

CYCLIC EFFECTS ON THE CP EDGES HINGE ON CHECKING CASE

Kálmán Olivér DUDÁS, ELTE / Theoretical Linguistics
odudas@citromail.hu, szekelyzsbt@hotmail.com

1 BOUNDING EFFECTS

The main objective of this paper is to present an account of cyclic effects at the boundary of CP by way of edge/peripheral features in the minimalist framework. I claim that the licensing process of the syntactic categories CP and DP by way of feature checking of edge/peripheral features (of little ν) on the edge of a phase affords an explanation of successive cyclic and island effects on CP domains and boundaries. The licensing of an object domain under Agree relation (Chomsky (2000, 2001), see (10) below) will lead to removing the islandhood of a certain set of object domains and the same argument denies that adjuncts, subjects and complex NPs could call on this same process, and, thus, they must be islands (examples (1) to (3)).

The supporting arguments will be grounded on Minimal Link Condition, Phase Impenetrability Condition, and a special view of domain licensing by matrix predicates which recasts V-relatedness in Cinque's (1990) sense. I develop an account of the following structures (illustrated below with three relevant English data) by putting the notions of phase theory to use. (The unpronounced copies are struck through in all examples in the text.)

- (1) ** *What did Paul's orchestra play the concerto* [_{CP} *after learning* ~~*what*~~] ?
- (2) *Who did Paul say/*report* [_{CP} *that he inoculated* ~~*who*~~]?
- (3) ** *Who did* [_{DP} *a picture of* ~~*who*~~] baffle John?

For readers' convenience, I quote the most relevant definitions for the rest of discussing the locality issues.

- (4a) Minimise Chain Links
Chain links must be kept at a minimum length.
- (4b) Minimal Link Condition /MLC/ (Chomsky 1995:331)
L attracts K only if there is no C, C closer to L than K, such that L attracts C.
- (4c) Closeness in nodes
A node X is closer to node N than Y if the number of nodes intervening between N and X is less than the number of nodes between N and Y.
- (4d) Closeness by c-command /where the metric is c-command rather than node-counting/
(Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), rule (12)):
A syntactic category CAT is closer to an upper head K than syntactic category X if this head K c-commands the category CAT and CAT c-commands the category X.

- (5a) Edge (Chomsky (2001:13)):
The edge of a head X is the residue outside of X₀; it comprises specifiers of X (and adjuncts to XP).
- (5b) Phase Impenetrability Condition /PIC/ (Chomsky (2001:14)):
The domain of a head X of a phase XP is not accessible to operations at ZP (the next phase); only X and its edge are accessible to such operations.

The consequence of this latter rule is that the search space is enlarged, and, thus, operations in YP can now seek a Goal beyond the boundaries of a phase. Since Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004, 2005) makes the strong claim that only edges of phases are at hand for syntactic operations (in essence, it is the Phase Impenetrability Condition, first stated in Chomsky (2000), any other category not on the edge, i. e. those inside the phase, is opaque. The main effect of this constraint is this general opacity effect, which is essentially Ross's (1967) island effect.

In addition, Huang's (1982) constraint rests on government relations between a licensing category and the extraction domain.

- (6) Condition on Extraction Domains /CED/ (Huang (1982))
A phrase X can be extracted from a domain Y only if Y is properly governed.

Possible domains Y are the subject domain as well as the adjunct domain within which a dependency cannot be formed with elements outside the domain (known as the subject and adjunct condition). In GB terms, extraction¹ can only take place from a lexically governed domain.

Since the distinction between extraction domains does not seem to be inherent in the phrase (e. g. a DP) constituting the domain (see the well-known object-subject asymmetry in (7a, b)), the particular configuration of the opaque phrase is unlikely to determine whether the edge feature is checked. An object DP allows wh-movement whereas a subject DP does not:

- (7a) *What have you blown up [a picture of ~~what~~] ?* (Non-island object)
(7b) **What has [a picture of ~~what~~] baffled Fred ?* (Subject Island)

I will proceed as follows.

In section 2 I will argue that the differences emerge from the difference of T and little v when a phrase goes through a phase, and, further, the differences can be derived from the different structural relations that an object, subject, or adjunct have.

This approach does not involve assembling syntactic trees. Nunes (2001, 2004), Nunes and Uriagereka (2002), Hornstein and Nunes (2002) chose to make the most of building the tree by introducing the mechanism of sideward movement, by assuming that if a phrase marker X (the islands) was assembled sideward, i. e. 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, which is a type of a generalised adjunct late insertion (see section 2.1.1). Sideward movement builds subjects and adjuncts, which are thus different from other domains. However, this sideward movement model

¹ I will use the word *extraction* as a descriptive term to refer to the fact that certain phrases phonologically appear in a position to which they are not related by lexical subcategorisation, argument structure, etc. and, also, the position where such lexical relation would hold for them can be located clearly.

is rigid and unable to tackle cross-linguistic variety. Therefore, I shift the burden of the account from the tree building mechanism to licensing. Edge features in Chomsky (2001, 2004, 2005) on any edge head enable categories with unsatisfied uninterpretable features to have a copy in the phase edge specifier position of the phase head. This situation fulfils the PIC in (5) but brings up questions of why most phases put a ban on the formation of dependencies through their boundaries, that is to say, are islands for the categories inside them. My paper will give an answer in a model combining properties of cyclic domains and licensing certain domains as arguments/complements of the matrix verb.

In section 2.1.1, I argue that the syntactic model must account for both ubiquitous island effects (all strong phases are islands) and its alleviation by using the edge of phases (see (5)). Since Cinque (1990) used *c*-selection and [+V]-relatedness as the means of licensing (see (13)), it would be payable to use a formal feature which is characteristic of selecting a DP or CP, typical domains of *c*-selection by the verb (this feature is [Case]).

I chisel the licensing mechanism in section 2.1.2. An Agree relation (see (10)) exists between two elements (concretely, *v* and its object domain) that each bears an edge feature, which is a concomitant feature in that the Agree relation checking off EF involves other features as well. (It is a subfeature in the same sense as, for instance, the EPP/OCC feature requiring a phrase to be in the specifier of a head is.)

Section 2.2 presents a technical realization of the concept that certain heads (the [+V]-related ones) are able to license domains lexically, whereas other domains are not licensed in this way, and, thus, little *v*P checks objects by way of Case at the phase boundary. In this process of licensing, establishing an Agree relation by way of checking an object XP involves checking its [Case] and concomitant edge feature. This process involves DP as well as CP categories (these latter take [Case], too).

I compare various object domains in connection with verb classes and DP/CP structures in section 2.3. I will argue that complex noun phrases for which I adopt a Kaynean (1994) raising analysis and clauses introduced by a correlative pronoun (hypophor) are similarly licensed. The intervening correlative pronoun, a DP itself, can block the licensing of the CP owing to the pronoun's ability to check a [Case], and, by being the closer Goal (see Minimize Chain Links in (4a-d)) for Agree than the CP checking a [Case]. Although the Agree relation can guarantee licensing the object domain, these remain islands when embedded by common (non-bridge) verbs. Since extraction is still licit from domains licensed by bridge verbs, and I stick to the uniformity of the mechanism of seeking a way of licensing a domain (by way of EF checking with bridge verbs) when Agree is established, the cyclic measurement seems to be different for these particular verbs. This solution opens up in the phase theoretical framework. A PF-null hypophor—whether or not rigged with a [Case]—is in another phase than the lower CP phase or the higher *v*P phase in general, but a small class of verbs (bridge verbs) allows this hypophor DP to be in the *v*P phase. Thus, once the CP domain is licensed, the edge of the domain is available in the next (*v*P) phase. By analysing Hungarian data, I will show that the phonologically unrealised hypophor (a kind of pro-drop) is characteristic of both structural and inherent case-bearing hypophors and, on the other hand, both by bridge verbs and non-bridge verbs. Thus, the causal connection between the PF-null hypophor and (only) bridge verbs or those checking a structural Case is refuted, and the PF-qualities of hypophor as well as the phase- and research space enhancing quality of verbs are distinct lexical factors interplaying in licit long-distance dependencies.

I turn to the question of subject islands in section 2.4. The mechanism of seeking a way of licensing a domain (by way of EF checking) when Agree is established is uniform, just in this

case the T is lacking in the required feature checking subjects involves checking the [NOM] feature in a higher position, namely, TP. To check off its Case and T's uninterpretable phi-features, the subject DP enters into an Agree relation with T and since the T cannot have an EF (because T is not a strong phase), its defectiveness thwarts checking. In this section I go on to present an argument for the abstract Case borne by a CP, and the difference between ν and T.

Wh-phrases and non-wh-phrases can differ in their ability to participate in clause-spanning dependencies even though all other important properties of the elements concerned are identical. The question I am to ask in section 2.5 is how a wh-phrase and the pertaining Agree relation based on an interrogative feature influence the chance of EF checking. Since no Agree relation of declarative (non-wh) subjects with C involving other features than the EF can be established, this possibility of a wh-phrase is not available to non-wh-subjects but it is available for wh-subjects. These wh-subject domains can establish an Agree relation based on [wh] features and allow a marginal type of extraction. On the subject of wh-object/subject asymmetry, although wh-phrases are rigged with an uninterpretable interrogative feature in both object and subject clauses, the C cannot have an EF-checking based on an interrogative relation regardless of whether it is in the subject or object position of the higher clause.

Two classes of adverbial arguments can be licensed through inherent case and no case at all. Section 2.6 will sift through instances of true adjunct islands and cases where the neutralizing effect of hypophors makes all dependencies ill-formed. The class of adverbial arguments which establish an Agree based on inherent Case seems to be licensed in the same way as structural Cases. The other group must have a hypophoric embedding as a rule, and no dependency can be tested. Adjuncts have no Case to check, and, therefore, they are not licensed domains in the relevant sense. Whatever could check a discretionary feature of an adjunct, the licensor would not be ν and, thus, it would not possess the EF. Therefore, the Agree relation might be established but the potential EF features of an adjunct would remain unchecked.

The third section sums up the main conclusions.

2 PHASES, LICENSING DOMAINS IN AGREE RELATION, AND CP EDGES

2.1 PHASES AS LICENSED DOMAINS

2.1.1 PHASE BOUNDARIES IN GENERAL

To attain the desired results, the theory must balance two extremes of locality constraints. Firstly, as a consequence of PIC in (5), every phase when complete will become an island for the XP's inside the phase (I will refer to these non-edge categories as phase-internal categories).

