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1 Introduction

The minimalist program (Chomsky (1993, 1994), Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)) does not allow any overt operation of verbs and objects before Spell-Out in languages like English. It is because covert movement at LF is more economical. However, there are interesting English data that avoid explanation by the covert verb/object movement approach. They are the cases of backward binding observed only in the dative construction but not in the double object construction. This contrast is not well explained by Larson (1988) or Chomsky (1993). Fujita (1996)'s well-constructed theory has also some theoretical weaknesses in its explanation. In order to explain the contrast between double object construction and dative construction, first I assume an alternate thematic hierarchy with Non-Themes in the Spec of the second-highest VP (Johnson (1991), Kozumi (1993), Lasnik (1997), and Stroik (1996)). Second, based on the alternate thematic hierarchy, I suggest a proliferated VP-Shell structure which has maximally two functional maximal projections between vP1 and VP2. Under this framework I argue that in English all verbs and objects move overtly in order to have actual surface word order. The binding theory as a global principle monitoring entire derivation from D1 to Dn will be discussed.

2 VP-Shell Structure and Thematic Hierarchies

2.1 The Second-highest Theme and Covert Object Movement

Larson (1988) explains the asymmetries in syntactic domains between the double object construction (1a&b) and the dative construction (2a&b) by suggesting the single complement hypothesis and the VP-Shell structure.

(1) a. I showed Mary, herself,
   b. *I showed herself, Mary,

(2) a. I showed Mary, to herself;
   b. *I showed herself, to Mary,

To satisfy the binding principle A for anaphor binding, the indirect object Mary of the double object construction (1) needs to c-command the direct object herself, while in the dative construction of (2) the direct object Mary needs to c-command the indirect object herself in PP Larson's "pseudo passive-like movement" illustrating the derivation of the double object construction from the dative construction is an attempt to maintain an argument with the thematic role of 'Theme' in the second-highest SPEC of VP when there are more than two arguments. The following structure shows the hierarchy of argument assignment:

---

1 I am grateful to the audience of the syntax section, especially to Sara Rosen and Thomas Stroik for helpful comments and encouragement.
The thematic hierarchy and subsequent derivation on the VP-Shell structure (3), however, do not correctly capture the backward binding relation found in the dative construction of (4a', b' & c'). Consider

(4) a *John showed each other's parents the boys
   a' ? John showed each other's boys to the parents ← Backward Binding

   b *John gave each other's mothers the babies
   b' ? John gave each other's babies to the mothers ← Backward Binding

   c *John sent his owner every paycheck
   c' ? John sent his book to every author ← Backward Binding

(Data from Fujita 1996 146-148)

In the pre-movement structure of (4a), which is shown as (5) in the following, Larsonian VP-Shell structure will locate the boys (Theme) in the Spec of VP₂. Given that at LF showed covertly moves to Agro via Agro and the boys in the Spec of VP₂ covertly moves up to the Spec of AgroP external to vP₁, we have an LF structure (6) in which the reciprocal pronoun each other is bound by the antecedent the boys in the Spec of AgroP (Note that in the minimalist program the binding relation is checked at LF). Consider

(5) Pre-Movement Structure of (4a)
   *[AgroP Spec [Agro vP₁ John [v₁ ' v₁ [vP2 the boys [v₂ showed [IP each other's parents ] ]]]

(6) LF-Structure of (4a)
   *[John showedk [Agro the boysj [Agro' t'k Agro [vP₁ k [v₁' t'k [vP2 l [v₂ l each other's parents ] ]]]

However, different from expectation, the resulting sentence is not only ungrammatical, but also it is not even identical with the actual word order (4a). In addition, instead of the structurally Case-marked object each other's parents the so-called inherently Case-marked object the boys has moved to the structural Case checking position, the Spec of AgroP, shown in (6)

Concerning (4a') where the opposite binding relation to (4a) is shown, the LF structure is judged 'marginal', not 'ungrammatical'. The other data from (4b) to (4c) also show a marginal reading, which is contra to the expectation of the grammar. Thus, these data raise a question about the thematic hierarchy adopted by Larson (1988) and Hale & Keyser (1993), calling for further discussion.
2.2. The Second-highest Non-Theme(s) and Covert/Overt Object Movement

