

Imbabura (Quechua) is a “double object” language with overt accusative case marking on both objects, as illustrated by the examples in (1) and (2). The two objects behave differently, not only with respect to ability to be the subject of a passive clause, but also with respect to object agreement (optional, 1<sup>st</sup>SG only) and ability to be a pivot in the *tough*-movement construction (Jake 1985). Only the recipient in the ditransitive construction and the causee in the causative construction behave like primary objects. The examples in (3) and (4) show the differences with respect to passivization. Using the version of Mapping Theory (e.g., Bresnan & Zaenen 1990) proposed by Kibort (2004), together with Butt’s (2006) general approach to case, we provide an account of both the accusative case marking and the differential syntactic behavior of the two kinds of object. Restricting a [–r] classification of arguments to at most one non-subject accounts for the passive facts. The causee and the recipient are the second arguments at the level of argument structure and, as such, are necessarily classified [–r], for which reason they alone can be mapped to SUBJ if the agent is “demoted” to OBL. NPs with the GF OBJ can determine object agreement on verbs and can be the pivot in the *tough*-movement construction. OBJ<sub>θ</sub> cannot. There can be two accusative-marked NPs in a clause because the case-marking procedure is sensitive to the feature [+o]. As shown in (9), accusative case differs from an oblique case such as instrumental only in that it is lexically specified to occur on an object of any kind, i.e., an NP whose GF is one of those in the category defined by the feature [+o]. Nominative (i.e., no morphological case at all), occurs as the default or elsewhere case, which in Imbabura means with the SUBJ, as well as the demoted first argument/agent in a passive clause, as illustrated by (3) and (4). The analysis can be extended to a third kind of double object construction, illustrated by (5), in which the experiencer of a desiderative predicate and a patient are both marked with accusative case. The experiencer has various non-subject properties in addition to its case marking, including not triggering subject agreement and determining object agreement, as shown in (5), and determining noncoreferential switch-reference marking even when there is a coreferential SUBJ in a related clause, as shown in (6). The lack of a Subject Condition in Kibort’s approach to Mapping Theory opens up the possibility of an analysis according to which desiderative predicates have an argument structure and GFs just like the ditransitive and causative constructions, except with no agent/SUBJ, as shown in (10). The experiencer is lexically specified to map to OBJ (in effect, it “undergoes inversion to OBJ,” in the sense of Jake 1985), leaving only OBJ<sub>θ</sub> for the patient/theme. The proposed analysis is shown to be preferable on various grounds to one on which the experiencer is SUBJ with quirky accusative case. By way of example, the ungrammaticality of a triple accusative desiderative ditransitive clause, illustrated by (7), falls out from the proposed analysis, since accusative case is restricted to objects, of which there can only be two: OBJ in the second argument slot and OBJ<sub>θ</sub> in the third. If the experiencer were a quirky case SUBJ, there would be no principled way to rule out two object slots filled by other arguments. The few “subject” properties that the accusative experiencer has, such as ability to undergo raising to subject, as shown in (8), can be attributed to its status as PIV, in the sense of Falk (2006).

- (1) *quitsa-Ø jari-ta aswa-ta kara-rka-mi* DOUBLE-ACC DITRANSITIVE  
 girl-NOM man-ACC beer-ACC serve-3.PST-WIT  
 ‘The girl served the man beer.’
- (2) *taita-Ø-ka churi-ta ruwana-ta awa-chi-rka-mi* DOUBLE-ACC CAUSATIVE  
 father-NOM-TOP son-ACC poncho-ACC weave-CAUS-3.PST  
 ‘The father made his son weave a poncho.’

- (3) *ruku-Ø-ka mikuy-ta ñuka-Ø kara-shka ka-rka* PASSIVE WITH DITRANSITIVE  
 old-NOM-TOP food-ACC 1SG-NOM serve-PASS be-3.PST  
 ‘The old man was served food by me.’  
 \**aswa-Ø-ka jari-ta quitsa-Ø kara-shka-mi ka-rka*  
 ‘The beer was served the man by the girl.’
- (4) *ñuka-Ø-ka Maria-Ø papa-ta yanu-chi-shka ka-rka-ni* PASSIVE WITH CAUSATIVE  
 1SG-NOM-TOP Maria-NOM POTATO-ACC cook-CAUS-PASS be-PST-1SG  
 ‘I was made to cook potatoes by Maria.’  
 \**ruwana-Ø-ka taita-Ø churi-ta awa-chi-shka ka-rka*  
 poncho-NOM-TOP father-NOM son-ACC weave-CAUS-PASS be-3.PST  
 ‘The poncho was made to weave his son by the father.’
- (5) *ñuka-ta-ka wawa-ta wajta-naya-wa-rka* DOUBLE-ACC DESIDERATIVE  
 1SG-ACC-TOP child-ACC hit-DESID-1SG.OBJ-3.PST  
 ‘I wanted to hit the child.’
- (6) [*ñuka-ta puñu-naya-chun*] *pastilla-ta ufya-rka-ni* SWITCH REFERENCE  
 1SG-ACC sleep-DESID-NONCOREF pill-ACC drink-PST-1SG  
 When I desired to sleep, I took a pill. (Note: *-chun* indicates absence of coreferential subjects)
- (7) \**jari-ta ñuka-ta kafi-ta kara-naya-rka-chu* \* TRIPLE ACC DESIDERATIVE  
 man-ACC 1SG-ACC coffee-ACC serve-DESID-3.PST-Q  
 ‘Did the man want to serve me coffee?’
- (8) *kan-Ø-ga [puñu-naya-y] yari-ngi* DESIDERATIVE & RAISING  
 2-NOM-TOP sleep-DESID-INF seem-2.PRS  
 ‘You seem to want to sleep.’

Data from Jake (1985) & Hermon (1985)

Glosses and orthography adjusted for consistency.

NB: topic marking (*-ka/ga*) is common, but not required & not restricted to SUBJ

- (9) *-wan* (↑CASE) = INSTR    *-ta* (↑CASE) = ACC    *Default: Ø* case marking if there is no  
 (OBL<sub>instr</sub> ↑)                    ([+o]↑)                    compatible lexical case.

(10)	DITRANSITIVE	DESIDERATIVE
	Agent Recipient Theme	Experiencer Pat/Theme
	< arg <sub>1</sub> arg <sub>2</sub> arg <sub>3</sub> >	< arg <sub>2</sub> arg <sub>3</sub> >
	[-o]    [-r]    [+o]	[-r]            [+o]
	SUBJ    OBJ    OBJ <sub>θ</sub>	OBJ            OBJ <sub>θ</sub>
	<i>PIV</i>	<i>PIV</i>

#### REFERENCES

- Bresnan, J., and A. Zaenen. 1990. Deep unaccusativity in LFG. In *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*, K. Dziwirek, P. Farrell, and E. Mejías-Bikandi (ed.), 45–57. Stanford: CSLI.
- Butt, M. 2006. *Theories of case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jake, J.L. 1985. *Grammatical relations in Imbabura Quechua*. New York: Garland.
- Hermon, G. 1985. *Syntactic modularity*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Falk, Y. 2006. *Subjects and universal grammar: An explanatory theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kibort, A. 2004. Passive and passive-like constructions in English and Polish. Cambridge University dissertation.