Recall that I advertised that Accusative Case has a locality condition on it, and put that into the definition of Accusative Case assignment with the clause about "klose." The case I offered as evidence for the kloseness was (1).

(1) a. *I made him running easy.
   b. I made PRO running easy.

This example looks like (2).

We've got other problems that are the result of our move to v. We no longer have anything that ensures that the accusative Case marked DP is the first of complements in a VP. We should expect both of the structures to be grammatical.

I formulated a definition of klose that that didn't let Accusative Case assignment travel through more than one phrase. At the time, we had the idea that Accusative Case is assigned by verbs, and in (2) that verb would be \( \sqrt{\text{make}} \). Because him is separated from made by two phrases (AP and IP), they are not klose and Accusative Case assignment fails. But this way of rendering klose doesn't survive the hypothesis that it is v that assigns Accusative Case.

This was accounted for with an adjacency condition on Accusative Case assignment, but that too doesn't look like a useful proposal.

Imagine, for a moment, however, what would happen if we left the klose clause in our Accusative Case assignment rule. In all of these parses, \( \sqrt{\text{agree}} \) would not be able to value the acc feature on the object DP, since it is separated from v by more than one phrase. That could be corrected by deploying Argument Movement, which would produce the derivations in (4).
That problem is to understand why some verbs must have an external θ-role; that is, why some verbs must cooccur with v. The present syntax forces verbs to cooccur with an external θ-role optionally. By separating them, it makes their occurrence in any one sentence independent. Verbs like *melt* and *bounce* do seem to optionally cooccur with a v that contains *Agent*.

This correctly gets the DP to be first, so it solves that part of our problem. Of course, it wrongly puts the accusative Case-marked DP not only before every other phrase in the VP, it puts it before the verb as well.

Could the verb maybe also move? If the verb moves to v, then we would get the correct word order.

But this isn't the case for many other verbs. We want to preserve the controlling influence that particular lexical items have on the occurrence of v.

We can do this with Lexical Insertion and the X⁰ Constraint, if Head movement combines the verb with v. We can let the lexical items that make up the vocabulary of English force the combination of v with V. For instance, suppose that all versions of *make* (i.e., *makes*, *made*, etc.) match X⁰ positions only if those positions contain *Agent* as well as √*make*. Lexical Insertion, then, will only be successful if we assemble into one X⁰ position both the root √*make* and *Agent* (along with whatever features are relevant). Because the syntax separates *Agent* and √*make*, this will require Head Movement to put them together. By contrast, we can imagine that there are two lexical items for *bounce*. One of these only matches an X⁰ position that contains *Agent*, as well as √*bounce*, and that one, like *make*, requires a syntax that contains v, as well as a derivation that puts that v together with the verb containing √*bounce*. In addition, however, there is another *bounce* that does not require an X⁰ position that contains *Agent*. That *bounce* can be lexically inserted into a syntactic representation that contains no *Agent*, just so long as it contains a V⁰ with √*bounce* in it. This second *bounce* cannot be used,
however, in a syntactic representation in which v occurs but Head movement has not applied, because in that situation, the v0 that contains Agent will not satisfy the X0 Constraint. That constraint, recall, requires that every X0 be spelled out by Lexical Insertion, and in English there is no lexical item that expresses just Agent.

At present we have a constraint on Head Movement that prevents it from bringing to X0's together unless they are in an agree relation. We've adopted this constraint to prevent main verbs in English from moving to I0 when NegP is present. We do not have an entirely satisfactory account of the verbal system in English, so we should perhaps not be too wedding to conditions we've adopted solely as our result to account for these facts. If we do stick with the condition that requires agreement for Head Movement to occur, however, we'll have to build that into our account of v. We'll have to adopt the view that the θ-role that resides in v0 is the valued version of an unvalued exponent of that θ-role in V0. Our picture would be (7).

I will leave this out of our picture, but it's easily incorporated if it turns out that Head Movement is, indeed, licensed only when agree holds.

This, then, affords us an account for why accusative Case-marked DPs come before all other phrases in VP. But we still don't have an account for why (2) is ungrammatical. As we've just seen, it should have a derivation that leads to the grammatical S-structure in (8).

What goes wrong here has to do with a property of syntax that we have not yet broached. It turns out that movement operations are subject to what Ross (1967) called “island constraints.” The way he Ross conceived of these constraints is as syntactic structures that acted like islands. Nothing could be moved out of them. One of Ross's islands he called the “left branch condition,” and I'll formulate it with (9).

Ross did not investigate Argument Movement or Head Movement, but he did investi-gate Wh Movement. And he discovered that Wh Movement is blocked when it removes a wh phrase from another phrase that is on a “left branch.” Here are some examples.

What goes wrong in (8), then, is that it violates the Left Branch Condition.
This is roughly the proposal in Johnson (1991). The application of Argument Movement that brings the accusative Case marked DP into Specifier of VP is called "object shift," after a process found in the North Germanic languages which more obviously moves accusative Case marked DPs leftwards. Johnson does not call the position the verb moves into v, however. He does not equate the head that assigns Accusative Case with the head that assigns an external θ-role. Instead, he calls this head μ.