The fuzzy binding relation of (4) might look properly handled by employing an alternate thematic hierarchy of Agent>Non-Theme(s)>Theme under the same covert movement approach of verbs and objects as in 2.1, though we will reject the idea immediately. Pre-movement structures (or roughly D-structures) of (4) obeying the alternate thematic hierarchy with Non-Themes in the Spec of VP2 are shown in the following (7) and (8). Data (4) are rearranged according to grammaticality. Consider the pre-movement structures

(7) a. * [[PP]John \[v \ v1 \[vP2 each other's parents \[v showed the boys]]]] (for (4a))
   b. * [[PP]John \[v \ v1 \[vP2 each other's mothers \[v gave the babies]]]] (for (4b))
   c. * [[PP]John \[v \ v1 \[vP2 its author \[v sent every book]]]] (for (4c))

(8) a. ? [[PP]John \[v \ v1 \[vP2 to the parents \[v showed each other's boys]]]] (for (4a'))
   b. ? [[PP]John \[v \ v1 \[vP2 to the mothers \[v gave each other's babies]]]] (for (4b'))
   c. ? [[PP]John \[v \ v1 \[vP2 to every author \[v sent his book]]]] (for (4c'))

Ungrammaticality of the sentences (4a-c) which are derived from (7a-c) might be explicable correctly. First movement of the verbs showed, gave, and sent to v1 before Spell-Out will produce actual surface order (4a-c). Second covert movement of the verbs to Agro after Spell-Out should be followed by covert movement of Non-Theme arguments such as each other's parents and its author to the Spec of AgroP. This derivation does not produce a configuration in which reciprocals are bound by their possible antecedents such as the boys, the babies, and every book, since it is reciprocals that keep moving higher than their possible antecedents. Thus, the grammar correctly judges the sentences of (4a-c) ungrammatical.

However, this approach does not work for the dative constructions (4a'-c'). Unlike (4a-c), movement of the verb to v1 before Spell-Out cannot provide the expected actual word order (4a'-c') from the initial structures (8a-c).

We may stipulate for overt verbal movement to Agro passing over vP1 so that Theme arguments such as each other's boys and his book may be located higher than Non-Theme arguments. However, this movement is rejected immediately due to illegitimate operation the minimal complement domain\(^2\) that is formed by the verb movement from v1 to Agro no longer includes the innermost arguments, that is, Themes, thus making movement of Theme argument unlicensed.

The problem we have here actually cannot be solved only by overt/covert distinction of movement. The problem is that regardless of which thematic hierarchy we adopt, as far as we maintain the VP-Shell structure of (3), we come to have (some) outputs that do not reflect actual surface word order of the sentences at hand. This observation leads us to reconsider the VP-Shell structure of (3) for modification.

3 Proliferated vP Structure and Overt Object Movement

Get back to the sentences (6a-c) which are repeated as (9)

(9) Pre-Movement Structures for (4a'-c')

a ? [vP1 John [v1 v1 [vP2 to the parents [v2 showed each other's boys]]]

b ? [vP1 John [v1 v1 [vP2 to the mothers [v2 gave each other's babies]]]

c ? [vP1 John [v1 v1 [vP2 to every author [v2 sent his book]]]

Note that the problems we have had so far are closely related with adjacent vP1 and VP2 actually disallow the most deeply imbedded Theme argument to move to a higher position than the Non-Theme argument to produce expected surface word order (4a'-c')

Note that given the verb movement from v2 to v1 in (9), the verbal chain (showed, t2) has both [Spec, vP1] and [Spec, VP2] as minimal domain 3 [Spec, vP1] is already filled with ‘John’, or its trace, and [Spec, VP2] is filled with PP to the parents. Thus, there is no position where the DP each other’s parents to move to and get its Case checked. Thus, if we build some functional projection between vP1 and VP2 to provide a landing site for the Theme argument, then the problem caused by adjacent two VP’s may disappear. The rough structure with a VP-internal functional projection will be as follows 4

(10) [vP1 [v1 v [FP F [vP2 [v2 V [XP]]]]]]

The FP of (10) should be AgrP because the Theme object each other’s parents gets its Case checked in the Spec of the FP against the verb adjoined to F. In the following section, let us first discuss if the structure of (10) and the subsequent overt object derivation strategy ensure actual surface word order of (4a'-c') from (9a-c)

