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Abstract. In certain types of infinitival complementation constructions in three quite dissimilar languages (German, Japanese and Itelmen) expected interpretations curiously, but systematically, fail to arise. The missing interpretations are precisely those that would be expected if Agree—the establishment of licensing relations without movement—were possible; this is shown by comparison to minimally different constructions that establish both the existence of the Agree operation and the independent possibility of the interpretations in question. The account we are led to suggests that locality domains are not absolute but are relativized in two ways: firstly, Agree and A-movement respect different (if overlapping) locality conditions, and secondly, whether or not a given projection constitutes a domain boundary depends partly on its syntactic context. At the
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core of the paper is the proposed generalization that A-movement is forced, and cannot reconstruct, exactly when a DP originates in a lower agreement domain than its licensor.

1. Introduction

Certain predicates interact with quantified objects in a manner that can be succinctly captured by treating the predicates as scope-bearing elements. This is true of modals, and also of verbs containing an inherent negation such as forget. The examples in (1) allow an interpretation corresponding to the scope of forget (as negation) over the universal quantifier in the embedded clause, that is, these sentences can be truthfully uttered in the context in (1c).¹

(1)  a. John forgot to close all the windows.
    b. weil er alle Fenster zu schließen vergessen hat

since he all windows (ACC) to close forgotten has

since he forgot to close all the windows

¹ All examples are collected and/or verified by us unless otherwise noted. German examples will often be given as embedded clauses, to control for root effects such as V2. Note that we will use the term “matrix” predicate to refer to selecting (embedding) predicates (such as forget in (2)) and not to refer exclusively to root-clause predicates. The Itelmen transcription is broad as our interests here are syntactic. In glosses, CPL = copula, POT = potential, CL = clitic, PRT = participle, 1>3 designates portmanteau agreement (here 1st person subject on 3rd object). For Tsez, Roman numerals indicate (agreement in) noun class, and we have omitted some information from the segmentation and glosses that is not directly relevant (see the source cited for more detailed glosses). Letter-number combinations such as (S6:6-7) indicate the source of the Itelmen example (by notebook and page number). All other abbreviations should be transparent.
It was about to rain, and John decided to close all the windows in the apartment. He closed the windows in the kitchen and the living room but forgot the window in the bedroom, which thus remained open.

In particular syntactic contexts, this reading becomes unavailable, and the only possible reading corresponds to the embedded object taking scope over the matrix predicate. Examples are given from German in (2a), Itelmen (Chukotko-Kamchatkan) in (2b), and Japanese in (2c).

(2) a. weil er alle Fenster vergessen hat [ tOBJ zu schließen]
   
   since he all windows (ACC) forgotten has tOBJ to close
   
   since he forgot to close all the windows

   ∀ » forget; * forget » ∀

b. t'-əntxa-čeʔn [ miɬ oknoʔn sop-es ].

   1SG-forget-3PL.OBJ all window-PL close-INF

   I forgot to close all the windows. (S6:6-7)

   ∀ » forget; * forget » ∀


   John-TOP all-GEN apple-ACC eat-forget-PAST

   John forgot to eat all the apples.

   ∀ » forget; * forget » ∀

In the German example in (2a), which differs from (1b) in displaying remnant extraposition, and in the Itelmen example in (2b), the only interpretation available is that none of the windows are closed; the sentences are incompatible with the situation in (1c), and are judged false in that context (on German examples of this sort, see among others Bayer & Kornfilt 1990, 1994). Similarly, the Japanese example in (2c) is infelicitous if John ate any apples—the required interpreta-
tion is that all of the apples remained uneaten.