One piece of evidence that Johnson musters on behalf of letting the verb move is phrasal verbs or, as they are sometimes called, particle verbs. These verbs are the English cognates to the separable prefix verbs that we encountered in German. Recall that those verbs behave like they are one lexical item, but they can be broken up by Head Movement. In Johnson (1991), the analysis that puts the verb and the particle part together at D-structure into one X^0 is adopted. This allows D-structures like (11).

(11) TP
    ┌───────┐
    │       │
    │ T     │
    └───────┘
    │ TP    │
    │ ┌───────┐
    │ │       │
    │ │ T     │
    │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ pres │
    │ │ │ nom │
    │ │ │ unnom│
    │ │ │ vP   │
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ she  │
    │ │ │ │ Agent│
    │ │ │ │ acc  │
    │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ PP     │
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ V     │
    │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ V   │
    │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ V   │
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ hand
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ stuff
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ └─────────┘
    │ │ └─────────┘
    │ └─────────┘
    └─────────┘

A movement and Head Movement will create derivations like (12).

(12) TP
    ┌───────┐
    │       │
    │ T     │
    └───────┘
    │ TP    │
    │ ┌───────┐
    │ │       │
    │ │ T     │
    │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ pres │
    │ │ │ nom │
    │ │ │ unnom│
    │ │ │ vP   │
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ she  │
    │ │ │ │ Agent│
    │ │ │ │ acc  │
    │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ PP     │
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ V     │
    │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ V   │
    │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ V   │
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ hand
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ stuff
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ to them
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ └─────────┘
    │ │ └─────────┘
    │ └─────────┘
    └─────────┘

The Word Order in which the particle comes before the accusative Case marked DP I suggested comes by moving the verb and the particle together, as in (13).

(13) TP
    ┌───────┐
    │       │
    │ T     │
    └───────┘
    │ TP    │
    │ ┌───────┐
    │ │       │
    │ │ T     │
    │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ pres │
    │ │ │ nom │
    │ │ │ unnom│
    │ │ │ vP   │
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ she  │
    │ │ │ │ Agent│
    │ │ │ │ acc  │
    │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ to them
    │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ V     │
    │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ V   │
    │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ V   │
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ hand
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ stuff
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ │ │ ┌───────┐
    │ │ │ │ │ │ │ to them
    │ │ │ │ │ │ └───────┘
    │ │ │ │ └─────────┘
    │ │ └─────────┘
    │ └─────────┘
    └─────────┘

Note, then, that this analysis requires that Head Movement be able to move the verb+particle together, and this means that these two together are put into D-
structures as a single $X^0$. We saw in our examination of separable prefix verbs in German that something must prevent the verb+particle from moving into $C^0$ position. Head Movement in German necessarily separates the verb and its accompanying particle. We need to find an account for this difference. In Johnson (1991) it’s suggested that this is related to the fact that morphology generally doesn’t parse the entire verb+particle unit, but instead only the verbal part. The past tense morphology, for instance, changes the verbal part and not the verb+part part. Let’s assume this means that the inflectional features are bundled with the verbal root part of the expression and not the V+particle part. I suggested, then, that there is a condition that allows only the part containing inflectional features to be able to head move to an inflectional head. We can do that with a condition like (14).

(14) Only the smallest $X^0$ containing a feature can move to the $Y^0$ which that feature agrees with.

Because verbs in German must go through an inflectional head to get to $C^0$, this condition will force the verbal part of the V+particle to separate. Johnson (1991) thought main verbs in English also move to a Pollockian $T^0$ position, and were therefore forced to separate in that movement as well. (We’ve not adopted that view, however.)

An interesting feature of the verb particle construction in English is that if the object is a pronoun, there is a strong preference for it to come between the verb and the particle.

(15) a. She handed it out to them.
   b. *She handed out it to them.

In Johnson (1991), this fact was related to a generalization about the Germanic languages, which is that pronouns move as far leftwards as possible. Because Johnson (1991) held that the main verb in English could move as far as $T^0$, he speculated that pronouns shift leftwards out of the VP altogether. Since the movement of the verb to $T^0$ forces the separation of the particle and the verb, this results in the pronoun coming necessarily between verb and particle. If we don’t adopt that view, we might follow Diesing and Jelinek (1995), who suggest that Accusative pronouns in English are enclitic on a verb. They select the verbal part of the verb+particle pair to attach to. We have derivations that include (16).

(16) ![Diagram of verb particle construction]

This system derives what we need, but it does so in a way that relies on there being a locality condition on agree that doesn’t seem to hold generally for agree. For Accusative Case assignment, but not Nominative Case assignment, we have to embrace a locality condition that disallows agree through more than one phrase. Can we derive the same consequences without saying something special about Accusative Case assignment?

One direction has been to look for a locality condition of the sort that will do just what our present hypothesis claims. Another direction is to separate $v^0$ from the head that assigns Accusative Case. This head goes by various names – I called in $\mu$ and others have called it Object Agreement (Agr$_O$). One way of deploying this head is as in (17).
Head Movement can, in this framework too, bring the verb and v together, though now presumably there would be an intermediary step in which the verb and µ combine.

This model is called the “split VP” hypothesis, and Koizumi (1995) is its champion. It requires that we give up on explaining Burzio’s generalization by way of assigning the accusative Case assigners to v.
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