Derivation from (9a) will be as follows. First, the verb showed overtly moves to F. Then the complement of the verb each other’s boys, which is within the minimal complement domain of the chain (V, t2), also overtly moves up to the Spec of FP for Case checking. The Non-Theme to the parents remains in-situ (within VP2) through entire derivation, since all its morphological features, especially the Case feature, will be checked in-situ against P probably by way of AgrP (Greed). Thus, we can correctly produce the expected surface word order (4a’) John showed each other’s boys to the parents. Further derivation will still be able to maintain the Theme each other’s boys structurally superior to the Non-Theme to the parents 5 (9b&c) under (10) also reach the expected surface order (4b’) and (4c’) respectively.

Now let us discuss the production of double object construction (4a-c) under (10). Before we test our approach under (10) to gain the actual word order (4a-c), however, it might be useful to discuss previous approaches to the double object construction especially by Chomsky (1993) and Fujita (1996) for comparison’s sake

---

3 Refer to Chomsky (1993 16)
4 For a similar discussion of functional projections within the VP, refer to Fujita (1996 154-156)
5 The binding issue raised by the derivation will be discussed in the following section
Let us begin with Chomsky (1993). He suggests, following Larson (1988), that the inherently Case-marked object should remain in-situ. Under the minimalist program, this presumably means that the inherently Case-marked object already has its Case feature licensed and therefore does not raise to the Spec position of some Agr projection for Case checking but remains in-situ even after Spell-Out (see Lasnik 1995 for a different view). His analysis starts from (11b) to end with (11a) through the derivation (11c).

(11) a. *John showed each other's parents the boys  
   b. [TP:John [v v [vP each other's parents [vV showed the boys]]]]  
   c. [AgrsP:John [Agrs each other's parentsk [Agrs showed] + Agrs [TP: t1 t1 t2 [vP:t2 t2 t1 the boys]]]

The non-movement approach to the inherently Case-marked object is also shared by Fujita (1996), though detailed structures are different. As (12) and (13) show in the following, their structures for the double object construction contain only one AgrsP in which only structural Case can be checked.

(12) Chomsky (1993) for Double Object construction  
[AgrsP Spec [Agrs Agrs TP [t1 [TP: Agrs Spec [Agrs Agro [TP: t1 Spec [v v [vP: Spec [v2 V DP]]]]]]]]

(13) Fujita (1996 160-161) for Double Object Construction  

For further discussion, let us review Fujita’s structure for double object construction in more detail. Consider (14) (next page).

In his structure (14), the Spec of VP2 is the position in which the Causer role is assigned. By suggesting (14) he ensures that the second object does not c-command the first object anywhere in the derivation. V3 raises to V2 in overt syntax, as before. Then at LF the V2-V3 complex raises to Agro and DP2 moves to [Spec, AgroP] for accusative Case checking. By contrast to DP2, which has structural Case, he assumes with Larson (1988) that DP1 has inherent Case, as mentioned before. Thus no movement is applicable even after Spell-Out. Consequently, DP1 does not c-command the trace of DP2 at any time during the derivation, and VP-internal backward binding under LF reconstruction is correctly excluded.

Either approach can correctly produce the actual word order (4a-c) from the initial.

6 Chomsky and Fujita do not assume the alternate thematic hierarchy adopted by this paper. However, the surface order of the inherent Case-marked object as in (7) is the same as that under the alternate thematic hierarchy. That is, it is located in the second-highest argument position on the surface structure.

7 Chomsky (1993) assumes that the inherently Case-marked object does not move at all. Thus, in terms of AgroP, he does not distinguish the structures between the double object construction and the dative construction. Both structures are analyzed to have only one AgroP. Fujita (1996) basically agrees to Chomsky’s non-movement approach to the inherently Case-marked object. However, concerning the backward binding dative construction, he departs from Chomsky in that he builds up another maximal projection AgrP between VP2 and VP3. See Fujita (1996 158-162) for additional discussion
structures (7a-c) respectively and well explain why there is no backward binding occurring in the double object construction

