Asymmetric Syndetic Conjunction of Ukrainian Relative

Clauses: Implications for the Theory of Coordination.

John A. Barnstead, Dalhousie University

Several Indo-European languages allow a relative
clause to be conjoined with a second clause in which a
personal pronoun is coreferential with the head of the
relative clause.[1] In Ukrainian, however, this phenomenon,
exemplified by the sentence

(1) "Ce, -- nu, pravdu skazaty, -- Antosyni čerevyky,

    z <u>jakyx</u> vona davno vyrosla j davno <u>jix</u> ne nosyt'."

                (Dokija Humenna, <u>Dity čumac'koho šljaxu</u>)

"These, to tell the truth, are Antosja's shoes, which

she outgrew long ago and which she hasn't worn for a

long time." (Note that a more literal translation is

ungrammatical: *"These, to tell the truth, are Antosja's

shoes, <u>which</u> she outgrew long ago and hasn't worn <u>them</u>

for a long time.")

has not been analyzed or indeed noticed, nor have the
restrictions on such conjoinability ever been systema-
tically described or motivated for any language.

The analogous constructions in English are often
at best only marginally acceptable, as is evidenced in
the translation of the Ukrainian, or by the following

examples:

(2) "There are things, however, $\emptyset$ one can do and live

on with the thought of them."

(Mary Renault, The Mask of Apollo)

(3) "The passages in between must be reduced to sutures

of sense, logical bridges of the simplest design,

brief expositions and explanations, which the reader

will probably skip but must know they exist in order

not to feel cheated (a mentality stemming from the

routine of "true" fairy tales in childhood)."

(Vladimir Nabokov, "On a Book Entitled Lolita")

Jesperson 1928 terms these constructions "exhausted relative

clauses" and characterizes them as follows: "Not infrequently

a relative clause, which has been begun in the ordinary way,

is continued irregularly as if the power of the relative

were exhausted, a personal pronoun being substituted for

it" (p. 107). This intuitive analysis of the second conjunct

as a relative clause in which the relativizer has been re-

placed by a personal pronoun is, at least on the surface,

a very attractive solution. It preserves the Coordinate

Constituent Constraint proposed by Schachter 1977 ("The con-

stituents of a coordinate construction must belong to the

same syntactic category and have the same semantic function"),

and it fits in with current analyses of the structure of rela-

tivizers. However, several syntactic phenomena in Ukrainian

cast doubt on this "replacement hypothesis", forcing its refinement.

In Ukrainian a relative clause may be introduced by the words <u>jakyj</u>, <u>kotryj</u>, or <u>ščo</u>. <u>Jakyj</u> and <u>kotryj</u> contain morphological markers of gender, number (identical with the gender and number of the head of the relative clause) and case (which is determined by the relativizer's syntactic role within the relative clause and may differ from that of the head):

(4) Ja baču ljudynu, jaka napysala cju knyžku.

(5) Ja baču ljudynu, kotra napysala cju knyžku.
    "I see [the] person [f. sg. acc.] who [f. sg. nom.] wrote this book."

<u>Ščo</u> does not contain such morphological markers, and is used by itself only in the nominative and prepositionless inanimate accusative. In other cases <u>ščo</u> must be combined with a third person pronoun which agrees in gender and number with the head and acquires its case from the role it plays in the subordinate clause:

(6) Ja baču ljudynu, ščo napysala cju knyžku.
    "I see the person who wrote this book."

(7) Os' knyžka, ščo vin meni dav.
    "Here [is the] book [f. sg. nom. inan.] which he to-me gave."

(8) Os' knyžka, ščo pro neji my hovorymo.

"Here [is the] book which about it [f. sg. acc.] we

are-speaking."

All three relativizers are identical in morphological shape

with question words: jakyj? "which? (out of an indefinite

set)", kotryj? "which? (out of a limited set)" and ščo?

"what?". In addition, ščo has the same shape as the ščo

which introduces sentence-relatives (and which differs from

the relativizer ščo in that it is declinable and may be pre-

ceded by a preposition) and the ščo complementizer introducing

reported speech, while jakyj contains the morpheme jak, used

in the question word jak? "how?" and as a complementizer intro-

ducing reported action after certain verbs of perception.

The gender-number-case markers bear a strong resemblance to

declined forms of the third person pronoun.

On the basis of analogous morphological similarities and

of work on complementation done by Joan Bresnan (Bresnan 1972),

Chvany 1973 suggests that in Russian K-words[2] are composed

of the complementizing morpheme K (=WH) plus a pronominal ele-

ment, and may be "spelled out" from a combination of K plus a

bundle of pronominal features simultaneously with inflectional

morphemes. If we adopt this scheme in Ukrainian, sentences like

(1) may be derived from underlying structures containing con-

joined relative clauses, with the complementizing morpheme in

the second conjunct deleted under indentity by an EQUI-type
rule.