A similar effect arises with objects and objects involving only or an NPI. As shown in the German (3a) and the Japanese (3b) (the latter is from Koizumi 1995: 62, see also Sano 1985 and references below), the focus particles nur/dake ‘only’ have to be interpreted outside the scope of the matrix predicates. That is, (3a) receives the interpretation that the only attempts were attempts to repair German cars and it cannot refer to a situation in which an attempt was made to repair German cars only. Similarly, (3b) is only felicitous in a context where, among the things that John was supposed to eat, it is only apples that he did not eat. The scope of only under forget would be consistent with a scenario in which John ate some apples but forgot that he was to eat just apples and ate something else as well. The sentence in (3a) is infelicitous in such a context. Finally, (3c) shows that NPIs such as auch nur einer ‘a single’ are not licensed in these contexts, indicating that they are not in the scope of the potential licenser forget.

(3)  
a. weil nur deutsche Autos zu reparieren versucht wurden

\[ \text{since only German cars (NOM) to repair tried were} \]

since they only tried to repair German cars

*since they tried to only repair German cars

\[ \text{only » try; *try » only} \]


\[ \text{John-TOP apple-only-ACC eat-forget-PAST} \]

John only forgot to eat apples.

\[ \text{only » forget; *forget » only} \]
c. *weil er auch nur ein Fenster vergessen hat [tOBJ zu schließen]

since he even only a window forgotten has tOBJ to close

since he forgot to close a single window

We will refer to the scope effects in (2) and (3) as *anti-reconstruction effects* for reasons that should become transparent presently. One of the main aims of this paper is to provide a unified account of the distribution of the various readings across a variety of constructions. The crux of our account lies in the observation that anti-reconstruction effects arise in a subset of restructuring (i.e., clause union) configurations, specifically, those involving lexical (as opposed to functional) restructuring predicates (following Wurmbrand 2001b, 2004a). Remnant extrapolation, for example—the process distinguishing (2a) from (1b)—is a restructuring diagnostic for German, and we will argue that the other examples also display the hallmarks of restructuring. For Itelmen, restructuring is indicated by long distance agreement [henceforth LDA], where the matrix predicate agrees with an argument of the embedded, non-finite clause.

Restructuring is central in the following way: first, we assume that restructuring infinitives are VP complements (or perhaps slightly larger), crucially lacking the functional projections responsible for Case-checking (TP, vP); second, we assume that the Agree relation (in essence, the relationship of Case/agreement licensing under government) respects a domain-based locality condition (which we might call the *Domain Impenetrability Condition*), whereby Case/agreement-checking may occur without DP-movement but only within a single *agreement domain*; and third, that *agreement domains* are defined in part thematically, such that a VP complement of a lexical (thematic) verb constitutes an independent domain. It will follow from these assumptions (articulated below) that a DP in a restructuring VP-complement cannot satisfy its
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Case/agreement-checking requirement in situ and must therefore raise into the higher domain; on the assumption that checking requirements must be visible at LF, reconstruction will be impossible across an agreement domain boundary, though nothing will block reconstruction within a single domain.

These assumptions, in particular the assumption that checking relations must be LF-visible, yield the agreement-scope correlation in (4), which will correctly constrain reconstruction in restructuring infinitives.

(4) A DP may not be interpreted (for scope and binding) in a position lower than in the domain in which it undergoes Case/agreement-checking.

In the remainder of the paper, we will show that the agreement-scope correlation accurately characterizes the distribution of anti-reconstruction effects, restricting these effects to the correct environments but allowing reconstruction otherwise. In addition, we will compare the LDA effects considered here to those discussed elsewhere in the recent literature (in particular, LDA in Tsez and Passamaquoddy), showing how our approach not only allows for a unified approach to the observed similarities but is also flexible enough to admit of the attested differences.

The paper is organized as follows. We first outline and defend our assumptions about clause structure, restructuring, and the licensing (feature checking) of DP arguments. We then present the core pieces of an empirical argument, based on facts from German topicalization, that supports the recognition of the mechanism Agree as one possibility for satisfying Case/agreement licensing. Section 3.2 develops the core analysis for German and Japanese. We argue for the notion of an agreement domain, a locality condition that is relativized in two ways: first, agreement domains constrain only the Agree relation but are not barriers for movement, and
second, domainhood is at least in part determined contextually. A key assumption is that Agree relations are evaluated at LF. From this, it follows that although an Agree relationship is in principle sufficient for licensing a DP without movement, when the distance between agreeing elements spans more than one agreement domain, A-movement is forced. The assumption that the Agree (or feature-checking) relation must obtain at LF hence puts a lower bound on reconstruction (i.e., a maximal distance on lowering), and thus provides an account for the effects noted at the outset of this paper. In sections 4 and 5, we extend the account to morphological object agreement in Itelmen, where the same anti-reconstruction effects arise and then compare Itelmen LDA with other cases of LDA discussed in the literature. Finally, section 6 closes with a discussion of some loose ends and directions for future research.