(14) a. \([\text{VP} \ V \ \text{DP}_2 \ \text{DP}_1]\)  
   b. *John showed each other’s parents the boys 
   c. \(\text{VP}_1\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{Subj}_1\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{V}_1\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{AgroP}\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{Spec}\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{Agro}'\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{Agro}\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{VP}_2\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{Subj}_2\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{V}_2\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{VP}_3\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{DP}_2\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{V}'\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{each other’s friends}\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{showed}\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(/\)  
      \(\text{the boys}\)  

However, immediate questions that we can ask about the two analyses will be why the inherently Case-marked object remains in-situ ?, why is there only one AgroP which is only for structural Case checking ?, how does the inherently Case-marked object have its Case checked ?, is it necessary to post two separate Case checking systems, one by Spec-head relation (structural Case checking) and the other possibly by head-complement relation (Inherent Case checking) ?

The questions are very closely related with the (backward) binding relation that is assumed to be checked at LF in the minimalist program Fujita 8 explains the marginal reading of the dative constructions (4a’-c’) by the LF reconstruction effect His analysis is as follows

(15) LF-Reconstruction and Binding
a. \([\text{VP} \ V \ \text{DP}_1 \ P \ \text{DP}_2]\)  
   b. \([\text{VP}_1 \ \text{Subj}_1 \ [\text{VP} \ V \ \text{I} \ [\text{AgrpP Spec} \ [\text{Igrpo}\text{ Agro} \ [\text{VP}_2 \ \text{Subj}_2 \ [\text{V}_2 \ \text{I} \ [\text{AgrpP Spec} \ [\text{Igrpo}\text{ Agrp} \ [\text{VP}_3 \ [\text{DP}_1 \ each other’s friends} \ [V \ showed \ [VP \ to \ [\text{DP}_2 \ the \ boys}\]\) \]

Note that in order to explain the VP-internal backward binding found in the dative construction, he introduces AgrpP external to VP3 but below AgroP His idea is that in the dative construction the second object DP2 covertly moves to the Spec of AgrpP for Case checking, from which it c-commands the trace of the first object DP1 in the Spec of VP3 However, because the second object DP2 that has covertly moved to the Spec of AgrpP is still c-commanded by the first object

---

8 Note that the backward binding phenomenon in the dative construction is not properly dealt with in Chomsky(1993)
DP₁ that has already moved to the Spec of AgrP, only the marginal reading is available.

One important question here is how DP₂ moves up to the Spec of AgrP external to VP₂. In order to move the second object the boys from its original position, it is required for its head to move upwards to somewhere it can adjorn, so that the minimal domain should be formed.

In order to make P move, Fujita adopts “reanalysis”, by which he argues that P adjorns to V₃ like an instance of incorporation. Then the V-P complex raises to AgrP and Case-checks the second object DP₂ which moves to [Spec, AgrP]. He provides the following as evidence for adjunction of P to V (ibid, 156-157) Consider:

(16) a. John talked to Mary
   b. Mary was talked to t,
   c. P adjorns to V, the V-P complex raises to AgrP, Obj Mary in (b) moves to [Spec, AgrP]

We, however, should be very careful in adopting “reanalysis” as syntactic evidence. We may take advantage of P to V incorporation based on reanalysis, for which the stranded P after V in (16b) can be good evidence. However, it is a different story when it comes to the so-called transitive constructions like the dative construction. Consider the difference between the following two sets of sentences:

(17) a. John talked to Mary
   b. Mary was talked to t, (=16b)

(18) a. *John showed each other’s boys to the parents
   b. The parents were shown each other’s boys to t (=4a’)

The ungrammaticality of (18b) indicates that P to V incorporation may not occur so freely as Fujita assumes. If P to V incorporation is not allowed for (18b) as it is in (17b), then we do not have any way to move P to AgrP via V in (15b), which will be a big problem for Fujita’s theory with AgrP external to VP₃. The location of AgrP external to VP₃ in (15) is crucial because it is supposed to guarantee the VP-internal backward binding. Consider why he denies the conventional position of AgrP immediately over PP:

(19) a. [VP V DP₁ P DP₂ ]
   b. [VP₃ DP₁ [V’ V₃ [AgrP Spec [AgrP AgrP [PP P DP₂ ] ]]

(19a) stands for a backward binding dative construction in which syntactically lower DP₂ binds the trace of DP₁ at LF, resulting in a marginal reading. If AgrP were built immediately over PP as in (19b), then after P moves to AgrP and DP₂ to Spec of AgrP, DP₂ cannot c-command DP₁ (or the trace of DP₁). Therefore, he constructs AgrP external to VP₃ based on the weak evidence of P to V incorporation.

