

- VOVIN, ALEXANDER. 2001. North East Asian historical-comparative linguistics on the threshold of the third millennium. *Diachronica* 18.1.93–137.
- WIIK, KALEVI. 2000. Some ancient and modern linguistic processes in Northern Europe. In Renfrew et al., 463–79.

Department of Linguistics  
University of California  
405 Hilgard Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90095–1543  
[anttila@humnet.ucla.edu]

**The syntax of ditransitives:** Evidence from clitics. By ELENA ANAGNOSTOPOULOU.  
Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. Pp. xiv, 379. ISBN 3110170280. \$114.40 (Hb).

Reviewed by MARCEL DEN DIKKEN, *CUNY Graduate Center*

The syntax of ditransitives has long been a densely researched topic—an octopus whose tentacles have touched upon many a major issue in linguistic research, including the representation of argument structure, the syntax of argument-structure alternations, case theory, configurational structure and the binary branching hypothesis, A'-syntax and scope, c-command-based vs. linearity-based approaches to asymmetries, and locality. Elena Anagnostopoulou's eminently detailed book contributes to this fertile field a study that focuses on the last-mentioned issue: the ways in which ditransitive constructions impinge on locality theory—particularly, the locality of A-movement. And by doing so, it defends a syntax of ditransitives in which double-object and prepositional ditransitives have radically different (and transformationally unrelated) structures, and, along the way, it elucidates the role of case theory in reining in the possibilities of A-movement by showing that case theory plays no major role here at all (thus lending support to Chomsky's (2000, 2001) 'demotion' of case as a factor in triggering and constraining movement). Its results bear obliquely on the many questions surrounding the argument structure of triadic verbs; but by making the locality restrictions on A-movement its focal point, this study sheds much-needed light on major questions that have lingered in footnotes or disclaimers for much too long, issues on which the minimalist approach to syntactic derivation affords us a particularly clear window.

A sets herself two major goals in her book: (i) 'establishing that NP-movement can be used as an analytic tool for probing into the properties of ditransitives', and (ii) showing that 'cross-linguistic variation results from the interplay between the morpho-syntactic properties of double object constructions and the syntax of clitics' (1). This second goal earns the book its subtitle, which, interestingly enough, is not reflected in the blurb text on the back cover. And indeed, evidence from clitics plays a central role only in the last two, relatively short, chapters of the book, with Ch. 4 making a detailed case for the idea that clitics obviate locality effects and Ch. 5 addressing person restrictions. Clitics figure prominently in the context of these person restrictions: in ditransitives with two weak pronominal or clitic objects, the direct object has to be third person. But one of the main contributions of Ch. 5 is precisely its demonstration of the fact that these restrictions by no means cluster specifically around clitics: in Icelandic constructions with a quirky dative subject, the nominative object agreeing with the finite verb has to be third person as well.

Overwhelming in empirical detail, drawing directly and heavily on other scholars' work, and often contenting itself with stipulations instead of explanations, Ch. 5 is a somewhat unfortunate finale. It is nonetheless an important piece of the puzzle because of its impact on the fine-tuning of the definition of locality and the cycle that the book needs. To explain how the indirect object restricts the person specifications of the direct object, A has the indirect object clitic raise to the *v*-head that checks the clitic's  $\phi$ -features FIRST, followed by the direct object. On the assumption (supported by Icelandic quirky subject agreement but not derived from anything) that the indirect-object clitic checks person but not number on *v*, cliticization of the indirect object leaves *v* with a number feature to check against the direct-object clitic, which it can indeed check if the direct-

object clitic is third person (i.e. NONPERSON; Benveniste 1966) but not if it is first or second person: a first or second person direct-object clitic, possessing both number and person features, fails to MATCH a  $v$ -head that only has a number feature left.<sup>1</sup> For this analysis to work, we must make the MINIMAL LINK CONDITION (MLC) an integral part of the definition of Move/Attract: If we required that the derivation proceed strictly cyclically within phases (Chomsky 2001), the direct-object clitic would go up to  $v$  first, checking ALL of  $v$ 's  $\phi$ -features if first/second person and thus wrongly making the derivation of *\*tha mu se stilune* 'They will send me you' converge.<sup>2</sup>

This account of the 'person-case constraint' thus shows that both within a phase and across phases, movement observes the MLC, with multiple movements to the same probe proceeding in countercyclic fashion. Even if the multiple movements do NOT target the same probe, the derivation proceeds countercyclically so long as the two probes are not separated by a phase boundary, as shown by A's intelligent discussion of the core datum for this study: the fact that in Modern Greek (1b and 1c), the genitive-marked indirect object does not count as an intervener for NP-movement of *to vivlio* 'the book' to subject position, while in 1a it does block raising to subject.<sup>3</sup>

- (1) a. ?\*To vivlio      ðoθike                      tis Marias.  
           the book.NOM give.NONACT.3SG the Maria.GEN  
           'The book was given to Maria.'
- b. To vivlio      tis      ðoθike                      (tis Marias).  
           the book.NOM CL<sub>GEN</sub> give.NONACT.3SG the Maria.GEN  
           'The book was given to her/Maria.'
- c. Tinos      ðoθike                      to vivlio?  
           who.GEN give.NONACT.3SG the book.NOM  
           'Who was the book given to?'

