University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 11 | Issue 1 Article 11

1-1-2005

A-movement locality in applicative constructions

JU-EUN LEE

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol11/iss1/11
For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

A-movement locality in applicative constructions

This working paper is available in University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics: http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol11/iss1/11

A-movement Locality in Applicative Constructions

Ju-Eun Lee*

1 Introduction

Much work on ditransitives and applicatives notes that while some languages allow both internal arguments to undergo movement to the subject position in passivization (symmetric passive languages), others allow only one internal argument to do so (asymmetric passive languages) (cf. Baker, 1988; Bresnan and Moshi, 1990; Marantz, 1993; Ura, 1996; McGinnis, 2001; Anagnostopoulou, 2003; among others). In this paper, I advocate locality-based accounts for the passivization asymmetry between symmetric passive languages and asymmetric passive languages, based on recent developments in applicatives and the theory of phases. I, in particular, propose that the distribution of phases in applicative verbal structures can be derived from a version of "anti-locality," thereby eliminating stipulations in previous locality-based accounts and confirming that both standard locality and anti-locality constraints are at work in constraining passivizing A-movement.

2 Passivization Asymmetry in Ditranstives: Data

There is a well-known restriction on A-movement in the context of passivization of ditransitive verbs as to which internal argument can raise to the subject position, which is exhibited by the patterns of passivization in American English double-object constructions in (1) and Norwegian ditransitives in (2). In American English,[1] only the Goal argument can undergo A-movement, whereas in Norwegian, both the Goal and the Theme arguments are allowed to raise to the subject position. German (Czepluch, 1988) and Chichewa (Bresnan and Moshi, 1990), among others, belong to asymmetric passive languages along with American English. Symmetric passive lan-

*Special thanks are due to Cedric Boeckx. I would also like to thank the audiences at PLC 28 for their comments and suggestions.

[1]In British English, the Theme may move to the subject position by passivization, as shown in (i), unlike in American English. Even in American English, the Theme-passivization becomes better if the Goal argument is realized as a weak pronoun, as (ii) illustrates (Oherle, 1976). See Lee (2004) for details.

(i) The book was given Mary (by John).

(ii) A letter was given'im/?? me/* HIM by Mary.

guages include Swedish (Falk, 1990), Kichaga (Bresnan and Moshi, 1990) and others as well as Norwegian.

(1) a. John gave Mary the magazine. (Active)
b. Mary was given the magazine. (Goal-passive)
c. ?* The magazine was given Mary. (Theme-passive)
(2) a. Jon gav Marit ei klokke. (Active)
John gave Mary a watch.
b. Jon vart gitt ei kolkke.
John was given a watch.
'John was given a watch.' (Goal-passive)
c. Ei klokke vart gitt Jon.
A watch was given John
?* 'A watch was given John' (Theme-passive)
(Åfarli, 1987 (44), (5))

3 Previous Approaches: Case and Locality

In the GB era, Case-theoretic accounts, which attribute the ungrammaticality of (1c) to a Case-filter violation, have prevailed (cf. Larson, 1988; Baker, 1988; among others). However, these accounts cannot explain languages like Greek, which has designated morphological case for Goals (typically dative, but sometimes genitive, as in Greek) and Themes. In these languages, both Goal and Theme arguments satisfy their respective Case requirements but the passivization of Theme is disallowed nonetheless. For detailed arguments against Case-theoretic accounts, see Anagnostopoulou (2003:52–72).

In Locality-based accounts, however, the ungrammaticality of Theme-passivization in (1c) is accounted for by a locality constraint on A-movement. In other words, the higher Goal argument, being the closer element to the target, blocks the movement of the lower Theme argument over it. The schematic representation of (1b) and (1c) is given in (3).

(3) a. √ [Goal-NOM .... [t_{Goal} .....Theme]] (Goal-passivization, 1b)
b. * [Theme-NOM .... [Goal ..... t_{Theme}]] (Theme-passivization, 1c)

Apparent locality violation in symmetric passive languages, illustrated in (2c), have been accounted for by positing an intermediate movement of the lower internal argument to the multiple specifier position of a head where the higher internal argument is hosted, i.e. by utilizing an "escape hatch" strategy which makes A-movement to proceed successive cyclically in symmetric passive languages, in the manner schematized in (4) (cf. Vikner, 1990;

Holmberg and Platzack, 1995; Ura, 1996; McGinnis, 1998,2001; Anagnostopoulou, 2003).