2. Long distance Case/agreement dependencies

The first point we wish to establish is that (argument) DPs must be licensed by a VP-external functional head, that is, that DPs must satisfy a formal requirement along the lines of what is standardly called “abstract” or “structural” Case-checking. Such licensing will play a central role in the explanation of the anti-reconstruction effects. The argument comes from the case and agreement properties of restructuring infinitives (RIs) in German (and Japanese), i.e., those infinitival complements that display certain “clause union” effects with the selecting (matrix) verb

---

2 We keep to the familiar terminology, although we acknowledge that the implicit connection to (morphological) case is problematic for reasons discussed in Marantz (1991) and elsewhere. However, since we will argue that German lacks the EPP property but DPs in certain contexts nevertheless require formal licensing, reference to notions
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(see Aissen & Perlmutter 1983, Rizzi 1978, Sabel 1996, Wurmbrand 2001b and references therein). The considerations necessary to understand the Case-theoretic properties of these constructions also provide support for our assumption that RIs are VP complements, lacking their own Case-assigning functional projections. The argument and data are laid out in more detail in Wurmbrand (2001b: Chapter 2), to which we refer the reader for additional discussion and for comparison to other approaches.

A special property of RIs is that the Case of the embedded object depends on properties of the selecting matrix predicate. In German, for example, the Case of the embedded object depends on the voice properties of the matrix predicate. When the matrix predicate is active (and not un-accusative), the embedded object obligatorily occurs with accusative case. This is shown in (5) with typical (lexical) verbs that can select RIs, versuchen ‘try’ and vergessen ‘forget’.

(5)  a. weil er den/*der Traktor versucht hat [tOBJ zu reparieren]

\[since \text{ he the.ACC/*the.NOM tractor tried has to repair}\]

since he tried to repair the tractor

b. weil er jeden/*jeder Brief vergessen hat [tOBJ zu öffnen]

\[since \text{ he every.ACC/*every.NOM letter forgotten has to open}\]

since he forgot to open every letter

If a matrix restructuring predicate is passivized or unaccusative and combines with an RI (see sections 3.2, 3.3.2 for superficially similar examples which are not RIs), accusative on the embedded object becomes unavailable; the embedded object bears nominative case and correspond-
ingly controls agreement on the matrix auxiliary. The examples in (6) illustrate this in the “long passive” construction. In this construction, only the matrix predicate is passivized, the RI bears no passive morphology, yet the underlying embedded object is marked for nominative ((6a)) and governs agreement on the matrix passive auxiliary ((6b)).

(6) a. weil der Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde

\[ \textit{since the.NOM tractor to repair tried was.SG} \]

since they tried to repair the tractor

---

3 It has been occasionally suggested that the long passive construction is “marked”, and that thus no conclusions can be drawn from its properties. However, data collected from a corpus search show that long passive is a frequently occurring construction and is felt by many speakers to be natural in context (see the second author’s web site \( \text{http://wurmbrand.uconn.edu/} \) for the results of the corpus search). More to the point, the properties of the construction (including the scope contrasts discussed below) are relatively uniform across speakers: of approximately 25 speakers consulted, even those speakers who claim to find the construction itself marked nevertheless found the scope judgments to contrast as indicated, in some cases remarkably sharply. The fact that judgments are uniform on a “marked” construction constitutes in our view a strong \textit{prima facie} argument that the scope properties must follow from properties of grammar and not from extra-linguistic considerations (we are not aware of any alternative explanation on offer).

