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This monograph consists of a revision of the author’s doctoral dissertation, with the addition of extensions and related work by the author and collaborators. In this work Grohmann makes the interesting suggestion that along with STANDARD LOCALITY (the familiar upper bound on the length of syntactic dependencies), movement dependencies are subject to a lower bound, that is, ANTI-LOCALITY. This suggestion is implemented through a partition of the clause into three parts (roughly the theta-domain, the agreement domain, and the left periphery) and some simple conditions on movement between and within these domains. The result is a new candidate proposal in the realm of multiple/cyclic spell-out theories that provides a novel analysis of anaphora in several domains, as well as of left dislocation of various types. Although the proposal also has interesting theoretical implications (for example, a less stipulative ban on “improper movement”), it suffers from some empirical and theoretical shortcomings, which I will outline below.

The Anti-Locality thesis introduced in chapter 1 is implemented through the theory of PROLIFIC DOMAINS. According to this theory, the clause consists of three parts, or domains, defined over familiar syntactic categories: (1) the Θ-domain, in which θ-roles are discharged/assigned/checked (material at and below the vP level), (2) the Φ-domain, where agreement/∅-features are checked (material above the vP level including agreement projections (Agr), tense, and aspect), and (3) the Ω-domain, the location of syntactically represented discourse roles, such as topic and focus (a finely articulated left periphery along the lines of Rizzi 1997). Anti-Locality states that movement cannot take place within a single Prolific Domain.

To some extent, Anti-Locality could be viewed as a response to critics of the line of research that seeks to explain syntactic dependencies.
in terms of movement rather than construal, chains, or accidental binding (Hornstein 2001, Kayne 2002, among others). Since Hornstein (2001) makes crucial use of movement to \( \theta \)-position, critics might ask why, if such movement is allowed, we do not observe sentences such as 1a with the meaning of 1b, given the possibility of the movement operation in 1c where *John* is merged as theme and moves to the external argument position.

(1) a. *John likes.
   b. \textit{John} likes \textit{himself}.
   c. \[ \text{\"{}GP John \"{}} \text{\[VP likes \]} \]

The Anti-Locality framework provides a principled answer. Movement within a single Prolific Domain (in 1, movement from one \( \theta \)-position to another within the same VP) is too local. If independent evidence for Anti-Locality could be found, this critique of movement into \( \theta \)-position would then disappear. This book attempts to provide such evidence. However, it should be noted that were Hornstein to be wrong, much of Grohmann’s proposal would still be tenable.

In chapter 2 the following is introduced as an explicit Anti-Locality condition:

\textit{Condition on Domain Exclusivity (CDE)} (p. 78)
For a given Prolific Domain \( \Pi \Delta \), an object O in the phrase-marker must receive an exclusive interpretation at the interfaces, unless duplicity of O yields a drastic effect on the output of \( \Pi \Delta \).

Putting aside for the moment what “duplicity” and “drastic” mean, the CDE essentially states that a given object can only appear once in a Prolific Domain. Grohmann attempts to explain this restriction as a ban on ambiguity at the PF interface. A phonological form for a given Prolific Domain must contain unambiguous instructions. If an object appears twice in the domain, as it would if it moves domain-internally, ambiguity arises. However, there is one way to circumvent the ban on domain-internal movement imposed by the CDE: an object can appear more than once in a Prolific Domain if one copy of the object is pronounced differently from the other. Grohmann calls this escape hatch
COPY SPELL-OUT. This is, presumably, what is meant by the vague “drastic effect” condition above.

While there is an intuitively appealing aspect to Prolific Domains and the CDE, Grohmann’s explanation of the CDE in terms of a PF ban on duplicate spell-out suffers somewhat from his adoption of Nunes’ (1995) approach to copy theory and deletion. Nunes argues that, due to the Linear Correspondence Axiom (Kayne 1994), only one copy of a given syntactic object can be spelled out phonologically. Other copies, formed through movement (envisioned as copy+merger), must be deleted. Lower copies are generally deleted since they contain more unchecked features. But if copies can be deleted, it should be simple to circumvent the CDE and allow all sorts of domain-internal movement, as long as all copies (but one) are deleted. Grohmann addresses this concern to some extent by saying that unpronounced copies are not deleted, but ignored. This is presumably due to a spell-out algorithm (unspecified in the monograph) that determines for a given domain where a given phrase with multiple occurrences is spelled out. If this is true, then the adoption of Nunes’s approach to copy theory and deletion is only a hindrance. Grohmann’s work could be done by a simple remerger account of movement, without the problems introduced by a copy operation and subsequent deletion.

Chapter 2 spells out the architecture of the system within which the Anti-Locality thesis is couched. The introductory material in the first two chapters might have benefited from additional editorial attention, as it may be vague and confusing at times. As such, it will be difficult to follow for readers not already familiar with recent work in minimalism. In fact, some of this material could have been omitted without affecting the book’s main proposals, although some material in chapter 2 becomes crucial later in the book. First, Grohmann argues against Chomsky’s (1995) proposal that little v is the locus of both external argument licensing and accusative case marking. Grohmann wishes to divorce the former, which is part of the Θ-domain, from the latter, which is a Φ-related property. Second, Grohmann argues against the existence of multiple specifiers. The clausal architecture assumed here allows a single specifier for a given XP (formed either through direct merger or movement) and any number of adjuncts, which appear above the specifier and can only be formed through (external) merger. This approach to specifiers and adjuncts allows an account of certain facts
about left dislocation addressed later in the book. However, when this issue is discussed, the reader is left wondering why one would wish to rule out multiple specifiers. Unsupported statements, such as “multiple specifiers are undesirable, do not buy us much empirically, and can be banned from the grammar” (p. 53) are even more puzzling, especially given much recent work on multiple specifiers (see, for example, Richards 1999).

Following Chomsky (2000:116), Grohmann attempts to derive fundamental specifier-head, head-head, and head-complement relations through the use of what he calls the “Natural Relations” provided by merger. However, this attempt does not quite go through. While Grohmann is correct that the combination of SISTER and IMMEDIATELY-CONTAIN, two relations that arguably fall out from the operation Merge, provides a natural account of the specifier-head relation, this same relation should hold between a head and the specifier of that head’s complement. Therefore, while Grohmann’s approach includes the Spec-Head relation, it might be too permissive. Grohmann also argues for a greed-based over an attraction-based treatment of movement based on these relations. The Spec→Head relation, viewed as Immediately-Contain(Sister-Of (XP)), fits into a greed-based framework since it is the XP in the specifier position that checks features on the head, not the other way around. However, this deduction seems spurious to me. It is based on the assumption that the Mother→Daughter relation (Immediately-CONTAIN()) is fundamental, but the Daughter→Mother relation (Mother()) is not. Furthermore, the discussion is open to Chametzky’s (2003:200–201) critique that more “natural relations” are definable from these assumptions than are needed.

