LEXICAL VARIATION IN A PHASE-BASED (*v*-related) ACCOUNT OF MORPHOLOGICAL FORMS AND PF-REALISATION OF PROPOSITIONAL PRO

Kálmán Dudás, ELTE, Budapest, Hungary

Notation: [DP (pro)]   P-pro = prepositional (or clause-associate) pro

(i) (Phase C [vP .... *V* matrix ... (Phase B [DP [DP P-pro] (Phase A [CP C [......]]]]

(ii) [vP ...... mond.... [DP [DP az] [CP   hogy   [.........]]]]
           say   P-pro   C:that

I claim that all propositional (sentential) pro-forms (henceforth, P-pro) are realised within the same licensing (Agree) system at the PF-interface owing to a minimal parametric difference of phasehood (Chomsky 2001, 2004, 2008).

Specifically, the parametric difference is related to special matrix verb groups.

If the DP that contains the pro in the Spec,DP of the clause associate is in the same phase as the matrix *v*P (traditional grammar labels such matrix verbs as *bridge verbs*), the P-pro may be phonologically unrealised, null.

The issue bears on extraction asymmetries from the same clause types as well as argument vs. adjunct differences (see the last section).

1   Location of P-pro

(1) [CP [TOPP [DP az]   [FOCP [DP az]   [vP ...... mond .... [DP [DP az]
[CP hogy [.........]]]]

Consider an optionally null P-pro in various positions:

- Cannot be null in the left periphery (in topic and focus positions):

 (2)   *(Azt)   (pedig)   [FOCP (csak) tegnap mondta Pál], hogy Évát   megtalálta.
     P-pro:ACC TOP   only yesterday said Pál   C:that Eve:ACC found
   'Only yesterday Paul said that he found Eve.'

 (3) Tegnap (pedig) [FOCP (csak) azt   mondta Pál],   hogy Évát   megtalálta.
     yesterday TOP   only P-pro said Paul   C:that Eve:ACC   found
   'Yesterday what Paul said was that he found Eve.'

- Can be null VP-internally (as a first look at facts – later: both must/must not be null, too):

(4) Tegnap pedig [FOCP (csak) a barátjának   mondta azt   Pál], hogy Évát megtalálta.
     yesterday TOP   only the his-friend-to told   P-pro:ACC Pál C   Eve:ACC found

2   Forms of null pro in Hungarian (a pro-drop language)

In theory, only personal pronouns can be null - the distribution is identical with that of P-pro above; the 3rd person inanimate pronoun (*azt*) is the same as P-pro by form

   i)   *Pro* is personal pron in the nominative/accusative: can be phonologically null:

 (5) Tegnap   (őt)   látta Pál.   Tegnap (azt)   látta Pál.
   yesterday him/her saw Paul   yesterday it (inanimate 3rd pers.) saw Paul

   ii)   *Pro* is a personal pron in some oblique case: cannot be null:

(6) Tegnap   *(neked) adott egy ötletet Pál.
   yesterday   you-to gave a tip:ACC Paul

Hungarian P-pro (*az-* forms) (suffixed *azzal, arra, arrol* 'pronoun + with/on/of', etc. similarly to *darüber, daran, davon* or (prep +) *to, togo, tom* in Slavic languages) must be

phonologically realised on the matrix left (split CP) periphery above T to relate the CP to those communicative-logical functional projections above *v*P, (namely, [TopP [FocP [*v*P]]] order) where it expresses/represents the semantic import, interpretation properties of its associate clause which stays in the VP. Bear in mind that such P-pros are obligatorily present

Full parallelism between personal pronouns and P-pro bearing a structural case (nom/acc):
- If P-pro patterns with the pers pron: null subject and non-null oblique options are expected
Nominative P-pro:

(7) Tegnap   (az) tűnt föl   Pálnak, hogy Éva is kereste   (őt/azt).
      Yesterday   it was_conspicuous Paul-to C:that Eve too looked_for him/her/it

P-pro is in some oblique case: can be null (!): if the verb allows it – *deal* does not:
(8) Tegnap   *(azzal) foglalkozott Pál, hogy Éva is   kereste   (őt/azt).
      Yesterday   it-with dealt   Paul C:that Eve too looked_for him/her/it
'Yesterday Paul dealt with the news that Eve, too, had been looking for him/her/it.

Stress on focussed pro:
Focussed P-pro (as any DP) takes the primary stress: it moves to the edge of a phonological phrase to receive main stress assignment (Szendroi 2003); at the same time I accept a modified view of Horvath (2005) that (exhaustive) focus movement is not PF-driven in Hungarian (cases of foci in situ with a primary stress; cases of primary stress not falling on focus).

Non-stressed P-pro within VP:
Unmoved and non-stressed P-pro (reducible to a null P-pro) within VP contribute to the neutral semantic value (i. e. no focus/topic interpretation) for its associate CP.

To sum up (1 & 2): our concern will be
    (a) VP-internal and (the only) potentially null P-pro
    (b) the contrast of structural and oblique morph. cases on P-pro

3 Minimalist edges

If, by hypothesis, agreement (Chomsky's Agree) with little *v* is what licenses an edge feature on any (other) phrase (importantly for our subject, the pro-associate CP), an edge f. (EF) needs to be licensed by any Agree relation based on another feature Z, and, thus, arguments can get their edge features checked off if there is such a licensor of Agree.