Both Chomsky (1993) and Fujita (1996) are able to produce the actual surface word order of the double object construction (4a-c) from their initial structures. Both of them could also explain why there is no backward binding phenomenon occurring in the double object construction (recall discussion from (11) to (14)). However, as we have discussed, their
approaches to the inherently Case-marked object have weaknesses in assuming the unclear in-situ Case checking mechanism and the P to V incorporation, etc.

In the following sections, departing from Chomsky and Fujita, I will first deepen the postponed discussion on the production of the actual word order of the double object construction (4a-c) under the proliferated VP structure (10) and the alternate thematic hierarchy. The discussion will extend to include the asymmetry of backward binding phenomenon between double object construction and dative construction.

The proliferated VP structure (10) and the alternate thematic hierarchy that we have adopted in 2.2 are repeated as (20a&b). A double object construction (4a) and its pre-movement structure under the proliferated VP structure (10) are repeated as (21a&b) in the following.

Consider (20).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(20) a. } & [vP_1 [v_1 v [\text{FP} [F_1 [vP_2 [v_2 V [\text{XP}]]]]]]] \quad (=\text{(10)}) \\
& \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\
& \text{(Agent)} \quad \text{(Non-Themes)} \quad \text{(Theme)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[b \quad \text{Agent} > \text{Non-Theme(s)} > \text{Theme} \quad (=\text{(3)})\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(21) } [vP \quad V \quad DP_2 \quad DP_1] \\
& a \quad *\text{John showed each other's parents the boys} \quad (=\text{(4a)}) \\
& b \quad *[vP_1\text{John} [v \quad v_1 [\text{AgroP Spec} \quad \text{Agro}] \quad \text{Agro} \quad \text{DP_2} \quad \text{each other's parents} \quad [v_2 \quad \text{showed} \quad [\text{DP_1 the boys}]]]
\end{align*}
\]

Remember that our approach is not favorable to in-situ Case checking. If the inherently Case-marked DP_1 should also move to a higher position for Case checking, then we are definitely in need of another maximal functional projection of Agro. The label will be AgroP and inherent Case is supposed to be checked in the Spec of AgroP. Its position on the structure will be decided by cyclic movement of constituents for actual word order (21a). The structure including the new AgroP will be as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(22) } & [vP_1 \quad \text{Spec} [v_1 v [\text{AgroP Spec} \quad \text{Agro} \quad \text{AgroP Spec} \quad \text{Agro} \quad \text{DP_2} \quad [v_2 V \quad [\quad \text{DP_1} \quad ]]\quad ]]
\end{align*}
\]

When the verb showed first moves to the AgroP external to VP_2, then DP_1 which belongs to the minimal complement domain\(^9\) of the chain (V_1, tv) will follow to the Spec of AgroP. Next movement of the verb to Agro will induce the movement of DP_2 to the Spec of AgroP. Further derivation will still maintain the surface word order of (4a) correctly John showed each other's parents the boys. (Note that for the dative construction, there will be no necessity of AgroP). In this way, we can correctly derive correct surface word order for all (4a-c).

Next discussion is about how we can explain in a unified way that a marginal reading is available for the dative construction (4a'-c') while it is not for the double object construction (4a-c). Let us think about the marginal reading of the dative construction (4a'-c') first.

\[^9\text{Refer to Chomsky (1993 19)}\]
Recall that as is discussed in (15) and below, Fujita explains the marginal reading of the dative construction (4a'-c') based on the observation that at LF, covertly moved DP2 the parents in the Spec of AgrpP c-commands the trace of NP1, each other’s boys, partially satisfying binding theory A. Under our theory assuming the alternate thematic hierarchy, DP2 in the PP to the parents should remain in-situ, or it should go up to the Spec of Agrp immediately dominating the PP for accusative Case checking against P adjoined to Agrp (23a) in the following shows the initial structure of (4a’), and (23a’) is the detailed structure of Agrp over PP occupying the Spec of VP2 (23b) has the partial LF structure of (4a’) under our theory.

