CHAPTER 2

INNER DERIVED OBJECTS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I start to argue for an articulated VP structure by investigating the position of derived objects. While syntacticians generally agree that there is a derived object position, there is less agreement on the details of the landing site. My aim is to show that there is a position within the VP, below the merged position of the external argument, to which movement of a maximal projection is possible. Generally this is a position to which objects move, but in special circumstances we will see that elements other than canonical objects will appear in this position. The common denominator between objects and these other elements will be that both will appear in this position through A-movement.

---

1 The claims that (i) there is a projection, Aspect, within the VP and (ii) this is the position to which derived objects move were both made in a paper I presented at NELS XXIII at the University of Delaware in (1991). This chapter is basically an expansion of the first part of that paper. The idea for a derived (case-related) object position within the VP was an idea that sprang up in several places around the same time for example, Koizumi (1993) and Sportiche (1990). These two works are presented briefly later in the chapter.

2 As will become obvious, this articulated VP structure has much in common with Chomsky’s ‘little’ vP structure (Chomsky 1995: Chapter 4), Hale and Keyser’s L-syntax structure (Hale and Keyser 1993, 2002), and the work of others such as Arad 1998, Harley 1995, Pylkkänen 2002, Rackowski 2002. Because the translation from one system to another is not trivial, I use my own labels of $V_1$ and $V_2$ instead of $v$ and $V$.

3 In Chapter 7 I will discuss some very particular cases where a theta-role may be assigned to the SPEC of this category.
2.2 BACKGROUND

The status of derived objects has a very rocky history as syntactic theory developed through the Principle and Parameters theory towards the Minimalist Program. Often characterized by Raising to Object constructions such as the one given in (19) below, movement to object position was for many years ruled out by the Projection Principle and the Theta Criterion.

(19)  
   a. Mary believes the children to be lying.
   b. Mary believes [the children]ₐ [IP t₁ to be lying]

Within the context of the Principle and Parameters Theory, the problem with the derivation given in (19) was that movement appears to have occurred to a complement position. A position that is a complement to the verb, however, can be created at D-structure only through theta-assignment. If this is a theta-position, however, it is not a possible landing site for movement since the chain would contain two theta-positions violating the Theta-Criterion.⁴ Further, the position cannot be created between D-structure and S-structure since this would involve changing the complement relations of the head, a violation of the Projection Principle, which ensured that every syntactic level encodes the same lexical relations. The Theta-Criterion and the Projection Principle together, then, forced an analysis of these constructions that did not involve movement of the embedded subject to the matrix object position, but rather the exceptional case assignment of accusative case by the matrix verb to the embedded subject (see, for example, Chomsky 1981: 68ff.).

The principled unavailability of a movement analysis for such constructions, however, runs into empirical problems. One such problem comes from languages where the positioning of the embedded subject in structures such as (19) is not ambiguous between the embedded subject position and the matrix object position, as it is in the English example. Such a language is Malagasy, a Western Austronesian language

---

⁴ Some work (e.g. Pesetsky 1995 and Hornstein 1999) posits movement that violates the Theta-Criterion but generally the observation that movement into a theta-position is ruled out still holds.
spoken in Madagascar. Malagasy is a VOS language, which allows us to see the difference in position between the embedded subject and the matrix object as the example below shows.

(20) **MALAGASY**

a. Nanantena Rakoto [ _fa nianatra tsara ny ankizy_]  
PST.AT.hope Rakoto COMP PST.AT.study good the children  
‘Rakoto hoped that the children studied well.’

b. Nanantena an’ _ny ankizy_[ _ho nianatra tsara t1_] Rakoto  
PST.AT.hope ACC ’the children COMP PST.AT.study good Rakoto  
‘Rakoto hoped that the children studied well.’

In (20a) we see a non-raising construction where the embedded clause (italicized in the example) appears in an extraposed position to the right of the matrix subject (giving a V-S-CP order in the matrix clause). In (20b), the raised structure, the embedded clause remains in the normal object position between the verb and the subject. The subject of the embedded clause (given in bold), however, appears at the beginning of the embedded clause giving an SVO order within that clause.

Malagasy, then, appears to be a language where movement from the embedded subject position to the matrix object position is clear. In fact, within the past fifteen years, derived objects have made their way back into the theory for empirical as well as conceptual reasons. Below I present four of the earlier proposals for derived objects. These four proposals have been chosen to represent different possible landing sites for derived objects. I conclude the section with Chomsky’s (1993) and (1995) influential view of derived objects.

---

5 In fact, there are arguments that objects raise in English using more subtle data from word order as well as binding facts. See e.g. Lasnik (2001). On the other side, there are accounts where the Malagasy word order shown is accounted for without raising to object (see e.g. Pearson 1996).
2.3 EARLY PROPOSALS

One of the main empirical reasons that object movement has come to be an accepted part of recent work in generative syntax is due to the work done on object shift in Scandinavian languages. Holmberg (1986) introduces data from Swedish and Icelandic which show that objects in these two languages may appear, under specific conditions, either to the left or to the right of negation and a subject-oriented floated quantifier. Typical examples from these two languages are given in (21) and (22) below.

(21) **SWEDISH** (Holmberg (1986: 165)\(^6\))

a. Varför läste studenterna *inte alla* v *den* ?
   
   why read the students not all it
   
   ‘Why didn’t all the students read it?’

b. Varför läste studenterna *den* \(_i\) *inte alla* v \(_i\)

(22) **ICELANDIC** (Holmberg (1986: 166)\(^7\))

a. Hvers vegna lasu stúdentarnir *ekki allir greinina*
   
   why read the students not all the article
   
   ‘Why didn’t all the students read the article?’

b. Hvers vegna lasu stúdentarnir *greinina ekki allir*

In Swedish the shifted object must be a pronominal while in Icelandic it may be a full DP. We return to examples of Scandinavian object shift, looking at the restrictions placed on it and comparing it to similar phenomena in other languages, but before doing this, I present four early proposals for object shift.

---

\(^6\) The v in these examples is meant to indicate where the finite verb originates.

\(^7\) This example is glossed as in the original. *Hver vegna* together means ‘why’. The translation was provided by A. Holmberg (p.c.).
2.3.1 Mahajan (1990)

Mahajan (1990) argues that, in certain constructions, Hindi allows objects to appear in a derived A-position. He assumes that this position is SPEC, AGRo in a tree such as the one proposed by Chomsky (1991) developing the ideas of Pollock (1989) and Belletti (1990). In most instances, A-movement of the object is triggered by Case, similar to A-movement of subjects. Mahajan argues that perfect participles in Hindi do not assign Case to their objects and therefore the objects in perfective constructions must move to SPEC, AGRo to receive structural Case in this position. To begin, we look at an example of the imperfective, which does assign Case to the object, in (23) below. Here the verbal forms show agreement with the masculine subject raam ‘Ram’.

