



**Analysis:** Our corpus investigation thus provides evidence for two distinct constructions which both linearise as SOV: a high preverbal object construction (SOAdvV) and a low preverbal object (SAdvOV). The positions are further stratified semantically: salient and indefinite objects occur principally below *low* (e.g. manner and temporal) adverbials, whereas given/specific objects occur above them and optionally in an even higher position (Cinque 1999, Ernst 2002/2020, Biskup 2011). Crucially, this is only the case for Ukrainian; comparing our results to S&M’s (2022) shows that Russian does not allow non-salient NP preverbal objects. We take this to suggest that only Ukrainian has Object Shift – movement to a high position – which optionally alternates with prosodic recontouring in-situ (Antonyuk-Yudina and Mykhaylyk 2013).

The existence of salient objects in both languages begs a more concrete characterization. Prior work (on Russian) has noted that they are the most ‘accessible’ constituents in a sentence (Slioussar 2007) and that they elicit comparison with more probable alternatives (Titov 2020). We propose that this intuition can be unified through the notion of *mirative* focus: the salient object expresses unexpectedness relative to other discourse-salient alternatives. Note that salient objects are degraded if the resulting predicate is presupposed or probable under the interlocutors’ prior world knowledge:

- (3)a. Ja segodnja *uroki* sdelal!  
I today homework did  
‘I did my homework today!’  
(*Felicitous only if the speaker does not typically do their homework / see their father*)
- b. Ja zavtra *moego papu* uvižu.  
I tomorrow my.ACC dad.ACC see.FUT  
‘I will see my dad tomorrow.’ (RU)

- (4) Q: Čem ty včera *zanimalsja*?  
what you yesterday were.busy.with  
‘What were you up to yesterday?’
- A: (# Kak vseгда,) ja včera v *šaxmaty* igral.  
as always I yesterday in chess played  
‘(#As usual), I played chess yesterday.’ (RU)

Crucially, we find that the mirative interpretation is unavailable in the base position: the object must move to its low preverbal position in both Russian and Ukrainian to be interpreted as mirative focus. Furthermore, the fronted object receives a distinct prosodic contour which renders it the most accentually salient constituent in the clause. The unexpectedness interpretation is maintained in interrogative contexts (5) and cannot be directly challenged by an interlocutor (6), a crosslinguistic feature of miratives as not-at-issue content (Rett and Murray 2013, Cruschina et al. 2016).

- (5)a. Ty *kavu* budeš?  
you coffee.ACC be.FUT  
‘Will you have coffee?’  
(*Felicitous if listener doesn’t usually have coffee, or not expecting to be offered a drink.*)
- b. Ty budeš *kavu*?  
you be.FUT coffee  
‘Will you have coffee?’ (UA)  
(*Degraded if addressee is known to rarely drink coffee, or if the offer is unexpected*)

- (6) A: Ja segodnja *prezidenta* uvidel!  
I today president.ACC saw  
‘I saw the president today!’
- B: #Net, èto sovsem ne udivitel’no.  
no this completely not surprising  
‘No, that’s completely unsurprising.’ (RU)

Drawing on recent work by Cruschina (2021) and Bianchi et al. (2016) on similar mirative constructions across Romance, we analyse salient objects as an instantiation of contrastive focus coupled with a mirative conventional implicature (Potts 2005). Specifically, the focused constituent moves to a low preverbal position (assumed to be Spec,vP based on adverb distribution). A mirative feature is optionally inserted at the vP phase edge, encoding the relevant ordering of alternatives and prosodic realisation (cf. López 2009). Crucially, such insertion is unavailable for in-situ objects or objects which ultimately move higher (Object Shift), correctly blocking the mirative interpretation in both of these contexts.

**Conclusion:** This study has provided evidence for both similarity and differences in the possible derivations of preverbal objects in Russian and Ukrainian, and crucially evidence for distinguishing at least two distinct derivations within one language (Ukrainian). We reinforce prior arguments for Object Shift in Ukrainian and provide novel evidence for syntactic mirativity in East Slavic.

**References:** Antonyuk-Yudina, S., & Mykhaylyk, R. (2013). Prosody of scrambling. In *Proceedings of NELS* (Vol. 40, pp. 31-44). Antonyuk, S., & Mykhaylyk, R. (2022). Scope freezing and object shift in Ukrainian: Does Superiority matter? *Syntax*, 25(1), 122-146. Biskup, P. (2011). Adverbials and the phase model. *John Benjamins B.V.* Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., & Cruschina, S. (2016). Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 9, 3-1. Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press. Cruschina, S. (2021). The greater the contrast, the greater the potential: On the effects of focus in syntax. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 6(1). Ernst, T. (2002). *The syntax of adjuncts* (Vol. 96). Cambridge University Press. Ernst, T. (2020). The syntax of adverbials. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 6(1), 89-109. López, L. (2014). *A derivational syntax for information structure* (Vol. 23). Oxford University Press, USA. Mykhaylyk, R. (2011). Middle object scrambling. *Journal of Slavic linguistics*, 19(2), 231-272. Potts, C. (2005). *The logic of conventional implicatures* (Vol. 7). OUP Oxford. Rett, J., & Murray, S. (2013). A semantic account of mirative evidentials. In *Semantics and linguistic theory* (pp. 453-472). Qi, P., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., Bolton, J., & Manning, C. D. (2020). Stanza: A Python natural language processing toolkit for many human languages. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: system demonstrations* (pp. 101-108). Slioussar, N. (2007). *Grammar and information structure. A study with reference to Russian*. LOT. Titov, E. (2020). Optionality of movement. *Syntax*, 23(4), 347-374.