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NP Movement in Oriya

0.1 The 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, Extrapolation, 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 mūla.
   Ram by Ravan was killed.
   Ravan was killed by Ram.
5. Ravan Ram dwara mūla.
   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 pāḍha hela.
   The book read was.
   "The book was read".
8.* bōhi pāḍhila.
   '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 pāḍhilla
   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 :— Extraposition involves the movement of an embedded clause to the end of the immediatley superordinate clause

13.*[Ram murkhī āte] laguchi
   Ram fool is seems
14. Laguchi je Ram Murkhī āte
    It seems that Ram fool is.
    'It seems that Ram is a fool'

The ungrammaticality 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 chah'uchi
   Ram Ravan to kill wants
   Ram wants to kill Ravan.

16.*[ Ram Chahuchi ] Ravan m'oru
   Ram wants Ravan die

(15) is derived from (16) which is an ungrammatical sentence as a surface struture, 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 \( \theta \) 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 enviroments. 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.*A Bõhi Padhila
   book read
   A read book

18. Bõhi 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 'Bõhi' is obligatorily passivized where it receives case as in (18).

19. Ram Ravanku maribaku chah'uchi
   Ram Ravan to kill wants.
   Ram wants to kill Ravan.
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 - struture and D - struture. 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 the next s boundry prohibiting the nominative terms from being anaphoric.

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

21. Ram Sita ku [tī ta ghārāku
Ram Sita to his house
jiba ] dekhila
  go-inf saw
Ram saw sita going to his house.

22.*Ram Sita ku [ ta ghārā 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 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 (S) or an NP with a specified subject.

2.3 E kōtha sēto [je[Ram' ghārāku jibā]]
this news true that Ram home to will go.
'It is true that Ram will go home'
24. *ghörd̄ ku E Kōtha söt̄ [Comp je [Ram - jib̄ ]
   home to this news true that Ram - go
25. [Ramārd̄ ghörd̄ jiba] kōtha söt̄
   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 asib̄
   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 asib̄
   I knew that that boy today will come
   [jie ethi pōdhuchi chi]
   who here is studying
   28.* jie mū jani thili je [se pila [ - ethi
   podhuchi ]] aji asib̄
   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.
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