(23) raam roTii khaataa thaa (Mahajan 1990: 76)
     Ram(M) bread(F) eat.IMP.M be.PST.M
     ‘Ram (habitually) ate bread.’

The perfective is given in (24a) and now we see that agreement is with the feminine object roTii ‘bread’. The relevant post-movement tree is given in (24b) (adapted from Mahajan 1990: 79).

(24) a. roTii raam ne khayii (Mahajan 1990: 79)
     bread(F) Ram(M) ERG eat.PERF.F
     ‘Ram ate bread.’
Since the perfect participle khayii does not assign Case, the object roTii must move to SPEC, AGR\textsubscript{O} to receive Case in this position. Agreement is an overt reflex of this movement. What is important to note in this structure is that the derived object position is outside of (excluded by) the VP. Further, it is clearly above the merged subject position. In this way, Mahajan’s account differs from the next three to be discussed.

2.3.2 Johnson (1991)

Johnson (1991) also assumes that there is an A-position which is a landing site for derived objects, but he believes this position to be SPEC, VP. He argues that it is this landing site which accounts for the alternation in English in directional particle constructions such as the one given below.

(25)  a. He looked up the number.
     b. He looked the number up.

The direct object, the number, may appear before or after the particle, a fact that Johnson takes to be an indication of a change in position of the direct object. In (25a) the direct object is in its base-generated position as complement of the V, and in (25b), it has moved to SPEC, VP. Since in (25b) the object is at the edge of the VP, the V looked must itself have moved out of the VP. As shown in (26), Johnson assumes, following Jaeggli
and Hyams (1988) and Pesetsky (1989), that there is a position for such verb movement, called $\mu$.\(^8\)

\[(26)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\mu' \\
\mu \\
V_j \\
look \\
\text{the reference} \\
V \\
NP_i \\
V' \\
\end{array}
\]

\[(27)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
VP^* \\
\text{External Argument} \\
V' \\
V^* \\
\text{Structural Case Position} \\
V^{**} \\
NP! \\
\end{array}
\]

Johnson makes no explicit mention concerning the merged subject position with respect to the landing site of the object. One could assume, however, that the subject originates higher since, within the trees in the paper, it is placed directly in the SPEC, TP.

2.3.3 Sportiche (1990/1998)

For a third account, we turn to Sportiche (1990/1998).\(^9\) Sportiche agrees with Johnson and Mahajan in that there are derived objects. He states explicitly, however, that the landing site of these objects is below the merged position of the external argument. The structure he proposes is given in (27) below.

---

\(^8\) This is a simplified version of Johnson's full account but sufficient for our needs. It is important to note here that overt movement of the object in English necessitates overt movement of the verb as well in order to arrive at the appropriate word order.

\(^9\) Sportiche (1998) is the published version of Sportiche (1990). The idea of a VP-internal $\text{AGR}_o$ is also contained in Koopman and Sportiche (1991).
In this case, a Larson (1988) type of layered VP is used. The object is generated as the complement of the lower V and moves to the Spec of the lower VP to be assigned Case. In a brief comment, Sportiche says that if there is an Agr which is the landing site for object movement, it is within the VP such as in the bracketed structure in (28) below (Sportiche 1998: 214).

(28) \[ \text{[Spec, IP] ... [NP* ... [ Agr VP ...} \]

(where NP* = base-generated external arg)

2.3.4 Koizumi (1993, 1995)

Koizumi (1995) (in a development of Koizumi (1993)) presents the Split VP hypothesis, where, as in Sportiche (1998), the landing site of the derived object is explicitly below the merged position of the external argument.\(^\text{10}\) The structure he proposes for a sentence such as ‘John opened the door’ is given in (29) below (where V\(^u\) and V\(^l\) refer to upper and lower V respectively).

\(^{10}\) Another early account using a type of split VP hypothesis is Lefebvre (1991). In an earlier version of the present work, I included her data from Haitian Creole as supporting evidence. Because of complications that are introduced by AGREE with no movement, however, the conclusions are less clear. I thank a reviewer for pointing this out.
I repeat one of his arguments for the Split VP hypothesis here.\(^{11}\) He shows that quantifier float is allowed from objects in examples such as the ones below where in the first case the object appears in a post-verbal position, and in the second case that object has moved to the subject position through passivization (Koizumi 1995:106).

(30) a. I gave the books all to John.
    b. The books were given all to John.

It is important to note that quantifier float from external arguments is not allowed in a post verbal position.

\(^{11}\) Koizumi gives other arguments for his structure that involve adverb placement, Minimal Link Condition, Participial agreement, and Chain Condition. I refer the reader to his work for more development of his ideas. Others since the early 90s have used this sort of structure. My aim here is simply to give an early account.
Koizumi’s argues first that the quantifier float in (30a) shows both that the object has moved to its derived position (to \(\text{Spec, Agr}_o\)) and that the verb has moved across it (to \(V^u\)). Neither of these movements, however, can have crossed the merged external subject position since they cannot cross the quantifier that floats from the external argument as shown in (31).\(^{12}\)

These four views agree on the following three things: (i) there is a derived object position, (ii) the landing site is lower than Tense, and (ii) it is somewhere near the edge of the VP. For Mahajan, the position is in the first Spec outside of the VP. For Johnson, it is the Spec position of the VP itself, and for Sportiche and Koizumi, it is a Spec position below the merged position of the external argument.

2.3.5 Chomsky (1993), (1995)

Chomsky (1993) presents not so much a new view of object movement but rather adopts the type of view that Mahajan (1990) presents. I include Chomsky’s structure here as it has become, for many linguists, the standard account of object movement. In this earlier work, as in Mahajan (1990) and Koizumi (1995), object shift is captured through DP movement to \(\text{Spec, Agr}_o\). In a revised structure, however, Chomsky (1995:349ff) does away with \(\text{Agr}\) heads since \(\text{Agr}\) heads, having no interpretable features, are seen to violate interface conditions. The newer version of object movement assumes that the object has moved to a (second) \(\text{Spec}\) position of \(v\) to check features on \(v\). The question that arises in the context of this structure is which \(\text{Spec}\) is the “outer \(\text{Spec}\)” — the one that is theta-related (the external argument) or the one that satisfies a feature of the head (the derived object). The two possible structures are shown in (32) below.

\(^{12}\) This argument alone might suffer if Boskovic’s (2004) proposal that floated quantifiers cannot be found in theta-positions is correct. However, Koizumi provides other evidence as well.
In fact, Chomsky (1995: 358-9) entertains both possible orders of the Specs. Either one could be argued for and it largely depends on one’s view of when in a derivation a feature must be checked and whether or not there is “tucking in” (as in Richards 2001). For example, Rackowski (2002) in her account for the phrase structure of Tagalog argues that the derived object merges with vP first in order to check the EPP feature of v. The external argument merges later but tucks in. The resulting structure is (32a). The order in (32b) could just as easily be justified conceptually either in a view where theta-relations must be satisfied before features of a head. The external argument would merge first followed by a tucking in of the derived object. Alternately, one could assume that features must be satisfied first (as in Rackowski’s work) but that theta-relations do not involve tucking in.