The ungrammaticality of 1a is analyzed in Ch. 3 as an intervention effect: the genitival indirect object *tis Marias* is assumed to occupy the specifier position of an applicative  $v$ -head,  $v_{APPL}$  (cf. Marantz 1993, Pykkänen 2002);<sup>4</sup> the nominative direct object originates within the root VP,

<sup>1</sup> Nontrivial questions arise here about the definition of matching. Why should  $v$  care that its goal has MORE features than it itself still needs to check? (Matching is not explicitly defined in the book, as far as I have been able to determine, although, since 'matching' is not included in the otherwise quite extensive, ten-page subject index, tracking the author's assumptions on this topic is not an easy task.) In Ch. 4, A has transitive  $v$  (possessing an active gender feature) attract genderless direct-object clitics, thus allowing  $v$  to have a relationship with something with FEWER features than it has itself; and in Swiss German double-object constructions with two pronominal objects (296), where either pronoun may move to transitive  $v$  first (unlike in Romance or Greek, apparently), first-turn movement of the accusative pronoun checks all of  $v$ 's  $\phi$ -features, leaving NOTHING for the dative (which moves next) to check against  $v$ . In both contexts, A parenthetically suggests 'semantic or phonological factors' as the trigger for the second movement (204). The overall picture of what drives movement to  $v$  and how feature matching works that emerges from these clips is less than clear.

<sup>2</sup> The example here is from Modern Greek. That the 'person-case constraint' (Bonet 1991) restricts the person of the direct object even if the indirect object itself is third person follows only if it is assumed that, while their accusative counterparts do not, third person DATIVE clitics DO have a person specification. A refers to Georgian (270–71) for morphological support for this claim.

<sup>3</sup> English is often claimed to be like Modern Greek with respect to 1a: *The book was given Mary* is routinely starred in the literature. A points out that in British English this is grammatical, and that speakers of other varieties accept direct-object passives if the indirect object is an unstressed pronoun (*The book was given 'er*). While this is by and large correct, it does not paint the complete picture; see Postal 2004:240–43 for detailed discussion and references.

<sup>4</sup> A shows convincingly that Greek genitives qualify as indirect objects of double-object constructions. One of her diagnostics in Ch. 2 is that the contrast between English *John sent the boarder the package* and *\*John sent the boarder the package* is reproduced in Greek. She takes such contrasts to be a function of the ANIMACY of the indirect object, attributing the claim to Stowell (1981) and an explanation for it to den Dikken (1995:127). But the claim that double-object constructions demand animate goals is plainly false, as I show in fact in the work A refers to: on p. 128 I quote *The revolution gave Romania a new government* as a grammatical double-object construction. A's second diagnostic for the double-object status of Greek ditransitives with a genitival goal comes from their sensitivity to the semantic properties of the selecting verb, as



that the *se*-PP occupies a structural position that is in the minimal domain of the same head that also accommodates the direct object. For A, the head in question is the verb root: the direct object and the *se*-PP are both arguments of the verb root, accommodated in positions in its minimal domain (cf. 4a,a'). This being the case, 3a comes out perfect with *stin Maria*: the locality theory of Chomsky (1995:Ch. 4) ensures that the direct object can raise to Spec,TP unobstructed, even if the *se*-PP were to asymmetrically c-command the direct object's base position (as in 4a),<sup>8</sup> since PP and DP<sub>DO</sub> are equidistant from T.

- (4) a. . . . [VP PP [V' V DP<sub>DO</sub>]]                      a'. . . . [VP DP<sub>DO</sub> [V' V PP]]  
 b. \* . . . [VP DP<sub>IO</sub> [V' V DP<sub>DO</sub>]]  
 c. . . . [VP DP<sub>IO</sub> [V' V<sub>APPL</sub> [VP V DP<sub>DO</sub>]]]

We now need to ensure that 3a with a genitival goal CANNOT have the structure we just assigned to 3a with *stin Maria*. So, says A, 'it must be concluded' that 4b is 'the incorrect structure (for the purposes of locality)'; instead, 'the correct parse for the double object construction is [4c] in which the goal originates in a higher VP-shell above the theme, blocking movement of the theme to T' (147). I reproduced A's own words here to give the reader a sense of the way she goes about picking 'the correct structure' for double-object constructions. The hypothesis space is bizarrely limited from the start (transformational approaches to the dative alternation are never seriously considered; no attempt is made to cover the enormous literature on ditransitives), but even within its limited hypothesis space, the book merely DICTATES the structure of double-object constructions without presenting a carefully crafted argument for the analysis adopted.<sup>9</sup> For a book entitled *The syntax of ditransitives*, this is unsatisfactory. This study could have cast much more light on the syntax of ditransitives had it paid more serious attention to independent arguments that could underpin the analyses that A takes to be needed 'for the purposes of locality'.

