CHAPTER 5

Interaction of Objects and Aspect

In the previous chapters, I have argued that, within the VP, there is a landing site position for objects and that this position is the Specifier position of an event related category, Inner Aspect. This raises the question of whether there is any relation between objects and aspect. In our discussion of aspectual predicate classes in the last chapter, we have seen that the shape of the object can effect the aspectual predicate class. This is at least suggestive of a link between objects and Inner Aspect. In this chapter I look at the relationship more closely especially as it relates to grammatical issues such as case marking and syntactic position. In this chapter, I show how they may be related and then answer specific questions in the context of this relationship.

5.1 THE INTERACTION OF CASE AND ASPECT

In our investigation of the relationship of the grammatical representation of objects and aspect, we will see that both viewpoint and situation aspect appear to have an effect on the grammatical marking of the object. I will eventually argue, however, that only situation aspect, i.e. Inner Aspect, has a direct relationship with the object. This means that any apparent effect of viewpoint aspect on the form of the object will be indirect. Such a conclusion is important to the overall thesis of this book in that any shift in the form of the object will be due to VP-internal factors.

5.1.1 Objects and viewpoint aspect

In the discussion of the relationship between grammatical case and viewpoint aspect, Finnish is usually the exemplifying language. Below is an example that shows a difference in viewpoint aspect that is indicated entirely by a change of case (from Arad 1998, credited to Pylkkänen 1997). In (216a) where the object appears with partitive
case, the meaning is imperfective/incomplete. With accusative case on the object as in (216b), the meaning is perfective/complete (from Arad 1998: 74, fn. 15).

(216) a. Anne rakensi taloa
    Anne built PART-house
    ‘Anne was building a/the house.’

    b. Anne rakensi talon
    Anne built ACC-house
    ‘Anne built a/the house.’

Further, the syntactic position of an object also seems to be dependent on viewpoint aspect, as we have already seen in Chapter 2. The clearest case is that of Scots Gaelic where, as Ramchand (1997) shows, depending on the aspect of the verb, the object appears either after the verb (217a) or before it (217b) (Ramchand 1997: 51-52).

(217)a. Bha Calum a’faicinn a’bhalaich PAST PERIPHERASTIC
    be-PAST Calum AG see-VN boy-GEN
    ‘Calum saw the boy.’

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

Crucially, it is the perfective form that has the preverbal object, while the imperfective (present, past) has the post-verbal object. The correlation of perfective with accusative case or higher (moved) objects is pervasive in non-related languages.

In the case of Hindi, through Mahajan’s work (Mahajan 1990) also outlined in Chapter 2, we see that the perfective form as in (218b) creates a situation where the
object is in a position higher than the object of an imperfective construction as shown in (218a).\footnote{1}

\begin{align*}
(218) & \quad \text{raam roTii khaataa thaa (Mahajan 1990: 76)} \\
& \quad \text{Ram(M) bread(F) eat.IMP.M be.PST.M} \\
& \quad \text{‘Ram (habitually) ate bread.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{roTii raam ne khayii (Mahajan 1990: 79)} \\
& \quad \text{bread(F) Ram(M) ERG eat.PERF.F} \\
& \quad \text{‘Ram ate bread.’}
\end{align*}

While Hindi is a language with fairly free word order, Majahan gives arguments that the surface position of the DP in (218b) is higher in the structure than that of the DP in (218a). Finnish, Scots Gaelic and Hindi, then, are three examples where viewpoint aspect appears to affect the syntactic realization of an object by affecting the case and/or the position of the object. Before concluding, however, that the main indicator of case shift is viewpoint aspect, let us look at interactions between case assignment and situation aspect. My aim is to show that Case is more closely related to situation aspect and that the link between viewpoint aspect and Case is mediated by situation aspect.

### 5.1.2 Objects and situation aspect

We saw in the previous chapter the importance of the presence and shape of an object for the determination of the aspectual class of a predicate.

\begin{align*}
(219) & \quad \text{He ran *in five minutes/\sqrt{\text{for five minutes}}} . \\
& \quad \text{b. He ran the race \sqrt{\text{in five minutes/}} *\text{for five minutes}.}
\end{align*}

\footnote{1 The interaction with case assignment is different in Hindi as, according to Mahajan, the imperfective assigns accusative case while the perfective does not. This is the reverse of Finnish. However, accusative, absoulutive, and nominative case are all zero-marked in Hindi so giving them names is theory internal. One can think of it as the functional head related to structural case is associated with perfectivity and that the accusative case assigned by imperfective verb forms in Hindi assigns inherent case.}
(220)a. He drank the beer in five minutes/*for five minutes.
   b. He drank beer *in five minutes/√for five minutes.

It is the presence of the object *the race* with the verb *run* in (219b) that makes the event telic (thereby allowing the frame PP ‘in five minutes’). But as (220) shows, it is not simply the presence of an object that is important, but also the shape of the object. If the object is a bare plural or a mass noun, as in (220b), no explicit endpoint is encoded and the event remains atelic (thereby allowing the duration PP ‘for five minutes’). Now the question is whether the case on the object can affect the aspectual class of the predicate, i.e. affect the situation aspect. One example from English is the conative as shown below.