(9)   [*v*P ...... *V-little* .... [DP [CP hogy   [.........]]]]
                                                   C :that $\langle Z \rangle$
              |__Agree_____|
              An edge feature cannot be assigned freely to the head of a (complement) domain of e. g. a matrix verb, and in particular, to the domain in lack of an Agree relation between the subordinate CP and the matrix verb which dictates the form of a P-pro "az" (Agree does not hold; edge feature is not assigned.)
    Note that a pro (whether a personal pronoun or a P-pro) is checked off by the matrix V, a CP may not be checked off.
    - Traditional "bridge" verbs such as *sagen / mond* 'say' (see section 1) must license a null P-pro:

(10)   [*v*P ...... *V-little-bridge* .. [DP [DP ____] [CP hogy   [.........]]]]
                                                      P-pro   C :that

|___ *Agree*_____| _ _ _ _ _|

- Two conjugations of Hungarian: "definite" and "indefinite": the verb takes morphological suffixes of the DP-oriented/centred ("definite") conjugation in response to its DP-object (cf. Bartos (1998, 2000)). The personal pronoun can be null.
(11)

(1) lát-om, hall-om: the verb checks a DP-object - 'see_him' 'hear_him'	(2) lát-ok, hall-ok : non-object-centred 'see something' 'hear sg'

- P-pro goes with the DP-object-centred conjugation obligatorily.
- DP-shell (see above) embeds CP: whenever a DP is present, the DP-centred conjugation of the (matrix) verb is triggered.
- VP-internal P-pro can be null optionally (see above).

(12) Gondoltad-e   (azt),   hogy   Éva   Péterrel   találkozott?
      You_think Q (P-pro:ACC)   C:that Eve   Peter-with   met

'Did you (ever) think that Eve met Peter?'

Long-distance dependency with a bridge verb, *gondol* 'think': P-pro <u>must</u> be null

(13) [DP   WH- [vP ...... v .... [DP [DP ____] [CP hogy   [.........]]]]
                                              P-pro   C :that

                    |___ *Agree ?*____| _ _ _ __|
(14)   Tegnap   mondta   Pál   (azt),   hogy   Évát
       Yesterday told me/said Paul   (pro:ACC)   megtalálta.
                                                            C   Eve:ACC   found

          'It was yesterday that Pál said that he had found Éva.'

Long movement of a DP-focus and a wh-phrase (the latter is inherently focussed in Hung.), respectively:

(15)   Évát   mondta Pál   (*azt),   hogy ~~Évát~~ megtalálta.
          Eve:ACC asked Paul   pro:ACC   C   found
'It is Eve that Pál told me / said that he had found.'

(16)   KIT   mondott Pál   (*azt),   hogy ~~KIT~~ megtalált?
          Eve-with asked Paul   pro:ACC   C   found
'Who is it that Pál said that he had found?'

(17)   KIVEL   gondolod (*azt),   hogy találkozott Éva   ~~kivel~~?
          Who-with   you_think P-pro:ACC   C:that met   Eve:NOM
          'Who do you think that Eve met?'

Since dropping the P-pro (null pro) in Hungarian is never compulsory except the long-distance dependency option with bridge verbs, and the verb takes morphological suffixes of the DP-oriented ("definite") conjugation in response to its DP-object (cf. Bartos (1998, 2000)), it is most likely that
a DP-shell (that the verb agrees with in its conjugation type) is present above subordinated CP, this DP-shell can account for the obligatory lack of P-pro.
EF-checking verbs are related to P-pro

I wish to add two remarks.
i) Firstly, the category DP does not have to check accusative of its object to trigger the Hungarian DP-oriented (definite) conjugation.
ii) Secondly, several verbs can subcategorise for a CP semantically (none of them must). However, this does not require a c-selection between the CP and verb since a verb can determine the semantic content of

its complement <u>non-locally</u>, across D or C; such content as interrogative or subjunctive modality. Svenonius (1994) argues for analysing certain types of embedding in terms of non-local selection, and Suranyi (2005) brings up arguments of the same vein when rejecting Liptak's (2001) arguments for covert wh-movement from alleged selection constraints.

4.1   P-pro in DP as an intervener

The status of DP (including P-pros as DPs) as a (strong) phase is less clear (cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004, 2005)). Therefore, I am to consider the P-pro with regard to the two options: as a phase and then as a non-phase, with two respective licensing scenarios.

The point is that the overlapping distributional facts of syntactic islands and non-bridge verb object complements can receive a unified explanation based on a shared lexical primitive: bridge verbs (i. e. edge-feature-checking verbs for CPs in the present framework).

Facts, such as non-extractability out of these complement domains:

(18)   **Kivel**   *válaszoltad   (*azt),   hogy   találkozott   Éva   ~~kivel~~?
       Who-with   you_answered pro:ACC   C:that   met   Eve:NOM
       'Who do you think that Eve met?'

- for Polish: Indicative Clausal Tense Island, too:
Extraction from Polish embedded clause with an indicative verb (indicative clausal tense island) is ungrammatical:

(19) * CO   pro   wiesz   ze   studenci   mowia/czytaja {~~co~~} ?
        what   (you)   know   C   students   say/read
        'What do you know that students say/read?'

Conjecture:
a   Domains embedded by bridge verbs must have a CP which is licensed (see above)
b   [EF] checking licenses a CP
Conclusion: [EF] checking is associated with bridge verbs
    Long-distance movement is licit from complements of bridge, i. e. edge-feature-checking verbs. Arguments that are complements of non-checking (common, non-bridge) verbs pattern with adjuncts (see the last section): these complement positions are opaque.

