CYCLIC EFFECTS ON THE CP EDGES HINGE ON CHECKING CASE

I maintain that it pays to detail a similar insight that V-relatedness (Cinque 1990) can explain (structural) island effects if these are recast as a result of phases (CPs and DPs) with/without checking case when cyclic movement takes place at the phase edges.

The (sporadic) theory of bounding in Chomsky (2000, 2001) calls for Phase Impenetrability Condition /PIC/ banning dependency formation through the boundary of a strong phase after its completion. Since features drive all movements, one can bank on what I dub as Ubiquitous Island Effect: all strong phases would in theory act as islands. Example (1) shows that no dependency can be formed with a copy inside complex NP (1a) or a subject (1b), and (2) illustrates an adjunct of a CNP which is not inserted in the NP in low cycle, the hypothetical generalisation of which is (1a,b).

(1a) *WHICH claim [*that Eve made*] *did they hear the gossip that Ann forgot* {which claim}?
(1b) *WHICH claim [*that Eve made*] *did her interest in* {which claim} *baffled us?*
(2) WHICH claim [*that Eve made*] *was he willing to forget* {which claim}?

In (2) [$_{DP}$ *which claim*] is merged to the V *forget* by external merge forming VP. Then the object [$_{DP}$ *which claim*] must be internally merged at the edge of the phrase *forget* as a consequence of the PIC. If the complement remains in situ (off the edge), it will not be able to raise to Spec,CP (and further, into upper CPs) cyclically (instead, it must be spelled out (at the operation *transfer*)). After [$_{DP}$ *which claim*] is internally merged in Spec,vP, the adjunct [$_{CP}$ *that Eve made*] is merged to [$_{DP}$ *claim*], forming the set {*claim, that Eve made*}. Since reconstruction applies in the base position (Chomsky (2001)), there is no copy of the adjunct in that position that can give rise to a condition C violation. Whereas Nunes and Uriagereka (2000), Nunes (2004) make the most of a variety of late insertion, the parallel tree building, by assuming that if a phrase marker X (the islands) was assembled sideward (=there is a derivational point at which X and Y co-exist in the derivational space, and are unconnected) with a phrase marker Y, and then X and Y were merged, whereupon Y projects, no extraction is ever possible from X. The explanations in the style of (2) might carry over to (1a,b) as a generalised adjunct late insertion. However, the contrast in grammaticality between empirical data (1a,b) vs. (2) refute this. The sideward movement model is rigid and unable to tackle cross-linguistic variety (cf. for various non-sideward assembling models: Fukui&Saito 1998, Ouhalla 1996, Stepanov 2001)).

Therefore, I shift the burden of the account from the tree derivational mechanism to licensing. P(eripheral)-features in Chomsky (2000, 2001) on any edge head enable categories with unsatisfied uninterpretable features to have a copy on the phase edge spec position of the phase head. While this uncurbed device of freely assigned [P]-features (strong phases thus allow long dependency) as well as the Ubiquitous Island Effect (the above-mentioned opposite extreme) are grossly inadequate for explaining bounded dependencies, the latter is certainly absent with *v*P in transitive constructions (never an island domain). The strong phase *v*P should uniformly be allowed to have a [P] to Agree with the argument which must thus possess P-features, unlike an argument – the subject DP – which Agrees with Tense. This leaves open the issue of why CPs and DPs that allow extraction in complement position, and are rigged with [P] for that purpose, still ban extraction when they sit in subject or adjunct position. If agreement with *v* is what licenses P-features on any other phrase, since adjuncts never agree to V, they will not have a [P], and thus adjunct islandhood follows free.

P-features are concomitant features in that each Agreeing category has to bear other features than [P] (note that Agree is compulsory anyhow for checking Case on the DP and phi-features on *v*). It is worth including P-features in a requirement that they be checked at the same time as other uninterpretable features (as is required of the phi-features) of their bearer (for a GB approach to islandhood variety and agreement, see e. g. Georgopoulos 1991). If this holds, the same Agree relation that checks off other uninterpretable features on the head, namely, Case on object DPs (and similarly for subjects with the lack of a head that could meet this requirement) will delete [P].