Chapters 3 through 6 form the empirical core of the book. Chapter 3 presents a treatment of local anaphora as the result of too-local movement within the Θ-domain, with Copy Spell-out of the lower trace as an anaphor, as in 2, where Copy Spell-out is shown as (→X).

(2) \[\text{vp John} v \text{vp likes John (→ himself)}\]

This analysis is only available if movement to a theta position is possible, as it is in a system where theta roles are treated as features to be checked through merger or movement. This treatment of anaphora serves
as a proof-of-concept of the CDE and Copy Spell-out in the Θ-domain. It differs from other movement-based analyses of binding (see, for instance, Kayne 2002) in that the anaphor is not present prior to Copy Spell-out. In this chapter, anaphora in exceptional case marking contexts are also treated through Copy Spell-out, but in the Φ-domain.

The PF explanation of the CDE is challenged further if an analogous analysis applies to sentences that contain multiple anaphora, as in *John is protecting himself from himself*. Here one would expect the CDE to rule out multiple Copy Spell-out of *John as himself*. Grohmann acknowledges this problem, but provides no clear solution.

Chapter 4 contains perhaps the most interesting empirical case study of the CDE and Copy Spell-out, namely that of left dislocation, including topicalization as in 3a, contrastive left dislocation (CLD) as in 3b, clitic left dislocation (CLLD) as in 3c, and two types of hanging topic left dislocation (HTLD), shown in 3d,e.

(3) a. Diesen Mann mag ich nicht. German
    this man know I not
    ‘This man, I don’t know.’

b. Den Martin, den habe ich schon lange German
    the Martin D-PRON have I already long
    nicht mehr gesehen.
    not anymore seen
    ‘Martin, I haven’t seen [him] in a long time.’

c. [Afton ton andra], dhen ton ksero. Greek
    this the man not CLITIC know.1SG
    ‘This man, I don’t know [him].’

d. [Diese-r/-n Mann]—den/ihn habe ich German
    this man PRON have I
    noch nie gesehen.
    yet never seen
    ‘This man, I’ve never seen him before.’
e. [Diese-r/-n Mann]—ich habe den/ihn noch nie gesehen.

This man, I've never seen him before.

According to Grohmann, topicalization, CLD, and CLLD suggest that the left-dislocated XP is derived through movement from a clause internal position, while this is not true of HTLD. Evidence for this, some of it well-known, includes Case connectivity and reconstruction effects (binding of anaphora, bound variable readings, obviation of weak crossover) in the first three, but not in HTLD. Turning to CLD, we can ask how the left-dislocated XP could be moved from a clause-internal position when the resumptive pronoun (RP) is in the prototypical preverbal topic position, presumably moved from a clause-internal position. Grohmann suggests that the RP is the result of Copy Spell-out of a lower occurrence of XP within the $\Omega$-domain, as shown in 4.

\[
(4) \quad [CP \ \text{XP} \ [\text{TopP} \ \text{XP} \ (\rightarrow \text{RP}) \ V\text{-Top}^0 \ [IP \ \ldots \text{XP} \ldots \ [v\text{P} \ \ldots \text{XP} \ldots ]]]]
\]

Here the dislocated XP moves to topic position (within the left-peripheral $\Omega$-domain), and then moves on to a “quasi-extra-sentential” CP projection. While it is not clear what this CP projection is, this movement is too local and only Copy Spell-out can make the derivation legitimate by the CDE. The assumptions regarding specifiers and adjuncts from chapter 2 allow an account of the ordering among HTLDed and CLDed XPs, where the former always appear to the left of the latter. One appealing aspect of Grohmann’s analysis of the demonstrative pronoun in CLD as the spell-out of a copy due to Anti-Locality is that resumptive pronouns now appear when standard (maximum-distance) locality is violated, as with islands for movement, and also when Anti-Locality is violated. This treatment of CLD might also provide an argument against chain formation as a plausible alternative to movement. In this case, one would have to posit a difference between chains in CLD and coreference (presumably also encoded with coindexation) in HTLD.

Chapter 5 returns to CLLD and analyzes this phenomenon as Copy Spell-out in the $\Phi$-domain. Grohmann suggests that the CLLDed XP
moves through two positions in an Agreement projection: one adjoined to the Agr head and one in the specifier of this head. The occurrence adjoined to the Agr head is spelled out as a clitic. The XP in \([\text{Spec}, \text{AgrP}]\) then moves on to a left-peripheral topic position.

\[(5) \quad [_{\text{AgrP}} \text{XP} [_{\text{Agr}} \text{XP(→ Clitic)–Agr}] [_{\text{xP}} \ldots \text{XP} \ldots]] \]

This analysis of CLLD is perhaps the book’s most problematic part. First, it predicts that all languages with CLLD should have clitic doubling. There is nothing inherent in 5 that would force XP to move on to a topic position, so the derivation should be possible in any clause. However, Italian is a classic example of a language with CLLD but no clitic doubling. Furthermore, since the left-dislocated XP does undergo movement to the Ω-domain (presumably the domain of A-bar movement), the analysis falls to Cinque’s (1990) argument that if CLLD involves A-bar movement, it should license parasitic gaps, contrary to fact. The advantage of the CLD and CLLD analyses is that they would explain several observed differences between the two, as well as moving toward an account of why and in which languages these types of left dislocation should occur.

Why does Copy Spell-out emerge as an anaphor in some cases, a pronoun in others, and a clitic in still others? Grohmann comes close to explaining this distinction by appeal to different domains: anaphors arise in the Θ-domain, clitics in the Φ-domain (when the language has Agr-related clitics), and pronouns in the Ω-domain. However, the analysis of ECM anaphors as arising in the Φ-domain makes this line of reasoning less consistent. Furthermore, the author provides no explanation for why only lower copies undergo Copy Spell-out as a pronoun/anaphor/clitic. Grohmann alludes to a possible feature-based explanation along the lines of Nunes 1995, but, as noted above, Nunes’ assumptions may be problematic for the CDE theory.

Chapter 6 summarizes Grohmann and Haegeman 2003 and extends the Copy Spell-out paradigm to the DP level, where Grohmann argues that the DP contains multiple Prolific Domains (analogous to clausal structure), and that domain-internal movement within the DP also triggers Copy Spell-out. The latter is used to account for pronominal possessor doubling in Germanic, as in German *dem Vater sein Auto* ‘the father’s car’ (lit. *the father his car*). If movement (and Copy Spell-out) is
at play here, Hornstein’s (2003) suggestion that movement does not underlie control in DPs (as in John’s attempt PRO to leave) may be at risk.

Chapter 7 presents some of the most interesting ideas of the book. Grohmann reviews the long history of research into syntactic cyclicity and develops a view of cyclicity in the Prolific Domains framework in the form of two generalizations.

(6) a. Inter-Clausal Movement Generalization
Movement across a clause boundary can only target a position within the same Prolific Domain as the source position.

b. Intra-Clausal Movement Generalization
Movement within a clause always targets the next highest Prolific Domain.