(20)   [$_{v}$P ...... *V-little-common* .... [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ az   ]   [$_{CP}$ hogy   [.........]]]]
                                                            P-pro   C :that

                    |_ _ _*Agree_ _ _   _ _ _ _ _>

    An Agree relation is established between the CP and the matrix little *v* and EF is checked under Agree when long movement is licit.
    The example below shows an ungrammatical long extraction if the P-pro is present. What causes the illicit dependency is that the object CP is an island. It is an island because it does not Agree with *v* of a bridge matrix verb which would check off the uninterpretable features on goal C. (Trivially, if a bridge verb is missing – but *gondol* 'think' below is typically a bridge verb…)
Hungarian -   intended as: 'What book do you think they read?'

 (21) MILYEN KONYVET gondolod   [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ (***azt**)], [$_{CP}$ hogy olvastak ~~milyen konyvet~~]]?
     what book:ACC   think:2SG.def.agr.   P-pro   C   read:3P
     'What book do you think they read?'

Conjecture: the characteristic difference (their relation to CP which I have assumed to be an EF-checking property) between a common and a bridge verb is neutralised here.

Take long movement again with different checking mechanisms:

(22) [FocP wh-phrase [vP v . [DP [DP az] [CP hogy [...wh-phrase......]]]]
                                  P-pro   C < ! EF>
                    |___Agree____| _ _ _ _ _|

The verb *közöl* 'inform' in (23a) is a common (non-bridge verb) whereas *mond* 'say' in (23b) is a bridge verb → a difference which I will return to in this section.

(23a) PÁL közölte tegnap   Klárával   (**azt**),   hogy elolvasta a könyveket.
       Pál informed yesterday Klára:INS   P-pro:ACC   C:that read   the books:ACC

       'Pál informed Klára yesterday that he had read the books.'

(23b) PÁL mondta   tegnap   Klárának   (**azt**),   hogy elolvasta a könyveket.
       Pál said   yesterday Klára:DAT P-pro:ACC   C:that read   the books:ACC
       'Pál told Klára yesterday that he had read the books.'

At first sight, the little *v* checks the EF of the CP in the Agree relation. This predicts that raising a focussed phrase or wh-phrase from the embedded clause will not exhibit island effects. Then the following sentence type involving free long-distance focalisation is expected:

(24)   A KÖNYVEKET mondta   Pál Évának   (__/*azt),   hogy elolvassa

       the books:ACC   said   Pál Éva:DAT   P-pro   C   reads
       a könyveket.
       'Pál told Éva that it is the books that he will read.'

Since the presence of the P-pro seems to induce the island effect, in theory, two possible causes of the effect can come to mind.
(i) Firstly, the Agree relation by way of checking the [Case] of the CP takes place without EF checking. Since the CP has an [EF] freely, if the licensor possesses EF (and *v* does), such a situation cannot arise. However, one can come up with potential different kinds of licensors with subsequent effects on islandhood.
(ii) Secondly, the Agree relation itself is thwarted and, thus, the necessary condition for EF checking is missing. I believe this scenario to be relevant here.
   Agree is impossible owing to an intervening pronoun (P-pro) acting as the object and entering into Agree with *v*. The CP is thereby hindered from agreeing with *v* on account of a Relativized Minimality/Minimal Link Condition effect (see (1, 2)) and any potential edge feature on the C will remain unchecked. In short, MLC effect seem to hold for both verb classes. A common verb would perhaps be understood as one that has a continuous MLC effect (É. Kiss 1990 states it in different terms and approach), but it does not hold true empirically for Hung. (see later).
       The clause-spanning dependency itself could play a role in the blocking effect. What could be decisive is a test by which we can differentiate between types of dependency of an argument DP and an AdvP. The latter cannot check a [Case] since it does not have any. If the test shows that both AdvP and DP can form a grammatical dependency only if the P-pro is null, the fact that the argument DP forming the long-distance chain carries a case is unimportant in this intervention effect. The long-distance dependency of the (caseless) adverbial with akar 'want', a matrix bridge verb, corroborates this assumption.

(25) ÓVATOSAN   akarta Pál *azt,   hogy   a vízzel   bánjunk   óvatosan.
carefully   wanted Pál P   C   the water-with treat:SUBJUNC.1PL
'Pál wanted us to treat water ``carefully.'

Therefore, what causes the illicit dependency is that the object clause CP is an island for any potential category since the matrix verb cannot license it owing to a blocking intervening P-pro entering into Agree with *v*. An example where the P-pro is not accusive but superlative ('on the top of')

(26) [CP[TOPP[FINP [VP Tűnődsz [DP [D(P) **azon**] [CP hogy
                           wonder:2SG   P-at   C:that

[TOPP Éva [FINP [VP vásárolt   egy házat   ]]]]]]]].
                    Éva   bought   a house:ACC
'You wonder if Eve bought a house.'

For this blocking effect, one can find examples of intervening correlative/hypophoric pronouns in my context in several languages, like Polish:

(29a)   *CO Tomek chce [DP tego   [CP zeby   Maria mu   przeczyatala ~~co~~]]?
            what Tomek wants   HYP   C:SUBJUNC. Maria him:DAT read:SUBJUNC.
                Intended as: 'What does Tomek want Maria to read to him?'

Hungarian

(29b) *MILYEN KÖNYVET gondolod [DP   azt, [CP hogy olvastak ~~milyen könyvet~~]]?
            what book:ACC   think:2SG.DO HYP   C   read:3PL
            Intended as: 'What book do you think they read?'