Assume that the relation of islands and tree structure can be set down to one crucial factor. Namely, the licensing configuration is the only relevant factor which determines the grammaticality of a dependency rooting in a certain domain. I take licensing to be a primitive of syntactic theories.

(8) Syntactic Licensing Domain

A syntactic category K is in the licensing domain of a syntactic category LR acting as the licenser if a dependency formed between K and LR is licit; the exact nature of the dependency can involve subject-predicate, predicate-argument, or specifier-head relations.

Phases are introduced into the theory of (cyclic) locality in Chomsky (2000, 2001) by way of the PIC, with the result that movement is prohibited from a strong phase (i. e. CP or ν P) after its completion (with the exception of the head of the phase and its specifiers). As a consequence of another key requirement that all movement be driven by morphosyntactic features, if nothing else were added, the elements would remain phase-internal (Dudás (2004, 2005) discusses the issue of an overall economy of costly movement and earliness, i. e. Move as soon as possible), and one could reckon with what I dub as

(9) Ubiquitous Island Effect

All strong phases will act as islands for phase-internal elements.

Straightforwardly, this consequence in (9) of the overall rules above is the desirable outcome for the pertaining phenomena of adjunct islands, subject islands or complex NP islands affording evidence of the presence of such an effect in (9). Concretely, if the phase edge and the rest of the phase—the opaque domain—are unrelated, i. e. in phase-theoretic terms, no Agree relation (see below) is established, the islandhood is guaranteed.

(10) Agree relation (X, Y; F) (Chomsky (2001))

For any syntactic objects X and Y, where X bears a feature F with value Val(F) and Y bears a matching unvalued inflectional feature uF : , and X c-commands Y, let Val(uF) = Val(F) and if uF is weak, then let $uF = \#F$

However, the extreme ubiquitous island effect is not always observed. As is well-known, maximal projections under certain conditions can enter into displacement relations even though they are contained in what is now called a strong phase, for instance, movement to the left periphery does cross ν P, and various types of clause-spanning (long-distance) movement do cross CP in several languages.

German

- (11) Wer glaubt Paul [_{CP} dass ihn geimpft hat] ?
who believes Paul C:that him inoculate:PP AUX
'Who does Paul believe inoculated him?'

Serbo-Croatian

- (12) Ko misliš [_{CP} da je ga udarila] ?
who think:2SG C:that AUX him beat:PP
'Who did you think beat him?'

To allow this (and, in combination with the PIC, to require clause-spanning movement to proceed in successive cyclic fashion), the system of phase theory also includes edge/peripheral

features (henceforth EF) to allow movement from inside the phase to its edge (i.e. to the specifier position of the head of the phase (as defined in (5)).

Any head with an EF can attract syntactic categories with unsatisfied uninterpretable features to its specifier. This results in the EF being checked by the attractee, and the attractee will occupy a position from which it can move further to satisfy its uninterpretable feature (and thus prevent the derivation from crashing). From this point of view, an EF is a device of realizing the principle of Enlightened Self-Interest (first in Lasnik (1992, 1995), Chomsky (1995)). The account should not have to rely on a blind mechanism of phase edge feature assignment. Otherwise any ν P-edge and CP-edge can attract any kind of XP, and the ubiquitous island effect, PIC, and even the concept of the phase itself loses its meaning. No domain should be an island if all strong phases freely allow movement out of them (due to any kind of mechanism), unless some totally unrelated factor brings about the islandhood (a theoretical possibility not examined in this paper).

If the mechanism, however, can constrain the workings of EF, some phase edges will not attract XP's from inside the phase (the non-edge area). Concretely, if EF cannot be assigned to any phase edge, unbounded/non-local dependencies can be hindered. Ideally, these phase edges should belong to phases which show the ubiquitous island effects, i. e. phases which are an island domain for the phase-internal syntactic categories (cf. Dudás (1998, 2000, 2003, 2004)).

The following considerations pave the way to the desired outcome. I maintain that it pays to detail a similar insight that V-relatedness (Cinque 1990) can explain island effects if these are recast as a result of phases (CPs and DPs) with/without checking a characteristic nominal feature when cyclic movement takes place at the phase edges. Cinque asks what the nature of the locality conditions on long and successive cyclic movement is and arrives at this set of locality principles.

(13) V-relatedness in Cinque (1990:42)

- 1 Every maximal projection that fails to be (directly or indirectly) selected in the canonical direction by a category nondistinct from [+V] is a barrier for binding.
- 2 Every maximal projection that fails to be directly selected by a category nondistinct from [+V] is a barrier for government.

Cinque made use of the following notions (for a quick overview):

Selection is direct (from a sister node) or indirect (from a non-sister node) theta-marking.

Direct selection (Cinque 1990:41)

A lexical category is directly s<emantically>-selected. A non-lexical category will be directly c<ategorially>-selected.

The two [+V] lexical heads are V(erb) and A(djective).²

Canonical direction in (1) means that government was supposed to be operative in one direction, i.e. to the right or to the left in a given language (in English, to the right canonically).

Rule (1) then involves constructions which lack a lexical category of the [+V] type or its selection. The maximal projection in (14) fails to be directly selected in an adjunct clause (14a), and fails to be selected by a [+V] category in an NP complement clause (14b), or a relative clause (14c). Lastly, the maximal projection fails to be selected in the canonical direction (15).

² The status of the preposition (P) in Romance languages seems to be [-V]-related, see also examples below in the text whereas English prepositions are not followed by proper infinitival clauses to test the structure.

- (14a) Il modo, [_{DP} **in cui** sei uscito [_{CP} senza formulare la richiesta ~~in cui~~
the way in which AUX:2SG gone_out without word:INF the request
 oggi]] *é sorprendente .*
today is amazing
 ‘The way you went out without wording the request was amazing.’
- (14b) Gianni, [_{CP} **da cui** disapprovo [_{DP} i tentativi [_{CP} di andare a stare ~~da cui~~]],
Gianni by whom disapprove:1SG the attempts InfPt stay:INF
é ingegnoso.
is clever
 ‘Gianni is clever, and I disapprove of the attempts to stay with him.’

A dependency which roots in a relative clause (headed by the object NP *qualcuno*, and undergoing extraposition) is ungrammatical:³

- (14c)****Con chi** avevi presentato [_{DP} qualcuno [_{CP}] a Gianni [_{CP} che voleva parlare ~~con chi~~]]?
with whom AUX introduce:PP someone to Gianni who wanted speak:INF
 Intended as: ‘Who was the man that you introduced someone who wanted to speak to Gianni?’

The lack of the canonical direction in (15) makes indirect selection of a subject domain strongly marginal. Preverbal sentential subjects are indirectly selected, and yet, they are opaque with respect to binding (the ungrammaticality may be milder than that produced by crossing strong islands in general). According to Cinque’s rule (1) this result is expected since the position of the subject exemplifies the non-canonical direction of the selection:

- (15a) */?? **A chi** credi [_{CP} che [_{CP} parlare ~~a chi~~] sarebbe vitale]?
To whom believe:2SG C:that speak:INF be:COND. vital
 Intended as: ‘Who is the man who you think that speaking with would be vital?’
- (15b) ?? Una persona [_{DP} **a cui** credo [_{CP} che riuscire a parlare ~~a cui~~ oggi]
a man to whom think:1SG C be_able:INF InfPt speak:INF today
sara impossibile] pesca.
be:FUT impossible is angling
 Intended as: ‘A man is angling and I think that it will be possible for one to be able to speak with him today.’
- (15c) ??Gianni, [_{DP} **a cui** non so [_{CP} se [_{CP} parlare ~~a cui~~ oggi] *sara possibile*]],
Gianni to whom not know if speak:INF today be:FUT possible
é ingegnoso.
is clever
 Intended as: ‘Gianni is clever and I do not know whether to speak with him today will be possible.’

³ Only one barrier separates the relative clause with its NP head, and, yet the ungrammaticality is strong as one-barrier violations of subjacency. Such structures raised the serious problem of whether a two-barrier approach in Chomsky (1986) is correct to define islandhood. The *Barriers* approach expresses the differences between island types (roughly weak vs. strong islands (see Dudás (1998, 2000) for a cross-linguistic discussion) in the quantity of barriers to be crossed, two for weak islands, and one for the rest.

Let us skip on to some illustrations of Cinque's rule (2). The maximal projection in (16) fails to be directly selected in (16a,b), and although directly selected by a category, that category is distinct from [+V] in (17).

(16a) ***How** were you [DP counting on him [CP behaving in public ~~how~~]] ?

(16b) *[DP Il modo [DP **in cui** mi ha costretto [CP a comportarmi ~~in cui~~]] é speciale.
the way in which me AUX force:PP InfPt behave#me is special
'The way in which he forced me to behave was special.'

(17) How did John announce [DP a plan [CP to fix the car]] ?

In essence, I will take the maximal projections at issue to differ in their relation to the verb through formal syntactic licensing for domains (uninterpretable feature at the LF interface) where the verb is involved. Cinque used *c*-selection as the means of licensing (13). In the minimalist framework, it would be reasonable to use a feature that is characteristic of selecting a DP or CP, typical domains of *c*-selection by the verb (cf. Dudás (2001, 2003). Theoretically, one can think up such a feature for the model but here I abide by a less radical option, namely, such a feature does exist, which is [Case].

It seems conceivable on minimalist assumptions that the verb and T (tense node) act as a Case checkers. If realizing Case is not part of narrow syntax (an issue yet to decide in the literature), but the morphosyntactic or PF component matches Case and its bearer, a step will be taken towards a narrow syntax without uninterpretable features.

The technical details can be designed to make V-relatedness conspicuous:

- a) DP objects are assigned [ACCUSATIVE] in the little *v*P;
- b) DP subjects are not assigned [NOMINATIVE] in the little *v*P; TenseP /TP/ (but TP is not a phase) assigns [NOM] to subject (cf. Pesetsky and Torrego (2001, 2004) who suggest that the [T] and [NOM] feature are identical in nature);
- c) Arguments of a matrix head but not adjuncts are assigned Case

Argument CPs are two-faced (some CPs must be assigned Case, see more in section 2.4)

On the subject of little *v*P, it is involved in the determination of island domains in the following way. Supposing that *v*P in transitive constructions constitutes a strong phase and adopting EF as a means of allowing extraction out of a strong phase, this fact might suggest that *v*P, which is permeable to dependencies, must be allowed to bear an EF.⁴ The restriction to be imposed on EF is not linked to some inherent structural characteristic of particular phrases as licensed domains. Instead, the connection between a licenser and the domain bearing EF matters.

