence does not violate SSC.

The Oriya examples obeys SSC.

3.3 Subjacency Condition(SC) :- this requires that no constituent can move across more than one bounding node in any single rule application.

26. Mū janithili [je [se pila [jie

I knew that that boy who

ethi pōdhuchi]] aji asibō

here is studying today will come

I knew that the boy who is studying here will come today.

27. Mū janithili [je se pila aji asibō

I knew that that boy today will come

[jie ethi pōdhu chi]

who here is studying

28.*jie mū jani thili je [se pila [- ethi

podhuchi]] aji asibō

The ungrammaticality of (28) is because the NP jie crosses two bounding node S2 and NP - violating the subjacency condition.

4. Conclusion :- NP movement is significant in Oriya and confirms to the various constraints as well as to the case theory and θ theory.

REFERENCE

- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. "Conditions on Transformation" in S.R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky (eds.), 1973. A Festschrift for Morris Halle 236-286. (Reprinted in Chomsky, 1977)
- 1976 "Conditions on Rules of Grammar". Linguistic Analysis. Vol.2, 303-351. (Reprinted in Chomsky, 1977)
- 1981 Lectures on Government and Binding. Dordrecht: Foris.
- 1982 Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 6. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Freidin, Robert. 1975 "The Analysis of Passives". Language, Vol.51 384-405
- K.Rangan. 1978 "Grammatical Relations and Passivization : Tamil Case". Dravidian syntax (Seminar proceedings). 1981. Annamalai Univ., Annamalai Nagar - 608002.
- Kachru, Yamuna 1980 Aspects of Hindi Grammar. New Delhi : Manohar Publications.
- New Meyer Cambridge Survey.
- Radford, Andrew 1988 Transformational Grammar. Cambridge Univ. Press
- Riemsdijk, Henkavan and Edwin Williams 1986 Introduction to the Theory of Grammar. Cambridge, MA : MIT Press
- Sinha, Anjani K. 1987 (MSS) "The Interaction of Case theory and Theta theory in GB".
- S. Sivakumar 1978 "Noun Complementation in Tamil". Dravidian Linguistics (Seminar Proceedings), 1981. Annamalai Univ., Annamalai Nagar - 608002.
- Steever, Sanford B 1978 "The Pragmatic Exploitation of Raising to Object position in Tamil". Dravidian Syntax (Seminar Proceedings), 1981. Annamalai Univ., Annamalai Nagar - 608002.