(221)a. The hunters shot the deer (*for five minutes).
   b. The hunters shot at the deer (√for five minutes).

(222)a. The child ate the apple (*for five minutes).
   b. The child ate at the apple (√for five minutes).

Another way that situation aspect interacts with case assignment involves the distinction between state predicates and eventive predicates. As pointed out by Noonan (1992), many languages appear to have a restriction against the accusative case assignment by stative predicates. She gives examples of this from Irish and I add examples from Japanese.

In Irish, there are no transitive stative predicates that would be the counterparts to the English verbs *know, fear, respect*, etc. The relevant structures for these verbs in Irish would be those given in (223) below.

(223) a. Tá gaeilge ag Fliodhais
    (Noonan 1992: 186)
    is Irish at Fliodhais
    ‘Fliodhais knows Irish.’
b. Ta eagla roimh an bpúca ag Ailill
is fear before the Puca at Ailill
‘Ailill fears the Puca.’

c. Tá meas ar Meadhbh ag Ailill
is respect on Meadhbh at Ailill
‘Ailill respects Meadhbh.’

In Japanese, stative predicates also have an effect on case assignment to the object. Many stative predicates in Japanese assign nominative case to their object as shown in (224a) below. Compare this to a regular dynamic verb which would assign accusative case as in (224b).

(224) a. John-ga nihongo-ga wakaru (koto)
John-NOM Japanese-NOM understand fact
‘John understands Japanese.’

b. John-ga nihongo-o hanasu
John-NOM Japanese-ACC speak
‘John speaks Japanese.’

Now we return to Scots Gaelic, Hindi, and Finnish. Ramchand (1997) shows very clearly that the data from Scots Gaelic is also sensitive to the situation aspect of the predicate. Recall that certain aspectual forms of the verb require the objects to be in the genitive case and others require the objects to be in the direct case. This is summarized in the table below.

2 Koto is added to the stative construction to avoid use of the topic marker –wa.
To begin our discussion of the interaction between case and situation aspect, we first note that stative verbs may be used with the periphrastic present or past as shown in (226).³

(226) a. Bha mi 'ga chreidsinn PAST PERIPHERASTIC be-PST I-DIR AG.he-GEN believe-VN (Ramchand 1997: 45)

'I believed him.'

b. tha mi ag iarraidh a’bhuill PRESENT PERIPHERASTIC be-PRES I-DIR AG want-VN the ball-GEN (Ramchand 1997: 48)

'I want the ball.'

In both the past periphrastic and the present periphrastic, the object, if there is one, receives genitive case. These stative verbs, however, may not appear in the forms where the object is given direct case marking, e.g. with the simple past or the past or present perfect periphrastic, and retain their stative meaning. As we see below, there is a meaning shift from stative to eventive in (227a, b, b') where there is direct case on the direct object.

(227) a. Chreid mi e SIMPLE PAST believe-PAST I–DIR he-DIR (Ramchand 1997:45)

'I came to believe him'

³ 'ga is a portmanteau for ag and the genitive pronoun (see Ramchand 1997:30). Normally genitive DPs appear after the V.
Two things are shifting, however, in these structures. Concomitant with the shift of case is a shift of viewpoint aspect. We can see that what is at stake is not so much the case marking of the object, however, but rather the choice of viewpoint aspect which restricts what type of situation aspect we can have. Looking at verbs that do not take direct objects, there is still a restriction on the situation aspect of verbs that can appear in the perfect constructions. Verbs such as the idiomatic reading of ‘look’ or the stative reading of ‘run’ may appear in the imperfective constructions as in (228a, b). However they are not allowed in, for example, a simple past construction as in (228c,d)).

(228) a. Bha e a‘coimhead gòrach PAST PERIPHRASTIC
   be-PAST he-DIR AG look-VN silly (Ramchand 1997:44)
   ‘He looked silly.’

   b. Bha abhainn a’ruith seachad PAST PERIPHRASTIC
   be-PAST river-DIR AG run-VN past (Ramchand 1997:45)
   ‘A river ran past.’

   c. * Choimhead e gòrach SIMPLE PAST
   look-PAST he-DIR silly (Ramchand 1997:44)
   ‘He looked silly.’

\footnote{4 Here, rather than glossing the root, Ramchand leaves it in its original form \textit{iarr}.}
d. * Ruith abhainn seachad  
  run-PAST river-DIR past  
  ‘A river ran past.’

When used in the non-stative (and non-idiomatic sense), the verbs can, not surprisingly, appear in this form as shown below.

(229)  
a. Choimhead e a-mach  
  look-PAST he-DIR out  
  ‘He looked out.’

b. Ruith gille seachad  
  run-PAST boy-DIR past  
  ‘A boy ran past.’

Ramchand points out that verbs that have no dynamic meaning such as the verb *ciallachadh* ‘to mean’ can only appear in the past periphrastic construction (imperfective) and not in the simple past construction (perfective) given in (230).