(4) [Theme Z [$_{KP}$ t_{Theme} [$_{KP}$ Goal K [t_{Theme}]]]] (Anagnostopoulou, 2003:75)

Greek data, which is problematic to the Case-theoretic approach, can also be given a locality-based account in a coherent manner. Since this is not an issue relevant to the current paper, I refer the reader to Anagnostopoulou (2003) and Lee (2004) for an analysis of Greek.

4 Deriving Escape Hatch Effects

Assuming that the escape hatch effects in the locality-based accounts are responsible for the passivization asymmetry between symmetric passive languages and asymmetric passive languages in the way schematized in (4), I will review two such representative locality-based accounts, namely Anagnostopoulou's (2003) parametric approach and McGinnis's (2001) analysis based on theories of applicative typology and phases.

4.1 Anagnostopoulou's (2003) Parametric Approach

Anagnostopoulou's (2003) proposal is couched in Chomsky (1995)'s system, where Feature Attraction is assumed to affect the phrase that has appropriate features and is closest to the target, as stated in (5) (i.e. Shortest Move/Closest Target).

(5) K attracts F if F is the closest feature that can enter into a checking relation with a sublable of K. (Chomsky, 1995:297)

The "closeness" depends on the notion of a minimal domain, as specified in the version of the Minimal Link Condition, given in (6).

(6) If β c-commands α, and τ is the target of movement, then β is closer to τ than α unless β is in the same minimal domain as (i) α or (ii) τ.

Under (6), α can move across a c-commanding element β to the target τ if either (i) potential attractees α and β belong to the minimal domain of the same head or (ii) the intervening β and the target τ belong to the minimal domain of the same head. In this way the locality condition, i.e.

Minimal Link Condition (MLC), is relativized to minimal domains and not just defined in terms of c-command in Chomsky (1995)'s system.

For the structure of the (underlying) double object variant of ditransitives, Anagnostopoulou (2003) adopts Marantz's (1993) proposal, which takes double object constructions as akin to applicative structures found in Bantu languages (given in (7)) as a universal representation for double object constructions. In this structure, indirect objects are semantically external to the event described by VP and that a Goal (or Benefactive) argument is merged in the specifier of a light applicative verb (*v*APPL).

(7) $[_{vP}$ Agent v $[_{ApplP}$ Ben/Goal *Appl* $[_{VP}$ V Theme]]]

In (7), the Goal argument is not in the same minimal domain with the Theme argument and is closer to the target T than the Theme, hence the movement of the Theme over the Goal is in violation of the Shortest Move, which leads to ungrammaticality in asymmetric passive languages.

The Theme-passivization in symmetric passive languages is an apparent non-local derivation. Anagnostopoulou (2003:157) proposes "The Specifier to vAPPL parameter", given in (8), to account for it.

(8) Symmetric movement languages license movement of DO to a specifier of *v*APPL. In languages with asymmetric movement, movement of DO may not proceed via *v*APPL.

According to (8), Norwegian allows the movement of a Theme DO to the specifier of *v*APPL, in which the Goal IO is hosted, as illustrated in (9).

(9) $[_{vAPPL}$ DO $[_{vAPPL}$ IO $[_{vAPPL'}$ *v*APPL $[_{VP}$ V $t_{DO}]]]]$

This intermediate movement of the Theme DO to the specifier of *v*APPLP on its way to the specifier of T makes DO and IO "equidistant" from the target T in Chomsky's (1995) system, in which multiple specifiers are treated as equidistant from the target of movement. Thus either the Theme or the Goal can undergo passivizing A-movement in conformity with locality. Unlike symmetric passive languages, however, asymmetric passive languages do not have an option of passing through *v*APPL by the parameter setting given in (8). Therefore, the movement of the Theme over the Goal directly to T results in violation of locality (MLC), leading to ungrammaticality.

Anagnostopoulou's (2003) parametric approach explaining the passivization asymmetry in terms of the presence or absence of an escape hatch, which is assumed to be a parametric value, is a stipulation.

4.2 McGinnis's (2001) Applicative Typology and Phase Structures

McGinnis (2001) derives the escape hatch effect by adopting Pylkkänen's (2002) theory of applicatives and Chomsky's (2000, 2001a, 2001b) theory of phases. McGinnis's (2001) analysis is superior to Anagnostopoulou's (2003) approach, as the escape hatch effect is reduced to independent properties of a given language rather than just stipulated as a parameter. Or rather, to put it differently, a parameter is located elsewhere (i.e. from specifier to *v*APPL parameter to parameter of phases, in a way) but is possibly deduced by some other considerations.