The combination of 6a and 6b, together with the unnoted assumption that a syntactic object must have an occurrence in each clause between the highest and lower occurrence of that object, ensure a strongly falsifiable type of cyclicity. Moving phrases always target either the next highest clause-internal domain or the same domain in next highest clause. The result is a satisfying account of so-called “improper movement” (the ban on A-bar movement followed by A-movement) without simply stipulating that this type of movement is “improper”.

Grohmann adopts a MULTIPLE SPELL-OUT approach that differs in crucial ways from both Uriagereka’s (1999) and the phase-based approach put forth by Chomsky (2000). In the Prolific Domains framework, each domain—Θ (vP), Φ (IP), and Ω (CP)—is submitted to PF and LF computation after it is built. Cyclicality in movement is viewed as a fundamental property of this system, not as an accidental property of intervening heads, as in theories that incorporate the EPP as a trigger for movement.

The principles in 6 predict that raising verbs embedded under control verbs should behave as if they were control verbs, a prediction that Grohmann claims is born out in English. For example, in 7a John is raised clause-internally from its first theta position to the Φ-domain, from where it raises clause-internally to the Φ-domain of the raising verb seem. However, from here John would have to move to the Θ-domain of the control verb hope, a move ruled out by 6b. Therefore, the derivation
must be as in 7b, where John moves from Θ-domain to Θ-domain until it reaches hope. This entails that John must be an argument of seem, and so seem must behave like a control verb, a prediction Grohmann claims is born out.

(7) John hopes to seem to be intelligent.
   a. *[θ John hopes [θ to [θ seem [θ John to be [θ John intelligent]]]]]
   b. [θ John hopes [θ to [θ John seem [θ to be [θ John intelligent]]]]]

But this prediction does not hold up cross-linguistically. Rizzi (1986) shows that a coreferential anaphor can appear between an NP and a controlled PRO, as in 8a, but not between an NP and its trace position in raising, as in 8b.

(8) a. Gianni self promises to be diligent.
   ‘Gianni promises himself to be diligent.’
   b. *Gianni self seems to be intelligent.
   ‘Gianni seems to himself to be intelligent.’

The discussion of 7 suggests that when embedded under a control verb (such as sperare), raising verbs (such as sembrare) should pattern with 8a. However, as shown in 9, this is not the case.¹

(9) *Gianni hopes to seem to himself to be intelligent.
   ‘Gianni hopes to seem to himself to be intelligent.’

Further problems arise with this strict view of cyclicity if wh-adjuncts in the Θ-domain must pass through the Φ-domain on the way to their surface Ω-domain position. The question is what type of agreement

¹ My thanks to David Pesetsky for pointing out this argument to me, and to Enzo Moscati for the Italian data.
forces adjunct movement to the Φ-domain since most (all?) languages lack agreement with adjuncts.

As a whole, the proposals of the book are thought provoking and appealing. Grohmann does a good job of motivating his proposals independently, so Anti-Locality does not become an ad hoc patch required by Hornstein’s (2001) treatment of control as movement. However, since it adopts many of Hornstein’s assumptions, the book is open to criticism along the lines of Landau 2003 and Culicover and Jackendoff 2001. The tripartite division of the clause has intuitive appeal, and Grohmann’s treatment of cyclicity within the three-domain system provides an interesting alternative in the realm of multiple spell-out theories. It also provides a satisfying ban on improper movement. While empirical and theoretical problems remain, they are outweighed by the book’s virtues and should serve as challenges to those pursuing a theory of Anti-Locality.
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“The fundamental challenge of comparative linguistics is to find a way of doing justice to both the similarities and the differences without contradiction, without empty compromise, and without sacrificing one truth to the other” (Baker 2001:16). It is my belief that Anagnostopoulou has managed to do this in her book in such a way that it can only be admired. The topic that Anagnostopoulou has chosen is—to put it mildly—rather complex, and as to complicate things even more, Anagnostopoulou uses the entire theoretical apparatus provided by the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995), including multiple specifiers,
“tucking in”, equidistance, minimal domains, EPP, long-distance agree, etc. (In fact, Boeckx (2004) criticizes Anagnostopoulou’s use of the whole range of theoretical apparatus.) Nevertheless, the book is very easy to read, and Anagnostopoulou’s argumentation is easy to follow. For example, it is the rule rather than the exception that she uses examples from many different languages in support of each of her claims. In this way, a reader like myself who sometimes finds it difficult to decode and understand the Greek (as well as the Romance) data, can be reassured by the fact that Anagnostopoulou usually elaborates on her claims by showing the direction the Germanic languages (Dutch, English, German and Scandinavian) choose to go. These languages sometimes follow Greek and/or Romance, and sometimes they choose an altogether different direction.

Although the central focus of the book is on Greek clitic doubling and the Greek double object construction, in this review I am mainly concerned with Anagnostopoulou’s analysis of the Germanic languages, and in particular, passivization and object shift in Scandinavian and constructions with oblique (or quirky) subjects in Icelandic. First, I summarize the main theoretical claims that Anagnostopoulou makes.

The book is divided into five chapters. In the first chapter, Anagnostopoulou briefly introduces the overall embracing claim of the book that a dative (the indirect object, henceforth IO) blocks movement of a lower nominative if “(i) the dative is higher than the base position of the nominative and (ii) not contained in the same domain as the nominative [...]” (p. 4). Thus, the derivation in 1 (Anagnostopoulou’s 2, p. 4) is ill-formed, whereas the derivation in 2 (Anagnostopoulou’s 3, p. 5) is well-formed because “the features of the dative move out of the way of the lower nominative [...] and thus the higher dative argument does not count anymore for locality.”

(1) \[
\text{NOM} \{\text{Domain}_\alpha \text{DAT} \{\text{Domain}_\beta \text{iNOM}\}\}
\]

(2) \[
\text{NOM} \{\text{DAT-Clitic} \{\text{Domain}_\alpha \text{iDAT-Clitic} \{\text{Domain}_\beta \text{iNOM}\}\}\}
\]
In the second chapter, Anagnostopoulou establishes the generalization reflected in 1 and 2 that in Greek a nominative DP may not move across a dative DP unless the dative DP is realized as a clitic or a part of a clitic doubling chain. Here too, the typology of ditransitives is investigated. Anagnostopoulou argues that two different types of double object constructions should be distinguished, based on where the IO is base-generated. According to Anagnostopoulou, an IO may either be base-generated high within the VP (only this construction qualifies as a true double object construction in Anagnostopoulou's system) or it may be base-generated low within the VP (in which case it shows the characteristics of a prepositional dative).

The crucial difference is, in Anagnostopoulou’s view (following Marantz 1993), that in addition to the main verbal root only the former (the true double object construction) contains a light applicative head (see 3).