4 For non-pronominal DPs, accusative case is morphologically distinct from nominative only in the masculine singular. Since singular agreement is the default in impersonal constructions (including impersonal passives), only plural marking is unambiguously agreement. Case and agreement can be shown simultaneously by using coordinated DPs (see Wurmbrand 2001b: 19). However, since this adds unnecessary complexity to the examples and agreement in German is only ever with nominative DPs, we do not use examples with coordinated subjects here. For the purpose of this paper it is sufficient to note that even where case is not marked overtly, agreement with a DP is an unambiguous indicator that the DP bears nominative case.
The examples in (7) (see Haider 1993) make the same point with the unaccusative restructuring predicate *gelingen* ‘manage’ (which takes a dative experiencer argument).

(7) a. ?weil mir der Brief auf Anhieb zu entziffern gelungen ist
   *since me.DAT the.NOM letter straightaway to decipher managed is*
   since I managed to decipher the letter straightaway

b. ?weil mir die Briefe auf Anhieb zu entziffern gelungen sind
   *since me.DAT the letters straightaway to decipher managed are*
   since I managed to decipher the letters straightaway

As argued in Wurmbrand (2001b), the fact that the Case of the embedded object is dependent upon the Case-assigning properties of the matrix functional domain strongly suggests that it is that higher functional domain (specifically, the *voice* head, v) that is responsible for Case. Restructuring infinitives must therefore lack vP, the functional projection associated with accusative case, and the embedded DP must be associated with a matrix functional head in order to satisfy Case-checking requirements—v” in active clauses, T” in passives and unaccusatives. On the basis of this and a series of converging arguments (lack of PRO, lack of independent tense specifications, and others) the conclusion drawn in Wurmbrand (2001b) is that RIs are in fact bare VP complements, lacking CP, TP, vP. We adopt this conclusion here, hence our analysis of the case
dependencies is given in (8). If the matrix predicate is an accusative assigner (has a \( v \)), then the embedded object receives accusative form from the matrix \( v \) ((8a)); if the matrix predicate lacks an accusative assigner (i.e., when it is unaccusative or passive), the embedded object raises to the matrix \( T \) and receives nominative ((8b)).

(8) a. Active RI: (5) (w/o extraposition)  
   b. Passive RI: (6b)

Case effects controlled by the matrix predicate in restructuring environments also arise in Japanese, most clearly with stative predicates, which may license nominative case on their objects. Stative restructuring predicates license nominative on the object of their complement, even if the

---

5 The label VP is not to be taken too literally. RIs may be somewhat larger (e.g., they may contain some infinitival or aspectual projection, as we intend to convey with the label InfP in (8), borrowed from Kayne 1991). For simplicity, we represent the infinitival marker in German as a verbal prefix in the diagrams (as suggested, for instance, in Haider 1993, den Dikken 2003 among many others). However, nothing hinges on this; what is important for us is that they are smaller than \( vP \) and do not contain any Case or tense related projections.
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embedded verb is not stative (see, for example, Koizumi 1995, Yatsushiro 1999). Example (9a) shows that the predicate *tabe- ‘eat’ cannot assign nominative to its object (as it is not stative), hence the only source for nominative case on the object in (9b) is the higher, stative, predicate – rare-, typically referred to as the “potential”, glossed here as ‘can’.

(9)  a. Emi-ga ringo-o / *ringo-ga tabe-ta.

\[
\text{Emi-NOM \ apple-ACC/*apple-NOM \ eat-PAST}
\]

Emi ate apples.

b. Emi-ga ringo-ga tabe-rare-ta.

\[
\text{Emi-NOM \ apple-NOM \ eat-can-PAST}
\]

Emi was able to eat apples.

Following Wurmbrand (2001b), we may assimilate these to essentially the same configurations as in (8), abstracting away from the question of whether nominative for stative objects is assigned by T or v in these constructions; see Tada (1992, 1993) vs. Koizumi (1995) for different views.