4.2.1 Two Types of Applicative Structures: High and Low

Pylkkänen (2002) argues (building on previous observations in the literature, e.g. Baker, 1988 and Marantz, 1993) that there are two types of applicatives, "high" and "low," which have different lexical semantics.

A high applicative (ApplH) is located above the verb phrase but below the position of the external argument, where it denotes a relation between an event and an individual (thus simply adding another participant to the event described by the verb). A low applicative (ApplL), which is located in the complement position of the verb root, by contrast, relates two individuals in a possessive relationship. In other words, the low applied argument (Goal) bears no semantic relation to the verb but only bear a transfer of possession relation to the direct object (Theme). According to Pylkkänen (2002), because of its semantics, ApplH head merges with an (eventive) VP complement and a DP specifier, and ApplL head with a DP complement and a DP specifier, as illustrated in (10a) and (10b), respectively.

(10) a. High applicative
$[_{\text{ApplHP}}\ \text{IO}_{\text{Goal}}\ \textit{ApplH}\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ \text{DO}_{\text{Theme}}]]$
b. Low applicative
$[_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ [_{\text{ApplLP}}\ \text{IO}_{\text{Goal}}\ [_{\text{ApplL}'}\ \textit{ApplL}\ \text{DO}_{\text{Theme}}]]]$

One diagnostic Pylkkänen (2002) proposes for distinguishing two kinds of applicatives is compatibility with unergative verbs. Low applicatives relate two DP objects and require the presence of an underlying direct object, hence are not compatible with unergatives, whereas high applicatives relate a DP and a VP, thus require only VP, irrespective of the presence of an underlying object in the VP. This predicts that high applicatives are compatible with unergatives.

McGinnis (2001) argues that ditransitives in symmetric and asymmetric passive languages have high and low applicative structures, respectively. McGinnis shows that Kinyarwanda (a symmetric passive language) benefactive applicative construction is indeed compatible with unergatives, whereas it is not the case with an asymmetric passive language like English.[2] English has neither unergative-based benefactives (12a) nor ditransitives with omitted Theme argument (12b).

(11) Umugabo a-rá-som-er-a umugóre.[3]
man SP-PR-read-APPL-ASP woman
'The man is reading for the woman'
(McGinnis, 2001:2, cited from Kimenyi, 1980)

(12) English
a. John read *(for) Mary.
b. John baked Mary *(a cake).

McGinnis (2001) argues that the different applicative structures underlie the passivization asymmetry. Adopting McGinnis (2001), I suggest that the restrictions on passivization (A-movement) may be useful as a probe into the internal structure of a given ditransitive construction: symmetric ditransitive passive pattern hints a high applicative structure.

4.2.2 Phases and Phase-EPP Features

McGinnis (2001) adopts the phase theory of clause structure of Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b). According to phase theory, syntactic derivations proceed in chunks or phases, and once a phase is complete, it is sent to phonological and semantic spell-out at once, before the syntactic computation proceeds to higher portions of the clause, thus the domain (i.e. the sister of a phase head) of a phase is not accessible to operations at/above the next higher phase and the only edge (i.e. a specifier of a phase head) of a phase is accessible to such operations ("Phase Impenetrability Condition"). Phases

[2] It seems that Norwegian patterns with English rather than Kinyarwanda in disallowing unergative-based benefactives and Goal-ditransitives with omitted Theme-objects. I interpret Pylkkänen's (2002) diagnostic in a loose way, unlike McGinnis (2001), such that the compatibility with unergatives imply high applicatives but not vice versa. Low applicative structures in principle resist unergative verbal roots. Also, even within low applicatives, the compatibility with unaccusative-based benefactives differ depending on a language and/or construction, even though the low applicative structure, in principle, allows it (e.g. English '*Mary died *(for) her daughter*').

[3] The following abbreviations are used: SP (subject pronoun), PR (present), APPL (applicative), ASP (aspect), NOM (nominative), DAT (dative).

are defined as complete propositions, and as such the (strong) phase boundaries proposed by Chomsky are φ-complete transitive *v*P and CP. Because of Phase Impenetrability Condition, a constituent that does not move to the edge of the phase is trapped in its domain.