Furthermore, one must consider island/non-island asymmetry in two respects.

On the one hand, an object CP in the form of a *that* clause differs from an object complex NP embedding a relative clause or complement clause in that these latter are usually islands. The structure of these constructions can bring about part of this difference. However, regardless of such structural differences, firstly, if it is not a bridge verb that embeds an object CP, the object is

⁴ An alternative which I will not pursue here is that *v*P is not a strong phase contrary to Chomsky (2000, 2001), in which case one would expect any category to be able to be extracted out of *v*P. One would at the same time not hope for intermediate landing sites of successive cyclic movement in [Spec, *v*P] (unless *v* has as uninterpretable IR (interrogative) feature (see section 2.5) for an independent reason) and one might need to rethink other reasons for postulating the *v*P as a strong phase.

an island, and in general object nominal clauses (too) are islands just as complex NPs are. Secondly, no evidence shows that some inherent property of the syntactic category itself with regard to the featural makeup in checking process contributes to the potential islandhood or well-formed finite clause-spanning, thus, phase-spanning dependency. My analysis which goes along with these considerations is at least compatible (even desirable) with keeping to a uniform account by way of PIC (5) and the Agree relation (10).

On the other hand, the same categories that allow extraction when in object position (namely CPs and DPs) forbid extraction when they occupy subject or adjunct position. It would therefore be tough to associate the possibility of extraction with an inherent property of the categories or their internal set-up unless we hypothesise an account of islandhood that does not hinge on local domains and the PIC. Under such a latter view, the islandhood status might not correlate with phase status at all anyway if an EF is generally possible on heads of all strong phases.

To find an alternative which does not rely on PIC is not fully absurd. By applying tools of phase theory, one can take a subtype of a tree-hierarchically restrictive programme to be the sideward movement model of Nunes and Uriagereka (2000) or Nunes (2001, 2004) where islandhood is basically reduced to a parallel assembly, the question of tree building. If there is no possibility of connecting the tree sector that shows the island effects and the domain containing V, little *v*, and T because the insertion/merge of the former takes place too late, the impossible dependency formation follows. Let me briefly go over a conceptual difficulty of this alternative theory.

No dependency can be formed with a copy inside complex NP (18a) or a subject (18b), and (19) illustrates an adjunct of a CNP which is not inserted in the NP in low cycle, the hypothetical generalisation of which is (18a,b).

(18a) *WHICH claim [_{CP} that Eve made] did they hear the gossip that Ann forgot ~~which claim~~?

(18b) *WHICH claim [_{CP} that Eve made] did her interest in ~~which claim~~ baffled us?

(19) WHICH claim [_{CP} that Eve made] was he willing to forget ~~which claim~~?

In (19) [_{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 (op. cit.) 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, i. e. 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 (19) might carry over to (18a, b) as a generalised adjunct late insertion. However, the contrast in grammaticality between empirical data from even English ((18a,b) vs. (19)) refute this (for a detailed criticism, see Dudás (2001, 2003, 2005)). The sideward movement model is rigid and unable to tackle cross-linguistic variety (cf. various non-sideward assembling models: Fukui&Saito (1998), Ouhalla (1996), Stepanov (2000, 2001)).

Therefore, I shift the burden of the account from the tree derivational mechanism to licensing throughout. The overall mechanism of licensing involves V-relatedness in the general sense as I sketched above. I will give the main strand of the process in section 2.1.2, the technical details of which can be spelt out in various ways.

2.1.2 THE LICENSING PROCESS

The overall configuration where category licensing (see rule (8) in section 2.1.1) takes place in English consists of a little ν P that checks the object in its Spec, ν P, and a TenseP that checks the subject in its Spec,TenseP as illustrated in (20).

$$(20) \left[\text{TP} \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJECT DP} \\ [+EF][+NOM] \end{array} \left[\nu\text{P} \begin{array}{l} \text{OBJECT_DP} \\ [EF][+ACC] \end{array} \left[\text{VP} \left[\text{DP/CP} \langle \text{SUBJ/OBJ} \rangle \dots \right] \right] \right] \right]^5$$

We can sum up the relevant characteristics of the EF as follows (cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004)). Firstly, the head with an EF is able to attract elements with unchecked uninterpretable features of a certain character. Unless *wh*-movement, topicalization and other types of what used to be A-bar movement are all driven by the same feature, which is unlikely, not any specific feature is concerned when theorising about the process of licensing. Secondly, the EF has an OCC/EPP property, that is to say, the specifier of a head with the OCC \neq EPP/ property must be filled with an overt phrase (Chomsky (2000)), and in certain cases multiple OCC/EPP property since they can attract more than one syntactic category. Thirdly, with respect to the needs of the Goal, the EF-bearing head is defective. The Agree relation between the Probe (the attracting EF) and the Goal (the attractee) is not sufficient to delete the uninterpretable feature on the Goal since it has to remain active for further movement to a higher domain, perhaps because the EF-bearing head does not have other features necessary to check off the uninterpretable feature on the Goal (i.e. the defectiveness with respect to the needs of the Goal).

To require the EF to seek another EF, it seems as if it is not only the uninterpretable feature on the Goal that cannot be checked off, but the EF on the Probe as well.

One solution that could be afforded is finding a way to regulate the checking of the EF with regard to the Agree relation between the Probe and the Goal.

Since I make use of the concept of [+V]-related domains (Cinque (1990)) above (see section 2.1.1), the relation generalizes to the domain-selecting matrix head in the following way. This would essentially involve the concept that lexically licensed domains allow the categories inside the domain to form various grammatical dependencies with antecedents, whereas lexically unlicensed domains cannot form such grammatical dependencies. I include the EF in the requirement that an EF should be checked at the same time as other uninterpretable features (as is required, for example, of the ϕ -features) of the head that bears it. If this holds true, an EF can only be deleted by the same Agree relation that checks off other uninterpretable features on the

⁵ In the following syntactic trees, I also use FinP (to set it off against FocP or TopP) of the split left periphery (Rizzi (1997)), which includes both ν and T.

head, namely, a feature which is characteristic of the formal licensing of DPs. For the time being, Case on DPs seems to be the best candidate, which I abide by for the rest of the paper.⁶

As long as some other such characteristic feature or a special feature licensing nominal domains feasibly could come to mind, the leading ideas and formal relation in this model would not be modified⁷. This mechanism works similarly for subjects with the caveat that there is no head which could meet this requirement, a T head being unable to do so (section 2.4). This mechanism works vacuously for adjuncts since they lack in a Case feature to be checked (section 2.6). This section 2 will go on discussing the particular domains and flesh out this sketch.

It would be right if we could assimilate the EF to the characteristically domain-related feature (one that characterises domains embedded by a [+V] category) in this respect, allowing for getting rid of the EF when the head enters into an Agree relation and checks off other features.

As far as positioning EF-bearers goes, the special relation with the verb shows again. Given that little *v* is the only head category that seems to always allow an EF, it is evidence of the striking role of [+V]-relatedness to find that it is precisely the argument—the object—entering into Agree relation with *v* that can have an EF, unlike another argument—the subject—which agrees with T.

I summarise the main ideas again. An Agree relation exists between two elements that each bear an EF. This EF is concomitant in that the Agree relation checking off EF involves other features as well. (An EF is to be checked only if some other feature is checked; a subfeature in the same sense as, for instance, the EPP/OCC feature requiring a phrase to be in the specifier of a head is.)

The general line of reasoning in the particular cases will be as follows. If there is Matching,⁸ but Agree is hindered, EF remains unchecked, mainly for two reasons. Either interveners hinder Agree, or EF should be checked by itself (not as a concomitant feature).

In the following sections (2.2 to 2.6) I will examine the domains one by one.

2.2 OBJECTS: DP AND CP

An object DP bears an EF in order to get round the ubiquitous island effect (in (9)) in a domain-internal position (and, thus, allow extraction out of its domain). An Agree relation has been formed between the object DP and the little *v* in need of checking Case on the DP and phi-features on the little *v*. The object DP can get its EF checked by this independently necessary

⁶ Thematic roles are elusive in that their feature-checking status is controversial (see e. g. López 2001) and in one respect, the expletives (see later), evidence based on a hypothesised theta-role checking is not conclusive.

⁷ For the presentation of, for instance, Hungarian data, the feature [Case] seems to be concrete enough.

⁸ Matching (Chomsky 2000:122)

~ is a relation that holds of a probe P and a goal G. For Matching to induce Agree, G must at least be in the domain D(P) of P and satisfy locality conditions.

I. Matching is feature identity.

II. D(P) is the sister of P.

III. Locality reduces to closest c-command.

D(P) is the c-command domain of P, and a matching feature G is closest to P if there is no G' in D(P) matching P such that G is in D(G'). Terms of the same minimal domain are equidistant to probes.

agreement with little *v*. Objects, which avoid the ubiquitous island effect on account of getting licensed by EF in this way, are thus not islands. However, only object domains embedded by bridge verbs can allow the removal of islandhood (which suggests various licensing possibilities for object domains, which section 2.3 will discuss at length). Furthermore, objects observe the complex noun phrase constraint which must hold for subjects as well as objects for additional reasons (section 2.3).

Little *v*P checks objects by way of case at the phase boundary. Bear in mind that this is a technical realization of the concept that certain heads (the [+V]-related ones) are able to license domains lexically. In this process of licensing, establishing an Agree relation by way of checking an object DP involves checking its [Case] feature at the left edge of *v*P. Building on this Agree relation, the EF is checked at the same time as [Case] as a concomitant feature by hypothesis.

To extend this analysis to object CPs, let us assume that a CP does in fact enter into the same relations as a DP, namely, an object CP with little *v*. Hungarian, various Slavic, English CPs, then, need case (section 2.4 discusses Case on CP). Hungarian CPs even trigger agreement on any transitive verb, which displays DP-sensitive conjugation when licenses a CP. Bartos (1998, 2000) proves that the decisive factor in choosing for the objective (i. e. DP-sensitive) paradigm of conjugation is the presence of a DP, or at least the object of the verb counts as a DP (the definiteness or specificity of the NP does not play a role in the choice).

Three phenomena need more attention. Firstly, any CP agrees with a verb conjugated on the DP-sensitive pattern. In other words, either a hypophoric⁹ pronoun (in short, hypophor) whose role is to refer cataphorically to the subordinate clause (hypotaxis), accompanies the clause or the CP comes alone, the verb agrees with the DP.