Once it is recognized that the case dependencies in RIs involve a higher functional head and a DP originating in the lower VP, the question arises as to whether this relationship is established/checked via movement or via some version of (head)-government such as the relation Agree in Chomsky (2000).\(^6\) In (8), we have sketched the dependency between the functional

\(^6\) We do not distinguish between Agree and feature movement (Move-F) in this work. What we call Move involves movement, possibly covert, of a collection of features, such as those involved in scope and binding relations along with those involved in Case and agreement. By government, Agree (or Move-F), we mean the establishment of a
head dominating the matrix verb and the associated DP as a movement dependency, reminiscent of analyses which held Case-checking to invariably involve movement to the specifier of a functional projection (such as Chomsky 1991). Below, we will provide an argument from constituency diagnostics that this is correct, and we will offer a theoretical motivation for this movement. However, we will argue that this should be a surprising conclusion, since we will also summarize arguments from Wurmbrand (2004b) showing that in German, there is no general requirement that Case-checking be established by movement; in particular, in mono-clausal environments, Case-checking may be established without movement, under Agree. We will thus conclude that Agree and Move are distinct operations, and that UG permits both; agreement is not (uniquely) a reflex of A-movement (contra Bobaljik 2002) nor is it dependent on a prior Agree operation, as characterized in Chomsky (2000).

3. Agreement, movement, and domains

3.1 Agree: Feature-checking without movement

Evidence for Agree (without movement) as a sufficient relation for Case/agreement-checking in German is presented in Wurmbrand (2000, 2001a, 2004b). There, it is shown that Case and agreement licensing with T* occurs in contexts where overt movement to Spec,TP does not occur and covert movement of the nominative, agreeing DP is blocked for independent reasons. For licensing relation between a head H and a DP, where H e- (or m-) commands the DP and relevant locality conditions are respected but where DP does not occupy a specifier of H, overtly or covertly, and the independently detectable features of the DP (such as those involved in scope and binding) likewise remain low.
fuller presentation of the details, we refer to Wurmbrand (2004b), however one part of the argument bears repeating here as it establishes a constituency diagnostic that we will make use of later.

The shape of the argument for Agree is illustrated in (10) (concrete examples will be provided presently). There are configurations in which a DP can be shown to overtly occupy a low VP projection (indicated solely for expository convenience as $VP^*$ in (10a)), and in which it can be shown that covert movement out of that VP is independently excluded (10b). In such configurations, the DP nevertheless bears nominative case and triggers agreement on the finite verb. Assuming that these properties indicate feature-checking with $T^\circ$, that checking must occur in the Agree configuration (10c) (see Haider, to appear, Meurers 1999, 2000 for similar argumentation but different theoretical conclusions).

(10) a. PF 
   b. LF 
   c. Agree 

Examples instantiating the scenario in (10) are given in (11). The examples in (11) are unaccusatives taking a dative indirect object in addition to the nominative theme. These are the baseline examples for our argument. In these examples, the underlying hierarchical order among arguments is as in (10), where the dative c-commands the nominative (see Frey 1989, 1993, Haider &
Rosengren 2003, Wurmbrand 2004b for evidence for this hierarchical order. As (11) illustrates, these unaccusative constructions allow scope ambiguity between the two arguments, indicating that covert movement of the nominative is in principle possible.\(^7\)

(11) a. weil mindestens einem Kritiker jeder Film gefallen sollte

\[ \text{since at least one critic should like every movie} \exists \forall / \forall \exists \]

b. weil mindestens einem Kind jede Übung gelungen ist

\[ \text{since at least one child managed to do every exercise} \exists \forall / \forall \exists \]

Now, the scope ambiguity in (11) disappears in VP-fronting contexts in which the nominative is contained in the fronted/topicalized VP but the dative remains behind.\(^8\) Specifically, while (11a) is compatible with a context in which no single critic likes all the films (it is sufficient only that each film should be liked by some critic or other), (12a) is infelicitous in this context.