(3) 

```
(3)  v1P
    \  /  \\
   /    \ \\
  /      \ \\
 v-TR  v2P
    \  /  \\
   /    \ \\
  /      \ \\
 IO   v'
    \  /  \\
   /    \ \\
  /      \ \\
 vAPPL VP
    \  /  \\
   /    \ \\
  /      \ \\
 v   DO
```

In some languages the light applicative head (vAPPL) may assign morphological case to the IO, while in other languages it may not. vAPPL is also responsible for the different types of object shift found in the Scandinavian languages. Norwegian and Swedish differ from Danish and Icelandic in that the former allow for non-parallel object shift (that is, the order of the IO and the direct object, henceforth DO, can be reversed), whereas the latter only allow for parallel object shift. According to Anagnostopoulou, this difference is due to the fact that in Norwegian and Swedish, but not in Danish and Icelandic, vAPPL allows for an additional specifier position into which the DO can move on its way to the target position of object shift (an outer specifier of vP).
The third chapter introduces the three “ingredients” that are needed for a locality-based account of ditransitives cross-linguistically; namely Case and the EPP, c-command, and minimal domains. In this chapter, Anagnostopoulou argues that equidistance (and not only closest c-command) plays a crucial role in the notion of locality. For example, A-movement of derived subjects across higher goals or experiencers is ruled out in the passive when the two arguments are not in the same minimal domain, but such movement is allowed whenever the two arguments are in the same minimal domain, that is, are equidistant from the target position.

In the fourth chapter, Anagnostopoulou shows how minimal link condition violations can be avoided if the dative DP is realized as a clitic, or if the dative DP is a part of a clitic doubling chain. In such constructions, movement is not ruled out because the cliticized or the clitic doubled argument is in the same minimal domain as the target of movement.

In the fifth chapter, Anagnostopoulou discusses q-feature checking in environments where a dative DP enters into a Move/Agree relation with T/transitive v. In particular, Anagnostopoulou discusses two types of person restrictions: the PERSON-CASE CONSTRAINT (PC-Constraint) and the PERSON RESTRICTION ON NOMINATIVE OBJECTS (PRN-Constraint). The PC-Constraint is a restriction on clitics in Romance, Greek, Swiss German, Basque and many other languages (also known as the *me/lui or I-II constraint; see, for example, Perlmutter 1971, Kayne 1975, and Bonet 1991, 1994, among many others). Anagnostopoulou’s Greek examples (p. 252, 342) are found in 4. (Note that 4d is incorrectly translated in the book as they will send you to him).

(4) a. Tha mu to stilune
    FUT C1.GEN.1SG C1.ACC.3SG.NEUT send.3PL
    ‘They will send it to me.’

b. Tha su ton stilune
    FUT C1.GEN.2SG C1.ACC.3SG.MASC send.3PL
    ‘They will send him to you.’

c. *Tha to me stilune
    FUT C1.GEN.3SG.NEUT/MASC C1.ACC.1SG send.3PL
    ‘They will send me to him.’
The PRN-Constraint is attested in Icelandic DAT-NOM constructions (that is, constructions where the subject is dative and the object is nominative), and in Italian impersonal *si*-constructions (compare D’Alessandro 2003). The PRN-Constraint prohibits agreement with nominative DPs in NOMINATIVE WITH INFINITIVE constructions (compare Sigurðsson 1989, 1996); that is, when the nominative DP is not in the same clause as the verb. The example in 5b shows that the verb can agree neither in person nor in number with the first person nominative DP. The example in 5a shows that such constructions are grammatical if the verb does not agree with the first person nominative DP.

(5)  

5a. Ykkur þótti ég /við fyndin  
You.DAT.PL thought.3SG I.NOM/we.NOM amusing  
‘You found me/us amusing.’

5b. *Ykkur þóttum /þóttu við fyndin  
You.DAT.SG thought.1PL/thought.3PL we.NOM amusing

The PRN-constraint also prohibits the occurrence of first and second person nominative objects. The example in 6 shows that nominative objects cannot be first person (the same holds for second person, but not for third person), even if the verb shows default agreement (compare Sigurðsson 1996 for a detailed discussion of the grammaticality of such examples; for me, they are ungrammatical).

(6)  

6. *Dérg líkaði / líkúðum / líkuðu við  
You.DAT liked.3SG / liked.1PL / liked.3PL we.NOM

Anagnostopoulou shows that although the PC-Constraint and the PRN-Constraint have many similarities, they differ in three crucial ways (p. 264). First, the PC-Constraint only holds if there is an external argument present, whereas the PRN-Constraint only holds if there is no external argument (Anagnostopoulou assumes that dative subjects are
derived subjects, compare p. 275, tree 369). 1 Second, the PC-Constraint, but not the PRN-Constraint affects weak elements, and finally, the “emergency strategies” induced by the two constraints are different. Romance and Greek “rescue” the respective construction by replacing the clitic with a strong pronoun, whereas in Icelandic the verb simply does not show agreement with the nominative DP.

I turn now to what I think are the problematic aspects of Anagnostopoulou’s analysis of passivization and object shift in Scandinavian and Icelandic DAT-NOM constructions. As mentioned, the PRN-Constraint does two fairly different things at the same time. First, the PRN-Constraint regulates the agreement relationship between a verb and a nominative DP, which is not an object but the subject of a small clause. Second, the PRN-Constraint prohibits the occurrence of first/second person nominative objects. In Hrafnbjargarson 2004, I show that the PRN-Constraint can be accounted for in terms of the harmonic alignment of prominence hierarchies (person, case, and grammatical relation). The advantage of such an analysis is that the PRN-Constraint will only prohibit the occurrence of first and second person pronouns as nominative objects, whereas other constraints will regulate the impoverished agreement relationship between the verb and the nominative DP in Nominative with Infinitive constructions.

Anagnostopoulou (p. 239ff.) also discusses the intervention effect of dative arguments in Icelandic. In DATIVE WITH INFINITIVE constructions, the matrix verb cannot show agreement with a nominative object in the lower clause. The example in 7 is Anagnostopoulou’s example 327.

(7) Mér fannst /*fundust henni leiðast þeir
Me.DAT seemed.3SG/seemed.3PL her.DAT be-bored they.NOM
‘I thought she was bored with them.’

Anagnostopoulou (p. 240) also mentions that such intervention effects are not found in transitive expletive constructions where the associate of the expletive is a dative DP.

1 This assumption is rather appealing to me, as I think that it makes the correct predictions about the behavior of verbs in DAT-NOM constructions. For example, they cannot occur in the passive (as a consequence of one argument already having been promoted).
Following Chomsky 2000, 2001, Anagnostopoulou assumes that the dative DP enters into an Agree relation with T (the dative DP checks person on T) and that the nominative DP checks number on T. The intervention effect can thus be explained if one assumes that the dative does not enter into an Agree relation with T in 7. Unfortunately, the data that Anagnostopoulou presents do not show the whole picture. All her examples have plural dative arguments as the associate of an expletive, but as Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir (2003:1000) show it matters whether the intervening dative is plural or singular. When the intervening dative is singular, the verb cannot show agreement with the embedded nominative (9b), whereas if the intervening dative is plural such agreement is fine (10b).