In a way, these two views combine the views that we have just seen. Like Johnson’s account, the derived object has landed in a verbal specifier position. (32a) is similar to Mahajan’s account in that the derived object has moved beyond the external argument. (32b) is similar to Sportiche’s and Koizumi’s accounts in that the object has a landing site below the external argument. In the end, Chomsky chooses to follow up the order given in (32b) above as this is the order that would pose the clearest problem for a trivial notion of closeness and necessitates a re-evaluation of equidistance. The theoretical concerns here do not give a clear answer and empirical work is needed. With this in mind, I turn to more cross-linguistic evidence that there are two object positions.

2.4 TWO OBJECT POSITIONS

Above we have seen constructions in Malagasy, Swedish, Icelandic, Hindi, and English that are arguably derived through object movement. In this section, we extend the range of data and begin to gather details concerning the restrictions on object shift. The goal is
to argue that there are at least two possible object positions — the logical object position where the argument is first merged into the structure, and then a derived object position — and that the choice of position used can depend on a variety of factors. In the sections below, I divide the examples depending on whether only one object position is filled at a time (EITHER/OR), or there are two positions filled simultaneously (BOTH).

2.4.1 One object: EITHER/OR

In all of the cases we have seen so far, there has only been one object but it seems to have a choice of positions in which it can occur. Returning to our examples from Swedish and Icelandic, we note here that the choice of position has particular effects on information structure. While the relevant semantic distinction has been debated, Bobaljik (1995) argues, using the data from Icelandic and Dutch given below, that the distinction is one of new versus old information. The Icelandic example in (33) shows that, in terms of grammaticality, the specific definite object *Barriers* can appear either before or after the adverb. However, the position before the adverb is used for old information and the position after the adverb is used for new information.

(33) **ICELANDIC** (from Bobaljik 1995:127-128)

```
context: Does he know Barriers?
       (Barriers = old information)

a. Hann les Barriers alltaf
    he reads Barriers always
    ‘He is always reading Barriers.’

b.# Hann les alltaf Barriers
    he reads always Barriers
    ‘He is always reading Barriers.’
```
(34) context: Does he know Chomsky's work?

(Barriers = new information)

a. Hann les alltaf Barriers
   he reads always Barriers
   ‘He is always reading Barriers.’

b. Hann les Barriers alltaf
   he reads Barriers always
   ‘He is always reading Barriers.’

An example from Dutch shows that the object Marie, when preceding the adverbial phrase gisteren ‘yesterday’ is used to encode old information. However, as new information, as an answer to a question, for example, the same DP will follow the adverbial.

(35) DUTCH (from Bobaljik 1995:126)

a. dat Jan Marie gisteren gekust heeft
   that Jan Marie yesterday kissed has
   ‘that Jan kissed Marie yesterday’ [Marie = old information]

b. dat Jan gisteren Marie gekust heeft
   that Jan yesterday Marie kissed has
   ‘that Jan kissed Marie yesterday’
   [felicitous answer to: ‘Who did Jan kiss yesterday?’ = new information]

Objects in these languages, then, move to the left, over adverbial type material, and this movement is dependent on the information structure of the sentence.

Below we will see two more cases where objects appear in two different positions, and again, the position is dependent on fairly subtle interpretational differences. I add
these languages to the discussion partly because they are less frequently seen in the literature on object shift and partly because they will become important later.

2.4.1.1 Chinese
In Chinese, certain objects may appear either after the verb in which case they are bare, or before the verb in which case they are preceded by the particle BA.

(36) ta pian-le Lisi (Huang 1982:27)
    he cheat-ASP Lisi
    ‘He cheated Lisi.’

(37) ta ba Lisi pian-le
    he BA Lisi cheat-ASP
    ‘He cheated Lisi.’

While much has been written on BA constructions in Chinese, my purpose here is simply to show that it has been observed that there are two surface object positions — one of which is semantically restricted. A more detailed analysis will be given in section 2.5.1 of this chapter.

Cheng (1986) points out that the post-verbal and the pre-verbal positions are not both available for the objects of all verbs. As the examples in (38a) and (38b) below show, which argument appears in the preverbal BA position is determined by which argument is affected by the verb. In (38) we see an example similar to a spray/load locative alternation in English (see e.g. Rappaport and Levin 1988). If the NP hua ‘the flowers’ appears with BA, then the interpretation is that the flowers are affected. If the NP huaping ‘the vase’ appears with BA, then the vase is interpreted as affected (from Sybesma 1992: 120).14

13 ‘Chinese’ will refer to Mandarin throughout the book.
14 There is also a change in the verb from cha ‘stick’ to cha-man ‘stick-full’. This type of verb change will be important to the discussions in Chapter 4, section 4.5.2 and Chapter 8, section 8.2.1xx.
(38) a. wo ba hua cha zai huaping-li le
   I BA flower stick at vase-inside LE
   ‘I stuck the flowers into the vase.’

   b. wo ba huaping cha-man-le hua
   I BA vase stick-full-LE flower
   ‘I stuck the vase full of flowers.’

In (39) we see two verbs that do not take affected objects and in both cases, the BA construction is not possible (from Sybesma 1992: 120).15

(39) a. * wo ba ta ai-le
   I BA him love-LE
   intended: ‘I love him.’

   b. * ta ba wo tingjian-le
   he BA me hear-LE
   intended: ‘He heard me.’

Further, it appears that the difference in position has something to do with specificity (from Sybesma 1992:128, credited to H.Wang 1983).

(40) a. Li laoshi gai-le ji-gen zuoye
   Li teacher correct-LE few-M homework
   ‘Teacher Li has corrected a few pieces of homework.’

   b. Li laoshi ba ji-gen zuoye gai-le
   Li teacher BA few-M homework correct-LE
   ‘Teacher Li corrected the few pieces of homework.’
Chinese, then, like the Scandinavian languages, makes use of two different object positions. Here the determination of which position will be used seems to depend on the specificity of the DP as well as the aspectual class of the predicate.\textsuperscript{16}

2.4.1.2 Scots Gaelic

Scots Gaelic also presents evidence for two different object positions. Like the examples from Hindi that we have seen above, one of the factors determining the use of these object positions is the grammatical aspect of the predicate. Like the examples from Chinese, the aspectual class of the predicate is also relevant.

Ramchand (1997) shows that the direct object in Scots Gaelic appears in a different position and with a different case marking depending on the form of the verb.\textsuperscript{17} For example, in the past periphrastic form of the verb, the object appears in the genitive case following the verb (as in (41a)). If the verb is in the perfect periphrastic form, the direct object appears in what is called the direct case form, this time preceding the verb (Ramchand, 1997: 51-52).\textsuperscript{18}

(41) a. Bha Calum a’faicinn \textit{a’bhalaich} PAST PERIPHRASTIC
be-PAST Calum AG see-VN boy-GEN
‘Calum saw the boy.’

b. Bha Calum air \textit{am balach} (a) fhaicinn PERFECT PERIPHRASTIC
be-PAST Calum AIR the boy-DIR A see-VN
‘Calum had seen the boy.’