In Chomsky (1995), EPP is assumed to be a requirement on T that it should have its specifier position filled by an element. EPP is reinterpreted as a generalized requirement of T and of phase heads *v* and C to merge with a specifier in Chomsky's (2001a) system. EPP is responsible for triggering the complex operation Move. A generalized EPP feature can be added to a phase head, providing an escape hatch for a lower argument to move to its edge. This generalized EPP on phase heads, *v* and C, is called phase-EPP. A non-phase EPP feature (like that of T) is obligatory, whereas phase-EPP features are optional.

4.2.3 Phasehood of Applicative Heads

The central proposal of McGinnis (2001) is that the two different applicative structures underlie the passivization asymmetry and that the two applicative structures have different phase structures. Namely, the high applicative head is a phase head, and the low applicative head, by contrast, is not. Being a phase head, the high applicative structure has an option of escape hatch through phase-EPP feature, which attracts an element to its specifier.

McGinnis (2001), showing that symmetric passive languages and asymmetric passive languages have two different applicative phrase structures, argues that the availability of escape hatch in high applicative structure follows if we adopt Chomsky's theory of phases and assume that only a high applicative head is a phase head. If there is evidence for phases in the grammar and for (non)phasehood of applicative heads, then McGinnis's (2001) approach seems superior to Anagnostopoulou's (2003) in reducing the stipulations in deriving the escape hatch effect.

Chomsky (2000, 2001a, 2001b) suggests that a phase is a proposition, thus *v*, C, and (possibly) D heads are assumed to be a phase head. McGinnis (2001) proposes (13) to add ApplH in the set of phase heads.

(13) The sister of VP heads a phase if an argument is generated in its specifier. (McGinnis, 2001:7)

By this definition of a phase, a high applicative head (i.e. ApplH) is a phase, whereas a low applicative head (i.e. ApplL) need not be a phase.

Symmetric passive languages have a high applicative structure (14). In this structure, the lower Theme is embedded within the domain of the ApplHP phase, and the ApplH, being a phase head with an EPP-feature, can

attract the lower Theme into its specifier. From this position, the lower Theme, being a closer element to T, can move further into the subject position, yielding a Theme-passive.

(14) $[_{\text{ApplHP}}\ \text{DO}_{\text{Theme}}\ [_{\text{ApplH'}}\ \text{IO}_{\text{Goal}}\ [_{\text{ApplH'}}\ \textit{ApplH}\quad [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ t_{\text{Theme}}]]]]$

[phase-EPP]

On the other hand, asymmetric passive languages have a low applicative structure (15). Both the Goal and the Theme are embedded within the domain of the *v*P phase. Within the phase, the Goal is higher than the Theme, and the low applicative head cannot provide an escape hatch, being a non-phase head. Thus, the passivization asymmetry is explained with the assumption that a high applicative head is a phase head and a low applicative head is not.

(15) * $[_{\text{vP}}\ v\ [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\ [_{\text{ApplLP}}\ \text{IO}_{\text{Goal}}\ [_{\text{ApplL'}}\ \textit{ApplL}\ \text{DO}_{\text{Theme}}\ ]]]]$

In addition to passivization, differences in phonological phrasing (discussed in Seidle, 2000) and pronoun incorporation between the two types of languages and/or constructions follow nicely in the phase-analysis, as McGinnis (2001) points out: In Kinyarwanda's benefactive applicatives (with the symmetric passive pattern), both the Goal and the Theme pronouns can be incorporated into the verb, while in locative applicatives (with the asymmetric passive pattern), only the Goal can be incorporated. Also, from Bantu languages, there is evidence showing that in applicatives that have a symmetric passive (i.e. here, high applicative), the two objects are grouped together in phonological phrasing with the verb, while in those that have an asymmetric passive (i.e. low applicative, here), only the indirect object is phrased together with the verb and the direct object is in a different phonological phrase. Considering that phases are a phonological unit too, the phase-theoretic account for the passivization asymmetry has advantage over the parametric approach in that wider range of phenomena can be treated in a uniform way.

5 Anti-locality

For the locality-based account resorting to applicative typology and phase theory to be truly not stipulative, we need to make certain that low applicatives are not phases but high applicatives may be so. I propose that "anti-

locality" notion can confirm this, thus corroborating McGinnis (2001) on the distribution of phases.