(29c) *WHAT do you regret   [DP   it   [CP that you left {what} in the bag]]?

        It is the correlative/hypophoric pronoun (*to* 'it' in various Slavic tongues, *da(r)-* (as in *darauf, dazu, daran* etc.) in German, *az* in Hungarian (cf. Kenesei (1994), É. Kiss (2002)), that enters into Agree relation with the case checking *v*. The object CP does not Agree with *v* which would check off the uninterpretable features on goal C including EF. The CP is thereby hindered from agreeing with *v* on account of a Relativized Minimality/Minimal Link Condition effect) and any potential EF on the C will remain unchecked.

        Once this neutralization effect is lifted, the contrast becomes conspicuous. Common (non-bridge) verbs like *közöl* 'inform' do not allow extraction even though the P-pro is absent.

Hungarian *közöl* 'inform, send word' : *gondol* 'think' (the latter is a bridge verb):

(30a) * MILYEN KÖNYVET közöltél [DP ___, [CP hogy   olvastak   ~~milyen könyvet~~]]?
            what book:ACC   informed:PAST.2SG C:that read:PAST.3PL
            Intended as: 'What book did you inform us about in that they read it?'

(30b) MILYEN KÖNYVET gondoltál [DP ___, [CP hogy   olvastak   ~~milyen könyvet~~]]?
            what book:ACC   think:PAST.2SG   C:that read:PAST.3PL
            Intended as: 'What book did you think they read?'

        If bridge verbs change the configuration in some way to be made clear, it is <u>not at all only the MLC effect that counts in defining islandhood conditions for *that*-clauses</u> although it can account for complex NP constraint indeed. Thus, the lack of the intervention of the P-pro (e.g. *azt*) is a necessary but not sufficient condition for all long-distance dependencies.

4.2   PF-realization of P-pro, DP as a (non-)phase, and the CP

        In what follows, I will go over the various options of the association of the CP and the rest of the sentence. The status of DP as a (strong) phase is less clear (Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004, 2005)), and the status of a DP projected by a pronominal P-pro category is even less clear. Therefore, I am to consider the hypophor DP with regard to the <u>two options: as a phase and then as a non-phase, with two respective licensing scenarios.</u>
        Scenario 1 supposes that the DP in the tree configuration (repeated below) is a phase.

(32)   [vP ...... *v* .... [DP [DP az] [CP hogy [.........]]]]
                                    HYP   C:that
            |___*Agree*____|_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _|
        'the fact that…'

        The data show that the actual PF-realization of the DP may be null. Assume that such a PF-null category can check no case and, thus, <u>such a DP is not a Goal of checking [Case]</u> features or EF either. Then, <u>the CP-dominating DP as a phase</u> is subject to PIC and becomes an

island for the categories within it. Such a category is CP, which does not need to be an island at all. Since the Probe in *v* seeks to check [Case] in CP and the MLC dictates that the uppermost [Case] on C must serve as a perfect Goal, the CP below DP is a potential Goal. By hypothesis, CP can check the EF when [Case] is checked. Therefore, the CP is a licensed domain with an EF on its domain head C and can house a raising focus or wh-phrase in 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 *v* will check its [Case, EF] featural makeup[1] 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 P-pro 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,[2] is a relevant configurational effect to ensure that the DP-internal categories (crucially, CP) could not Agree with any licensor 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.[3]

Conclusion: PF-null hypophors do not have an effect on the structure. Essentially, the DP is either an island (the first scenario) or a domain which is licensed by *v* (the second scenario). Either way, the MLC effect in the Agree relation prevents 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 *v*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).

I will put forward a phase-based account of bridge verbs which will suppose that a null DP under a bridge verb is not a (strong) phase.

---

[1] I believe that EF is a "subfeature" like OCC/EPP is in minimalism; this notation refers to this assumption.

[2] 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. For an analysis of large-scale interaction between universal/negative universal quantifiers and interrogative (wh-) quantifiers in German, see for instance Pafel (1997, 1999), Beck (1996); for quantifier interaction in Hungarian see Surányi (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2005). I will demonstrate a relation between C-checking and wh-checking in section 2.5 of this paper.

[3] 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 complemetizers do not have potential triggers above the DP housing the N head in contrast to interrogative wh-chains (more details in Dudás 2001, 2004).

Two ways of explanation have remained.

i) One is that <u>the P-pro DP may be a phase</u> but locality conditions remain unaffected since <u>the DP edge and the CP edge is identical</u>: the Spec,DP hosts the CP when large-scale pied-piping takes place (specific to some languages, e. g. Latin adjunct constructions or Basque CP-pied-piping into CP, cf. Dudas 2004).

ii) The other way is that the null P-pro 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 vP. In effect, the CP will become an island with its unchecked [Case, EF] again. However, <u>if a null P-pro does not count as a Goal for case checking</u>, the <u>MLC will pick out C as the closest Goal</u>; 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.

5 Inherent cases on P-pro

Even bridge verbs cannot facilitate dependency formation based on Agree if DP intervenes (thus, the CP phase remains an island). If a P-pro 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. Hungarian has evidence of the former class!

Null P-pro is an exclusive property of bridge verbs (É. Kiss 1990): not borne out:

i) Bridge verb:

(33) Pál tegnap   mondta   azt,   hogy Éva elutazott.
         Pál yesterday said   P-pro C   Éva went away.

ii) Common (non-bridge) verb:

(34)   Pál olvasta/közölte/elmesélte   (azt), hogy Éva   elutazott.
          Pál read / inform (give info) / narrate P-pro C   Éva   went away.