(12) a. ?[Jeder Film gefallen ]\text{VP} sollte mindestens einem Kritiker.

\[ \text{At least one critic should like every movie.} \exists \forall ; * \forall \exists \]

\(^7\) A well-known fact about German scope is that the inverted scope interpretation requires a special rise-fall intonation (cf. Frey 1989, 1993, Krifka 1998, Lechner 1998). While it is important for German speakers to keep this fact in mind in evaluating the examples, we have no reason to believe that this has any bearing on the argument for Agree.

\(^8\) For some speakers, topicalization of a constituent including a strong nominative QP is marked. The judgments in this section are from speakers who allow this construction. See Wurmbrand (2004b) for further discussion.
b. [Jede Übung gelungen]VP ist mindestens einem Kind.

Every exercise managed at least one child.

At least one child (has) managed to do every exercise.

The loss of inverse scope in (12) illustrates an unsurprising effect of fronting a VP projection (VP* in (10a)) on the scope possibilities for the quantifiers, namely, scope-freezing (see Barss 1986, Lechner 1996, 1998, Sauerland 1998, Sauerland & Elbourne 2002). Familiar examples illustrating scope-freezing in English are given in (13), where (13b) lacks the reading where each bank is guarded by a different policeman, asserting instead that the same policeman stood in front of all the banks.

(13) a. ...and a policeman stood in front of every bank that day

b. ...and [stand in front of every bank] a policeman did that day

One characterization of these effects is that the fronted VP may (or must) itself reconstruct but in its reconstructed position, it is an island both for covert movement out of it and reconstruction into it. We have nothing new to offer in the way of an explanation of this effect; however, an important consequence of the effect is that covert movement out of the fronted VPs in (12) is expected to be impossible. Importantly, however, nominative Case on the DPs in the fronted VPs in (12) is obligatory and the nominative DPs also obligatorily agree with the finite verb. If covert movement is not possible, then Case/agreement-checking must occur in these constructions via

9 For the argument to be provided here it is crucial that scope freezing is seen as a restriction on movement (see Bruening 2001a for an alternative account); furthermore, we assume that reconstruction is a syntactic phenomenon (see Lechner 1996, 1998 for an alternative view).
Agree (as in (10c)); the nominative argument can stay in situ throughout the derivation while still Agreeing with the probe T. This conclusion thus goes beyond the claim that nominative can be assigned to arguments in VP-internal position in German (a claim which has been made by several researchers; see, for instance, den Besten 1985a, b, Haider 1993, to appear, among many others) but that in certain constructions, nominative must be assigned to arguments that remain inside the VP at both PF and LF. A corollary of this analysis of the scope freezing effects is that the EPP (as a requirement that Spec,TP be obligatorily filled) does not hold in German.

There is one final point to note about the examples in (12), which we mention here as it will become relevant again in section 3.3.3. Since German is a V2 language, in which the finite verb always occupies C* in matrix clauses, the argument just sketched relies on excluding the possibility that (12) involves scrambling of the Dative DP to an extremely high position (say, TP adjoined), followed by fronting of a remnant TP. This hypothetical derivation would leave open the possibility that nominative case is checked under movement to Spec,TP, where such movement takes place internal to the fronted projection. Arguments against this hypothetical derivation are provided in Haider (1990, 1993, to appear), Wurmbrand (2001a, 2004b,c), and Abels (2003). Despite various theoretical differences in these approaches, they all converge on the claim that a TP-fronting derivation as sketched above would not be compatible with basic principles of German or grammar in general. For reasons of space, we cannot reproduce any of the arguments presented in the above works but simply note that there is independent evidence against fronting of a TP-projection.  

---

10 Haider and Wurmbrand (2004c) argue that the ban on TP-fronting is part of a more general constraint against the
In this section, we have reviewed an argument for the existence of Agree as an abstract feature licensing mechanism. The argument was based on German topicalization constructions in which the subject (i.e., a nominative XP agreeing with the finite verb) is in a position lower than its Case/agreement licensor (i.e., T˚) at PF, and importantly, is trapped in this position at LF. Since in these contexts, movement to the specifier position of the licensing head cannot occur (neither overtly nor covertly), the acceptability of these constructions leads to the conclusion that Case and agreement licensing does not require a specifier-head configuration in German, which is compatible with the Agree approach to feature licensing but incompatible with the Move approach under which all feature-checking takes place in specifier-head configurations. We therefore conclude that Agree in situ without Move is possible in German and that German lacks the EPP property. In light of this conclusion, however, the anti-reconstruction effects in restructuring configurations (such as (2) and (3) above) become surprising. We turn to these in the next section.