\textsuperscript{15} In section 2.5.4xx, I will suggest that the examples in (39) are out because the predicates are stative.
\textsuperscript{16} More will be said of the interaction of specificity and the aspectual class of the predicate in Chapter 5xx.
\textsuperscript{17} Others have worked on the issue of the varying position of the object in this and related languages and accounted for it via case-related object shift (e.g. Bobaljik and Carnie 1996, Guilfoyle 1993, Noonan 1992). Interesting in Bobaljik and Carnie’s work (p. 229) is that one of their arguments that subjects in Irish cannot be in situ is dependent on their assumption that the only position for a derived object is above the merged position of the external argument. ‘… if the object has raised overtly to the specifier position of AgrOP yet the subject still precedes the object, then the subject \textit{must} have raised past the object.’ Arguing in the opposite direction, Ramchand assumes that the subject is in situ and therefore the derived object position must be lower. Since McCloskey (1996) presents convincing arguments against having subject in situ in Irish, I choose not to assume that it is in situ.
\textsuperscript{18} The direct case is also what is used for nominative subjects.
As with the other languages discussed above, there are meaning shifts tied to position shifts. The connection is quite complex and will be discussed again in Chapter 5, section 5.1.2xx, and Chapter 8, section 8.4xx. I give an example here, however, to indicate the direction that the meaning shift takes. Unlike the examples given in (40) for Chinese, the distinction is not one of specificity in Scots Gaelic. Definite DPs can appear in genitive case as shown in (42a). There is an effect on the interpretation of the verb, however, as shown in the contrast between (42a) and (42b) (from Ramchand 1997, 83).

(42) a. Tha mi ag iarradh a'bhuill
   be.PRES I.DIR AG want.VN the ball.GEN
   ‘I want the ball.’

   b. Tha mi air am ball iarradh
   be.PRES I.DIR AIR the ball.DIR want.VN
   ‘I have asked for (and got) the ball.’

Ramchand argues that the object appears in two different syntactic positions and that the difference in structure accounts for the differences in word order and case realization. Further, while the two positions do not differ in terms of the specificity of the object, if the object appears in the higher position, the predicate must be dynamic.

There are, then, reasons to believe that there are at least two possible object positions. We have seen various examples where, sometimes restricted by semantic considerations such as specificity, affectedness, grammatical aspect and aspectual verb class and/or case considerations, different object positions can be utilized. In the next section, more controversially, I will argue that there are environments where two object positions may be filled simultaneously.

2.4.2 Two objects: BOTH

Baker (1988) discusses a wide range of applicative constructions in which an element other than the logical object is behaving like the object of the verb. An example of a
“dative” applicative construction is given below (taken from Baker 1988: 234, due to Chung 1976 — boldface added).

(43) **Bahasa Indonesia**

a. Saja mem- bawa surat itu kepada Ali
   I TRANS-bring letter the to Ali
   ‘I brought the letter to Ali.’

b. Saja mem- bawa- kan Ali surat itu
   I TRANS-bring- to Ali letter the
   ‘I brought Ali the letter.’

In Baker’s account, the dative preposition is incorporated into the verb. The DP *Ali* must appear adjacent to the V+P complex in order to be assigned case, and acts like the object of the verb. The logical object, *surat itu* ‘the letter’, is no longer adjacent to the verb and no longer acts like the direct object. Baker introduces what he calls Marantz’s Generalization (given below), which describes this effect.

(44) **Marantz’s Generalization** (Baker 1988: 246)

Whenever a verb appears with both extra morphology and an additional NP argument bearing some oblique thematic role, that additional NP argument will behave like the surface direct object of the complex verb.

Two ways in which we can see that the argument with the oblique thematic role has taken on the object properties are through (i) verbal agreement and (ii) passivization. Baker shows this for the benefactive applicative construction in Chichewa. In the examples below we see that when the verb appears with the applicative morphology, agreement can be triggered by the benefactive object (45b) but not the logical object (45c), and passivization will promote the benefactive object to the subject position (46b) but will not promote the logical object (46c).
INNER DERIVED OBJECTS

(45) a. Amayi a-ku-umb-ir-a mwana mtsuko  (Baker 1988: 247)
    woman SP-PRES-mold-for-ASP child waterpot
    ‘The woman is molding the waterpot for the child.’

b. Amayi a-ku-mu-umb-ir-u mtsuko mwana
    woman SP-PRES-OP-mold-for-ASP waterpot child
    ‘The woman is molding the waterpot for the child.’

c. * Amayi a-na-u-umb-ir-a mtsuko mwana
    woman SP-PAST-OP-mold-for-ASP child waterpot
    ‘The woman is molding the waterpot for the child.’

    hare SP-PAST-buy-for-ASP zebras shoes
    ‘The hare bought shoes for the zebras.’

b. Mbidzi zi-na-gul-idw-a nsapato (ndi kalulu)
    zebras SP-PAST-buy-for-PASS-ASP shoes (by hare)
    ‘The zebras were bought shoes by the hare.’

c. * Nsapato zi-na-gul-idw-a mbidzi (ndi kalulu)
    shoes SP-PAST-buy-for-PASS-ASP zebras (by hare)
    ‘The shoes were bought for the zebras by the hare.’

It is clear that the oblique DPs have taken on all of the grammatical properties of objects but the question is how does this happen? There are two obvious directions to take — base-generation and movement. I will pursue the second and propose, similar to Baker’s proposal for the applicative constructions above, that the object has moved over the

---

19 I have left this example as it is found in Baker (1988:247) even though it seems as if the translation should be in the past tense.
Applicatives, then, would be an example where both the logical object position and the derived object position are filled.

We have seen cases where the sole logical object of a predicate appears in two different positions and other cases where an oblique has taken on object properties leaving the logical object to behave as a secondary object. I claim that both of these types of construction are the result of A-movement of a DP to a derived object position parallel to A-movement of a DP to a derived subject position. While the question of whether the position of this DP are due to movement must be addressed, I first look more closely at the proposed surface position.

In many cases the position of the derived object is difficult to determine because there is no lexical material that the DP would move across. Looking at the tree proposed by Sportiche in (27) above, we can see that if movement takes the direct object out of the VP, it will move across the top V and the external argument, suggesting that such movement should be visible. However, in many languages, the external argument moves out of the VP to the Spec, TP (as in an active construction) or is realized as an oblique (as in a passive). Further, the V also moves out of the VP to some functional category in languages like French, and to μ in English according to Johnson’s account. Given this, it is actually very difficult to choose between the analyses given above. For this reason, I turn to other languages for more evidence concerning the details of the movement.21

## 2.5 Objects Within the VP

Below I present data from different constructions in various languages with the intent of showing that the derived object position is in a position within the VP, asymmetrically c-commanded by the logical subject position — Spec, VP. The basic structure that I will be arguing for is given in (47) below. I will be referring to the higher V as V₁ and the lower V as V₂. At this time, I label the projection that houses the derived object as a generic functional category, F.