Null P-pro is an exclusive property of verbs assigning structural (nom/acc) case (Lipták 1998): not borne out:

(A) Inherent case checking verbs:

A.1   Bridge verbs among them:

(35) Pál kérte   a barátját   (arra),   hogy Éva   elutazhasson.
         Pál asked   his friend:ACC   P-pro-for   C   Eve   go_away_could

'Paul asked his friend if Eve could go away.'

A.2   Common (= non-bridge) verbs:

(36) Pál érdeklődött   (arról),   hogy Éva   elutazott-e.
         Pál asked_about   P-pro-about   C   Éva   went away Q

'Paul asked about Eve's going away'

(37)   Pál figyelmeztette a fiút   (arra), hogy Éva   elutazott.
          Pál warned   the boy   P-pro-for   C   Eve   went away.

'Paul warned the boy that Eve had already gone away.'

Adverbial complement bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed hypophor embedded under a common (non-bridge) verb allowing hypophor drop:[4]

(38a) Érdeklődtem [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ (arról)], [$_{CP}$ hogy kitől   jött   levél Évának.]].

---

[4] Frequent verbs that follow this pattern are *figyelmeztet* 'warn', *meggyőz* 'convince', *tudakozódik* or *érdeklődik* 'ask about', *tűnődik* 'speculate, muse', *rámutat* 'point out'.

asked_after:1SG   HYP:DEL   C:that who:ABL   came letter Éva:DAT

(38b)   *ÉVÁNAK   érdeklődtem (arról),   hogy   kitől   jött   levél   ~~Évának.~~.
         'I asked about who the letter came from to Éva.'

(B)   Inherent case checking verbs: (no bridge verbs among them)
(39a)   Pál célzott   *(arra),   hogy Éva   elutazott.
          Pál hinted   P-pro-for   C   Eve   went away
    'Paul hinted at Eve's going away.'
(39b) Pál számított   *(arra),   hogy Éva   elutazott.
       Pál banked   P-pro-for   C   Eve   went away
       'Paul banked on Eve's going away.'

        Conclusion: it must be made clear on the basis of a wide range of Hungarian data that the null phonological realization (pro-drop) of the P-pro is not at all an exclusive property of either bridge verbs (against E. Kiss (1990)) or that of verbs assigning structural (nom/acc) case (against Liptak's (1998) view: null P-pro allegedly characterises this class). Common (i.e. non-bridge) transitive verbs, for instance, *közöl* 'inform' or *elmond* 'tell, narrate' can drop a personal pronoun as well as a P-pro.
    - **Two classes of <u>inherent (oblique) case</u> checking non-transitive verbs** embedding adverbial arguments through a suffixed P-pro differ with respect to realization of P-pros
- which may be null with a large class (A) of non-transitive verbs - by a large class of verbs (36a) such as *érdeklődik* 'ask about' or *figyelmeztet* 'warn', some of which are bridge verbs such as *erdeklodik* 'ask about', *ker* 'request', or *figyelmeztet* 'warn', *válaszol* 'answer' some of which are bridge verbs,

(40)   [$_{CP}$ [$_{TOPP}$ [$_{FOCP}$ Figyelmeztettél [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ [$_{D(P)}$ **(arra)**]
                                warned:2SG   *P-pro-for*

    [$_{CP}$ hogy   [$_{TOPP}$ [$_{FOCP}$ vásároljak   egy házat   ]]]]]]]]].
        C:that   *buy:SUBJUNC.1SG   a house:ACC*
      'You warned me that I should buy a house.'

- whereas another large class (B) of verbs such as *celoz* 'hint at', *szamit* 'bank/reckon on', *törekszik* 'strive' do not at all allow pro-drop (and, therefore, none of which is a bridge verb).
 (41)   [$_{CP}$ [$_{TOPP}$ [$_{FOCP}$ Számítottál [$_{VP}$ [$_{DP}$ [$_{D(P)}$ ***(arra)**]   [$_{CP}$ hogy
                          bank:2SG   *P-pro-for*   *C:that*

    [$_{TOPP}$ Éva [$_{FINP}$ [$_{VP}$ vásárol egy házat   ]]]]]]]]].
            Éva   buys   a house:ACC
      'You banked on Eve's buying a house.'
    In sum, common (non-bridge) verbs may or may not allow a null P-pro, and if its case is structural: the choice of a VP-internal P-pro form is identical with the automatic change to the personal pronoun *pro*. By contrast, P-pros bearing various inherent cases are freely dropped <u>only if</u> the matrix verb does not forbid null form.
        We might still expect that a null DP embedded by a bridge verb might count as a weak phase or a non-phase in the way I assumed above only if it checks a structural case, but this does not hold for oblique cases, that is to say, bridge verbs would always license their domain through a structural Case.
    However, some bridge verbs, for instance, *kér* 'request', belong to "class A": can drop the oblique P-pro (parallel to Agree with structural Case). Thus, common and bridge verbs alike check various cases in the same way of licensing.

Grammatical long movement with a bridge verb with an oblique P-pro:

(42) [CP [TOPP [FINP (CSAK) EGY KÖNYVET kértelek [VP [DP [D(P)   **(*arra)**]
                      only   one/a book:ACC   requested:1SG   P-pro-for

[CP hogy [TOPP [FINP [VP vásárolj ~~egy könyvet~~]]]]]]]]].
     C:that   buy:SUBJUNC.3SG

'It is only one/a book that I asked you to buy.'