There are two factors which place the replacement hypothesis
just outlined in doubt. The first is a difficulty arising from
the position of the pronoun within the second adjunct: for example
if the pronoun in (1) were derived from jakyx by the deletion of
jak-, the underlying sentence would have the form

(9) *"Ce, -- nu, pravdu skazaty, -- Antosyni čerevyky, z jakyx

    vona davno vyrosla j davno jakyx ne nosyt'."

which would be ungrammatical due to the positioning of the adverb
davno in front of the relativizer. Relativizers in Ukrainian
may be preceded by prepositions, by noun phrases (if the rela-
tivizer is in the genitive) or by certain preposed infinitives
(highly restricted), whereas limitations on the positioning of
the pronoun are less severe. However, it may be that word order
in Ukrainian is determined relatively late in the chain of deri-
vation, after deletion of the complementizing element. It is
quite likely that the presence of the complementizing element
restricts positioning of the pronoun, as is evidenced by rela-
tive clauses introduced by ščo plus a form of the third person
pronoun, in which movement of the pronoun from the position di-
rectly following ščo produces changes in the focus of the sub-
ordinate cluase.[3]

The second objection to the replacement analysis is due
to a restriction on the placement of the conjuncts with respect
to the main clause of the sentence. In Ukrainian the conjoined
clauses must occur after the main clause in order to be acceptable;
interpositioning renders the sentence ungrammatical. Thus, al-
though the sentence

(10) Vin mov dytyna, <u>jaka</u> ščojno navčylasja xodyty j <u>jij</u>
      xočet'sja teper xodyty dosxoču.
      "He is like a child who has just learned to walk and
      who now wants to walk to his heart's content."

is grammatical, the sentence

(11) *Dytyna, jaka ščojno navčylasja xodyty j jij xočet'sja
      teper xodyty dosxoču, snidaje v cij kimnati.
      "The child who has just learned to walk and who now
      wants to walk to his heart's content has breakfast
      in this room."

is not. This restriction seems to hold true to some extent
in English as well, where speakers who accept (2) will often
reject

(12) The things one can do and live on with the thought of
      them paralyze the will.

No such restriction exists for conjoined clauses in which both

conjuncts contain a relativizer. This would suggest the presence of a boundary of some sort (perhaps the sentence boundary # ?) in sentences like (1), which boundary is not present in conjoined relatives. This, however, may be accounted for by making a slight modification in a proposal put forth in Chomsky 1965.

Chomsky suggests the generation of restrictive[4] relative clauses in the base by a phrase structure rule

$$NP_1 \rightarrow NP_2 \; \overgroup{S}$$

This rule is blocked from generating sentences in which the embedded sentence does not contain an NP coreferential with NP_2 by a filter which eliminates from the output of the grammar all sentences containing an internal sentence boundary. Part of the relativization rule in this scheme is the erasure of sentence boundaries during relativization of the embedded S. Sentences in which the embedded S contains no NP coreferential with an NP in the matrix S do not undergo relativization; thus the internal sentence boundaries are not erased and such sentences are eliminated from the output by the filter.

If elimination of the sentence boundaries is contingent not on application of the relativization rule but upon the presence of an overt complementizing element within the embedded S, sentences like (1) and (10), and the ungrammaticality of (11) are predictable on the basis of the universal constraint against the presence of internal sentence boundaries.

Other restrictions on conjoining relative clauses with clauses containing a third person pronoun coreferential with the head of the relative clause suggest that Schachter's Coordinate Constituent Constraint, while it may be a necessary condition for conjoining, is not a sufficient one. Consider the following sentences:

(13) "Čy bula koly-nebud' potreba zaminyty slovo čužynec' [...]
slovom inozemec', <u>jake</u> je kalkoju rosijs'koho slova
inostranec, i <u>joho</u> vže vyključno vžyvaje Žluktenko v
svojij hramatyci?"

               (Jurij Perfec'kyj, "Movne vzajemozbahačennja
               čy rusyfikacija ukrajins'koji movy?")

"Was there ever a need to replace the word čužynec'
[a native Ukrainian formation meaning "foreigner"]
with the word inozemec', which is a calque on the
Russian word inostranec and which Žluktenko already
uses exclusively in his grammar?"

(14) *Treba zaminyty slovo čužynec' slovom inozemec', <u>jake</u>
je kalkoju rosijs'koho slova inostranec i z <u>nym</u> Žluk-
tenko ne xoče maty spravu.