- (21) PÁL mondta tegnap Klárának (azt), hogy elolvasta a könyveket.¹⁰
Pál said yesterday Klára:DAT HYP:ACC C:that read the books:ACC
 ‘Pál told Klára yesterday that he had read the books.’

The structure is less than obvious and two main arguments have been pursued in the literature. Either the hypophor DP and the CP comes in one constituent, which is a DP always present as a higher dominating node above CP (É. Kiss (1987, 1990, 2002)) or, under a different theory, their relation is that of an argument-expletive chain (Kenesei (1992, 1994), and Lipták (1998) with a different version; É. Kiss (2002)). In this latter model, the hypophor is an expletive and the argument is the CP. If the hypophor is base-generated in VP as an expletive (Kenesei (1992, 1994)) and takes case from the verb, it is conceivable that a dependency is formed between the CP and the hypophor, and this dependency contains the case. If the hypophor occupies the Spec,CP, and the complementizer is in C, the verb can assign the Case to C, and the hypophor and the C share the case in spec-head agreement (Lipták (1998)). The hypophor DP then must move to various positions to the left periphery to express the actual function of the CP. For my model, it follows that the root of this dependency with the left periphery is related to the CP and its plausible position is the specifier of a maximal projection, DP or a CP dominating the clause, which must check its [Case] with the *v*P.

⁹ I borrowed this term from Priscian’s (c. 520 A.D.) *Institutiones Grammaticae Libri XVIII* /Eighteen Books on the Grammatical Dispositions/ by *pronomem hypophorikon* refers to pronouns which function in this same sense.

¹⁰ I mark focussed phrases by capitalising in the Hungarian examples. The list of Hungarian cases in this paper comes in the appendix at the end.

I am to discuss two other issues as well, namely, the option of checking Case on CP or DP (see also section 2.4), and, thirdly, the PF-null hypophor. Above all, it is to be noted that the Ubiquitous Island Effect in (9) characterises object clauses as well. Although the licensing of the vP checking mechanism of EF (section 2.1) affords the possibility of forming a dependency with an element inside the object is, there is no free extraction from objects. Bridge verbs are a further necessary ingredient to realize this potential long-distance dependency. Descriptions of the clause-spanning dependencies in the literature take bridge verbs to be an extra lexical factor. Undoubtedly, it is the massive island effect of non-bridge (henceforth *common* verbs) that fits in with the general characterisation of the phases. The bridge verbs have been treated as a lexical factor out of the sphere of hierarchical syntax, and I consider the cause of this treatment to be the configurational identity of a DP/CP embedded under a bridge or a common verb. Of course, there has been a possibility of treating bridge verbs as subcategorised for a categorially (and/or configurationally) different DP/CP complement, even though in most cases bridge verbs do not show any kind of structural speciality with their (non-)sentential complements, only by stipulating special (CP) structures which are not characteristic of common (non-bridge) verbs. The lack of a straightforward explanation based on the hierarchical configuration has resulted in putting the bridge verb problem aside as a semantic issue by way of a catalogue of their semantic characteristics. This difficulty of a syntactic explanation and then the syntactic issue itself should not be relegated to a semantic difference between two verb types and two types of object embeddings. A logical alternative of a licensing mechanism will afford the answer below, which will not be based on any further means of the syntactic theory than those introduced so far.

2.3 COMPLEX NOUN PHRASES, OBJECT DOMAINS AND THE CP

We set out to follow the present line of argumentation in section 1 by claiming that the position of the domain with respect to the licensor in the clause can answer for various island effects. It is sound to state that both DPs and CPs with their inner complex structure are subject to the ubiquitous island effect arising from the lack of licensing the edge of the DP or CP domain (I suppose that DP is a phase). Note that the structure of the Hungarian-type *that* clause is the same as that of a complex NP in the relevant respect: the NP/DP embeds a CP and a hypophor indicates the level of embedding. The relative clauses headed by the relative *wh*-pronoun form one constituent with a head which may be lexical or pronominal. The similarity between such relative clauses and *that* clauses embedded below a DP bearing a suffix, the realization of Case, and even adjunct clauses embedded in a suffixed DP is thus conspicuous (Kenesei (1984, 1992, 1994)). The non-lexical head, which I dubbed as hypophor in section 2.2 (a demonstrative pronoun from a morphological point of view) functioning as the head of the relative clause goes with restrictive and free relative clauses.

An object *that* clause embedded by a bridge verb is not an island since the little *v* is able to license the object including both the CP and the hypophor DP as a whole. If this same held true of complex NP embedding its two clausal subtypes, a relative or a complement clause, a structural homonym of the *that* clause with respect to the domain licensing conditions, the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint (CNPC) facts would go unexplained. In fact, there are languages that show no CNPC effect, for instance, Palauan (Georgopoulos (1991)), and their analysis could include a structural parallel of *that* clauses and CNP with a relative clause (an

Spec,CP. The next phase is, however, a DP island for the reasons I have discussed, and since no category is attracted to its edge, from the point of view of the resulting lack of dependency it is immaterial whether or not CP is an island.

Let us assume (in scenario 2), however, that both phonologically realized and null DPs (for instance, the null *pro* is assigned Case) will check [Case] in general. So will the null hypophor constituting the DP in the specifier of the upper DP. These two (null and non-null) cases can then be discussed under the same heading as follows. The Probe in ν will check its [Case, EF] featural makeup¹² of DP to get it licensed since DP is the uppermost Goal found by the mechanism of MLC in (4). In theory, whatever category comes at the edge of DP, it will be free to form further dependency upwards. Such a category is the hypophor itself, which can indeed take positions on the matrix functional left (split CP) periphery above T owing to this licensing. There is good reason to believe that for all potential case-checking categories deep in the DP, such as the DP-internal CP, to get their [Case, EF] licensed, the above effect, in essence, the MLC effect should cease. However, it is unlikely to eliminate MLC, since its effect, among others,¹³ is a relevant configurational effect to ensure that the DP-internal categories (crucially, CP) could not Agree with any licenser above DP (see the discussion of complex noun phrases above). Thus, this type of object CP within DP must remain an island, and although dependency formation through the DP edge with higher phases edge would be possible in theory, no categories participating in such a fictitious dependency can reach the DP edge through the CP edge subject to PIC.¹⁴

This state of affairs makes me conclude that PF-null hypophors do not have an effect on the structure. Essentially, either the DP is an island (see the first scenario) or a domain which is licensed by ν (see the second scenario), the MLC effect in the Agree relation is instrumental in hindering the categories from forming a dependency with the DP edge (if DP is a strong phase, filling its specifier would be necessary to further licensing in the next phase, the ν P). This mechanism is the embodiment of the Ubiquitous Island Effect, which is consistent with the fact that the object CP is an island in the absence of a bridge verb (for a different account with a similar result see Dudás (1999, 2003). The next paragraphs will put forward a phase-based account of bridge verbs, an improvement of scenario 1 above from a certain point of view, which will suppose that a null DP under a bridge verb is not a (strong) phase.

In fact, two ways of explanation have remained. One is that the hypophor DP may be a phase but locality conditions remain unaffected since the DP edge and the CP edge is identical: the Spec,DP hosts the CP when large-scale pied-piping takes place (e. g. Latin adjunct constructions or Basque CP-pied-piping into CP). The other way is that the hypophor DP is not a phase in the

¹² I believe that EF is a “subfeature” like OCC/EPP (see 2.1.1); this notation refers to this assumption.

¹³ MLC also plays a crucial role in licensing multiple operator constructions and other fields. For instance, Fanselow (2004) or Bošković (2002) shows (in two different frameworks) that the lower *wh*-phrase domain is not licensed in my terms, an upper *wh*-phrase counts as harmful intervener for left peripheral dependencies as hypophors (here) for V-related dependencies. A relation between C-checking and *wh*-checking will be demonstrated in section 2.5.

¹⁴ Obviously, PIC allows CP edge categories to form a dependency. A narrow range of objects can be the candidates, first of all those in Spec,CP. Bear in mind that in the advocated raising analysis of the relative clause construction, the relative pronoun is in Spec,CP and there is no essential difference in the position of relatives clauses with regard to a CP embedded under a DP.

(i) *dug up* [DP *the garden*, [CP *in which ~~garden~~ Eve plucked flowers*]].

Thus, the relative complementizer *which* should be able to establish a dependency with a position outside the DP phase. However, relative complementizers do not have potential triggers above the DP housing the N head in contrast to interrogative *wh*-chains (more details in Dudás 2001, 2004).

licensing process at issue (which does not exclude the possibility of DPs being phases in some other constructions).

I will examine this latter issue only (I believe the large-scale pied-piping construction is specific to some languages but certainly an issue to deal with in a different paper (cf. Dudás 2004). I will assume that a null DP does not count as a phase (or counts as a weak phase, which is not an island; its exact status does not alter the logic of the arguments here). This null DP can still have abstract [Case] and can play the part of an MLC intervener between the CP and the *v*P. In effect, the CP will become an island with its unchecked [Case, EF] again. However, if a null hypophor DP does not count as a Goal for case checking, the MLC will pick out C as the closest Goal; the Case-bearing C checks its [Case] and EF in the usual Agree relation. Since it is the sole lexical property of the bridge verb class to allow a null hypophor in the same phase where the Probe *v* is, i. e. the next phase above CP, for common verbs the DP is an intermediate additional phase with the resulting island effect.

Since I have examined structural Case so far, a natural parallel of nominative and accusative personal pronoun *pro* and the hypophor *az* might have been assumed (Hungarian is a pro-drop language). Whenever the hypophor is in the VP, it is dropped just as personal pronouns are. By contrast, since the personal pronoun in an inherent Case cannot be dropped, one can imagine a DP bearing an inherent case to display no PF-null forms (the hypophor drop). Does the checking of inherent Cases constitute a form of licensing only for embedding by non-bridge verbs? This does not follow from the facts and arguments, and it is rather a neutralisation effect of the hypophor on any embedding construction that the examples show. Even bridge verbs cannot facilitate dependency formation based on Agree if DP intervenes (thus, the CP phase remains an island). If a hypophor DP bears an inherent case and is always phonologically realized, it will check the [Case, EF] with the subsequent MLC effect for CP.