Inherent case:
(43) Pál kért   (arra),   hogy Évával   elutazzak.
      Pál asked_about   P-pro-for   C   Éva   away-go-should
(44) Pál tegnap   mondta   (azt),   hogy Éva elutazott.
      Pál yesterday said   P-pro   C   Éva away-went

A further parallel is that complement adverbials exhibit the intervention effects of the P-pro for the relevant class, the construction with a bridge verb.

Adverbial complement bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed P-pro embedded under a bridge verb allowing null P-pro:
(45) Tegnap   kért Pál   (arra),   hogy Évával   utazzak el.
      Yesterday asked Pál   (pro-for)   C   Éva-with   went away
'Yesterday Pál asked me to go away with Eve.'

(46) Évával   kért Pál   ___/*arra,   hogy ~~Évával~~ utazzak el.
     Eve-with   asked Pál   (pro-for)   C   went away
'It is with Eve that Pál asked me to travel.'

(47) KIVEL   kért Pál   ___/*arra,   hogy ~~kivel~~   utazzak el.
      Who-with   asked Pál   (pro-for)   C   went away
'It is with Eve that Pál asked me to travel.'

(48) ÉVÁNAK   kértelek   (___), hogy küldjél   egy levelet ~~Évának~~..
     Éva:DAT   requested:2SG P-pro C:that send:SUBJ.2SG a letter:ACC

'I asked you to send a letter to Éva.'

   The category DP does not have to check [Case] to trigger the DP-oriented conjugation (there is no forcing factor to that effect in the system that I have suggested). Furthermore, I go along with Kenesei (1992, 1994) that several verbs can subcategorise for a CP semantically (none of them must). In my opinion, however, this does not require a c-selection between the CP and verb since a verb can determine the semantic content of its complement non-locally, across D or C such as interrogative or subjunctive modality. Svenonius (1994) argues for analysing certain types of embedding in terms of non-local selection, and Surányi (2005) brings up arguments of the same vein when rejecting Lipták's (2001) arguments for covert wh-movement from alleged selection constraints.

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

   Thus, the appropriate bridge verb is able to license the complement adverbial domain and, consequently, there is no difference between structural cases and inherent cases with respect to either the licensing power of the matrix *v* or the P-pro intervention effect.

   In conclusion, an Agree relation (with *v*) holds of adverbial complements taking an inherent Case, which Agree licenses (with the same mechanism as structural cases) with the usual proviso that a bridge verb (only in class "A" above) must embed the complement.

6   A short argument against DP in Spec,CP

I will briefly argue against any model where the DP does not embed the CP. A structure in which the DP is in the Spec,CP (in Lipták (1998)) can account for this difference between an intervening and non-intervening DP which I analysed but it does not yield the whole range of Hungarian constructions.

I rephrase Lipták's model (not written in phase-theoretical framework), while keeping her positioning of DP. P-pro itself (when present) can form dependency between Spec,CP and the left periphery of the matrix above TP. Since this DP in Spec,CP will have a [Case, EF] to be checked, the [Case, EF] feature is checked on the CP itself and the edge of CP can thus attract categories from inside the CP. At the same time, whether or not an EF is assigned to the CP-edge, the P-pro 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 P-pro DP, this leaves the model without account of the striking islands effects when the P-pro is absent in Spec,CP.

Expected: the non-island CP is permeable for long-distance dependencies. However, most matrix predicates are of the non-bridge character regardless of the PF-quality of the complementizer.

All in all, the P-pro DP in the Spec,CP falsely predicts that all P-pro-dropping embedding verbs must act as bridge verbs.

Since Lipták (1998) also declares that a P-pro in an oblique case cannot be null, contrary to empirical data above, she cannot 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 P-pros extensively, can grasp the role of the P-pro in making the object CP an island/non-island.[5]

7   Conclusions about complements

In conclusion,

1   Even though beside case-checking there may be additional licensing ways to remove islandhood, it does not alter the thrust of my assumption: every possible option of grammatical extraction is related to licensing through Agree involving some formal feature FF (which I temporarily identified as [Case]) paired with a concomitant feature EF and its checking simultaneously.

2   The process itself is related to various licensors such as v or T, which vary in their character, and are also subject to general principles, such as Shortest Link or MLC, related to Agree.

3   It pays to follow Cinque's (1990) insight that the V-related categories play an outstanding role in non-local syntactic relations. (Thus, I have dealt with checking V-related FF, not of, for instance, Prep- or Adj-related features.)

4   The verbs themselves fall into different lexical classes among which that of the bridge verbs/predicates with their licensing quality has been recast in the framework of current minimalism. Bridge verbs are (exceptionally) able to access their CP complements in a special way: can eliminate the Shortest Link/MLC effect by licensing the DP as a category in the same phase where vP is (vP 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).

5   Note that you can compare complex DPs (relative or noun complement clause heads etc.) and P-pro DPs on the basis of their structure. It would be best to find a way of a non-stipulative

---

[5] 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).

statement of the configurational/structural differences between object islands (whether complex DPs or P-pro DPs) and non-islands. However, such a differentiation can only be carried out by devising such configurational differences (Dudás (2001, 2004) can derive it from certain derivational limitations of mainstream minimalist syntax) and only at the expense of 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).

6   In sum, common (non-bridge) verbs may, but bridge verbs must allow a null P-pro (when long movement – in my terms: a DP-phase is missing - takes place), and if the case on P-pro is structural, the choice of pro-drop of a VP-internal pronoun is allowed. By contrast, P-pros bearing various inherent cases are freely realized as null only if the matrix verb belongs to class (A).