"One must replace the word čužynec'with the word inozemec',
which is a calque on the Russian word inostranec and
which Žluktenko doesn't want anything to do with."

(15)   *Treba zaminyty slovo čužynec' slovom inozemec', pro

      jake [or: ščo pro njoho] pyše Žluktenko v svojij hra-

      matyci i vono je kalkoju rosijs'koho slova inostranec.

      "One must replace the word cuzynec' with the word inozemec',

      about which Žluktenko writes in his grammar and which

      is a calque on the Russian word inostranec."

Sentences (14) and (15) can be made grammatical by substituting
an appropriate relativizer for the third person pronoun in the
second conjunct. Nothing in their form or content violates
Schachter's Coordinate Constituent Constraint, and yet both of
them are unacceptable as they stand.

There appear to be a number of factors involved in deter-
mining whether a given sentence containing a conjoined structure
of the type under investigation will be grammatically acceptable.
In (14) the main reason for unacceptability is the instrumental
case of the pronoun in the second conjunct. Jakobson has shown
that the instrumental case is the most peripheral case from a
semantic point of view. It seems also to be the case least
susceptible to deletion of the complementizing element. In
(15) the nominative case of the pronoun seems to signal the
beginning of a new sentence: although all my informants have
rejected it as a unified sentence, several of them were willing
to accept it if the second conjunct were given parenthetical in-
tonation, or if a pause were made before beginning the second
conjunct.

Native speakers tend to disagree more about the acceptability of sentences the further we descend in Jakobson's case hierarchy. Sentences like (15) suggest that perceptual strategies may also play a role in determining possible conjoinings. It is time to begin developing a theory of inter- (as opposed to intra-) sentence coordination.[5]

NOTES

1. Examples of the type of construction considered in this paper are provided: for Modern English, Jesperson 1928 (p. 107-8); for Modern German, Paul 1920 (p. 212-16) and Curme 1955 (p. 565); for Latin, Hofmann 1964 (§305c). Dr. Pierre Gérin has pointed out to me (personal communication) that it is found in Old French and in Greek as well.

2. K-words are the Russian equivalent of English WH-words. The term is less appropriate in Ukrainian, since the morpheme jak- (corresponding to Russian kak-) does not contain the K element, although ščo and kotryj do.

3. For details see Barnstead (to appear). Similar focus phenomena are discussed in Chvany 1973.

4. Ukrainian does not distinguish restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses consistently. The distinction is discourse-conditioned, and different sources for the two types should not be posited. Details in Barnstead 1977 and (to appear).

5. I would like to thank Richard Brecht and Pierre Gérin
    for helpful information and suggestions in the preparation
    of this paper. Naturally I bear responsibility for the
    conclusions drawn. Thanks are also due my native informants,
    in particular Irina Belodedova and Martha Pryshlak, for
    service above and beyond the call of duty.

REFERENCES

BARNSTEAD, JOHN A. 1977. Review of I. K. Bilodid (ed.)
    Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova. Tom III:
    Syntaksys. Recenzija 7.2.

----------------- (to appear). Aspects of Relativization
    in Contemporary Standard Ukrainian. Harvard Doctoral
    Dissertation.

BRESNAN, JOAN W. 1972. On Complementizers: Toward a Syntactic
    Theory of Complement Types. Foundations of Language 297-321.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.
    Cambridge: MIT Press.

CHVANY, CATHERINE V. 1973. Notes on "Root" and "Structure-
    Preserving" in Russian. You Take the High Node and I'll
    Take the Low Node 252-290.

CURME, G. O. 1955. A Grammar of the German Language.
    New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.

HOFMANN, J. B. and A. SZANTYR. 1964. Lateinische Syntax und
    Stilistik. Munich: C. H. Beck.

JACKENDOFF, RAY S. 1972. Semantic Interpretation in Generative
    Grammar. Cambridge: MIT Press.

JAKOBSON, ROMAN. 1962. Morfologičeskie nabljudenija nad
    slavjanskim skloneniem. Selected Writings II. 154-183.

JESPERSON, OTTO. 1928. A Modern English Grammar. Volume III.
    London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

KEENAN, EDWARD L. and BERNARD COMRIE. 1977. Noun Phrase
    Accessibility and Universal Grammar. Linguistic
    Inquiry 8.1.63-99.

PAUL, HERMANN. 1920. Deutsche Grammatik, Band IV, Teil IV:
    Syntax (Zweite Halfte). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

SCHACHTER, PAUL. 1977. Constraints on Coordination.
    Language 53.1:86-103.