It would be illuminating to find out about a class of bridge verbs allowing only a phonologically realized or unrealized DP but there is no such a subclass. It must, however, be made clear on the basis of Hungarian data that the null phonological realization of the hypophor is not an exclusive property of bridge verbs at all (against É. Kiss (1990) stating that pro-drop of the hypophor only in the presence of a bridge verb) or that of structural case-assigning verbs (against Lipták's (1998) view that hypophor drop is characteristic of that class). Common (non-bridge) transitive verbs, for instance, *közöl* 'inform' in (34), can drop the hypophor, and two classes of verbs which embed adverbial arguments differ with respect to hypophor drop. Oblique case-bearing hypophors can be dropped by a large class of verbs (36a) such as *érdeklődik* 'ask about' or *figyelmeztet* 'warn', some of which are bridge verbs, whereas another class of oblique case-checking verbs such as *számít* 'bank, reckon' does not at all allow hypophor drop (36b).

- (36) [CP [TOPP [FOCP Figyelmeztettél [VP [DP [D(P) (**arra**)]
warned:2SG *HYP:SUB*
 [CP *hogy* [TOPP [FOCP vásároljak egy házat]]]]]]].
C:that *buy:SUBJUNC.1SG* *a house:ACC*
 'You warned me that I should buy a house.'
- (37) [CP [TOPP [FOCP Számítottál [VP [DP [D(P) ***(arra)**] [CP *hogy*
bank:2SG *HYP:SUB* *C:that*
 [TOPP *Éva* [FINP [VP vásárol egy házat]]]]]]].
Éva *buys* *a house:ACC*
 'You banked on Eve's buying a house.'

time, whether or not an EF is assigned to the CP-edge, the hypophor itself steadily blocks any dependency that would involve Spec,CP. While such a model along the updated lines of Lipták (1998) could yield the correct outcome that the object CP is one embodiment of the ubiquitous island effect on the basis of the phonological realization of the hypophor DP, this leaves the model without account of the striking islands effects when the hypophor is absent in Spec,CP. We should find that the CP, which is a non-island, is permeable for long-distance dependencies. It is clear, however, that most matrix predicates are of the non-bridge character regardless of the PF-quality of the complementizer. All in all, the hypophor DP in the Spec,CP falsely predicts that all hypophor-dropping embedding verbs must act as bridge verbs. Since Lipták (1998) also declares that hypophors in an oblique case cannot be null, contrary to empirical data, she does not account for those facts either. Therefore, no (improved) version of a theory which does not assume a D-shell above the CP for languages that use hypophors extensively, can grasp the role of the hypophor in making the object CP an island/non-island.¹⁵

In conclusion, even though beside case-checking there may be additional licensing ways to remove islandhood, it does not alter the main point of this paper: all possible options of grammatical extraction is related to licensing through Agree involving some formal feature F (which I temporarily identified as [Case]) paired with a concomitant feature EF and its checking simultaneously. The process itself is related to various licensors such as ν or T, which vary in their character, and are also subject to general principles, such as Shortest Link or MLC, related to Agree. It pays to follow Cinque's (1990) insight (section 2.1) that the V-related categories play an outstanding role in non-local syntactic relations. (Thus, the present paper does not deal with checking cases of, for instance, P or A-related, only V-related [Case] features.) The verbs themselves fall into different classes among which that of the bridge verbs/predicates with their licensing quality has been recast in the framework of current minimalism. They can eliminate the Shortest Link/MLC effect by licensing the DP as a category in the same phase where ν P is (ν P can effectively seek Agree in this search space), which corresponds to the intuition that long-distance dependency is restricted (a number of preconditions are needed), even most object clauses belong to the syntactic islands, and bridge verbs are (exceptionally) able to access their CP complements in a special way. Note that it is possible to compare complex DPs and hypophoric DPs on the basis of their structure. It would be best to find a way of a non-stipulative statement of the configurational/structural differences between object islands (whether complex DPs or hypophor DPs) and non-islands. However, such a differentiation can only be carried out by devising such configurational differences (Dudás (2001, 2004) derives it from certain derivational limitations of mainstream minimalist syntax) that seem ad hoc and, just as disturbingly, by making the striking island quality of various object clauses stem from a distinct configuration from those of complex NPs. A phase theoretical framework allows us to notice that islandhood differences hinge on the workings of a licensing relation automatically involving cyclic domains and their potential effects which interplay with the effects of the (undeniably differing) particular hierarchical relations (responsible for MLC effects among others).

¹⁵ This model can be extended to English-type languages where hypophors are rarely attested (see (33c)). Perhaps it is true that such a differentiation is more relevant for the anticipatory (that is to say, hypophoric) *it* constructions in English. The connection between these *it*-constructions and the licensing effects for domains would need a separate paper (see Dudás (2004) for details).

The conjunction of a concomitant EF and simultaneous deletion of EF and some other feature(s) yielded the desired outcome in the above object cases. However, there needs to be one more requirement since otherwise we should expect clause-spanning dependencies rooting in subjects to be equivalent to those rooting in objects. What is demanded is that the Probe also have an EF. (One possible reason could be that an EF is of a different nature than phi-features, and cannot be taken as a reflex of these matching on the Probe and the Goal (unlike, for example, Case). Or, if [Case] turns out to be an uninterpretable instance of a feature that is interpretable on T/ v , then one might require that the feature in question be always present on both the Probe and the Goal (thus eliminating free-riders from our system)).

Regardless of what the right formulation of this requirement is, grammar has to allow two uninterpretable features to check off each other. Plausibly, if v had an appropriate feature [b] which were interpretable on it and had the ability of EF of attracting elements to the edge of the phase, we would reach a fairly desirable result given that v seems to always allow clause-spanning dependencies rooting in its domain, unlike other strong phases. (However, what this feature [b] could be is foggy).

Checking subjects involves checking the [NOM] feature in a higher position, namely, TP. To check off its Case and T's uninterpretable phi-features, the subject DP enters into an Agree relation with T and since T cannot have an EF (because T is not a strong phase), checking is thwarted. Note that the mechanism of seeking a way of licensing a domain (by way of EF checking) when Agree is established is uniform, with the difference that in this case the T is lacking in the required feature. Unlike an object, a subject DP, if it had an EF, would be stuck with it owing to the fact that T with which it agrees does not have an EF which could check off the EF on the subject DP. The islandhood of subjects can thus be predicted in lack of the V-related licensing.¹⁶

(39) *What did [gathering ~~what~~] please Fred ? (subject island)

(40) *What did [that you gathered ~~what~~] please Fred ?

To extend my analysis to subject CPs, let us assume that CPs do in fact enter into the same relations as DPs, namely, a subject CP has to agree in some feature with T, most probably the [NOM] feature. Let us take a look at various options.

It may be true that there is no case feature for the CP although this paper takes Cases to be allowed on CPs (see in 2.3). Since C does not have a [Case], the agreement fails. Thus, the matrix verb cannot license a subject CP, which causes the islandhood effect. The logic of this explanation holds true of adjuncts too, the lack of an obvious Agree relation stops further licensing (cf. section 2.6). Then this would mean that subject DPs and CPs are different in that only DPs carry a [Case] to check. This difference is neutralized with respect to how actual checking takes place. Since T has no EF, it does not matter whether the particular subject type has a case (a necessary condition), the licensing relation cannot be established.

On the other hand, it is not at all clear whether or not a (subject) CP has a case. A requirement of agreement based on the case of CP (just as for an object CP) might seem to go

¹⁶ It is a point of interest that there are languages where extraction out of a subject domain is not fully forbidden, for instance, Japanese and Greek, the analysis of which would go beyond the scope of the present paper.

against the traditional view that CPs do not need Case and do not trigger full agreement on verbs. However, no strong evidence supports this view, and let me dwell on the issue of abstract Case of a CP in general.

The following considerations rather support a (partial) option of CP with [Case]. Firstly, an argument that a subject CP needs to enter into relation with T is independently provided by Pesetsky & Torrego (2001, 2004) whose idea is that the [NOM] case feature is [T] in the essential checking context. Secondly, the above argument about the relation of CP and T is also strengthened by the fact that the CP is able to check off the [EPP] (extended projection principle) feature of the T (which is claimed to be obligatory in English in the Minimalist framework). In general, the [EPP] is regarded as a concomitant feature with some other feature (e.g. case, wh-feature etc.)¹⁷. Compare these:

- (41) [That Eve comes home late] bothers her parents.
 (42) *John wondered [why [that Eve comes home late] bothers her parents].

The clause can function as a subject only if its subject position is accessible to a licenser which checks its Case as illustrated in the second example. This leads to the conclusion that a clausal object (CP) must take a case at times: clauses in subject position and topicalisation (illustrated in (43)) show that the syntactic variables (copies left behind) cannot remain Caseless (Dudás (2000, 2001, 2004)).

- (43) * [That Eve will come home late], I am afraid [\bar{CP}]

Furthermore, if there were no Case for a clause, it would be absurd that a preposition, which is known to check the case of the noun, is able to save the following topic construction:

- (44) [That Eve came home late], which I was frightened (*with)/glad (*about), bothers her parents.

Straightforwardly, the passive *frighten* or adjectives like *glad*, *afraid* cannot check [Case], and, therefore, cannot check the [accusative] of the relative pronoun *which* either.

At the same time, a *that* clause does not bear oblique Cases in contrast with wh-clauses above, and a preposition can only check oblique Case¹⁸:

- (45a) * That Eve brought a dog home, I was frightened with/glad about [\bar{CP}].
 (45b) What Eve brought home, I was frightened with/glad about [\bar{CP}].

¹⁷ The construction with the expletive-associate chain (*It bothers her parents that Eve...*) will check the case from T in the position of the expletive (at least in this type of “anticipatory *it*” construction). The analysis of expletive constructions is beyond the goal of this paper (see Dudás (2002, 2004, 2005) for discussions) but no kinds of analyses can bear on the issue of the Agree relation established between the chain and T and that this relation involves a typical nominal feature (such as abstract Case).

¹⁸ The prepositions in Mainland Scandinavian and Spanish can check cases of *that* clauses, so the restriction for English is not universal. All these facts, however, show clearly that certain types of clauses do bear and check cases.

All these facts are tough to account for if clauses do not bear [Case] (perhaps with restrictions on oblique/structural cases) and never check them.

It is reasonable to assume two kinds of C heads (with and without Case) or that this feature is optional (see the next paragraphs) on C. 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—as I assumed in 2.3 and 2.4. 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 . This, however, neither excludes, nor strengthens the possibility that bearing a [Case] is obligatory for certain CPs and never present for others. Moreover, this feature needs to be optional on CP rather than obligatory (as on DPs) since it would be hard to account for the case of a matrix C.