(230)  
Dè tha thu a’ciallachadh?  
  What be-PRES you-DIR AG mean-VN  
  ‘What do you mean?’

The restrictions that viewpoint aspect places on situation aspect are quite common. For example, in English, progressive is at best odd with most stative predicates and achievement predicates as the data below show.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) To the extent that (231b) is acceptable, it is targeting the preparatory stage of ‘looking for’ not ‘finding’, see Smith (1991:114) for more discussion of this.
Further, the sort of shift one gets in examples such as (227a) occur cross-linguistically. In the Spanish example below, the stative reading of the verb *conocer* ‘to know [people, places]’ is expressed when the verb appears in the imperfective form (see (232a)). When the verb appears in the perfective, however, a slightly different meaning emerges, as in the Scots Gaelic example (227a) above. This is shown in the translation given for (232b).\(^6\)

\[(232) \text{ Spanish} \]

   \[
   \text{when study.IMP.1SG in DET school know.IMP.1SG many people}
   \]
   ‘When I studied at school, I knew many people.’

b. *Conocí*, a Juan en 1980
   \[
   \text{know.PERF.1SG, a Juan in 1980}
   \]
   ‘I met Juan in 1980.’

Even in English, a dynamic reading of a stative verb can be coerced with the relevant context as shown in (233) below.

\[(233) \text{ All of a sudden, the child knew the answer.} \]

In Spanish, the same effect is achieved via a change in viewpoint aspect with the verb *saber* ‘to know [information]’ as shown below.

---

\(^6\) Thanks to Gustavo Beritognolo for the Spanish data and discussion surrounding it.
(234)a. Hace dos días sabía la respuesta.
   exist two days know.IMP.1SG DET answer
   ‘Two days ago I knew the answer.’

b. De pronto supe la respuesta
   from quickly know.PERF.1SG DET answer
   ‘Suddenly, I came to know the answer.’

The more striking examples are the ones where the meaning of the verb seems to change more dramatically as in the shift from ‘want’ to ‘get’ in the Scots Gaelic example of (226b) and (227b) above. Ramchand (1997) suggests that verbs such as iarr- in Scots Gaelic suffer in an effort to provide the appropriate English translation. She writes:

It is important to note that while English must use two different verbs to gloss these different examples, this is a reflection of the lack of a suitable equivalent in that language of the quite specific and consistent content of the SGaelic root. The SGaelic verb means really something more like ‘seek to get’ — the accomplishment interpretation expresses the completion of the act, and thus can imply the actual ‘getting’, whereas the stative or process interpretation emphasizes the state of ‘wanting’.

(Ramchand, 1997: 47-48)

Ramchand specifies that the meaning is underspecified for aspectual information and that once this information is supplied, the lexical item will take on the appropriate meaning.7

It is interesting to note that Hindi appears to show the same sort of effects. While not mentioned explicitly, the data and the translations given by Mahajan echo Ramchand’s observations of the Scots Gaelic data. Note the two examples given below.

---

7 In a footnote, Ramchand notes that the Accomplishment form of this verb can also mean ‘a completed act of seeking to get’.
(235) a. siitaa-ne laRkaa dekhaa  
Sita-ERG boy(M) saw-M  
‘Sita saw the boy.’

b. siitaa laRkaa dehk rahii hE  
Sita boy(M) see-PROG-be-F  
‘Sita is looking for a (suitable) boy (to marry).’

The difference between the viewpoint aspect (from perfective in (18a) to imperfective in (18b)) brings with it not only a change of status of the object (from object agreement to subject agreement) but also a change of situation aspect (from a telic event to an atelic event). Mahajan brings these data to the discussion because of a further change in the object, from specific to non-specific. More of specificity and the effect it has on object placement will be discussed in the next section.

Before turning to the question of specificity, however, we return to the Finnish data which is so often referred to. It turns out that Finnish case marking not only interacts with viewpoint aspect, but also with situation aspect. Objects of stative verbs are also marked with partitive case as shown below (taken from Arad 1998: 74, and credited to Pylkkänen, p.c.).

(236) Minä rakastan sinua / * sinut  
I love-1SG you-PART / you-ACC  
‘I love you.’

I propose that the case alternations of the type we have just seen are dependent on only VP internal information. The two heads that are directly involved are V₁ and (Inner) ASP, and the landing site for elements checking accusative case is Spec, ASP. I choose to categorize the Case variations we have seen are into four types. These are summarized below.
(237) **Case Variation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION ASPECT</th>
<th>States (-dynamic)</th>
<th>no accusative (e.g. Irish, Japanese, Finnish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities (-telic)</td>
<td>no accusative (e.g. English)$^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEWPOINT ASPECT</td>
<td>Imperfective (-bound)</td>
<td>no accusative (e.g. Finnish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective (+bound)</td>
<td>object movement for case (e.g. Hindi, Scots Gaelic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The generalization appears to be that dynamism and telicity/boundedness favor accusative case assignment, both within the domain of situation and viewpoint aspect. This conclusion is further confirmed by the data that showed that perfective aspect, as well as giving a bound to the event also forces the event to be dynamic. Next we put these observations onto the phrase structure. In the previous chapter I suggested that $V_1$ encodes dynamicty and the Asp head encodes telicity. Now let us look at the four cases in turn in the context of the phrase structure.

