## Movement from the double object construction is not fully symmetrical

Anders Holmberg (Newcastle), Michelle Sheehan (Anglia Ruskin) & Jenneke van der Wal (Harvard)

Norwegian is a language with symmetrical double object constructions (DOCs): it permits both Th(eme) and R(ecipient) passives. Nonetheless an intriguing asymmetry emerges in Th passives: A-bar extraction of the R becomes ungrammatical, whereas A-bar extraction of the Th in an R passive is fully grammatical:

(1)	Hvilken bok ble mannen gitt?	[Th-wh. R-passive]
	which book was the man given	
(2)	*Hvilken mann ble boken gitt?	[*R-relative, Th-passive]
	which man was the book given	

Note that no such asymmetry is observed in prepositional datives, and unlike in Standard British English, there is no general ban on A-bar extraction of R (3). This suggests that in (2) A-movement blocks A-bar movement, or vice versa.

(3)	Hvem ga	du	boken?	
	Who gave	you	the.book	'Who did you give the book to?'

Initial research suggests that the same effect arises in other symmetrical languages: in North Western varieties of English and the Bantu languages Zulu, Xhosa, Swati, Lubukusu, Haya, and Fuliiru R cannot be relativized, or object-marked on the verb, in Th passives, whereas the opposite is grammatical. We call this the Double object movement asymmetry (**DOMA**)

(4) ✓ Th-extraction out of an R-passive ('Which book were the children given?')
 × R-extraction out of a Th-passive (\* 'Which children was the book given?')

The question we address in this talk is how we can account for DOMA. Given the standard view, A-movement and A-bar movement do not interact (see Rizzi 1990) and so DOMA is unexpected. It is thus necessary to revisit this view in line with proposals by Aldridge (2004), Coon et al. (2014) and van Urk (2015).

Following Marantz (1993) and Pylkkänen (2008), we assume that R in the DOC is introduced by the applicative head (Appl). Unlike Pylkkänen, however, we assume that Appl selects VP.

(5) [ApplP Recipient Appl [VP V Theme]]

In order to derive symmetrical DOCs in the first place (a notorious challenge because of relativised minimality), we adopt Haddican & Holmberg's (2013, forthcoming) proposal that languages vary in the Case-assigning properties of Appl (as in (6). In symmetrical languages Appl can assign Case to either Recipient or Theme, leaving the remaining object to be Case-licensed by another head. In an active clause this is little v, whereas in a passive it is T.

```
(6) vP
(6) vP
(7) v ApplP
(7) v Appl VP
(7) v P
(7) v
```

To account for the DOMA and thus the ungrammaticality of (2) and (4), we propose the following analysis. A passive vP is non-phasal, making the object accessible to T. In DOCs, however, ApplP is present. Following Chomsky's (2008) definition of the lower phase as having complete argument structure, this means that ApplP is a phase in the passive. As

movement must proceed through the phase edge, this means that the object to be licensed by T must move from specApplP. This is why passives of DOCs are a unique context where A-movement must proceed through a phase edge.

In R-passives (7b), the need to move through the phase edge is trivially satisfied as R originates there. T licenses R, and C moves whTh from the outer specApplP.

In Th passives (7a), however, Th must raise to specApplP, and it is this movement which traps R inside the phase, assuming a 'single escape hatch' (see Aldridge 2004, 2008, Coon et al. 2014 for similar proposals for syntactic ergativity). That is, upon merging the next phase head (C), the lower phase (ApplP) is transferred to the PF interface and thus impenetrable for further operations (PIC2):



We show that this account correctly covers the DOMA in symmetrical languages and extend the analysis in two ways:

First, even in **Italian**, a language which superficially seems to lack the DOC, we find the same asymmetry:

(1)	*A chi saranno	date	alcune idee	da questo	libro?
	To who be.FUT.3PL	given.FPL	some ideas	by this	book

A-bar extraction of R is impossible from a Th passive with a non-agentive by-phrase. This non-agentivity is evidence for a true DOC (which does not need an agentive subject), rather than a prepositional dative (which does, Oehrle 1976). Italian is thus shown to have both constructions (cf. Cuervo 2003 on Spanish), but it only shows the asymmetry in the DOC.

Second, **object marking** in a number of symmetrical Bantu languages also 'becomes' asymmetrical in the passive, and our analysis accounts for this asymmetry as well.

- (8) a. Aba-ntwana ba-ya-yi-fund-el-w-a in-cwadi. Zulu (Adams 2010)
  2-child 2SM-PRES.DJ-9OM-read-APPL-PASS-FV 9-book
  'The children are being read the book.'
  \* In-cwadi i-ya-ba-fund-el-w-a aba-ntwana.
  - b. \* In-cwadi i-ya-ba-fund-el-w-a aba-ntwana
     9-book 9SM-PRES.DJ-2OM-read-APPL-PASS-FV 2-children int. 'The book is being read to the children.'

<sup>Aldridge, E. 2004. Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. PhD, Cornell University.
Aldridge, E. 2008. Phase-Based Account of Extraction in Indonesian.</sup> *Lingua* 118: 1440-1469.
Coon, J., P. M. Pedro & O. Preminger. 2014. The role of case in A-bar extraction asymmetries: evidence from Mayan. *Linguistic Variation* 14 (2), 179-242.
Marantz, A. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In Mchombo, S. (ed.), Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar, 113-150. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
Oehrle, R. T. 1976. The grammatical status of the English dative alternation. Ph.D. dissertation. MIT.
Pylkkänen, L. 2008. Introducing arguments. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.