---

20 I assume that the non-promoted logical object will be licensed (case-marked) in situ. This will be similar to non-promoted logical subjects in Western Malayo-Polynesian languages (see (61) below).
As we have just noted above, in most well-studied languages, it is difficult to determine whether an element is external to the VP on its left edge, or it is within the VP. The task here, then, is to find languages where either the Spec, V₁P or the V₁ positions are filled. The first argument for the positioning of the derived object position within the VP comes from the BA constructions in Chinese. Here I will be following Sybesma’s (1992) account where the *ba* morpheme appears as the head of the higher V projection. Since the derived object clearly follows this *ba*, it must appear in a position c-commanded by the top V. The second argument comes from a dialect of Swedish reported in Vinka (1999) where, as well as object shift of the type described by Holmberg (1986), there is also a lower object shift closer to the type seen in the English examples discussed by Johnson (1991). I will claim that the lower type of object shift, following Vinka’s own conclusions, occurs within the VP. Finally, I investigate a particular type of language labeled NOMINATIVE THIRD (N3) languages by Sells (1998). In these languages, there appears to be some sort of grammatical subject position below the position of the external argument. I argue that N3 languages are best accounted for through partial A-movement to the derived object position. All of these word order facts combined support the hypothesis that there is a derived XP position contained in the V₁P in a position asymmetrically c-commanded by V₁.

---

21 It is important to keep in mind here, as discussed in Chapter 1, evidence from other languages is being used to determine what is universal to language.
2.5.1 Chinese

One argument for the lower position of the derived object position comes from Sybesma’s work on Chinese (see Sybesma 1992) and his very careful study of the BA construction. Like Sportiche and Koizumi, Sybesma argues that the preverbal object has moved to a position within the VP. The structure he proposes for the Chinese sentences discussed above (repeated in (48) and (49) below) is given in (50) (see e.g. Sybesma 1992: 154). The object Lisi moves from NP3 to NP2. In constructions with no ba, the verb moves to the BA head. Where there is a ba, no verb movement occurs.22

(48) ta pian-le Lisi (Huang 1982:27)
    he cheat-ASP Lisi
    ‘He cheated Lisi.’

(49) ta ba Lisi pian-le
    he BA Lisi cheat-ASP
    ‘He cheated Lisi.’

22 Koizumi’s (1995) analysis of na constructions in Zarma, a Nilo-Saharan language, is very similar to Sybesma’s analysis of ba constructions in Chinese. Note that in fact, in these analyses, while the object is argued to move, the movement is obligatory. The preverbal vs. postverbal status of the object is determined not by whether there has been object movement but by whether there has been verb movement across the derived object. Arguments from Sybesma for object movement are given below. Given that this obligatory movement is string vacuous in the case of the non-ba construction, I will be assuming, contra Sybesma, that only in the ba-construction is the movement obligatory, accounting for the differences in the restricted interpretation of the ba-constructions. We have seen (and will discuss again) a similar case in Scots Gaelic where verb movement obscures the position of the derived object. When the verb does not move, however, we can see clearly the two object positions.
Sybesma’s arguments in favor of a movement analysis over a base-generation analysis will become crucial to my argumentation in the next section. What is of importance to the current discussion is the positioning of the ba morpheme in his tree. He claims that ba is a causative type morpheme (“The projection labeled BAP … should actually be labeled CAUSP”) which in my work I label V₁. One of his arguments for the causative nature of ba comes from causative like structures such as the one given below.

(51) zhei-jian shi ba Zhang San ku-lei-le (Sybesma 1992:154)
     this-M case BA Z.  cry-tired-LE
     ‘This thing got Zhang-san tired from crying.’

Sybesma (1992:159) argues that the grammatical subject in (51) gets its theta-role from the CAUS head ba. Again, in constructions that contain no ba, such as (52a) below, the same CAUS head has been generated, but this time it is filled by movement of the verb into this position as shown in (52b).

(52) a. zhei-jian shi ku-lei-le Zhang San (Sybesma 1992:155)
    this-M case cry-tired-LE Z.
    ‘This thing got Zhang-san tired from crying.’
Therefore, even in the non-BA construction, a similar phrase structure has been generated but the constituency is less clear because of the effects of verb movement. The result that is important here is that the nominal argument which follows ba is a derived object and it appears below the V₁ position.

2.5.2 Swedish

Now I turn to data from Swedish which, when added to object shift data from Swedish that we have already seen, shows that there is more than one type of object shift. We start again with Holmberg’s examples and what has come to be known as Holmberg’s Generalization. In the Scandinavian languages, object shift famously occurs only when the verb moves into the inflectional domain of the clause. As we can see in the examples below, where the verb has moved out of the vP, the object can also shift (see (53a,b)). In (54), however, we see that when the main verb läst ‘read’ has not moved, the object also cannot shift (from Holmberg 1986:165).

(53) a. Varför läste studenterna inte alla v den
   why read the students not all it
   ‘Why didn’t all the students read it?’

---


24 ExtP is Extent Phrase which is similar to Hoekstra’s (1992) small clause. See Sybesma (1992: 74ff) for details.

25 See Fox and Pesetsky (to appear) for a different way of accounting for these facts.
b. Varför läste studenterna den inte alle v e_i?

(54) a. Varför har stundenterna inte alla v läst den
   why have the students not all read it

   b. * Varför har stundenterna den inte alla v läst e_i?

Further, in embedded clauses, where again the verb also does not move into the inflectional domain, the object cannot shift.

(55) a. .... att studenterna inte alla läste den
   ... that the students not all read it

   b. * ... att studenterna den inte alla läste e_i

There are two reasons to believe that the object has shifted out of the VP into the inflectional domain. First, movement of the object is dependent on movement of the verb into the inflectional domain. Second, the object appears before sentential adverbs and floated quantifiers which are assumed to be at the left edge of the VP.

Other data from Swedish, however, support a view of VP-internal object movement that is different from the type of object shift we have just seen. Vinka (1999) discusses a phenomenon in Swedish where there is object movement across a particle.26 With a certain types of particles, a pronominal object may occur either to the right or to the left of the particle. This is shown in (56) below.27

26 Vinka is reporting on a northern dialect of Swedish and also the dialect of Swedish spoken in Finland. I am grateful for his input on these data.

27 The purpose of Vinka’s paper is to argue for a phrase structural distinction of two different types of particles in Swedish. My interest is only in the predicative type of particle since this is the one that allows both low object shift (across the particle) and high object shift.
(56) a. Jag stängde (den) av (den)
    I switched it off it
    ‘I switched it off’

b. Kalle sparkade (den) sönder (den)
    Kalle kicked it broken it
    ‘Kallen broke it, by kicking it.’