We have seen that stative predicates in some languages do not assign accusative case to their logical objects. Following Noonan (1992), I assume that the VP internal structure of a stative verb determines its case assigning abilities. The $V_1$ of all stative verbs will be –dynamic. In the unmarked case, this will be all the information given in $V_1$, in some senses similar to a copula verb like *be* in English. Some languages, however, will allow this head to also contain a case feature making this head similar (but not identical) to the English verb *have*.

The second example of case variation is tied to the telicity of the situation and is related to observations made by, for example, Tenny (1987, 1994). In order to measure out an event and thereby to provide an endpoint, an object must be in Spec, Asp. In English conative constructions like *to eat at an apple*, the logical object does not move to

---

$^8$ Here I assume that ‘see’ is the achievement version of this verb.

$^9$ As discussed in the previous chapter, the object in question must be an incremental object in order to be relevant. Since the direct objects of *push* or *stir* do not measure out the event, accusative case assignment is irrelevant.
Spec, Asp, is not assigned accusative case, and does not provide an endpoint to the event. In these first two cases given in the table in (237), we can see how the VP internal configuration affects both case assignment and interpretation.

The second two cases in (237) are the ones that raise problems for the view that only VP internal information can affect case assignment to an object. Looking first at the Finnish case, I suggest that three problems may point to a similar solution. My proposal is tentative and is the subject of ongoing research, but the impression is that imperfective/progressive, while technically Outer Aspect, can have interesting effects on Inner Aspect. We can see this using observations from semantics, morphology, and syntax. In the domain of semantics, imperfective can be seen as stripping off the endpoint of a telic situation. While *I built the house* entails *the house was built*, *I was building the house* does not have the same entailment. In the domain of morphology, we have seen Outer Aspect appear on an Inner Aspect head in the case of Tagalog [+incomplete]. In the domain of syntax, we have seen the imperfective can turn off the assignment of accusative case. Putting these three together, I assume that features may be transmitted from Outer Aspect to Inner Aspect through an AGREE type relation. These features can have the semantic effect of modifying the contents of Inner Aspect, they can have the morphological effect of realizing morphemes, and they can have the syntactic effect of neutralizing a case feature. This is sketched out in the structure below.  

---

10 Cinque places progressive aspect between terminative and completive. I assume that completive is most similar to Inner Aspect. Progressive would be the lowest Outer Aspect and therefore the one that can enter into an AGREE relationship with Inner Aspect.
The final case I treat separately since the use of perfective not only affects case assignment, it also affects the interpretation of the predicate. We saw this in Scots Gaelic and Hindi. As I argue in Chapter 8, these are instances of coercion. Perfective Outer Aspect selects situations of a certain shape. More specifically perfective Outer Aspect requires a dynamic $V_1$. In order to satisfy these selectional requirements, a dynamic $V_1$ is coerced (the details of this I save for Chapter 8). Further, the case marking specifications of the Inner Aspect are modified by the perfective nature of the Outer Aspect creating the other observable changes, i.e. the movement of the object to the derived object position, Spec, Asp.

A more careful study of case and its interaction with both viewpoint aspect and situation aspect is needed before drawing any conclusions, but my hypothesis is that case is related only to situation aspect, in particular the specifications of $V_1$ and (Inner) Asp. Apparent connections between accusative case and viewpoint aspect are indirect. Now we turn to the question of the object position.

### 5.2 POSITION OF INCREMENTAL THEMES\textsuperscript{11}

In this section, I look at claims in the literature that Themes that measure out an event must appear outside of the VP. We have already seen that the complement structure of the

---

\textsuperscript{11} Much of this section appeared in Travis (2005).
V is involved in the determination of aspectual verb classes. The point of this section, however, is to show that these complements may remain within the VP throughout the syntactic derivation. This is particularly crucial in the discussion of DP complements since there have been claims that only DPs that have moved outside of the VP (generally to \(\text{AGR}_o\)) may, in fact, take part in aspectual computation (see e.g. Borer 1994, van Hout 1996). For example, van Hout outlines her CHESS-mapping system (\text{CHESS-mapping system}). This is given below (taken from van Hout 1996:206).

\((239)\) The \text{CHESS mapping conditions}: \text{CHESS-mapping system}:

1. Mapping requires that the event structure of a predicate be identified.
2. There are two structural argument positions: the specifier positions of \(\text{Agr,S}\) and \(\text{Agr,O}\). An argument in either of these specifier positions identifies an event or subevent by referring to an event participant that is involved in that (sub)event.
3. Telic event type features must be checked in \(\text{AgrOP}\).