7   Here I remark that the only class of verbs that allow clause-spanning dependencies, that is, bridge verbs all check structural or inherent case. This is an argument for the relevance of licensing by Case, at least for bridge verbs, and, by extension, this carries over to all Case-checking verbs – even the ones checking an adverbial complement (last section below). 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 (to come upon a bridge verb belonging to this class would be decisive), and the multiclausal facts reflect this frequency coincidence only.

		DP in the *v*P phase **Must allow** null P-pro in long mvt (2nd column)		May allow null P-pro	Disallows null P-pro
Inherent case +	EF checked	*kér (arra)* 'ask'	*kér (__)*	*érdeklődik (arról)*	*céloz (arra)* 'hint_at'
Structural case +	EF checked	*mond (azt)* 'say/tell'	*mond (__)*	*közöl, olvas (_)* 'inform' 'read'	-------

8   Inherent case on P-pro: adjuncts versus complements

- 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 licensor 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.   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).

Adjunct:
```
 (49)  Pál  felébresztett        (azzal),  hogy  Éva    elutazott.
          Pál   woke me up            with the news that      Éva    went away Q
```

Adverbial complement:
```
 (50)  Pál  érdeklődött          (arról),  hogy  Éva    elutazott-e.
          Pál  asked_about                   C       Éva    went away Q
 'Pál asked if Eve went away.'
```

- 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 licensor, and, thus, adjuncts cannot get their EF checked off (preventing the structure from converging) in lack of such a licensor. Note that the mechanism of seeking a way of licensing a domain remains uniform, just in this case the above-mentioned fictitious licensor, ADV, lacks the required feature EF. Unlike a complement, 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. (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.)

- Can verbs that check an oblique case of an argument differentiate these embedded argument domains by this V-relatedness from adjuncts?

- What has been left is a short comparison between (i) complements which are adverbials (thus, do not get involved in case checking) as in (52a, b), and (ii) DP complements taking an inherent Case as in (51) while testing the embedding under the same verb *bánik* 'handle, treat', and (iii) non-arguments (adjuncts).

- Serves as an argument for the relevance of licensing by Case, at least for bridge verbs, and, by extension, this carries over to all Case-checking 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 (to come upon a bridge verb belonging to this class would be decisive), and these multiclausal facts reflect this frequency coincidence.

DP complement bearing an inherent Case
(51)   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
(52a)   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.'
(52b)   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.'

-        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.
Adverbial complement with adverbial general (demonstrative) P-pro:
(53a)   Pál   lakik *(ott),   ahol   kerestem   a házat   tavaly.
        Pál   lives   P-pro:'there' where looked_for:1SG the house:ACC   last_year
        'Pál lives where I looked for a house last year.'
(53b)   *A HÁZAT lakik Pál   ott,   ahol   tavaly   kerestem a házat.
        house:ACC lives Pál   HYP   where   last_year   I_ looked_for
        'Pál lives where I looked for a flat last year.'

- 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 my framework.

An adverbial comes at the edge, adjoined to VP and its internal structure is identical to that of an argument clause below DP.

(54)   Pál köveket   hordhat [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$] [$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ *(**attól**)], [$_{CP}$ hogy évekig   tanult
       Pál stones:ACC carry#can   P-pro-from   C   years:until   learned
       az egyetemen]]] .
       the university-at
       'Pál can carry stones even though he studied at the university for years.'

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. Adjuncts are islands even in the examples where the P-pro bears an inherent Case as in:
     Since the verb does not license Case in this class, the ungrammatical long mvt is expected.

Adjunct adverbial with obligatory adverbial (general demonstrative) P‑pro:

(55) * ELŐADÁST beszélhet a témáról   Pál *(attól),   hogy tavaly   tartottam
     lecture:ACC talks   the topic:on Pál P-pro-from that last_year gave
        ~~előadást~~.
        'Pál can talk about the topic even if I gave a lecture last year.'

Adjunct adverbial with an optional adverbial P-pro (addig 'until the time') – just as ungrammatical (possible null P-pro cannot alter the lack of Agree):

(56a) EGY SZÍVESSÉGRE   kértelek   a könyvtárban (addig),   amíg mások a
       a favour-for   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.'

(56b) *A FOLYÓIRATOKAT kértelek a könyvtárban egy szívességre (addig), amíg
        mások olvasták   ~~a folyóiratokat.~~

Witness various embedded clauses which are complements of verbs of class "B" with inherent case checking in section 4 (no null P-pro). For both complement adverbials with a lexical P-pro and the complement adverbial with a lexical P-pro: the phase-spanning dependency is blocked (in keeping with facts).

The ban against null P-pro 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 lexical P-pro will be at work. This entails the prediction that these adverbials remain islands even if the Agree relation has been established:

Complement adverbial bearing an inherent Case realized on a suffixed P‑pro:

(57a) Számít *(arra)   Pál, hogy kitakarítom a   szobát.
         bank   P-pro-for   Pál   C:that clean:1SG   the   room:ACC
         'Pál expects me to clean the room.'

(57b) *[$_{CP}$ [$_{TOPP}$ [$_{FOCP}$ A SZOBÁT számít [$_{VP}$ Pál [$_{DP}$ [$_{D(P)}$ ___] [$_{CP}$ hogy
        [$_{TOPP}$ Éva   [$_{PredP}$ kitakarítja[6] [$_{FINP}$ [$_{VP}$ ~~a szobát~~]]]]]]]]].