While the data above could be accounted for via the object shift we have seen in (53b), by changing the examples slightly, we can see that object shift across particles remains within the VP. In constructions parallel to those in (54) and (55) where the verb does not move out of the VP, we can see that object shift across a particle still occurs. However, while the object appears to the left of the particle, it still appears to the right of the verb and negation making this sort of object shift different from the type shown in (53b). Example (57) shows a case where an auxiliary verb blocks movement of the verb into the inflectional domain and (58) shows an embedded clause where the verb does not move into the inflectional domain. In both cases, however, the pronoun may still appear to the left of the particle.

(57) Jag har inte stängt den av
    I have not switched it off

(58) Kalle tror att jag inte stängde den av
    Kalle thinks that I not switch it off
    ‘Kalle thinks that I didn’t switch it off.’

The data from Swedish show clearly that pronominal objects may move but there are two types of movement, one that occurs within the VP and one that occurs, perhaps, across the VP boundary.
2.5.3 Nominative third (N3) languages

Now we turn to a different set of constructions. In the cases to be discussed here, I argue that the merged external argument remains in its merged position and that there is DP movement to a lower position, i.e. a position within the VP. The data come from a set of Western Malayo-Polynesian (WMP) languages that Sells (1998) has labeled NOMINATIVE THIRD (or N3) languages because of their particular word order. Discussion of these languages requires a bit of background on what I assume to be the appropriate account for the phrase structure of other WMP languages and their relatives in the larger Austronesian language family.28

In Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis (1992), it is argued that there are two ‘subject’ positions in many Austronesian languages represented structurally by SPEC, IP and SPEC, VP. The DP in the SPEC, VP is the external argument, in most cases the Agent.29 The DP related to the SPEC, TP position will always be a derived subject and may have a variety of theta-roles depending on the morphology on the verb. The existence of two subject positions is similar to what is assumed by many researchers currently but the Austronesian languages are particularly interesting because they allow the two positions to be filled simultaneously. In other words, the two subjects can co-occur.30 With verb movement to Tense in a head-initial structure, we get the following word order where Agent is one subject in SPEC, VP and “Topic” is the other subject in SPEC, TP.31

---

28 In fact, the phrase structure is probably much more complicated than what I present here. Most likely there is iterative predicate movement in many of these languages as proposed by Pearson 1998, Rackowski 1998, Rackowski and Travis 2000. I believe that none of the claims that I make in this book are affected by these proposals.

29 Because Experiencer is also found in this position, the label Agent has been avoided in the literature, replaced by Actor. I will often just use the term Agent, however, especially when discussing particular constructions where the external argument is an Agent.

30 This, in fact, would be the subject counterpart to the applicative constructions discussed above where both the merged and the derived object positions are filled simultaneously.

31 I use the term traditional term “topic” here mainly to be consistent with much of the literature in this area and to distinguish this position from the VP internal “subject” position. See Kroeger (1991, 1993), however, for arguments that this “topic” bears little similarity to the discourse notion of Topic. Others, however, such as Sells (2000), Richards (2000), Pearson (2001) have maintained that this position is a topic, or at least an A’-position.
The choice of element that appears in Spec, TP depends on the choice of “topic” morphology that appears on the verb. Malagasy basically has a three way distinction — Actor Topic, Theme Topic, and Circumstantial Topic (where something other that the Actor or Theme is the topic, see e.g. Paul 2000: Chapter 3). In the examples below, the sentence final (bolded) DP is in the subject (Spec, TP) position. The (italicized) DP is the Agent and is in Spec, VP when it has not moved to the sentence final subject position.

(60) a. **Actor Topic / Actor Voice**

[ Manasa lamba amin’ny savony ] **ny lehilahy**

PRES.AT.wash clothes with’DET soap DET man

‘The man washes clothes with the soap.’

b. **Theme Topic / Object Voice**

[ Sasan’ny lehilahy amin’ny savony ] **ny lamba**

PRES.TT.wash’DET man with’DET soap DET clothes

‘The clothes are washed by the man with the soap.’

c. **Circumstantial Topic**

[ Anasan’ny lehilahy lamba ] **ny savony**

PRES.CT.wash’DET man clothes DET soap

‘The man washes clothes with the soap.’

---

32 Obviously, some explanation for why a DP is licensed in this position is required. See Chapter 3, section 3.1.3.2 for an account of Case in Malagasy.

33 There are a variety of ways of promoting the object to subject position. I give only what is called the suffix passive (see Paul 2000 and Pearson 2001 for more on this in a Chomskian framework).
The tree in (61) below shows how movement accounts for the word order when the Subject/Topic is something other than the Actor.

(61)

```
TP
   T'       DP
   T        Subject/Topic
  V_k      VP
     DP    V'
     Actor
    V      XP
      t_k  ... t_i ....
```

I leave aside some of the details of these constructions. What is important to note at this stage, however, is that the left edge of the $V_1P$ is discernible when the Agent remains in $\text{SPEC, } V_1P$. My claim, then, is that any argument that moves leftward to a position to the right of the Agent must undergo movement within the $V_1P$.

Now we are ready to look at a specific case — Kalagan, a Philippine language. Kalagan is slightly different from Malagasy since the “topic” does not appear in a $\text{SPEC, } TP$ overtly, but rather in, what Sells (1998: 124) labels a NOMINATIVE THIRD or N3 position.34 Sells points out that, among Philippine languages, “[b]y far the most common (and often rigid) requirements for the ordering of constituents within the clause put the subject effectively in third position”. Examples of other languages with this word order that Sells gives are Pangasinan (Mulder and Schwartz 1981), Cebuano (Bell 1976), Dibabawon (Forster 1964), Isnag (Barlaan 1986), Balangao (Shelter 1976), and Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho 1993).

The facts are as follows. In N3 languages, in the case of a non-Agent topic, the topic immediately follows the Agent (and precedes all other arguments of the verb). The word order as described by Collins (1970) for Kalagan is given in (62) below, and a schematized version is given in (63).

---

34I return to a possible analysis of this in Chapter 3, section 3.4xx. I appreciate discussions with Mark Campana many years ago concerning Kalagan and the problems that it raises for phrase structure.
Kalagan word order generalization

the verb is first and is followed by the nominal elements as they are given [Agent-Object-Instrument-Beneficiary-Locative-Time: LDT]. The one regular exception is that when the ya-phrase [topic: LDT] is not the agent, it immediately follows the agent, all other phrases keeping their places. (Collins 1970: 4)

V - (Agent) - “Topic” - XP

Examples of a variety of topic constructions in Kalagan are given in (64). In (64a) and (64b), one could conceivably argue that the topic has remained in its base-generated position. In (64c-e), however, it is clear that there is a designated position in which the topic (the ya marked element) appears (adapted from Collins 1970: 5).