Different versions of anti-locality have been conceived in the literature. One version is the domain-based anti-locality hypothesis of Grohmann (2003), who proposes that there is a lower-bound restriction on the minimum distance of movement as well as standard locality which restricts the upper-bound on the maximum distance of movement. In Grohmann's (2003) words, movement must not be too local. For Grohmann (2003), movement is too local if an element K has two occurrences within a given domain α, where α ranges over thematic ("VP"), inflectional ("IP"), and discourse-related ("CP") domains.

The notion of Grohmann's (2003) anti-locality cannot capture the escape hatch effect exhibited in symmetric passive languages, since the movement of the Theme from the complement position of V to [Spec, ApplHP] is a movement within an anti-locality domain, *v*P.

However, I propose that if we adopt a notion of anti-locality in the line of Saito and Murasugi (1993), Bošković (1994) and Abels (2003), we can achieve the intended effect. First, Saito and Murasugi (1993) formulate a condition in the spirit of anti-locality as (16) for explaining the situation described in (17), i.e. the situation where the subject moves from [Spec, IP] to the IP-adjoined position within a single projection (as a short subject topicalization).

(16) A chain link must be at least of length 1
(A chain link from A to B is of length *n* iff there are *n* "nodes" (X, X', or XP, but not segments of these) that dominate A and exclude B.)

(17) * I think that [$_{IP}$ John, [$_{IP}$ <John> likes Mary]]

By (16), Saito and Murasugi (1993) flesh out the intuition disallowing too short a movement.

Bošković (1994) argues that Saito and Murasugi (1993)'s constraint in (16) is highly motivated. We may need (16) to prevent Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)'s Minimize Chain Link Principle, which requires that each chain link be as short as possible, from forcing a phrase in an adjoined position to adjoining to the same node over and again. Bošković (1994) also argues that (16) rules out adjunction of X to its own XP and substitution of X to [Spec, XP] (i.e. situations that Chomsky (1995:321) referred to as "self-attachment").

More recently, Abels (2003), in the similar spirit, proposed an anti-locality constraint formulated as (18), which is shown to apply to all heads

and their complements. No phrase can be both specifier and complement of the same head.

(18) Anti-locality constraint (Abels, 2003:12)

* $[_{XP}$ YP X' $t_{YP}]$

6 Proposal: Ditransitives and Anti-locality

Given the definition of a phase (i.e. a phase head can in principle allow an additional specifier that could induce escape hatch effects when there is a movement), a low applicative head cannot be a phase head if we assume anti-locality in the sense of Bošković (1994) and Ables (2003). Because of the locality constraint, the Theme first has to move into the outer specifier position where the Goal is hosted so that it could be closer to the target T, yet the movement of the Theme (complement) into the outer specifier position of ApplLP is not possible due to the anti-locality constraint, namely, anti-locality blocks escape hatch effects to arise in (A)-movement in a low applicative structure. It means that anti-locality categorically blocks the possibility of an additional specifier. The impossibility of having an additional specifier for a given head is interpreted as that the head is not a phase head.

Thus, the nonphasehood of ApplL does not have to be stipulated but can be derived from anti-locality. The stipulative nature of Anagnostopoulou's (2003) additional specifier parameter for symmetric passive languages can be derived from McGinnis's (2001) proposal that an applicative head involved in symmetric passive languages (i.e. ApplH) is a phase head. The stipulative nature of McGinnis's (2001) assumption that ApplL is not a phase can now be understood in terms of anti-locality.

7 Applicative Analysis of Experiencer Constructions and Phasehood

McGinnis (2001) argues that a low applicative head is not a phase head by extending the applicative analysis to raising A-movement in experiencer constructions. Suppose that ApplL is a phase head. In a low applicative structure, if a lower DP is not the direct complement of ApplL, it should be able to move to outer [Spec, ApplLP], since it is not a compl-to-spec movement, and move further over the higher DP, in the way illustrated in (19).

(19) [$_{\text{ApplLP}}$ EXP. [$_{\text{ApplL}'}$ *ApplL* [$_{\text{TP}}$ SUBJ. ....]]]

In Icelandic (20b), the movement of an embedded subject over the Experiencer dative is blocked.

(20) a. Jón telur [mér$_i$ virðast t$_i$ [Haraldur hafa gert þetta vel]]
Jon.NOM believes me.DAT to.seem H.NOM to.have done this well
'John believes Harald to seem to have done this well."
b. * Jón telur [Haraldur$_i$ virðast mér [t$_i$ hafa gert þetta vel]]
Jon.NOM believes H.NOM to.seem me.DAT to.have done this well

Unlike Icelandic, Italian allows the embedded subject to raise over the Experiencer, as (21) shows.