Borer also relates telicity to the assignment of accusative case and a specific position in the syntactic structure. For her, there are no positions within the VP, the head V is projected with a list of arguments which then move to Specs of functional categories. A structure where there is an accusative object is presented in (240) below (Borer 1994:30).

\((240)\)
For Borer, Asp2 represents the position for the Event Measurement (EM). In this view of having syntactic structure represent event structure, it is crucial that the position of the event measuring object be external to the VP.¹² These views of the relation of phrase structure and event structure are similar to the one presented her in that derived objects appear in a position connected to aspect and telicity. They fly in the face, however, of the claim that the derived object position or the Aspect head that encodes telicity are both VP internal. We turn to this issue next.

5.2.1 German VP internal objects

I begin by looking at data from German because German has been used in some of the original research on object movement and the correlation of object movement with interpretation (Diesing 1992, Kratzer 1996). My goal is to show that DPs that do not move out of the VP, overtly or covertly, still can affect the interpretation of the event structure of the verb. My aim, then, is to find a DP that is interpreted within the VP and show that this DP can measure an event. I look at indefinites because indefinites are ambiguous between a quantificational reading and an existential reading. The claim is that the two readings come from two different structures. Quantificational indefinites are assumed to move out of the VP and are thereby interpreted in the restrictive clause of a sentence. Existential indefinites are purported to remain within the VP and from this position are interpreted within the nuclear scope. Given that the difference in interpretation can be difficult to determine, I will rely heavily on the syntactic tests that have been argued to distinguish the two uses structurally.

To get a flavor of the issues, let us look at the sentence below which is ambiguous between a specific reading and a non-specific reading (taken from Flegg 2004).

(241) I am looking for a book about giraffes.

_A book about giraffes_ may be specific indicating a book that the speaker has in mind and is known to exist. It may be non-specific, however. The speaker doesn’t have

¹² To be fair, since Borer technically has no positions within the VP, appearing outside the VP is trivial. What is more important to me is that the EM position of the object be below the merged position of the external argument.
a specific book in mind and while such a book may exist, there is also a possibility that it doesn’t exist. A follow-up comment can disambiguate the two readings. With the specific reading, the follow-up of (242a) is appropriate, while the follow-up of (242b) is not. With the quantificational reading, the opposite is true. Now (242b) is appropriate while (242a) is not.

(242)a. It has pictures in it. SPECIFIC BOOK  
  b. It must have pictures in it. NON-SPECIFIC BOOK

Now let us turn to the syntactic tests that have been used to support this structural distinction. One of the tests that Diesing uses to determine whether a DP remains within the VP or not involves extraction. The idea is that extraction out of a DP that itself has moved out of the VP will violate the CED of Huang 1982.13 We will see two uses of the extraction tests below. In Kratzer (1996), the type of extraction that is used is quantifier split. Her claim is that the subjects of individual level predicates such as wissen ‘know’ are external to the VP while subjects of stage level predicates such as helfen ‘to help’ are generated within the VP. She supports this claim with extraction facts. The data below show that a quantifier can be split from a subject DP that is arguably still within the VP as in (243) and that it cannot be split from a subject DP that it not within the VP as in (244).

(243)a. … weil uns [viele Lehrer] geholfen haben  
                   since us many teachers helped have  
                   ‘… since many teachers helped us.’

13 The Condition on Extraction Domains (Huang 1982: 505) is given below.

CONDITION ON EXTRACTION DOMAINS
A phrase A may be extracted out of a domain B only if B is properly governed
b. [Lehrer], haben uns [viele], geholfen
   teachers have us many helped
   ‘As for teachers, many of them helped us.’

(244)a. … weil das [viele Lehrer] wissen
         since this many teachers know
         ‘… since many teachers know this’

b. * [Lehrer], haben das [viele], gewusst
   teachers have this many known
   ‘As for teachers, many of them have known this.’

Another set of extraction facts come from the was für split in German. Data like
(245) and (246) below are meant to show once again that elements that remain within the
VP, in this case objects, allow extraction out of them. First we see that there is a
difference in interpretation depending on whether the object DP appears to the left (245a)
or the right (245b) of the adverb immer ‘always’. The bare plural gets a non-specific
reading in (245a) and a specific reading in (245b).

(245)a. … dass Hilda immer Sonaten von Dittersdorf spielt
        that Hilda always sonatas by Dittersdorf plays
        ‘… that Hilda is always playing sonatas by Dittersdorf.’

b. … dass Hilda Sonaten von Dittersdorf immer spielt.
    that Hilda sonatas by Dittersdorf always plays
    ‘If it is a sonata by Dittersdorf, Hilda plays it.’

Now we apply the syntactic test of extraction to these two examples. The lower DP
allows extraction as shown in (246a) while the higher DP does not as shown in (246b).
As a final test for what DPs appear internal to the VP, we turn to a particular class of verbs that Diesing (1992) claims only have VP internal objects. She shows that verbs of creation do not let their objects undergo scrambling in German.