However, the Probe also has a P-feature, and since T does not have it, a subject DP will not check it off, and remains an island. A P-feature cannot be a reflex of simple matching on the Probe and the Goal (unlike Case); we have to allow two uninterpretable features to check off each other. This leads to the conclusion that a clausal object (CP) must take a case at times: clauses in subject position and topicalisation show that the syntactic variables (copies left behind) cannot remain Caseless (Dudás 2000). Since Case features are tagged to each category in the lexicon, lexical C heads can optionally have case: when they do, CPs are akin to DPs. CPs do in fact enter into the same relations as DPs: subject CPs have to agree in some feature with T and object CPs with *v*.

An argument that subject CPs need to enter into relation with T is independently provided by Pesetsky & Torrego (2001) (their idea: Nominative = T); and, also, CP is able to check off the EPP feature of the T (obligatory in English). Hungarian, various Slavic, English CPs, then, need case and Hungarian CPs even trigger agreement on verb (DP-sensitive conjugation. Although Polish, Hungarian, and English differ in CP structure, the blocking effect (for otherwise well-formed dependencies) with an intervening correlative pronoun is a general fact:

(3a) *CO   Tomek chce [DP *tego*   [CP *zeby*   Maria mu   przeczyatala* {co}]]*?
        what Tomek wants   it   C:SUBJUN. Maria him:DAT read:SUBJ.
        Intended as: 'What does Tomek want Maria to read to him?'   (Polish)

(3b) *MILYEN KÖNYVET gondolod [DP *azt,* [CP *hogy olvastak* {milyen könyvet}]]*?
        what book:ACC   think:2SG   it   C   read:3PL
        Intended as: 'What book do you think they read?'   (Hung.)

(3c) *WHAT do you take   [DP   it   [CP *that you left* {what} in the bag]]*?

These matrix verbs assign accusative case to a correlative pronoun (*to* 'it' in various Slavic tongues, *da-* in German, *az* in Hungarian (cf. Kenesei 1994, É. Kiss 2002)), which is a [P]-bearing goal for *v* in my context. When the correlative pronoun is absent, the object CP Agrees with *v* which checks off the uninterpretable features on goal C including [P]. In (3a-c), however, it is the correlative pronoun that enters into Agree relation with the case assigning *v*. The CP is thereby hindered from agreeing with *v* (a Rel. Min./MLC effect) and any potential [P] on the C would remain unchecked.

Likewise, as long as the embedded CP does not Agree with the head of the NP/DP in a complex NP, a structure which I assimilate to that of the intervening correlative, and there is no syntactic category *Z* inside the NP/DP that could check off C's [P] (the same job that *v* does), a CP embedded in a DP will be an island in keeping with CNPC facts. Since a nominal category cannot assign structural case, if there is *Z* in the nominal phrase to check off [P], its workings must differ from *v*, e. g. in Agree relation between the CP and *Z*.

Two issues will also show in new light. I recast the bridge/non-bridge verb contrast: [P]-checking verbs are bridge verbs. The point is that the overlapping distributional facts (i. e. non-extractability out of these domains) of islands and bridge verb complements (for Polish Indicative Clausal Tense Island, too) receive a unified explanation based on a shared lexical primitive.

Furthermore, some *wh-*/declarative contrasts become clear. If interrogative C happens to have a [P], the [P] on a *wh*-subject can get checked through the Agree with C thus allowing the derivation to converge. This option is unavailable to non-*wh*-subjects under this account because there can be no Agree relation with C involving other features than [P] while [P] must always be concomitant.

References *(selected references from my lecture handout)*

Cinque, Guglielmo (1990): Types of A'-Dependencies. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Dudás, O. Kálmán (2000): English, Serbo-Croatian, Italian and Hungarian Island Constraints Jammed into the Controversy of Focus and Topic Licensing. [forthcoming in Rivista di Grammatica Generativa].

É. Kiss Katalin (2002): The Syntax of Hungarian. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Fukui, Naoki and Mamoru Saito (1998): Order in Phrase Structure and Movement. LI 29: 439-474.

Georgopoulos, Carol (1991): Syntactic Variables. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kenesei, István (1994): The Syntax of Subordination. In F. Kiefer&K. É. Kiss (1994): Hungarian Syntax. 275-355.

Nunes, Jairo and Juan Uriagereka (2000): Cyclicity and Extraction Domains. Syntax 3: 20-43.

Nunes, Jairo (2004): Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.

Ouhalla, Jamal (1996): Remarks on the Binding Properties of Wh-in-Situ. LI 27: 676-707.

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego (2001): T-to-C Movement: Causes and Consequences. In: Kenstowicz (2001): 355-426.
Stepanov, Arthur (2001): Late Adjunction and Minimalist Phrase Structure. Syntax 4: 94-125.