Kalagan (Philippines)

a. Kumamang aku sa tubig na lata kan Ma’ adti balkon na lunis
   AT-get I water with can for Father on porch on Monday
   ‘I’ll get the water with the can for Dad on the porch on Monday.’

b. Kamangin ku ya tubig na lata kan Ma’ adti balkon na lunis
   TT-get I water with can for Father on porch on Monday

c. Pagkamang ku ya lata sa tubig kan Ma’ adti balkon na lunis
   IT-get I can water for Father on porch on Monday

d. Kamangan ku ya Ma’ sa tubig na lata adti balkon na lunis
   BT-get I Father water with can on porch on Monday

e. Kamangan ku ya balkon sa tubig na lata kan Ma’ na lunis
   LT-get I porch water with can for Father on Monday
Ferreirinho (1993:57-58) gives the following structures from Limos Kalinga, another Western Malayo-Polynesian language that also exemplifies N3 word order. The examples from Limos Kalinga show that full DP Agents can appear in the post-verbal position and that it is not the pronominal status of the Agent in the Kalagan examples which accounts for the word order.

(65) LIMOS KALINGA (Philippines)
   a. Nan-dalus si Malia-t danat palatu
      PERF:AT-wash SUBJ Maria-OBL PL plates
      ‘Maria washed some plates.’

   b. D-in-alus-an ud Malia danat palatu
      PERF-wash-TT GEN Maria PL-SUBJ plates
      ‘Maria washed the plates.’

   c. In-dalus-an ud Malia si ina-na-t nat palatu
      PERF-wash-BT GEN Maria SUBJ mother-her-OBL DET plates
      ‘Maria washed some plates for her mother.’

   d. In-dalus ud Malia nat sabun sinat palatu
      PERF:INSTT-wash GEN Maria SUBJ soap OBL plate
      ‘Maria washed plates with the soap.’

   If we take thea Kalagan example in (64c), we can represent it structurally as in (66), showing movement of the instrumental DP from its merged position — which is to the right of the logical object — to some position between the Agent and the Theme.\footnote{As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, it could be that the derived DP is in a high derived position outside of the VP and that both the verb and the external argument (Agent DP) have moved even higher. I resist this type of account since I see no need for the extra movements. Further, if the external argument is in situ, we can explain why the thematic content of this position is restricted to the external argument. In other words, if this DP were in a high derived position, we might expect other arguments (benefactives, instrumentals) to appear there.}

\draft
(66) KALAGAN

a. Pagkamangk $V_{1P}$ ku ya latai $V_{2P}$ sa tubig $V_K$ ti kan Ma’ ]
   IR-GET I can water for Father

b. $V_K$ $V_{1P}$ Agt derived DP $V_{2P}$ Theme $V_K$ ti XP ]

Putting the exact analysis aside for now (see Chapter 3, section 3.4xx), we can see
that the word order facts look similar to the Indonesian example given in (43) where an
element appears just to the left of the logical object. The difference is that the presence
of the Agent DP tells us that the moved element has remained within the V1P. For this
reason, I assume that there must be some position within the V1P that can be a landing
site for derived elements.

In the discussion above, I have been arguing for two VP internal positions in which
objects (DPs) can appear. The question still remains, however, whether these two
positions are related by movement. I turn to this question next.

2.5.4 Movement vs. Base-generation

Showing that there is a second object position within the VP only gets us half-way to the
conclusion that there is a derived object position within the VP. Many researchers would
agree that the position of an applicative object is below the position of an external
argument, but they would argue that this is a merged position (see e.g. Pylkkänen 2000).
The task, then, is to show that the object comes to be in the second/higher position
through movement. Part of the problem in tackling this issue comes from the fact that
there appear to be different types of object ‘movement’.

We could broadly divide the kinds of possible object movement into two types.
One type falls under a movement analysis more easily. First, it does not create a second
object but just shifts the existing one (the EITHER/OR case). Further, in some cases, there
appears to be little connection to the event structure of the predicate.36 The best example
of this would be the higher Scandinavian object shift. It is not surprising that researchers

36 As shown by, for example, Bobaljik (1995), there is an effect on the information structure, however.
working on this sort of construction propose a movement analysis and one that is solely related to the grammatical characteristics of the construction (e.g. Chomsky 1993, 2001).

At the other extreme, there are constructions where an additional object is represented and there is a shift in the event being described. In this situation, the additional object position is related more closely to the semantic characteristics of the construction. Much has been made of the effect on the event and the conclusion that has often been drawn is that the shift in meaning indicates a fundamental difference in the way the arguments have been merged. Some typical examples that are used are given below.

In the first set of pairs, we see that the double object construction changes the effect that the event has on the goal of the action. As pointed out by many researchers, there has to be a possession relationship at the end of the event when the goal appears as an object. A typical example uses the English verb ‘teach’. Below we see first the prepositional construction followed by the double object construction (taken from Arad 1998: 86). The double object construction entails a change of state in the first object.

(67) a. Mary taught French to Paul (but the idiot still doesn’t speak it properly).
    b. Mary taught Paul French (*but the idiot still doesn’t speak it properly).

We see a similar effect when we have possessor raising. When the possessor appears as the object, it has to be affected by the event (taken from Yoon 2002).

37 A reviewer points out that this is similar to the English ‘I hit Mary’s arm’ and ‘I hit Mary on the arm’ vs. ‘I saw Mary’s arm’ and *‘I saw Mary on the arm’. In fact, while similar, the English facts are not as productive as other possessive raising cases. Baker (1988:272) gives the interesting example from Choctaw (credited to a manuscript of Munro) where an idiom chunk may undergo possessor raising.

(i) Naahollo i-tobi-ya apa-li-tok
   white.man AGR-bean-ACC eat-1S-PAST
   ‘I ate the white man’s beans’ OR ‘I ate the green peas.’

(ii) Naahollo-ya tobi i-m-apa-li-tok
    white.man-ACC bean 3S-APPL-eat-1S-PAST
    ‘I ate the white man’s beans’ OR ‘I ate the green peas.’

Here ‘white man’s beans’ can be used idiomatically to mean ‘green peas’ and the idiomatic reading is preserved in the possessor raised example (ii).
These observations have led researchers to posit a different underlying structure for the two constructions. In the double object construction, and the possessor raised construction, the ‘derived’ object is, in fact, merged as an argument of an additional head. An example of the type of structure used for the double object construction is shown below (adapted from Beck and Johnson 2004: 104-5). The tree in (69a) is the one for the NP PP construction while the one in (69b) is for the NP NP construction.

Just as researchers investigating the Scandinavian object shift have come to the conclusion that the second object position must be a VP-external derived position created through grammatical requirements (such as the need to check uninterpretable features), researchers investigating these double object constructions have come to the conclusion that the second object position is a VP-internal merged position (such as SPEC, ApplP) created through a difference in argument (and/or) event structure.
It is tempting, given these observations, to conclude that there is a high second object position within the inflectional domain of the phrase structure and a low second object position within the lexical domain of the phrase structure. The high position would be a landing site of movement triggered by uninterpretable features introduced on an inflectional head. The low position would be a merged argument position created by an additional event related head.