3.2 Eppur si muove

We have just argued that Case and agreement in German may be licensed without movement—a government-like relation between the appropriate functional head and the DP is sufficient. This is illustrated in (14a), corresponding to the constructions discussed in the previous section. In fronting of constituents headed by a trace, whereas Abels argues that the source of the ban is a restriction blocking movement or deletion of the complement of a phase head (C, v). Either approach will work here; a direct comparison is undertaken in Wurmbrand 2004c, to which we refer the reader.
these constructions, the nominative DP occupies a VP-internal position at both PF and LF, despite entering into a checking relationship with T°. This contrasts with the analysis of nominative Case-checking in restructuring configurations, such as long passive, for which we posited movement as diagrammed in (14b).

(14) a. Simple predicate, VP* reconstructed  
        b. Restructuring infinitive (passive)

In this section, we will provide further evidence for the claim that (14b) indeed involves movement and suggest an account that derives the distributional difference between Agree and Move.

3.2.1 Evidence for movement in restructuring infinitives

So far, the key evidence that movement must occur in the restructuring cases (such as in (14b)) is that the scope properties of the nominative DPs are different from the scope properties of nominative DPs in simple predicates. In the VP-fronting constructions, the nominative DP was restricted to low scope, i.e., within its base VP (and hence below the dative DP). The example in (15a), on the other hand, shows that in the long passive construction, this option is not available: the nominative DP obligatorily takes scope wider than the matrix predicate; (15b)—repeated
from the introduction—shows that the same holds for an accusative DP in an active restructuring configuration (diagnosed by remnant extraposition).

(15) a. weil alle Fenster zu schließen vergessen waren

\[ \text{since all windows (NOM) to close forgotten were} \]

since they forgot to close all the windows \( \forall \) » forget; *forget » \( \forall \)

literally: since all windows were forgotten to close

b. weil er alle Fenster vergessen hat \( t_{OBJ} \) zu schließen]

\[ \text{since he all windows (ACC) forgotten has } t_{OBJ} \text{ to close} \]

since he forgot to close all the windows \( \forall \) » forget; *forget » \( \forall \)

In addition to the scope facts, constituency tests strongly suggest that the underlying object (the nominative DP in (15a)) must occupy Spec,TP in the restructuring case and cannot remain inside the VP.\(^{11}\) This is shown in (16). As illustrated in (16a,b), the nominative DP cannot be part of the fronted constituent in long passive configurations; however, fronting of the infinitive alone or together with the matrix verb is possible when the nominative DP is not part of the fronted con-

\(^{11}\) The constituency facts provide one of two (sets of) arguments against a complex predicate approach to the anti-reconstruction effect which might treat the restructuring configurations as compound verbs, lacking any syntactic VP complementation structure (as has been proposed for Japanese, see Saito and Hoshi 1998, Saito 2000). Such accounts might seek to relate the scope facts in the restructuring constructions with those of forget when combining with a simple DP object. A sentence like John forgot all his books is not ambiguous in the way John forgot to bring all his books is. Only the infinitival complementation structure is compatible with a scenario in which John brought some, but not all, of his books. In Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (to appear) we provide several arguments against a complex predicate analysis of the anti-reconstruction effects in German and Japanese.
stituent (cf. (16c,d)).