Adverbial complement with adverbial general (demonstrative) P‑pro (non‑suffixed)

(58)   *A HÁZAT lakik Pál   *(ott),   ahol   tavaly   kerestem ~~a házat~~.
         house:ACC   lives Pál   P-pro where last_year look_for
         'Pál lives where I looked for a flat last year.'

---

[6]PredP is a position which hosts a special class of Hungarian syntactic categories, for instance, non-monotone increasing quantifiers, or adverbal modifiers, mainly bare nouns and adverbial particles (see É. Kiss (2002) for an overview).

Adjunct clause below a P-pro with inherent case: even though the P-pro may be null, lack of Agree makes EF checking (and thus, long mvt (2nd example) impossible:

(59) Tegnap   keresett Pál   (azzal),   hogy Évát   megtalálta.
       Yesterday visited   Pál   (pro-with)   C   Eve:ACC   found
‘It was yesterday that Pál visited us with the news / saying that he had found Éva.’

(60) Évát   keresett föl Pál   *(azzal),   hogy ~~Évát~~   megtalálta.
       Eve:ACC   visited   Pál   pro- with   C   found:DEF.SG.3.

 ‘It is Eve that Pál visited us   saying   that he had found.’

- Contrast expected: 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 clause) holds of the adverbial complements bearing inherent [Case]. We have seen it in section 5.

     Adverbial complements 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, P-pros bearing an inherent Case accompany adjunct clauses in certain construction. Yet, adjuncts are not capable of getting licensed by Agree (with v) - by comparison, adjunct clauses are not capable of getting licensed by Agree (with v). Furthermore, what we expect is that not any form of long-distance movement rooting in the non-Case-checking domain type, the adjuncts, is grammatical in lack of Agree.

App. 1   Definitions:
(4a)   <u>Minimise Chain Links</u>
        Chain links must be kept at a minimum length.
(4b)   <u>Minimal Link Condition</u> /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 he category X.
(5a)   <u>Edge</u> (Chomsky (2001:13)):
The edge of a head X is the residue outside of X_0; it comprises specifiers of X (and adjuncts to XP).
(5b)   <u>Phase Impenetrability Condition</u> /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.
(9)   <u>Ubiquitous Island Effect</u>
        All strong phases will act as islands for phase-internal elements.
(10)   <u>Agree relation</u> (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 = ~~uF~~
(8)   <u>Syntactic Licensing Domain</u>

A syntactic category K is in the licensing domain of a syntactic category LR acting as the licensor 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.

References
Bartos, Huba (1998/2000): 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.
Beck, Siegfrid (1996): Wh-constructions and transparent logical form. Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Tübingen, Germany.
Belletti, Adriana (ed.) (2004): Structure and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol. 3. Oxford: OUP.
Bianchi, Valentina (1999): Consequences of Antiymmetry for the Syntax of Headed Relative Clauses. PhD. diss., Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa.
Bošković, Željko (2002): On Multiple wh-fronting. LI 33: 351-383.
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, Massachussetts: 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 (ed.)(2002): 109-136.
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 (2005): Licensors in Multiclausal Syntax and PF versus LF Bounding Effects in Phases. Ph.D. dissertation, version 3.1, pp. 180
É. Kiss Katalin (1990): Why Complement Clauses are Barriers? In: Mascaró and Nespor (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.
Hornstein, Norbert & Jairo Nunes (2002): On asymmetries between parasitic gap and across-the-board constructions. Syntax 5: 26-54.
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 (1994): The Syntax of Subordination. In F. Kiefer&K. É. Kiss (1994): Hungarian Syntax. 275-355.

Kiefer, Ferenc (ed.) (1992): Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. I. Mondattan /A Structural Grammar of Hungarian. I. Syntax/. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kiefer, Ferenc and Katalin É. Kiss (eds.) (1994): The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian = Syntax and Semantics 27, San Diego: Academic Press.

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.

Lipták, Anikó (2001): On the Syntax of Wh-items in Hungarian. Ph.D. thesis. Universiteit Leiden. LOT No. 45.

López, Luis (2001): On the (Non)complementarity of Theta Theory and Checking Theory. Linguistic Inquiry 32: 694–716.

Maleczki, Márta (ed.)(2002): A mai magyar nyelv leírásának legújabb módszerei /Modern Methods of Describing Today's Hungarian Language/. Vol. V. Szegedi Tudományegyetem. Általános Nyelvészeti Tanszék és Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék.

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.

Pafel, Jürgen (1997): Skopus und logische Struktur. Studien zum Quantorenskopus im Deutschen. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Tübingen.

Pafel, Jürgen (1999): Interrogative Quantifiers within Scope. LaP 22: 255-310.

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.

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.

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.

Surányi, Balázs (2002): Funkcionális projekciók a magyarban és kvantormozgatás /Functional Projections in Hungarian and Quantifier Raising/. In: Maleczki (2002): 97-108.

Surányi, Balázs (2003a): Multiple Operator Movement in Hungarian. Ph. D. thesis. Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht. LOT No. 72.

Surányi, Balázs (2003b): Quantifier Interaction and Differential Scope Taking. Studies in Modern Grammar /SMG/ 34: 31-70.

Surányi, Balázs (2005): Triggering Wh-movement. Ms. H. A. S. Res. Inst. for Ling., Budapest

Svenonius, Peter (1994): C-selection as Feature-Checking. Studia Linguistica XLVIII: 133-155.