(21) Gianni$_i$ non gli sembra [t$_i$ fare il suo dovere]
Gianni not him.DAT seems to.do his duty
'Gianni does not seem to him to do his duty.'

McGinnis (2001) analyzes Icelandic and Italian experiencer constructions as low and high applicatives, respectively. If the Icelandic experiencer construction is a low applicative structure with a low embedded subject argument in the position as in (19), the prediction under the assumption that a low applicative head is a phase head is that the embedded subject should be able to move over the Experiencer. However, this prediction is not borne out, as (20b) demonstrates. Thus, McGinnis (2001) concludes that the asymmetry in A-movement in experiencer constructions can be accounted for in an extended applicative analysis, but with crucial assumption that a low applicative head is not a phase head.

However, high and low applicatives are tied to semantic differences (Pylkkänen, 2002). The high applicative (ApplH) denotes a relation between an event and an individual, whereas the low applicative (ApplL) denotes a relation between two individuals. Considering similar semantics involved in experiencer constructions, splitting them into different applicative structures is not motivated. And it might be thinkable to analyze the experiencer construction as a high applicative but it is not plausible to give a low applicative analysis if the low applicative head encodes the possessive relationship between the two DP individuals. Thus, using Icelandic and Italian experiencer constructions as an argument for the nonphasehood of ApplL may not be relevant in the way McGinnis (2001) argues.

Moreover, A-movement in Italian experiencer construction is more complex than McGinnis (2001) presents. Although there is no blocking ef-

fect in (21), we should note that the Experiencer is in a clitic form in (21). If an Experiencer is a full DP, Italian also exhibits the intervention effect, just like Icelandic, as (22) shows, for which even a high applicative analysis cannot give an adequate account.

(22) * Gianni$_i$ sembra a Maria [t_i essere stanco]
Gianni seems to Maria to-be ill
'Gianni seems to Maria to be ill.'

See Boeckx (2003) for an analysis of Italian raising constructions without involving an applicative analysis.

8 Conclusion

I have shown in this paper that the distribution of phases, specifically non-phasehood of a low applicative head (ApplL) can be derived from anti-locality, thereby corroborating McGinnis's (2001) locality analysis that passivization asymmetry in applicative constructions across languages may be related to the phrasal and phasal structures of applicative constructions. Anti-locality prohibiting comp-to-spec movement in a projection is at work as well as standard locality in the grammar. Anti-locality sheds light on the structure and passivization patterns of ditransitives, and passivization of ditransitives, in turn, sheds light on the status/notion of anti-locality in the grammar.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Åfarli, Tor A. 1987. Lexical structure and Norwegian passive and ergative constructions. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 29:1–21.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York. University College London, London, UK.

Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. Raising and experiencers. Ms., Harvard University.

Bošković, Željko. 1994. D-structure, theta-criterion, and movement into theta-positions. *Linguistic Analysis* 24:247–286.

Bresnan, Joan and Lioba Moshi. 1990. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:147–185.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Martin, R., D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, eds., *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001a. Derivation by phase. In Kenstowicz, M., ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001b. Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. Ms., MIT.

Czepluch, Harmut. 1988. Case patterns in German: Some implications for the theory of abstract Case. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics*, Special issue on comparative syntax, 79–122.

Falk, Cecilia. 1990. On double object constructions. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 46:53–100.

Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2003. *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Holmberg, Anders and Chriser Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Larson, Richard. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:335–392.

Lee, Ju-Eun. 2004. Ditransitive structures and (anti-)locality. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In Mchombo, S., ed., *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 113–150.

McGinnis, Martha. 1998. Locality in A-movement. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

McGinnis, Martha. 2001. Variation in the phase structure of applicatives. Ms., University of Calgary. [to appear in *Linguistic Variations Yearbook*, ed. Johan Rooryck and Pierre Pica. John Benjamins Publishing Company.]

Oehrle, Richard T. 1976. The grammatical status of the English dative alternation. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. Introducing arguments. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Saito, Mamoru and Keiko Murasugi. 1993. Subject predication within IP and DP. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs, and Kinjo Gakuin University.

Seidle, Amanda. 2000. Minimal indirect reference: A theory of the syntax-phonology interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. Multiple feature checking: A theory of grammatical function splitting. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Vikner, Sten. 1990. Verb movement and the licensing of NP-positions in the Germanic languages. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Genève.

Department of Linguistics
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
jueunlee@fas.harvard.edu