She proposes that this syntactic restriction in German reflects a semantic restriction exhibited more generally. Indefinite objects of creation verbs will be restricted in interpretation, i.e. they do not allow the quantificational reading. This correlates with the syntactic behavior of these DPs since these objects are unable to appear outside the VP. Diesing gives data that support her claim that creation verbs do not have quantificational objects. Her examples from English are given below.

(248)a. I usually write a book about slugs.

b. * I usually write any book about slugs.


c. * I usually write the answers that you do.

cf. I usually like the answers that you do.
(248a) is an example of a sentence with a creation verb. (248b) shows that the quantificational use of \textit{any} is not possible. (248c) shows that ACD structures are not possible with the indefinite object of a verb of creation. Diesing’s conclusion is that indefinite objects with verbs of creation can only be interpreted VP internally.

Using the tests just discussed, I now return to the question of whether a VP internal object can measure out an event. In each example I use verb choice, extraction, and position with respect to an adverb to ensure the VP internal position of the DP. In (249) and (250) below, I combine at least two of these tests. First of all, the head of the VP is a creation verb, \textit{schrieben} ‘to write’. If Diesing is right, a non-specific object of such a verb must remain within the VP. Further, the object in this construction has undergone quantifier split in (249) and \textit{was für} split in (250). As shown in the examples above from Kratzer and Diesing, elements that have undergone quantifier split or \textit{was für} split must have remained within the VP. Finally, the element left behind by quantifier split is to the right of two adverbs in (249) showing that DP is still within the VP. In (249b) and (250b) below, however, we can see that these VP internal DPs are capable of measuring the event. In each case the event is telic and can be modified by a frame PP \textit{in nur einer Woche} ‘in only one week’ and \textit{in einer Stunde} ‘in one hour’ respectively, showing that these DPs have made the predicate telic.

(249)a. [Artikel], habe ich schon einmal [einen],geschrieben.  
\begin{tabular}{p{0.3\textwidth}p{0.7\textwidth}}
article & have I already once one written \\
‘As for articles, I already wrote one once.’
\end{tabular}

b. [Artikel], habe ich schon einmal [einen], in nur 
\begin{tabular}{p{0.3\textwidth}p{0.7\textwidth}}
article & have I already once one in only \\
einer Woche & geschrieben. \\
one week & written \\
‘As for articles, I already wrote one once in only one week.’
\end{tabular}
(250)a. [Was], hat Otto [für ein Buch], geschrieben?
   what has Otto for a book written
   ‘What kind of book did Otto write?’

   b. [Was], hat Otto [für ein Buch], in einer Stunde
   what has Otto for a book in one hour
   geschrieben?
   written
   ‘What kind of book did Otto write in one hour?’

I am assuming that constructions such as these argue that VP internal material is capable of entering into the computation of aspectual verb classes. If this effect is achieved by having the relevant DPs move to a position where they may enter into the computation of event structure, then this position must be VP internal.

5.2.2 Turkish and Malagasy objects

Aydemir (2004) has similarly observed that Turkish DPs may measure out an event from a VP internal position. She claims that there are three different positions for objects in Turkish — (i) adjacent to the V, (ii) within the VP but not necessarily adjacent to the V, and (iii) outside the VP.14 DPs in positions (ii) and (iii) can measure out the event. In other words, a DP which has not moved out of the VP is able to measure out the event and make the predicate telic.

First we note that there are three different types of objects in Turkish (see Kornfilt 1984, Aydemir 2004a, 2004b). One type of object must be bare (no adjectives, determiners, number), a second type may appear with these elements, but has no case marking, and the third type not only may appear with these elements, but is also overtly marked for case. Some examples of each are given below (taken from Aydemir 2004b).

14 Kornfilt (1984:206ff and especially 250: footnote 27) also describes a typology of direct objects in Turkish. I will be concentrating on Aydemir’s account as it relates the object typology to event structure.
Aydemir shows clearly that the three nominal arguments are syntactically distinct. First, the bare N cannot be modified. A pronominal adjective is forced to have an adverbial interpretation (see (252a)). Second, the bare N cannot be elided though the whole predicate can be (see (252b)). Finally, the bare N does not provide a referent in the discourse (see (252c)).
c. * Dün film, seyret-ti-m, o-nu_/on-lar-i, sen de
yesterday film watch-PST-1SG that-ACC/that-PL-ACC you too
seyret-meli-sin
watch-MOD-2SG
‘I watched movies/did movie watching yesterday, you should watch it too.’

In these ways, the bare N differs from the two other types of object in Turkish. The other two types differ from each other in the following ways. While the caseless DPs may appear with modifiers, they must, nevertheless, always be adjacent to the verb, unlike the case-marked object. Caseless DPs cannot be scrambled (see (253a)) and cannot be separated from the verb by an adverbial expression (see (253b)).

(253)a. * Bir anahtar Yasemin kaybet-ti
a key Yasemin lose-PST
‘Yasemin lost a key.’

b. * Yasemin bir anahtar dün kaybet-ti
Yasemin a key yesterday lose-PST
‘Yasemin lost a key yesterday.’

As we can see in (254) below, case-marked objects show no such restrictions.