Here I have not dealt with the issue of which feature exactly needs to be checked off by agreement with T/ v (it could be some form of optional Case, or any uninterpretable feature) since the choice is not crucial for the given analysis as long as there is such a feature.

In essence, C with [Case] is selected when the subject clause is merged into the structure. The process and effect is identical to the DP subject with regard to seeking the EF checking and failing to find a licenser that can check off the EF. Again, it would seem early to conclude that the nature of C is twofold with respect to this feature at issue.

Having discussed some properties of C and T, I will speculate on some properties of v with respect to checking options. So far, I have been proposing that all v s (when strong phases) can bear an EF. Let us assume the EF on v to have exactly the same checking requirements as any other instance of an EF. Concretely, the EF on v needs to be checked off by the same category that checks off the uninterpretable phi-features of little v . In effect then, v is required to have its EF checked off by the object (section 2.3). This in turn means the necessity of a requirement that the objects must always possess an EF, even though there might not be any phase-internal category to attract in the object XP. Since the attractee does not play a substantial role in checking off EF anyway, this does not pose a problem.

Furthermore, since a transitive v should always be able to check its EF, forming a long-distance dependency rooting in its domain should not pose a problem even for categories which cannot themselves agree with v , like adjunct focussed or wh-phrases. No object to check any EF might be troublesome for intransitive v . This problem does not arise in the current framework with an intransitive v since it is not a strong phase, i. e. it does not head an opaque domain, and, therefore, it does not need an EF to allow dependencies through its phase edge.

2.5 LICENSING WITH INTERROGATION

The foregoing discussion focussed on an Agree relation between the clauses and the licensers (v or T). What remains is to examine a possible path of the Agree relation without involving Case. We need a checking relation based on some other (discretional) feature for checking EF, and such a feature can perfectly satisfy the restriction on assigning EF. It has been well-known that wh-phrases and non-wh-phrases can differ in their ability to participate in clause-spanning dependencies even though the syntactic category and all important properties of the elements concerned are the same but the wh-quality. The question I am to ask here is how a wh-phrase and the pertaining Agree relation based on an interrogative feature influence the chance of EF checking. The null hypothesis would be that no special influence exists.

However, since no Agree relation of declarative (non-wh) subjects with C involving other features than the EF can be established, this possibility of a wh-phrase is not available to non-wh-subjects. This is insufficient for licensing the subject domain since an EF must be concomitant by hypothesis, and, thus, these subjects are islands as usual.

Speaking of wh-distinction, an interesting contrast holds between wh-objects (cf. section 2.3) versus wh-subjects (cf. section 2.4) with regard to checking. Given wh-phrases equipped with [uIR] in both object and subject clauses in the construction at issue, the C entering into Agree with the matrix licenser (*v* or T, respectively) is supposed to be able to have an EF-checking based on an IR-relation regardless of whether it is in the subject or object position of the higher clause. The factual object/subject contrast makes the prediction seem false:

(48a) **What is [_{CP} [_{DP} how many pictures of __] disappeared] not known?

(48b) ??What are you wondering [_{CP} [_{DP} how many pictures of __] disappeared]?

The C that can check off EF on the subject wh-phrase seems to need to have its EF checked the same way as if it were not checking an EF of some other syntactic category, that is to say, before C can license an EF on some XP (here: a subject wh-phrase), C still needs to enter into Agree relation with *v*, as if C itself needed its EF licensed. This situation in connection with *v* and C is indeed predicted if the EF had to be deleted at the same time as the uninterpretable feature on C that enters into Agree relation with *v*/T of the matrix clause (cf. Dudás (2004)). Then, in conclusion, EF must not be deleted together with the uninterpretable feature on C that Probes the [uIR] on the attracted *wh*-phrase.

2.6 ADVERBIALS, INHERENT CASES, AND ADJUNCTS

Establishing the Agree relation between an adjunct clause and a matrix head as (51) shows is hampered. Since it has no meaning to talk of V-relatedness in Cinque's (1990) sense, roughly speaking, verbs as syntactic licensors for adjuncts cannot be found, their deficiency in this respect is captured in my framework as follows.

In the previous sections I have discussed various types of categorially DP domains which bear a structural Case with some assumptions about inherent Case in section 2.3. This last section turns to a heterogeneous class of non-[+V]-related categories in Cinque's (1990) sense: adjuncts. Checking adjuncts should involve checking an abstract [Case] feature in a higher position, possibly in some functional projection of *v*P for VP-adverbials. (A Case-bearing adjunct is not so absurd when we think of adjuncts realized by a DP, also, CPs can bear Case in the present framework.) It seems unlikely that such an ADV licenser exists. Even though it existed, to check off its [Case] and this fictitious ADV's uninterpretable phi-features, the adjunct would enter into an Agree relation with ADV and since the ADV, not being a strong phase, cannot have an EF, checking is thwarted. The islandhood of adjuncts can thus be predicted in lack of this licensing.

(49) **What will you swim today [_{CP} unless they discuss ~~what~~]? (adjunct island)

In short, adjuncts are thus not taken to enter into Agree relations that would involve other features than EF (checking an adjunct's [Case] or some other feature does not exist).

It is a point of interest that there are constructions where a dependency rooting in an adjunct domain is not forbidden, or even required for anti-locality reasons. If the term *dependency* also involves non-displacement phenomena, binding effects of (at least) anaphoric and cataphoric pronouns certainly belong here. Among displacement phenomena, parasitic gaps (50) and some types of wh-scope marking (50) are well-known instances of anti-locality effects as illustrated below:

(50) What did you drink ~~what~~ [CP before you also produced ~~what~~]?

(51) Miért aggódsz, [CP mert KIVEL találkozol]?
why worry:2SG because who:INS meet:2SG
 'Who is the person that are you worrying about because you will meet him?'

Although this paper is too short to go over either LF-dependencies or anti-locality phenomena, the observer's conclusion is that the domain licensing offered in this paper must be modified/extended to include these cases, or these phenomena need no [+V]-related licensing and yet they are grammatical. Dudás (2001, 2004, 2005) attempted to discuss a uniform model of PF/LF locality differences where spellout parameters and PF-phases may be realized under different licensing conditions than interpretation parameters and LF-phases.

If, by hypothesis, agreement with *v* is what licenses an EF on any (other) phrase, EF needs to be licensed by an Agree relation with another licenser, and, thus, adjuncts cannot get their EF checked off (preventing the structure from converging) in lack of such a licenser. Note that the mechanism of seeking a way of licensing a domain remains uniform, just in this case the above-mentioned fictitious licenser, ADV, lacks the required feature EF. Unlike an object, an adjunct XP, if it had an EF, would be stuck with it owing to the fact that ADV with which it agrees does not have an EF which could check off the EF on the adjunct.

Note that this state of affairs does not change any respect of the core concept, rather strengthens the fact that an EF feature cannot be assigned freely to the head of a certain domain, and in particular, to the domain in lack of an Agree relation. Thus, it restricts the theory in the way as expected.

Yet, adjuncts are interesting in the present framework for two phenomena that need some account, namely, complement adverbials, and the hypophor system (see section 2.3) in languages which extensively use hypophors. What has been left is a short comparison between complements which are adverbials (thus, do not get involved in case checking) as in (53a, b), and DP complements taking an inherent Case as in (52) while testing the embedding under the same verb *bánik* 'handle, treat', and non-arguments (adjuncts) as later in (54) and (55). The verbs usually occupy positions on the functional periphery well above VP in most following examples.

DP complement bearing an inherent Case

(52) PÁL bánt ügyesen [VP [DP [DP **azzal**], [CP hogy előbb tudta a megoldást]]].
 Pál treated cleverly HYP:INS C earlier knew the solution:ACC
 'Pál cleverly treated the situation that he knew the solution earlier (than others).'

Complement adverbial

- (53a) PÁL lakott [_{AdvP} [_{AdvP} ott], [_{CP} ahol a festők renoválták a házat]].
 Pál lived there where the painters redecorated the house:ACC
 ‘Pál lived where the painters redecorated the house.’
- (53b) Pál bánt a barátaival úgy, ahogyan azok várták tőle.
Pál treated the friends:INS so how those expected he:ABL
 ‘Pál treated his friends (in) the way they expected him to.’

Complement adverbials come in two different classes in Hungarian with respect to their hypophors. The hypophor assumes either the form of the general locative, temporal demonstrative adverbial (*then, there, so* etc.) in an adverbial phrase in class A (53a, b) or the form of a suffixed DP (the [+V] category determines the suffix) in class B (52). This latter class resembles the argument cases in that the verb checks abstract [Case] on the CP complement.

Whereas the verb licenses the complement clause in class A (53a, b), its licensing does not involve Case since complement adverbials in this class cannot possess [Case]. However, they receive a theta role from the verb. As far as islandhood is concerned, the best guess to identify the licensing process is checking Case, which was my choice for the time being. Finding an embedded clause allowing a well-formed clause-spanning dependency is only possible among embedded clauses licensed by a Case-checking verb (whether or not one accepts the exact mechanism of licensing which I put forward in this paper). Here I remark that the only class of verbs that allow clause-spanning dependencies, that is, bridge verbs all check structural or inherent case.²⁰

This situation yields an interesting comparison between complement adverbials and adjuncts. If the complement has a certain feature to check with the verb (for instance, theta-role conceived as a feature (cf. López (2001), Fanselow (2001) for various views)), an Agree relation with concomitant feature checking fits in with the framework I use throughout. Let us look at adjunct adverbials with regard to their Case. An adverbial comes at the left edge adjoined to VP and its internal structure is identical to that of an argument clause below DP.

Adjunct adverbial bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor:

- (54a) Pál köveket hordhat [_{VP} [_{VP}] [_{DP} [_{DP} attól], [_{CP} hogy évekig tanult
 Pál stones:ACC carry#can HYP:ABL C years:TER learned
 az egyetemen]]].
 the university:SUP
 ‘Pál can carry stones even though he studied at the university for years.’
- (54b) Pál beszélhet a témáról *(attól), hogy tavaly tartottam előadást.
Pál talks the topic:DEL HYP:ABL where last_year gave lecture:ACC
 ‘Pál can talk about the topic even if I gave a lecture last year.’