(9) a. Pað fannst einhverjum manni
    There found.SG some man.DAT
    þessar ljósmyndir ljótar
    these photographs.NOM ugly
    ‘A man found these photographs ugly.’

b. *Pað fundust einhverjum manni
    There found.PL some man.DAT
    þessar ljósmyndir ljótar
    these photographs.NOM ugly

(10) a. Pað fannst mörgum mönnum
    There found.SG many.DAT men.DAT
    þessar ljósmyndir ljótar
    these photographs.NOM ugly
    ‘Many men found these photographs ugly.’
b. Það fundust mórgum mónnun
there found.PL many.DAT men.DAT
þessar ljósmyndir ljótar
these photographs.NOM ugly
‘Many men found these photographs ugly.’

From example 10b we cannot determine whether the verb shows agreement with the dative subject or the nominative object. However, we might conclude that the dative DP really can check number on T as well as person, and in fact there are some arguments that speak in favor of such an analysis. In my dialect, which is an obligatory agreement dialect (that is, verbs obligatorily show agreement with third person nominative objects), questions such as in 11, where the nominative element is plural and the dative subject may be interpreted as either singular or plural, have different interpretations depending on whether the verb shows default agreement or plural agreement.

(11) a. Hverjum fannst ljósmyndirnar ljótar?
who.DAT.SG found.SG photographs-the.NOM ugly
‘Who (which man) found these photographs ugly?’

b. Hverjum fundust ljósmyndirnar ljótar?
who.DAT.PL found.PL photographs-the.NOM ugly
‘Who (or which men) found these photographs ugly?’

In 11a, where the verb shows default agreement (third person singular), the subject is interpreted as singular. In 11b, where the verb shows number agreement, the subject is interpreted as plural.

As Anagnostopoulou discusses in detail, Icelandic ditransitive verbs fall into two classes. One class of verbs (gefa ‘give’, segja ‘tell’, sýna ‘show’, etc.) allows symmetric passives (that is, both the IO and the DO may raise to the subject position), while the other class of verbs (skila ‘return’, svipta ‘deprive’, ræna ‘rob’, etc.) only allows asymmetric passives (that is, only the IO may raise to the subject position). Following Falk 1990, Holmberg 1991, Holmberg and Platzack 1995, and Collins and Thráinsson 1996, Anagnostopoulou assumes that the verbs in the former class have a double base: one where the goal is base-generated above the theme (high in the VP, and thus a true double object
construction), and another where the goal is base-generated below the theme (low in the VP, and thus corresponds to a PP-construction). As a result, with verbs like gefa ‘give’, both orders, IO > DO, and DO > IO are found. The latter word order is known as the INVERSION CONSTRUCTION. One of the characteristics of the inversion construction is that the IO must be focused or stressed, and therefore it cannot be object shifted. The examples in 12 are Anagnostopoulou’s 161, originally from Collins and Thráinsson 1996:415. In 12b, I have added the negation to show the ungrammaticality of object shift.

(12) a. Hann gaf konunginum ambáttina ekki
   He.NOM gave king-the.DAT maidservant-the.ACC not
   ‘He did not give the king the maidservant.’

   b. Hann gaf (ekki) ambáttina (ekki)
      He.NOM gave (not) maidservant-the.ACC (not)
      konunginum (*ekki)
      king-the.DAT (*not)
   *‘He did not give the maidservant the king.’

Accordingly, these verbs have symmetric passives.

(13) a. Konunginum var gefin ambáttin
    king-the.DAT was given maidservant-the.NOM
    ‘The king was given the maidservant.’

   b. Ambáttin var gefin konunginum
      Maidservant-the.NOM was given king-the.DAT
      *‘The maidservant was given the king.’

Verbs in the other class do not participate in the inversion construction, and therefore do not have the symmetric passive. Nevertheless, even though verbs in the former class all have the symmetric passive, not all of them seem to participate in the inversion construction. One of these verbs is lána ‘lend’. (Note that Anagnostopoulou, p. 199, example 171b, brings an example from Collins and Thráinsson 1996 that is parallel to 14c. My six informants and I do not share their grammaticality judgments.) The examples in 14 show that
with lána ‘lend’, the IO must precede the DO even though the IO is stressed, as in 14c.

(14) a. Hann lánaði (ekki) bóndanum (ekki)  
    He lent (not) farmer-the.DAT (not) 
    graðfolann (ekki)  
    stud-the.ACC (not)  
    ‘He did not lend the farmer the stud.’

       b. *Hann lánaði (ekki) graðfolann (ekki) bóndanum (ekki)  
           He lent (not) stud-the.ACC (not) farmer-the.DAT (not) 

       c. *Hann lánaði (ekki) graðfolann (ekki) bóndanum (ekki)  
           He lent (not) stud-the.ACC (not) farmer-the.DAT (not) 

The examples in 15, however, show that the verb lána has a symmetric passive. In 15a, the dative goal, bóndanum ‘the farmer’, has raised to the subject position. In 15b the nominative theme, graðfolinn ‘the stud’, has raised to the subject position. It is necessary to embed the passive sentences in a question to avoid V2 effects, such as the possibility of topicalization. Note also that if 15b were derived from the inversion construction, the prediction would be that the dative goal should be focused or stressed. This is not the case in either 13b or 15b.

(15) Hún vill vita …  
    She wants know …  
    ‘She would like to know …’

       a. hvort bóndanum hafi ekki verið lánaður graðfolinn  
           whether farmer-the.DAT has not been lent stud-the.NOM  
           ‘whether the farmer has not been lent the stud.’

       b. hvort graðfolinn hafi ekki verið lánaður bóndanum  
           whether stud-the.NOM has not been lent farmer-the.DAT  
           ‘whether the farmer has not been lent the stud.’

Apparently, in some respects the verb lána ‘lend’ behaves like verbs that do not allow the symmetric passive (because it does not occur in the inversion construction). However, in other respects it seems to behave
like verbs that allow the symmetric passive (because both of its internal arguments may raise to the subject position). Since lána does not occur in the inversion construction, the derivation of 15b is problematic for Anagnostopoulou’s analysis. As she argues (chapter 3, section 8.2.1), vAPPL does not allow for an additional specifier in Icelandic (this also explains why Icelandic does not have non-parallel object shift as found in Norwegian and Swedish). If vAPPL allowed for an additional specifier, the nominative argument and the dative argument would be in the same minimal domain and the nominative argument could move to the outer specifier of v without violating locality conditions on A-movement. After having moved to the outer specifier of v, the nominative argument could move on to T. Since vAPPL does not allow for an additional specifier in Icelandic, the movement of the nominative argument across the dative argument in constructions such as 15b violates the MLC.