And when it comes to locality, the book once again asserts its claims, in the course of the discussion, rather than arguing for them on the basis of a variety of converging pieces of evidence. Sections 3 ('Introducing locality') and 4 ('Theoretical background') of Ch. 3 lay the foundations (in just six of the chapter's 140 pages), but talk about locality only in terms of minimal domains à la Chomsky 1995:Ch. 4; there is no mention here of the 'derivation by phase' model that plays a pivotal role in Ch. 4, where specific assumptions about cyclicity are again introduced out of the blue. Since the extant literature is replete with highly specific, complex, and not necessarily compatible assumptions about locality, a reader familiar with this literature finds him/herself in a constant state of uncertainty about A's core assumptions. Why do phases play a role in Ch. 4 but (apparently) not in Ch. 3? Is the applicative *v*P a phase or not (recall n. 6)? How does Chomsky's (1995:Ch. 4) definition of locality fit into the Agree-based derivation-by-phase model? How does it all add up to a coherent theory of locality? Since there is no concluding chapter in which the main assumptions and results of the book are assembled into an overarching theory of locality, the reader never gets an opportunity to take a bird's eye view that will allow him/her to answer such questions.

These are disappointing features, but there is plenty to make up for them. The book offers a tremendously valuable picture of the empirical facts of ditransitive constructions in the domain of NP-movement constructions, including passive, raising verb, and psych-verb constructions.

---

(i) Fenete {\*tis Marias/\*<sup>2</sup>s-tin Maria} [<sub>CP</sub> oti/pos ta peðia ðulevun poli].  
 seems the Maria.GEN/to-the Maria that the children work.3PL much  
 'It seems to Maria that the children work hard.'

<sup>8</sup> A considers both 4a and 4a' as possible base structures for *se*-PPs, without taking a stand on the word order alternation between DO > *se*-PP and *se*-PP > DO sequences (168–69). For locality purposes, the issue is immaterial (as she points out); but for a proper understanding of the syntax of ditransitive constructions, it of course is not.

<sup>9</sup> It is revealing that A presents only two, very microscopic pieces of independent support for the structure in 4c, both anchored in what is known in the literature as Myers's generalization (cf. Myers 1984, Pesetsky 1995), which stipulates that zero-derived words forbid further affixation.

The richness of this picture is particularly enhanced by the fact that the book touches upon a broad variety of languages—not just the usual suspects (the Germanic and Romance languages, whose representatives are covered nearly exhaustively) but also Sesotho, Japanese, and, of course, Modern Greek. The empirical discussion is beautifully detailed, taking the earlier literature further by providing additional (and often entirely new) data beyond the ones reported before. Thus, in Ch. 3's discussion of her 'specifier of *vAPPL* parameter' (which says—but does not derive—that 'symmetric' double-object languages of the Kinyarwanda/Norwegian type 'license movement of DO to a specifier of *vAPPL*'; 157), A shows in detail that in 'symmetric' languages, the direct object is free to NP-move across the indirect object, in both passives and object shift constructions—contrary to popular belief, the direct object CAN indeed object shift around the indirect object in Norwegian/Swedish, both when the indirect object stays in situ and when both objects shift. This is one of the many noteworthy empirical contributions of the book. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this is an important book—one which no scholar with a serious interest in ditransitives, clitics, NP-movement, or the theory of locality can afford to ignore.

#### REFERENCES

- BENVENISTE, EMILE. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.
- BONET, EULALIA. 1991. *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- BRESNAN, JOAN, and TATIANA NIKITINA. 2003. On the gradience of the dative alternation. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, ms. Online: <http://www-lfg.stanford.edu/bresnan/new-dative.pdf>.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *Step by step*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2001. Derivation by phase. *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- DEN DIKKEN, MARCEL. 1995. *Particles: On the syntax of verb-particle, triadic and causative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GROPEN, JESS; STEVEN PINKER; MICHELLE HOLLANDER; RICHARD GOLDBERG; and RONALD WILSON. 1989. The learnability and acquisition of the dative alternation in English. *Language* 65.203–57.
- MARANTZ, ALEC. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*, ed. by Sam Mchombo, 113–50. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- MORO, ANDREA. 1997. *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MYERS, SCOTT. 1984. Zero-derivation and inflection. *MIT working papers in linguistics 7: Papers from the January 1984 MIT workshop in morphology*, ed. by Margaret Speas and Richard Sproat, 53–69. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- PESETSKY, DAVID. 1995. *Zero syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- POSTAL, PAUL M. 2004. *Skeptical linguistic essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PYLKKÄNEN, LIINA. 2002. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- STOWELL, TIM. 1981. *Origins of phrase structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Linguistics Program  
 CUNY Graduate Center  
 365 Fifth Avenue  
 New York, NY 10016-4309  
 [MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu]

**Lexical strata in English:** Morphological causes, phonological effects. By HEINZ J. GIEGERICH. (Cambridge studies in linguistics 89.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp. 329. ISBN 0521554128. \$85 (Hb).

Reviewed by CHRIS MCCULLY, *Vrije Universiteit*

This monograph is organized into eight chapters and concludes with a very helpful apparatus—notes, references, a subject index, and an index of words, roots, and affixes. What Giegerich