Adjunct adverbial with adverbial (general demonstrative) hypophor (no Case involved):

²⁰This is an argument for the relevance of licensing by Case, at least for bridge verbs, and, by extension, this carries over to all Case-assigning verbs. Yet, a word of caution is in order. Since the class of the verbs taking a general adverbial complement (e.g. *live, treat*) is small, there is a chance that bridge verbs happen to be missing from this verb class, and the facts reflect this frequency coincidence.

- (55a) Pál köveket hordott *(ott), ahol a kőművesek renoválták a házat.
Pál stones:ACC carried HYP:there²¹ where the bricklayers redecorated the house
 ‘Pál carried stones where the painters redecorated the house.’
- (55b) Pál beszélhet *(ott), ahol tavaly tartottam előadást.
Pál talk_can HYP: there where last_year gave lecture:ACC
 ‘Pál can talk where I gave a lecture last year.’

On the basis of these examples, two classes represent the category of clausal adjuncts, too, namely, clauses are suffixed hypophors and adverbial general (demonstrative) hypophors. Let us take a look at this latter class represented by (55a, b). Straightforwardly, the Agree relation itself is missing from the structures where the verb does not check a [Case]. Thus, the island effects appear as expected.

Adjunct adverbial bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor:

- (56) * A HÁZAT hordott Pál köveket *(ott), ahol a kőművesek renoválták a házat.
the house:ACC carried Pál stones:ACC HYP:there where the bricklayers renewed
 ‘Pál was carrying stones where the bricklayers were renewing the ``house.’

In the other class, since the verb does not license Case in this class either, the same result is expected.

Adjunct adverbial with adverbial (general demonstrative) hypophor:

- (57) * ELŐADÁST beszélhet a témáról Pál *(attól), hogy tavaly tartottam előadást.
lecture:ACC talks the topic:DEL Pál HYP:DEL that last_year gave
 ‘Pál can talk about the topic even if I gave a lecture last year.’

These examples are tough to contrast with their minimal pairs which drop the hypophor (*ott*, *attól*), though, since these construction disallow hypophor drop. As is shown in section 2.3, a neutralizing effect characterizes the presence of the hypophor whether Agree is established and even bridge verb domains seem to be islands under this neutralizing effect.

Let us witness various embedded clauses which are complements of verbs but ban hypophor drop. We predict that the neutralizing effect of the hypophor is at work and, thus, the phase-spanning dependency is blocked (in keeping with facts).

Complement adverbial bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor:

- (58a) Számít *(arra) Pál, hogy kitakarítom a szobát.
bank HYP:SUB Pál C:that clean_up:1SG the room:ACC
 ‘Pál expects me to do up the house.’
- (58b) *[CP [TOPP [FOCP A SZOBÁT számít [VP Pál [DP [D(P) ___] [CP hogy [TOPP Éva [PredP kitakarítja [FINP [VP a-szobát]]]]]]]].²²

²¹ A general locative adverbial plays the role of the hypophor in this construction. I give the usual locative meaning of this pronoun (whereas I always give the case of the (demonstrative) nominal pronouns) only to show that no particular Case is associated with it.

Adverbial complement with adverbial general (demonstrative) hypophor

- (59a) Pál lakik *(ott), ahol kerestem a házat tavaly.
Pál lives HYP:there. where looked_for:1SG the house:ACC last_year
 ‘Pál lives where I looked for a house last year.’
- (59b) *A HÁZAT lakik Pál ott, ahol tavaly kerestem a házat.
house:ACC lives Pál HYP where last_year look_for
 ‘Pál lives where I looked for a flat last year.’

I showed in section 2.3 that the hypophor drop does not hinge on Case type, i. e. structural as well as inherent case-bearing hypophors can be dropped. Furthermore, (object) structures embedded under bridge as well as common verbs can drop their hypophors. The general ban against hypophor drop in all these illustrated classes of embedding holds true of certain classes of adverbials even though they are complements. Thus, it is plausible that the blocking MLC effect (on the Agree relation) of the hypophor would work just as in 2.3 where I demonstrated the effect of the lexical (non-null) hypophor. This entails the prediction that these adverbials are islands even if the Agree relation has been established. The (b) examples (58b, 59b) have clearly shown that this prediction is borne out.

If the relevant parallel of the licensing process of adverbials with object and subject DP’s holds, it is reasonable to expect the *v* to license only complement adverbials by checking off EF. It is fair to say that independent evidence of the Agree relation is hard to come by until the neutralizing effect of the hypophor meddles with the relation at any rate.

It follows that verbs allowing hypophor drop will afford the revealing examples of the contrast between complement adverbials which are reckoned to establish an Agree relation and adjunct adverbials without establishing Agree for the EF to build on. What we should test is whether the MLC effect for Agree with the head C of the object clause holds of the adverbial complements bearing inherent [Case] (examples 58 to 59). The following complement adverbial which is a minimal pair of (58) might let one conclude that the Agree relation involving inherent Case does not license the complement.

Adverbial complement bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor embedded under a common (non-bridge) verb allowing hypophor drop:²³

- (60a) Érdeklődtem [DP [DP (arról)], [CP hogy kitől jött levél Évának.]].
asked:1SG HYP:DEL C:that who:ABL came letter Éva:DAT
- (60b) *ÉVÁNAK érdeklődtem (arról), hogy kitől jött levél ~~Évának.~~
 ‘I asked about who the letter came from to Éva.’

I would like to point out that the conclusion depends on how comprehensive these tests are. The doublet in (60) proves that hypophor drop can make the Agree relation realizable. However, just as with the structural Case, a licensed domain is not automatically a non-island. The reason is that whereas it is natural that licensed clausal domains as (60a, b) are CP phases too, it is just as natural that phases are not licensed domains as a rule and the DP in (60a, b) is not licensed as I

²²PredP is a position which hosts a special class of Hungarian syntactic categories, adverbial modifiers, mainly bare nouns and adverbial particles (see É. Kiss (2002) for an overview).

²³ Frequent verbs that follow this pattern are *figyelmeztet* ‘warn’, *meggyőz* ‘convince’, *tudakozódik* or *érdeklődik* ‘ask about’, *tűnődik* ‘speculate, muse’, *rámutat* ‘point out’.

argued in section 2.3. While an adverbial complement bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor (60) corroborates the assumption of the existence of licensed domains where Agree is established involving inherent Case, the ubiquitous island effect in the CP shows in (60b), and one cannot yet draw the conclusions about islandhood based on inherent Case.

What we should study is a domain where the hypophor is in the uppermost (ν P) phase (and not in a DP or CP phase below it) and, therefore, the CP edge is freely accessible for a licenser in that ν P cycle. By hypothesis, these are the bridge verbs. If such a construction is well-formed, the relation based on inherent Case must license the adverbial domain at issue.

Adverbial complement bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor embedded under a common (non-bridge) verb allowing hypophor drop:

- (61) ÉVÁNAK kértetek *(arra), hogy küldjél egy levelet ~~Évána~~..
Éva:DAT requested:2SG HYP:SUB C:that send:SUBJ.2SG a letter:ACC
 ‘I asked you to send a letter to Éva.’

I conclude that the appropriate bridge verb is able to license the adverbial domain and, consequently, there is no difference between structural cases and inherent cases with respect to either the licensing power of the matrix ν or the intervention effect of the hypophor.

At the same time, the verbs that c-select an adverbial complement (clause) but do not check Case (the class of *live*, *treat*), cannot enter into Agree with their complement domain. I repeat the example:

Adverbial complement with adverbial general (demonstrative) hypophor

- (59a) Pál lakik *(ott), ahol kerestem a házat tavaly.
Pál lives HYP:there. where looked_for:1SG the house:ACC last_year
 ‘Pál lives where I looked for a house last year.’
 (59b) *A HÁZAT lakik Pál ott, ahol tavaly kerestem a házat.
house:ACC lives Pál HYP where last_year look_for
 ‘Pál lives where I looked for a flat last year.’

Furthermore, what we expect is that not any form of long-distance dependencies rooting in the other non-Case-checking domain type, the adjuncts, is grammatical in lack of Agree. This prediction is borne out indeed, and I can demonstrate that adjuncts are islands even in the examples where the hypophor bears an optional inherent Case as in the construction (63) and (64) in contrast to (62) in which the hypophor is obligatory.

Adjunct adverbial with obligatory adverbial (general demonstrative) hypophor (repeated):

- (62a) Pál beszélhet a témánkról *(attól), hogy tavaly tartottam előadást.
Pál talks the topic:DEL HYP C:that last_year gave lecture:ACC
 ‘Pál can give a lecture on the topic even though I gave one last year.’
 (62b) *ELŐADÁST beszélhet a témánkról Pál *(attól), hogy tavaly tartottam előadást.

Adjunct with optional adverbial (general demonstrative) hypophor

- (63a) Aludtam a könyvtárban (addig), amíg mások a
slept:1SG the library:INE HYP:TER while others the
 folyóiratokat olvasták.
the journals:ACC read:PAST.3PL

‘I was sleeping in the library while others were reading the journals.’
 (63b) *A FOLYÓIRATOKAT aludtam a könyvtárban (addig), amíg mások olvasták ~~a folyóiratokat.~~

(64a) EGY SZÍVESSÉGRE kértelek a könyvtárban (addig), amíg mások a
a favour:SUB request:1SG the library:INE HYP:TER while others the
 folyóiratokat olvasták.
the journals:ACC read:PAST.3PL

‘I was sleeping in the library while others were reading the journals.’
 (64b) *A FOLYÓIRATOKAT kértelek a könyvtárban egy szívességre (addig), amíg mások olvasták ~~a folyóiratokat.~~

In conclusion, an Agree relation (with ν) holds of complements taking an inherent Case, which Agree licenses with the usual proviso that a bridge verb must embed the complement. Whether or not this time the Agree involves an inherent (and not structural) Case which complement adverbials bear does not change the licensing that the overall model assumes for objects and subjects in general. A further parallel is that complement adverbials exhibit the intervention effects of the hypophor for the relevant class, the construction with a bridge verb. The superficially similar structures of complement adverbials and adjunct adverbials do not follow the same licensing mechanism although their morphological realization shows no difference and, from a syntactic point of view, hypophors bearing an inherent Case accompany adjunct clauses in certain construction. Yet, adjuncts are not capable of getting licensed by Agree (with ν).