Finally, let us turn to multiple specifiers and “tucking in”. I will not discuss the usual arguments against multiple specifiers; for example, that multiple specifiers pose a learnability problem as it can be difficult to figure out whether the structure is made of one projection with two specifiers or two projections with an empty head in the higher projection. Instead, I am concerned with the linear order of multiple specifiers.

Anagnostopoulou assumes (following many others) that the negation and sentence medial adverbs mark the left edge of vP in Scandinavian. Object shift is then movement into an outer specifier, above the negation. If both objects in a double object construction are object shifted, the DO “tucks in” between the IO and the negation (the tree in 16 is Anagnostopoulou’s example 234, p. 155; I have added the negation). First, the IO moves to an outer specifier of v1P. Since the IO does not intervene anymore, the DO can object shift and “tuck in” below the IO.
The negation occupies an extra specifier between the specifier into which the DO has been shifted and the specifier in which the subject is base-generated. Putting aside the argument that if the negation truly marks the left edge of vP, it should precede the objects, I do not understand the mechanism that regulates the linear order of the specifiers. In theory, it should be possible for the DO to “tuck in” below the negation, creating the word order IO–NEG–DO–SUBJ, a word order that does not exist in Scandinavian (unless the subject has been heavy NP shifted). It does, however, seem that the order is always fixed. Note, for instance, that negative shift in Swedish induces a freezing effect on double object shift (Ken Ramshøj Christensen, personal communication). If the IO is negative in Swedish, the only possible order is the one in 17a; that is, IO > DO. Non-parallel object shift in the presence of a negative object, as in 17b, is ungrammatical.

(17) a. Jag gav honom intet ofta
    I gave him nothing often
    ‘I didn’t give him anything often.’

b. *Jag gav intet honom ofta
    I gave nothing him often
The usual assumption (see Koch Christensen 1991; Christensen 2003a,b,c, and references there) is that the negative object in Scandinavian occupies the same position as the sentential negation, which evidently shows that object shift must target a position above negation, and not below it (otherwise examples such as 17b could be grammatical in Scandinavian). It therefore seems to me that some extra assumptions are needed to regulate the linear order of the specifiers. Alternatively, and perhaps also desirably, object shift should be accounted for by means other than multiple specifiers.

In spite of the problems I have touched upon here, Anagnostopoulou’s study is an extremely important contribution to the understanding of the double object construction. In addition, the book is very interesting because it raises important questions about the theoretical make-up of the Minimalist Program. This book should not only be recommended to those who are interested in the syntax of ditransitives, but to all linguists; not least because it is a showcase of what solid and thorough argumentation should look like. I really enjoyed reading this book.
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Reviewed by BRIAN D. JOSEPH, *The Ohio State University*

There are (at least) two types of data-oriented linguists: those who go for data across lots of languages and those who go for lots of data within a single language. David Fertig is clearly a linguist of the second type, as he has put together a masterful and painstakingly detailed study of verbal inflection in the German dialect of Nuremberg in the period between 1356 and 1619, thus based on data which Fertig characterizes as “drawn from a single local variety of a single language” (p. 1). The data for this study come from a collection of texts Fertig assembled consisting of letters, journals, diaries, reports, treatises, bookkeeping records, and protocols, and for all of the items included, a fairly accurate dating was possible, as was the identification of the author.

While Fertig gives a remarkably in-depth description of verbal inflection in his well-defined corpus, his goals are not (merely) descriptive in nature. In fact, as he states his aims, they are “to build a theoretical investigation of morphological change on a solid empirical foundation” (p. 1). Clearly, as the above account of the corpus indicates, the empirical foundation he works with is solid, and then some! Fertig is aware of the fact that one can sometimes drown, as it were, in too much data (see on this point Lass 1997, who, as Klein (1999:88–89) puts it, seems to believe that “despite our interest in taking into account as much data as possible in applying the comparative method, too much data can sometimes be a hindrance in that it may muddle the picture by making it
harder to know what forms to take as input to the method.”). Yet, Fertig realizes, wisely I would say, that a rich database is perhaps the only way that the historical linguist can overcome the basic problem faced by those engaged in analyzing language history, stated by Labov (1972:100) as the need “to make the best of [...] bad data—‘bad’ in the sense that it may be fragmentary, corrupted, or many times removed from the actual production of native speakers.” As a result, we are treated here to a study with an exhaustive basis—Fertig included in the database “every token of every verb that occurs in this collection of nearly one-half million words, about 86,000 tokens in all” (p. 1)—and with a foundation like this, it is fair to say that any theoretical conclusions Fertig reaches inspire confidence.

After two brief introductory chapters about the overall goals and the nature of the corpus, Fertig lays out in chapter 3 his views about language change and especially morphological change. This chapter is well thought out, and contains some provocative and downright iconoclastic ideas. Rejecting the semiotic principle of “one-form-to-one-meaning” as a viable principle of morphology, Fertig argues for the SEPARATION HYPOTHESIS and suggests that “indirect, conditional, non-one-to-one mapping between function (or meaning) and form is [to be] regarded as normal and expected in morphology” (p. 16). He goes on to take issue with the importance that some (see, for example, Bybee 1985) have placed on diagrammatic iconicity (involving the extent to which fusion of a stem with an inflectional marker reflects the relative semantic relevance of each piece to the lexical item’s meaning, to dispute the rareness of exaptation (Lass 1990’s term for the reuse of linguistic “detruitus” by speakers in novel yet rational ways), to reassess the relationship of analogy and rules, and to emend the definition of paradigm leveling to “the paradigm-internally motivated elimination of an allomorphic stem alternation” (p. 32). This last point is especially important since, as he notes (p. 31), “a very high proportion of the changes in verbal inflection observable in the Nuremberg texts involve [sic] what is traditionally referred to as analogical or paradigm(atic) leveling.” He also recognizes the importance of blends and hypercorrection (which he sees as “a kind of analogical development”, p. 37) for the data in his corpus, but is doubtful about traditional typologies of analogical change.
At this point in the book Fertig takes me to task for my lumping “all types of ‘change due to the influence of one form on another’ […] together under the heading ‘analogy’” (in Joseph 1998:362), saying that such “a practice […] has led to the frequent criticism of analogy as a ‘catchall’ term for processes that do not really have anything interesting in common” (p. 36). Let me offer, as a brief excursus, the following defense of my approach. My claim is that various changes, including such traditionally recognized phenomena as paradigm leveling, form-class (external) analogy, contamination (blending), re-compounding (renewal), reanalysis, and even folk etymology, do have much in common. For example, they are typically sporadic (as opposed to the regularity of sound change), typically show the involvement of some other form and a perceived relation to that other form (whereas sound change is impervious to such perceived relations), and typically are embedded in some grammatical subsystem of the language (whereas sound change is blind to grammatical involvement). We might add as well that these characteristics show these changes to have a psychological/cognitive grounding, whereas sound change can be seen as strictly phonetic and physiological in nature. This approach may indeed represent the defining of analogy “negatively as whatever is not sound change, semantic change, or borrowing,” a practice Fertig is clearly not impressed by, but so be it—to me, these characteristics represent valid properties of this otherwise disparate assortment of changes and show how they cohere as a group as opposed to other classes of changes with their own motivating factors (such as physiological ones, in the case of sound change, or social ones, as in the case of borrowing and diffusion more generally).