(254)a. Bir anahtar-1 Yasemin kaybet-ti
one key-ACC Yasemin lose-PST
‘Yasemin lost one key.’

---

15 Kornfilt (1984:250, fn 27) suggests that if the case-less DPs are made ‘heavy’ enough, they can act more like the overtly case-marked DPs.
b. Yasemin bir anahtar-ı dün kaybet-ti
   Yasemin one key-ACC yesterday lose-PST
   ‘Yasemin lost one key yesterday.’

To summarize these observations, I give the very sketchy characterization below. The bare N is very closely tied to the V, most notably because it cannot elide on its own as the other two can. The case-less DP, however, is also tied to the V in that it must always be adjacent to it. Finally, the overtly case-marked DP has the most liberal distribution.

(255) .......... DP-case .......... DP .......... N ...... V

Aydemir’s proposal is slightly different from the one that I will offer here. She argues that the bare N is part of a complex predicate, the case-less DP is in a non-derived position as sister to the V, and the case-marked DP is in a derived position.

Using arguments from Kornfilt (1984) and data from Malagasy, I will question parts of Aydemir’s proposal. In particular, I will claim that bare Ns are the elements that appear in a non-derived position. The argument will be that elements in this position cannot measure an event. The apparently caseless DPs do appear in a derived position and, in this position, can measure out an event. The overtly case-marked DPs move through the derived object position, but from there, because of their overt case, show a freer range of movement and may, in fact, move outside of the VP.

Let us start with Kornfilt’s arguments against an incorporation analysis of the bare N. While an incorporation analysis is not identical to a complex predicate analysis, they share the assumption that the nominal is not assigned case by the verb, and it is this part of the incorporation analysis that Kornfilt argues against. She gives data from Turkish causatives to support her claim that even bare Ns check case with the verb. Like many other languages, the case of the causee in a Turkish causative is determined by whether the embedded verb assigns case to an object or not. If the embedded verb is intransitive (does not assign accusative case), the causee will be assigned accusative case. If the
embedded verb is transitive, however, the causee will be assigned dative case (from Kornfilt 1984: 167).

(256)a. Ali köş-tu
       Ali run-PAST
       ‘Ali ran.’

       b. Ali-yi/*ye köş-tur-du-m
           Ali-ACC/*DAT run-CAUS-PAST-1SG
           ‘I made Ali run.’

(257)a. Ali süt-ü iç-ti
       Ali milk-ACC drink-PAST
       ‘Ali drank the milk.’

       b. Ali-ye/*yi süt-ü iç-ir-di-m
           Ali-DAT/*ACC milk-ACC drink-CAUS-PAST-1SG
           ‘I made Ali drink the milk.’

When a verb with a bare N object is causativized, the case array is the same as with a transitive verb rather than an intransitive verb as the examples below show. In this way, the bare N object behaves similarly to an overtly case-marked object (compare (258b) to (258c)) (from Kornfilt 1984: 212\textsuperscript{16}).

(258)a. Hasan pasta ye-di
       Hasan cake eat-PAST
       ‘Hasan ate cake.’

\textsuperscript{16} I have changed the transcription from Kornfilt to make it consistent with the system used by Aydemir.
b. Hasan-\textit{a/*ı} pasta ye-dir-di-m
   Hasan\textit{-DAT/*ACC} cake eat- \textit{CAUS-PAST-1SG}
   ‘I made Hasan eat cake.’

c. Hasan-\textit{a/*ı} pasta-yı ye-dir-di-m
   Hasan\textit{-DAT/*ACC} cake-\textit{ACC} eat- \textit{CAUS-PAST-1SG}
   ‘I made Hasan eat the cake.’

An account that is built on the assumption that the bare N does not receive case from the verb will have to explain these facts. I assume that a DP that remains within the VP still must rely on the verb for its case-marking (perhaps an inherent accusative case such as that proposed by Pereltsvaig 2000), and this case-marking will have the same effect on the case array of the causative as does the structural accusative assigned in the Spec, \textit{ASP} position.

Now I turn to evidence from Malagasy that bare Ns have a syntactic identity separate from the V. First, let us note that Malagasy has a counterpart to the bare N of Turkish. While some apparently bare Ns in Malagasy are better analyzed as DPs with no overt material other than the N (as in (259)), others appear obligatorily without determiners (as in (58)). The examples I give below in (260a) and (260b) are a bare N instrument (see Paul 2000:35 for a discussion of instrument advancement) and a bare N possessee respectively (see Keenan and Ralalaohery 2000 and Paul 2004 for a discussion of possessor raising). Neither the instrument nor the possessee can appear with a determiner as shown in (260c) and (260d) (similar to the Turkish case).

(259) a. Manasa lamba Rabe
   \textit{PRES.AT} wash clothes Rabe
   ‘Rabe is washing clothes.’
Taking the type of object DP in (259a) to be similar to the apparently case-less (and non-specific) DP of Turkish, taking the DP in (259b) to be similar to the overtly case-marked (and specific) DP of Turkish, and taking the nominals in (260) to be similar to the bare N of Turkish, we can see below that they have something else in common with their Turkish counterparts. Only the specific DP can be separated from the verb by an
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adverb. This is shown below. No adverbs can intervene between the V and either the bare N (as in (261a)) or the indefinite DP (as in (261b) below. This can be compared to (261c) where an adverb may intervene between the V and a specific DP.