3 SUMMARY

This paper set off to put forth and develop the hypothesis that cyclic effects at CP boundaries should be captured by balancing between two extremes of locality constraints in minimalist theory if the theory is to account for the basic motivations of bounding effects. One extreme was the ubiquitous island effect in (9) which would predict that once a phase is complete, it will not be any longer accessible for further computation. On the other hand, the PIC in (5) serves as a possible rule easing the extraction to such an extreme effect that unbounded dependencies are allowed, and the edge feature /EF/ is the means to move elements to the phase edge on which PIC will apply to them. However, two specific sets of proposals can significantly constrain the way the actual licensing takes place. Firstly, it is an independently attested subtype of the general Agree relation (10) that the head of a licensed domain in a V-related sense must establish with its licensor identified as ν for checking the characteristic feature of objects. The EF checking builds on this Agree relation as a concomitant feature and realizes licensing.

The licensors are different in character depending on the actual feature to be checked. Since various licensing mechanisms based on Agree in are available, the proposal does not specify one feature involved in general. During the present discussion both [Case] and interrogative [IR] features were shown to be able to act as the basis of Matching and Agree and there may be other features. My proposal does not specify the actual licensors in general but it has been shown that

little ν and T are worth considering. Furthermore, based on empirical evidence, a CP can bear a Case just as a DP can (see 2.4). Since the Agree relation can be blocked as a consequence of MLC in (4), possible interveners such as the correlative pronoun (hypophor) fatally influence the whole licensing process. This same blocking effect characterizes both complex noun phrases and hypophor DPs since, crucially, both structures contain a DP between the embedded CP and its potential licensor in the next (matrix) phase.

For a(n object) domain, the Agree relation opens up the possibility of being licensed with an EF, although in lack of more factors involved in the licensing process (Agree is insufficient in itself), object domains, too, are often islands. To summarise the most interesting option when an object domain is not an island, the hypophor's ability to check a [Case] makes the hypophor a possible intervener for other, hierarchically lower phrases, crucially for CP checking a [Case]. At the same time, a PF-null hypophor (whether or not endowed with a [Case]) is usually in a different intermediate (third) phase than the CP phase or ν P phase is, and only a small class of verbs (bridge verbs) allows this hypophor DP to be in the ν P phase. Thus, once a bridge verb licenses the CP domain, the edge of the domain is available in the next (ν P) phase.

On the other hand, Agree by itself is only a necessary condition, but certain licensors dependent on their phase status (namely, T and the TP it heads) are not capable of checking EF as discussed in section 2.1 and 2.4.

The following chart summarizes the options for licensing with reference to the main factors which this paper discussed.

DOMAIN:	LICENSED		UNLICENSED	
	AGREE : OK	NO EF checking	AGREE: OK	NO AGREE
1 <i>OBJECT</i>	bridge V EF checked	non-bridge V		when a hypophor intervenes
2 <i>COMPLEMENT ADVERBIAL</i>	EF checked, inherent Case			when a hypophor intervenes
3 <i>SUBJECT</i>	with T	since T is defective	On [IR] only	
4 <i>ADJUNCT</i>			In theory: on [IR] Only	no Agree on a V-related dependency

Appendix: Cases of the Hungarian declension (in the text)

Suffix	Case	Abbreviation
	NOMINATIVUS	NOM (not marked in glosses)
-tól/től	ABLATIVE	ABL
-t	ACCUSATIVE	ACC
-nak/nek	DATIVE	DAT

-ról/ről	DELATIVE	DEL
-val/vel	INSTRUMENTAL	INS
-ban/ben	INESSIVE	INE
-ra/re	SUBLATIVE	SUB
-n	SUPERESSIVE	SUP
-ig	TERMINATIVE	TER

References

- Bartos, Huba (2000a): Object Agreement in Hungarian: A Case for Minimalism.** In: G. Alexandrova and O. Arnaudova (eds.) *The Minimalist Parameter* (Ottawa Linguistics Forum 1997): pp. 327-340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bartos, Huba (1999/2000a): Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: a magyar inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere /Morphosyntax and interpretation: the syntactic background of the Hungarian inflectional phenomena.** Ph.D. thesis, ELTE, Dept. of Theoretical Linguistics, Budapest.
- Belletti, Adriana (ed.) (2004): Structure and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol. 3.** Oxford: OUP.
- Bošković, Željko (2002): On Multiple wh-fronting.** *LI* 33: 351-383.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986): Barriers.** Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995): The Minimalist Program.** Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995b): Categories and Transformations.** In: *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, Chapter 4: pp. 219-210-394.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000): Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework.** In: Martin et alia (2000): *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. 89-155.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001): Derivation by Phase.** In: Kenstowicz (2001): 1-52.
- Chomsky, Noam (2004): Beyond Explanatory Adequacy.** In Belletti ed. (2004): 104-131.
- Chomsky, Noam (2005): On Phases.** Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
<http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/hans/mrg/chomskyonphases1204.pdf>
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990): Types of A'-Dependencies.** Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Dudás, O. Kálmán (1998): Why Both Fewest Links and Minimal Link Condition Fail: The Island Conspiracy?** Ms. Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Dudás, O. Kálmán (1999): Long A-bar Movement of *Hogy* 'that' Complement Clauses.** In: *Doximp 3: Graduate Students' Third Linguistics Symposium = Working Papers in the Theory of Grammar*, Vol. 6, No. 3: 81-97. Research Institute for Linguistics, H. A. S., Budapest.
- Dudás, O. Kálmán (2000): English, Serbo-Croatian, Italian and Hungarian Island Constraints Jammed into the Controversy of Focus and Topic Licensing.** Ms. ELTE, Hungary.
- Dudás, O. Kálmán (2001): Bounded Areal Tree Sectors Partially Determine Interdomain Straddle.** Drafted as a full-article version [in publication with Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics].
- Dudás, Kálmán (2002): A (részleges) wh-mozgatás lehetséges modellje /A Feasible Way of Modelling Wh-movement/. In: Maleczki, Márta (eds.) (2002): *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei, V. /New Methods of Describing Today's Hungarian*, Vol. V./: 109-136. Szegedi Tudományegyetem, Szeged.**
- Dudás, O. Kálmán (February/July 2003): A Cross-Linguistic View of Bounding Conditions, Sentential Licensors, and Multiclausal Syntax: A Coenotopographical Approach.** PhD. thesis version 2.1 (pp. 290), submitted for ELTE Linguistics PhD program. (ELTE Elmélet Nyelvészet Tanszék /Department of Theoretical Linguistics at ELTE University, Budapest/)
- Dudás, O. Kálmán (2004): A Coenotopographical Analysis of Cross-Linguistic Bounding Effects and Multiclausal Syntax.** PhD. dissertation, version 2.3, pp. 195.

- Dudás, O. Kálmán (2005):** *Licensors in Multiclausal Syntax and PF versus LF Bounding Effects in Phases*. Ph.D. dissertation, version 3.1, pp. 180
- É. Kiss Katalin (1987a):** *Configurationality in Hungarian*, Dordrecht: Reidel & Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- É. Kiss Katalin (1990a):** *Why Complement Clauses are Barriers?* In: Mascaró and Nespó (1990): 265-277.
- É. Kiss Katalin (2002):** *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (2001):** *Features, theta roles, and free constituent order*. LI 32: 405-437.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (2004):** *The MLC and Interface Economy*. In Stepanov et alia (2004): 73-124.
- Fukui, Naoki and Mamoru Saito (1998):** *Order in Phrase Structure and Movement*. LI 29: 439-474.
- Georgopoulos, Carol (1991):** *Syntactic Variables*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hornstein, Norbert & Jairo Nunes (2002):** *On asymmetries between parasitic gap and across-the-board constructions*. *Syntax* 5: 26-54.
- Huang, Cheng-Teh James (1982):** *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1994):** *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. = **L. I. Monographs 25**.
- Kenesei, István (1984):** *Word Order in Hungarian Complex Sentences*, LI 15: 328-342.
- Kenesei, István (1992a):** *Az alárendelt mondatok szerkezete /The Structure of Subordinate Clause Types/*. In: Kiefer (1992): 529-714.
- Kenesei, István (1992b):** *On Hungarian Complementizers*. In I. Kenesei and Cs. Pléh (eds), *AtH, IV*: 37-50.
- Kenesei, István (1994):** *The Syntax of Subordination*. In F. Kiefer & K. É. Kiss (1994): *Hungarian Syntax*. 275-355.
- Kenstowicz, Michael (ed.) (2001):** *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kiefer, Ferenc and Katalin É. Kiss (eds.) (1994):** *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian = Syntax and Semantics 27*, San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lasnik, Howard (1999):** *Minimalist Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lasnik, Howard (1992):** *Case and expletives: Notes Toward a Parametric Account*. LI 23: 381-407.
- Lasnik, Howard (1995a):** *Case and expletives revisited: On Greed and other human failings*. LI 26 : 615-633.
- Lipták, Anikó (1997/98):** *A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése /One Minimalist Analysis of the Hungarian Long Focus Raising/*. In: Büky and Maleczki (1998): 93-115.
- López, Luis (2001):** *On the (Non)complementarity of Theta Theory and Checking Theory*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 694-716.
- Mascaró, Juan and Marina Nespó (eds.) (1990):** *Grammar in Progress*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Nunes, Jairo (2001):** *Sideward Movement*. LI 32: 303-344.
- Nunes, Jairo (2004):** *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Nunes, Jairo and Juan Uriagereka (2000):** *Cyclicity and Extraction Domains*. *Syntax* 3: 20-43.
- 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.
- Pesetsky, D., Torrego, E. (2004):** *Tense, case and the nature of syntactic categories*. In: Guéron, J. Lecarne, J. (eds.) (2004): *The Systems of Time*. MIT Press.
- Priscianus (c. 520 A. D.):** *Institutiones Grammaticae Libri XVIII /Eighteen Books on the Grammatical Dispositions/*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1991.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997):** *The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery*. In: Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, 281-337, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Ross, John R. (1967):** *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD. thesis. MIT. Distr. by Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club. = Repr. in a book format as **Ross, John R. (1986):** *Infinite Syntax*. New Jersey, N.J.: Ablex.

Stepanov, Arthur (2000): The end of the CED? In: WCCFL 20: 524-537.
Stepanov, Arthur (2001): Late Adjunction and Minimalist Phrase Structure. Syntax 4: 94-125.
Stepanov, Arthur, Gisbert Fanselow, and Ralf Vogel (eds.)(2004): Minimality Effects in Syntax.
Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Svenonius, Peter (1994): C-selection as Feature-Checking. Studia Linguistica XLVIII: 133-155.