To return to Fertig’s study, chapters 4 through 7 constitute the core of the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter 4 offers first a detailed look at the inflectional endings, organized by person and number, with a special section on the 1st and 3rd plural forms of the present of sein ‘be’, whereas chapter 5 treats stem alternations. In this latter chapter, the organizing principle is essentially strong versus weak verbs, with a separate treatment of the modals, wissen ‘know’ and tun ‘do’, with discussion of stem-final consonant alternations as well (for instance, Verner’s Law alternations). The theoretical point to be drawn from chapter 5 has to do with directionality in leveling, and Fertig finds that the notions of “local markedness and relative token frequency”
(espoused, among others, by Tiersma 1982 and Bybee 1994) do “not appear to be applicable to the cases of leveling in verbal morphology” seen in the Nuremberg corpus (p. 107). Chapter 6 examines shifts that some verbs show between inflectional classes, a phenomenon that provides an interesting test—and to some extent confirmation—of the theory of inflectional class stability advocated by Wurzel (1984) wherein the importance of the stem vowel in determining inflectional class membership was stressed. Chapter 7 focuses on the ge- participial prefix, clarifying, among other things, some aspects of the absence of this prefix where it might otherwise be expected.

In his concluding chapter, Fertig makes an important nod in the direction of sociolinguistics and variation and how change is to be understood in this context. Given the acuity of his remarks throughout the book, and the general reasonableness of what he says in this chapter, with its reference to usage differences seen in “the opposition between the chancery and administrators, on the one hand, and the women, on the other” (p. 144), one can only regret that this chapter is so short, a mere four and a half pages! Healthy iconoclasm is found here too, as Fertig concludes, following Labov 1989, that while there is a relation between variation and change, “the earlier view equating variation with change in progress is now obsolete” (p. 147).

This work is clearly written and very cleanly produced, with only a few typographical errors at most. There is no index—a minor failing—but Fertig does include an extensive (17-page!) bibliography, and three appendices, one a ten-page verb frequency list giving the frequency of occurrence for every verb in the corpus (not surprisingly, sein ‘be’ and haben ‘have’ are the two most common, followed by werden ‘become’ wollen ‘want’, sollen ‘ought to’, lassen ‘let’, kommen ‘come’, tun ‘do’, and schreiben ‘write’, to round out the top ten), one a two-page sampling of lines from his data tables, and the last a two-page listing of sources for the texts in his collection. All in all, this is a most satisfying contribution to our understanding both of the development of German verbal inflection and of the nature of morphological change. Despite the appeal of broad cross-linguistic surveys, real progress in our field is made, I would say, with fine-grained exhaustive studies of the sort that this excellent and provocative work represents.
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Reviewed by ANNIE ZAENEN, Palo Alto Research Center (PARC)

This monograph discusses some of the major problems in German syntax from the Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) perspective codified in Bresnan 2001. Although there are some LFG papers that discuss phenomena in German syntax and there is an older introduction by Berman and Frank (1996), there was until now no book-length work in the LFG framework that focuses uniquely on the syntax of German. This work, although still a rather slender volume, changes this state of affairs.

After an introduction to LFG based on Bresnan 2001 the book provides a treatment of some often, and some less, discussed phenomena and spells out their relevance to LFG theory. Chapter 3 (the first substantial one) translates the topological model of German sentence structure into a phrase structure model with functional projections, and centers on the problem of whether German has an IP along with a CP. Following mainly arguments given by Haider (1991, 1997), Berman adopts a non-IP analysis. She also follows Haider in proposing a flat structure for the clause final verbal complex. In the course of this chapter, Berman assumes, without much discussion, that German follows the endocentric mapping principles of Bresnan 2001 for the projections of C. This means that she assumes that these German c-to-f-structure mappings are configurational. For the projections of V, she also proposes several levels of VP embedding, but does not clearly say which role they play, because she proposes that the grammatical functions in the middle field are identified through lexicocentric function specification (case marking). Various levels of VPs in the middle field are often proposed in GB to account for the different partial VP-fronting possibilities, but LFG does not need this device.

Chapter 4 argues that although German has no subject position it requires a subject function in every sentence. Given the obvious absence of overt subjects in several types of German sentences, that point of view needs to be supported. Berman adapts to LFG a proposal made in GB, namely that the 3rd person marking on the tensed verb in ostensibly subjectless sentences constitutes the subject. In zu-infinitives with anaphoric control, the subject function with a “PRO” value is introduced
by a functional equation on the zu and in clauses with functional control via the functional control itself. As the discussion shows, the LFG machinery makes it very easy to introduce categories in the functional structure that do not have a corresponding c-structure. This makes clear arguments for such categories desirable. Berman shows that her proposals can be made work. However, she does not show that they solve any problems, such as the occurrence of nominative phrases in infinitives (for example, *einer nach dem anderen* ‘one after the other’), in a more elegant or economic way than other alternatives. Still, following GB tradition, she tries to link her treatment of verbal inflection as introducing a subject to a typology of languages with and without overt subjects. She contrasts Scandinavian languages without verb agreement with German to account for the obligatoriness of overt subjects in the former. However, she also classifies Dutch as a language with obligatory overt subjects; but it is well known that this is the wrong generalization for the majority dialect, where the expletive is optional. Moreover, it creates a problem for her account, as the morphology of Dutch is rich enough to allow the subject to be absent in the c-structure. Of course, the optionality of the Dutch expletive also creates a problem for the proposal advocated.

Chapters 5 is likely the most interesting for readers focusing on LFG theory rather than on German syntax because it discusses the introduction of empty c-structure categories (traces), a relative novelty in the theory. Berman follows Bresnan 2001 in proposing a limited set of empty c-structure categories in LFG on the basis of a study of weak crossover phenomena. The arguments follow Bresnan 2001 rather closely for long distance crossover (Bresnan’s account in turn is based in part on an earlier paper by Berman). The account relies on empty c-structure categories to handle contrasts such as that between 1 and 2.

(1) Who said that he consoled his mother?

(2) a. *Wen sagte seine Mutter habe sie getrööstet?*
   who said his mother have she consoled

   b. *Who did his mother say that she consoled?*

The argument is based on the assumption that one needs to refer to linear order to state the exact conditions on the grammaticality of such
crossover configurations. Bresnan (2001) motivates the need for empty categories in long distance dependencies by the mapping principles from c-to-f-structure, which state that in languages such as English, GF are mapped from configurationally identified c-structures. Berman assumes the same account for German.

