positioned between the two different verbal projections vp and VP .(231) (known as the split **VP hypothesis** cf. Bobaljik 1995, Carnie 1995, Harley 1995, and Koizumi1995) The core assumption underlying this analysis is that just as nominative DPs raise to spec-AgrSP in order to check their nominative case so too objective DPs raise to spec-AgrOP in order to check their objective case-feature and (in languages in which verbs inflect for agreement with their objects) their object-agreement features under spec-head agreement with AgrO. (231) In both cases, agreement features are checked under a spec-head relation between a functional head and its specifier. (231)

One argument that objective DPs move in order to check their case comes from systematic differences between the position of CP complements and DP complements. (231) By assuming the **uniform theta-assignment hypothesis**, the DP complement *robbery* , in (3), must originate in the same position as the CP complement *that there had been a robbery* since they both have the thematic role THEME argument of *reported.*

(3)

(i) He reported to the police *that there had been a robbery.*

(ii) He reported *the robbery* to the police.

(iii) * I was sure *of that she would come.*

(iv) I was sure *of the robbery.*

However, they have different underlying structures with the assumption that *that* -clauses do not take objective case as they cannot occur as complements of transitive prepositions, as shown in (3) (iii). Accordingly ,they do not move for checking purposes: this is why they are clause final. The DPs ,on the other hand, are postverbal ;i.e. as they carry objective case ,they have to raise to spec-AgrOP for case-checking. Accordingly, the **economy**