(23) [VP V DP1 P DP2]  
   a. [VP1 John [v v1 [AgroP Spec [Agro Agro [VP2 to the parents [v showed each other’s boys]]] ] ]  
   a’ [VP1 John [VP2 [Agrp [DP2 the parents]] [Agrp to2+Agrp [Pp [v t1] [v2 t2]]] showed EO’s boys] ]  
   b. [VP1 John [showed+ v1 [AgroEO’s boys] [Agro t1 [VP2 to the parents [v2 t1 t2]]]]]  

As is shown in (23a’), DP2 in the Spec of VP2 remains within VP2 during entire derivation, thus not being able to c-command DP1 in the Spec of AgroP. However, we have very important information that we can depend on to explain the marginal reading the initial c-commanding relation in which the Non-Theme object DP2 binds the Theme object DP1 as depicted in (23a). The subsequent derivation from the initial structure (23a) just disturbs the original structural relation between DP2 and DP1. Under the copy theory of movement in the minimalist program, the trace is a complete copy of the moved element. Thus, we can stipulate that though the original binding relation gets disturbed as we approach the LF, basically DP2’s c-commanding DP1 is still said to be maintained DP2 c-commands the trace of DP1 at LF. Thus, we can say that the marginal reading is due to the disturbed c-commanding relation between DP2 and DP1 when DP1 each other’s boys moves to the higher Spec of AgroP external to VP2 and c-commands DP2.

The explanation given above is very different from that of Fujita in that our binding theory monitors binding relation 'cumulatively during entire derivation'10 from Derivation1 to DerivationN until it reaches LF. This might look against the minimalist spirit which maintains that all syntactic principles including the binding theory apply at LF.

Concerning this issue, one idea is that we may consider the binding theory like the inclusiveness condition (Chomsky 1995 225)11 which is about the requirement of the outputs at LF but actually influences entire derivation from D1 to DN. I will leave this issue open for further discussion.

Next let us discuss the production of double object construction (4a-c) which do not show backward binding phenomenon. Initial and partially derived structures of (4a) are listed as (24a-c) in the following. Consider:

---

10 (23b) shows that at LF we have two opposite binding relations between DP2 and DP1 (1) DP1 c-commands DP2, and (2) DP2 c-commands the trace of DP1. In this paper, this bazaar situation is taken to be a main reason to cause a marginal reading because the original binding relation of DP2 c-commanding DP1 is blurred.

11 Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky (1995 225))

"Outputs consist of nothing beyond properties of items of the lexicon (lexical features) I e., the interface levels consists of nothing more than arrangements of lexical features"
The initial structure (24a) shows that the reciprocal pronoun each other is not bound by the boys. The initial binding relation becomes reversed in (24b) the boys c-commands each other. Thus, if the derivation ended in (24b), the disturbed binding relation might result in a marginal sentence. However, continued derivation (24c) confirms the initial non-binding relation between the two DPs. Therefore, the cumulative judgment from D₁ to D₉ for (24) will be an ungrammatical sentence. Marginal reading of (4b'&c') are also explicable by the same process.

4 Conclusion

In this paper I have discussed the contrast that are observed between double object construction and dative construction in the dative construction the second object can bind an anaphor contained in the first object, but analogous backward binding is prohibited in the double object construction I have shown that neither Larson's (1988) Thematic hierarchy and VP-Shell structure can handle the contrasts, nor can Chomsky (1993) As a recent approach, Fujita (1996) has been carefully evaluated I have argued that though his theory can explain the contrast very well, it has some weak arguments on which his important mechanisms such as P to V incorporation, in-situ Case checking for inherently Case-marked are based. To allow the inherently Case-marked object to move upwards so that inherent Case is also be able to be Case-checked structurally, I build up AgroP external to VP₂ but below AgroP. I have argued that the proliferated VP-Shell structure and the alternate Thematic hierarchy necessitates overt verb and object movement. In my approach, the binding principle is not just applicable at LF as is widely assumed in the minimalist program, but it is more like an inclusive condition which monitors entire derivation from D₁ (an initial structure) to D₉ (a final structure) until all the syntactic operations end.
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