While I do not go into a full discussion of the issues involved in this large and lively debate, I resist coming to this conclusion mainly because it is not clear that there is a clear division between the types of constructions. For example, into which category would the positioning of objects with respect to particles (in English and Swedish) fall? Vinka’s data suggest that it is of the lower type. It is not dependent on movement of the main verb into the inflectional domain in Swedish, and it is connected to choice of predicate. Further, one might want to argue that in English movement of the object across a particle also has some effect on the interpretation of the event, though more subtle. It seems to my ear and to other English speakers I have checked this with that the DP ‘the problem’ that has moved across the particle ‘through’ in (70a) gives the impression of having been measured out completely in a way that is not the case in (70b).

(70) a. I feel confident that they have thought the problem through.
    b. I feel confident that they have thought through the problem.

At the same time, however, it is hard to argue that movement of an object across a particle necessarily relates this object to a different argument structure since an embedded subject can also move to this position as we can see in the following example taken from Lasnik (2001).

(71) Mary made John, out [ t₁ to be a fool ]

---

38 This was not the first time this sort of structure was proposed in an articulated VP format. See e.g. Hoekstra (1995), Harley (1996).
These English data, then, show that the event related object position in (70) is also a derived position (see (71)).

Now I turn to an argument from Sybesma that the BA object in Chinese must be derived. As we just saw above, Sybesma claims that the ba in Chinese BA constructions is in a high caus head, a head I label V1. He further proposes that VP selected by ba is ergative (i.e. unaccusative) since it has no external argument. Let’s look again at the tree in (50). Sybesma proposes that the logical subject is generated in NP1, the logical object of a BA-construction is generated in NP3 and moves to NP2. This means that the object is assigned its theta-role by the material in X and not by the material in V. An example, taken from Goodall (1989), is relevant to the discussion here.

(72) a. ta ku-de tieshu kai-le hua (Sybesma 1992, 146)
   he cry-DE iron.tree open-LE flower
   ‘He cried such that iron trees blossomed.’

b. ta ba tieshu ku-de kai-le hua
   he BA iron.tree cry-DE open-LE flower
   ‘He cried such that iron trees blossomed.’

The argument is that tieshu ‘iron tree’ in (72) is an idiom chunk and as such cannot be base-generated apart from the rest of the idiom. Its preverbal position, then, must be explained through movement of the NP to the pre-verbal position.39

Finally let us turn to the data from N3 languages. These also do not fall neatly into either category of object shift. In Kalagan, a second object has appeared suggesting an additional VP-internal event related head, yet there appears to be no semantic effect. Any argument may move into this position as long as the verbal morphology is appropriate. My conclusion, then, is that there is a low VP-internal derived object position. Sometimes elements in this position are related to shifts in event structure (double objects in English) and sometimes they are not (N3 languages). It is this low position that is the
focus of this book. I do not, however, exclude the possibility of higher landing sites for derived objects within the inflectional domain. I leave further discussion of the distinction between these positions until Chapter 5, section 5.1.3xx.

In the next chapter, I turn the discussion to the nature of the landing site and case of the derived objects. If this movement is truly A-movement, we might expect that the landing site is a Spec position of some head parallel to the Spec, TP landing site for derived subjects.\footnote{See the discussion in Sybesma (1992:146ff) concerning Huang’s disagreement with Goodall’s conclusion). Recall that Cheng (1986) has shown that the ba NP must be an affected argument. More likely the distinction has to do with static vs. dynamic predicates.} Before turning to this discussion, however, I raise some issues involved in having an inflectional category within the VP.

In Larson’s seminal (1988) article, the VP is articulated with VP shells. These shells are seen as a way of extending the VP in order to have enough c-commanding positions within the VP. In other words, extra heads are created to meet the syntactic requirements of the arguments. The heads themselves are not given semantic content. By having another category within the VP between the VP shells, however, we are proposing that each V head acts quite independently — further suggesting that each one has some semantic content. Much more will be said about this later, but at this point, like Hale and Keyser (1993) and others (e.g. Harley 1995, Arad 1998), I assume that V₁ has a meaning similar (but not identical to) the English word cause. Further, just as the Agent is the external argument of V₁, the Theme will be the external argument of V₂. In some sense the Theme, then, will be the inner logical subject. Larson also saw Spec, V₂P as being a lower subject, but with the addition of a non-lexical category within the VP, this parallel can be pushed even further. Both subjects and objects, now, are generated in Specs of lexical categories (V₁ and V₂ respectively) and move to Specs of non-lexical categories (T and F respectively).

We can see this parallel structure in an adaptation of Larson’s inner and outer passives, where dative shift is an example of an inner passive. In each case, the highest

\footnote{As we have seen above, Chomsky (1995) proposes that the object moves to a second Spec, vP position (‘little v’). Movement, therefore, does not provide evidence for Spec of an additional non-lexical category. Further, he considers v to be a functional category. I differ from Chomsky in assuming that case-checking in a Spec, head configuration only happens with non-lexical categories, and that V₁ therefore is a lexical category. My view of lexical vs. functional categories is introduced briefly in Chapter 1 and fleshed out more in Chapter 6, section 6.5xx.}
argument position is by-passed and a lower argument moves to the SPEC position to check some relevant feature. In an outer passive, it is the Theme rather than the Agent that is targeted for movement. In an inner passive, it is the Goal rather than the Theme that is targeted. This is shown in the structure in (73) below.

(73) a. OUTER PASSIVE

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TP} & \quad \text{DSsubj} \\
\quad & \quad \text{T} \\
\quad & \quad \text{V}_1 \text{P} \\
\quad & \quad \text{Lsubj} \quad \text{V}_1' \\
\quad & \quad \quad \text{Agent} \\
\quad & \quad \quad \quad \text{V}_1 \\
\quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{FP} \\
\quad & \quad \quad \text{OUTER PASSIVE} \\
\quad & \quad \text{DObj} \quad \text{F} \\
\quad & \quad \quad \text{V}_2 \text{P} \\
\quad & \quad \quad \quad \text{LObj} \quad \text{V}_2' \\
\quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Theme} \\
\quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Goal}
\end{align*}
\]
b. INNER PASSIVE

Note that the inner passive (i.e. dative shift) leaves the logical object intact, in its base-generated position. This is also like the outer passives in a Western Malayo-Polynesian language like Malagasy where elements move to the SPEC, TP position while leaving the Agent in the SPEC, V₁P position as shown in the tree in (61). All cases of applicatives will be examples of inner passives.

2.6 CONCLUSION

By looking across several languages, I have argued that there is evidence for A-movement to a position below the merged external argument position. While this movement in some cases can be tightly related to the nature of an event (e.g. applicatives), in other ways it is like other cases of A-movement (e.g. N3 languages). In the next chapter I look more closely at the nature of the landing site of low object shift with the aim of determining why it is sometimes like and sometimes different from A-movement.