Berman accounts for the difference in grammaticality between German and English sentences, such as those found in 3, by assuming a different status for German local subjects and local topicalization: they are in the domain of lexicocentric function specification (identification through case marking).

(3) a. ... dass seine Mutter jeder mag.
    that his mother everyone likes

    b. Seine Mutter mag jeder.
    his mother likes everyone.

    c. *His mother everyone likes.

The proposal then assumes that there needs to be a trace in the German middle field to account for long distance crossover, but given the lack of crossover effects within the middle field it can be anywhere. The contrast between English and German with respect to object crossover is covered by some not very well-worked out but not implausible assumptions about constraints on argument structure.

Berman discusses the counterproposal of Dalrymple et al. 2001 that does not require traces, but rejects it because it does not rely on the endocentric mapping principles and the morphological function specification proposed in Bresnan 2001. It seems rather frivolous to accept a major revision of the theory and the whole philosophy of LFG without discussing in detail exactly what damage the Dalrymple et al. 2001 proposal does to the architecture of the c-structure to f-structure mappings. As far as I know, the long distance crossover facts are the only argument for traces in German (and any other language). One cannot reject a counter analysis by simply saying that it would contradict assumptions that are made only to make one’s own analysis possible.

The assumption that German is an endocentric (configurational) language in the relevant aspects, and the c-to-f-structure mapping principles defined in Bresnan 2001 make it impossible to account for
long distance dependencies without traces, and this is the path that Berman follows without further discussion in chapter 6. In light of these assumptions, she discusses both a functional uncertainty and a cyclic approach with iterating local dependencies without adducing data that would clearly favor one over another.

In chapter 7, “Distribution of Sentential Subjects”, Berman defends two claims: that all embedded tensed clauses in German are at the periphery (left-dislocated or extraposed), and that clauses have the same grammatical functions as nominal arguments, so that one can dispense with the COMP function. I find this chapter rather badly organized and do not understand very well what these two claims have to do with each other. What follows is my best attempt to make sense of it. The claim that sentential arguments have the same grammatical functions as nominal ones is based on a reconsideration of arguments presented in Dalrymple and Lødtrup 2000, who propose a mixed analysis where some clauses are COMPs and others are OBJs. Berman argues that some of their arguments rest on the wrong examples, and that when the right examples are chosen it can be argued that *that*-clauses in German can be OBJs or OBLs, and that none need to be assumed to be COMPs. An argument in favor of COMP-clauses given in Dalrymple and Lødrup 2000 is based on the contrast between 4 and 5.

(4) Dass die Erde rund ist, (das) hat ihn gewundert.
that the earth round is that has him surprised
‘That the earth is round surprised him.’

(5) Dass die Erde rund ist, *(darüber) hat sie sich gewundert.
that the earth round is *it-about has she herself surprised.
‘That the earth is round, she was surprised about that’

The assumption here is that OBJs can be topicalized, whereas COMPs cannot. Berman proposes to reanalyze apparent sentential topicalization as left-dislocation with deletion of the resumptive pronoun, which is seen as a case of topic drop. As Berman observes, this analysis is an LFG adaptation of an analysis proposed for Dutch by Koster (1978) and for German by Oppenrieder (1991). As topic drop is only possible with subjects and (accusative) objects, it accounts for the contrasts above.
Note, however, that this treatment of “topicalized” *that*-clauses does not require the assumed function assignment: left-dislocated elements are not assumed to have the same function as the element that they are anaphorically connected to. In fact they are generally assumed to have only a discourse function and no subcategorized one.¹ This, of course, is no argument against the proposed analysis, only against the way the argument is structured. Things become more puzzling if one looks at the second position where *that*-clauses can occur: extraposed in the *Nachfeld*. This is a position where nominal elements cannot occur. As sentences are not morphologically marked, we need to develop new positions to identify them. Berman proposes to right adjoin them to the VP. However, again this is not a position for other subcategorized arguments, so it does not jibe with the proposal that *that*-clauses have the same function as nominal arguments. Here I would rather argue that this is an argument against this proposal, as maintaining it weakens the mapping theory. What then are the arguments in favor of OBJ and OBL function? They are the ones developed in Dalrymple and Lødrop 2000: alternation with a nominal object, passivization, and coordination. However, passive sentences can be analyzed as involving topicalization/left-dislocation as above. Alternations have to be allowed in general, so the main argument is coordination. Here Berman makes the interesting observation that the (a) versions of the following sentences are grammatical, whereas the (b) versions are not.

(6) a. Ich informierte ihn über die Situation
    I informed him about the situation
    und dass Hans krank ist.
    and that Hans sick is
    ‘I informed him about the situation and that Hans is sick.’

¹ The structure that Berman proposes for “topicalized” *that*-clauses might be closer to that of contrastive dislocation construction as described in Thráínsson 1979, Zaenen 1997 and Grohmann 2000 for German, but that type of construction is not discussed anywhere.
b. *Ich informierte ihn, dass Hans krank ist
   I informed him that Hans sick is
   und über die Situation.
   and over the situation

(7) a. Er vergass die Verabredung und dass es wichtig war,
   he forgot the appointment and that it important was
   pünklich zu sein.
   on-time to be
   ‘He forgot the appointment and that it was important to be on
time.’

   b. *Er vergass dass es wichtig war, pünklich zu sein
   he forgot that it important was on-time to be
   und die Verabredung.
   and the appointment

However, she does not propose an analysis of this contrast. She
suggests that the sentence final versions can be assumed to be
extraposed, but if that is the case this would be the first clear violation of
the coordinated constituent constraint, and if we are to assume null
pronouns in the second constituent of the grammatical clauses it would
be nice to have some arguments for them.

To summarize: left-dislocated clauses do not need an OBJ or OBL
function, extraposed ones do not pattern with nominal OBjs or OBLs,
and so are no argument for a similarity in function. The contrasts in 6
and 7 might form the basis for an argument if identity of function is
required for coordination, but they remain unexplained under the analysis
given.

The last substantial chapter discusses the occurrence of es with finite
clauses. It is too complex to summarize, as it relies on six interacting
assumptions, only one of which is specific to this discussion. It is a rather
satisfying demonstration of the power of the framework developed in the
previous chapters. The book ends with a summary and a list of some
open problems.
Overall, *Clausal Syntax of German* is a more than competent analysis of some major problems in German syntax in the LFG framework. From the discussion above, it is most likely clear that its main quality is not originality, which is not surprising given that this is a reworked doctoral dissertation. The lack of originality is potentially positive because specialists in German syntax could read the book to familiarize themselves with LFG, as it allows one to see clearly what is common to previous analyses and what is specific to LFG. Most of the discussion is clear and coherent, adapted ideas are correctly attributed to their original authors, and problems are clearly flagged. Together with Bresnan 2001, this work constitutes an excellent source for anyone who wants to teach an introduction to LFG with German data.
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