(261)a. * Manosotra tsara menaka ny latabatra Rasoa
  PRES-AT-polish well oil DET table Rasoa
  ‘Rabe polishes the table well with oil.’

b. * Manasa tsara lamba Rabe
  PRES-AT-wash well clothes Rabe
  ‘Rabe washes clothes well.’

c. Manasa tsara ny lamba Rabe
  PRES-AT-wash well DET clothes Rabe
  ‘Rabe washes the clothes well.’

When material cannot appear between two linguistic elements, one can hypothesize that the two elements form one syntactic unit and thereby explain the adjacency. However, there is an alternative explanation. The two elements may be separate syntactic units but it is their structural relation that precludes any intervention. For example, Johnson (1991: 584) argues that it is syntactic structure that conspires to prevent material from appearing between an English verb and its object, not an adjacency condition on case assignment. I propose here that while the Turkish data cannot provide the evidence that the bare N is a separate syntactic element, the Malagasy data does. Malagasy has V-movement around the external argument which has remained in the specifier position of V,P. When this movement occurs, we can see that, even when there is a bare N, only the V moves. Here, then, we have a construction that shows that the adjacency between the bare N and the V can be broken, and we can see that the V is a separate linguistic unit.
I have given two types of bare Ns from Malagasy — the bare instrumental and the bare possessee. It may be that the bare possesseees are more similar to the bare Ns of Turkish. Paul (2004) shows that bare Ns fall into different classes which she terms bare objects and bare possesseees. The bare objects, unlike the Turkish bare Ns, introduce an entity into discourse. The bare possesseees, however, do not as shown in (263a) and (263b) below.

(263)a. Maty vady tampoka Rabe (K&R: (19b))
dead spouse suddenly Rabe
‘Rabe was suddenly widowed’

b. # Efa antitrantitra (izy) (K&R: (16b))
already oldish 3.NOM.SG
‘She was already oldish’

---

20 This V movement alone distinguishes it from the V+N movement that occurs in Niuean. For Massam (2001), the complex movement is an indication of XP predicate fronting. In Malagasy, it is clearly head movement.
As we have just seen in (262c), even these bare possessees are separable from the V. Facts such as these from Malagasy call into question an account where these bare Ns do not have a syntactic position of their own.  

I use the arguments from Kornfilt and from the Malagasy data to support a view of the bare N in Turkish that places it in the merged position of themes. If this is on the right track, the typology of Turkish DPs is comprised of the following three syntactic types — a DP within V₂P that never moves to Spec, ASP, a DP that has moved to Spec, ASP, and a DP that must at some point in a derivation be in Spec, ASP, but which, because of its overt case/specificity marking, is allowed to scramble more freely.

Of particular importance to the present discussion is that there is a derived object position that is within the VP that can measure out an event. In Aydemir (2004b), she shows that the bare Ns do not measure out an event while the case-less DP and the case-marked DP both do. The bit of data that we are most interested in is given below. We see that the case-less DP bir kitap ‘one book’ allows the predicate to appear with the frame adverbial.

(264) Esen (1 saatte) bir kitap oku-du
     Esen (1 hour.LOC) a/one book read-PST.3SG
     ‘Esen read a book (in an hour).’

We have seen through discussion of the German data and Aydemir’s observations on Turkish that VP internal DPs are able to enter into the computation of Aktionsart.

---

21 One may look to separable prefixes in German for an alternative account. In other words, perhaps only a part of the complex predicate moves. However, I assume a late adjunction analysis of separable prefixes in German (see Newell 2005). Such an analysis cannot be extended to the Malagasy facts since the element that would have to be analyzed as the adjunct would be an argument of the head. Late adjunction of an argument is unacceptable in Newell’s analysis.
5.3 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to investigate the relationship between derived objects and aspect. In Chapter 2, using syntactic data, I argued for a VP-internal derived object position. In Chapter 3, using morphological data, I argued for an aspectual head within the VP. While Chapter 4 set a view of event structure that offered a possible link between these two conclusions, it was important to provide evidence for the claim that the event related object position was indeed VP-internal. The data from Turkish was particularly helpful in showing that there are multiple object positions. There is a merged position which simply encodes the content of the event participant. Then there is a grammaticized position which allows the DP to measure an event. Finally, for appropriately licensed DPs, there are VP-external positions which interact with specificity and information structure.

Now that the phrase structure has been set up, I look more closely at the intersection of syntax and the lexicon (Chapter 6), the status of achievements (Chapter 7), and an account of coercion (Chapter 8).

---

22 There are many other languages that allow bare NPs appear in a position adjacent to the verb (e.g. Niuean (Massam 2001), Hindi (Dayal 1999)). Without further research, I make no claims about these languages.