(16)  

a. *[Ein blauer Wagen zu reparieren]_{TP} wurde erst gestern vergessen.
   
   a.NOM blue car to repair was just yesterday forgotten
   
   It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair a blue car.

b. *[Ein blauer Wagen zu reparieren vergessen]_{TP} wurde erst gestern.
   
   a.NOM blue car to repair forgotten was just yesterday
   
   It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair a blue car.

c. [Zu reparieren vergessen]_{VP} wurde erst gestern ein blauer Wagen.
   
   to repair forgotten was just yesterday a.NOM blue car
   
   It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair a blue car.

d. [Zu reparieren]_{VP} wurde erst gestern ein blauer Wagen vergessen.
   
   to repair was just yesterday a.NOM blue car forgotten
   
   It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair a blue car.

Given that fronting of TPs is excluded (see the previous section), the distribution in (16) receives a straightforward account if we assume that the nominative DP must be in Spec,TP in these examples. If the only position for the underlying object is Spec,TP (we will derive this in section 3.3.3), it follows that fronting of a constituent including the nominative DP is impossible since it would have to be TP. Stranding of the nominative DP is possible, on the other hand, since a lower projection (either the matrix vP in (16c) or the embedded VP in (16d)) can be fronted, without violating the restriction against TP-fronting.

The scope and constituency facts in the long passive are particularly striking when compared to a minimally different construction involving the same lexical items but where the verb
vergessen ‘forget’ selects a non-restructuring infinitive (NRI) complement. We will return to a more detailed discussion of the RI/NRI distinction in section 3.3.2 below. At this point, however, it suffices to note that in such constructions, the infinitive is larger than VP—in particular, it contains an accusative Case-checking head. As German allows impersonal passive, the matrix verb may be passivized, but in distinction to the long passive construction, there is no effect on case of the embedded object in the impersonal passive of a non-restructuring verb, and concomitantly, no effect on scope. Thus, in contrast to the RI in (15a), the NRI in (17a) allows low scope, since the infinitive constitutes a separate Case/agreement domain and therefore no relation (neither Agree nor Move) is established between a functional head in the matrix predicate and the embedded object. Furthermore, as shown in (17b,c), fronting of a constituent including the underlying object is possible when the infinitive is an NRI—i.e., when the embedded object occurs with accusative. Since the object does not depend on the matrix T for Case in these cases, no movement to the matrix clause occurs, and hence fronting of a constituent containing the embedded object does not have to involve TP but can be vP or VP. The grammaticality of these examples also shows that there is nothing inherently wrong with fronting these sequences.

(17) a. weil [alle Fenster zu schließen ]NRI vergessen wurde

since all windows (ACC) to close forgotten was

since they forgot to close all windows

literally: since it was forgotten to close all windows

b. [Einen blauen Wagen zu reparieren ]vP/VP wurde erst gestern vergessen.

a.ACC blue car to repair was just yesterday forgotten

It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair a blue car.
c. [Einen blauen Wagen zu reparieren vergessen]VP wurde erst gestern.

\begin{align*}
\text{a. acc blue car to repair forgotten was just yesterday} \\
\end{align*}

It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair a blue car.

The difference between (16a,b) and the minimally different (17b,c) strongly suggests a difference in constituency of the fronted XPs in these examples: TP in the former, vP/VP in the latter.

Our claim that the restructuring versions require movement to the matrix domain (in particular, to Spec,TP if the matrix verb is passive), explains why the fronted constituent has to be TP in (16a,b). If this was not the case, the difference between (16) and (17) would remain mysterious and one would need an explanation for why the fronted constituent can be the vP/VP in the relevant examples in (17) but not in (16).

In the next section, we will provide an account for the claim that Case/agreement licensing in RIs requires Move and cannot be established via Agree.

3.2.2 Agreement domains

Before we lay out our account, let us recapitulate the major empirical generalization to be accounted for: an embedded object cannot take scope in the embedded predicate when that object enters into a Case/agreement relation with a functional head in a higher predicate. That is, we claim that anti-reconstruction effects are tied to “long distance” case/agreement licensing. This is exactly what has been reported for Japanese as well (see Sano 1985, Tada 1993, Koizumi 1995, Saito & Hoshi 1998, Yatsushiro 1999, and Takano 2003). This is shown in (18a) versus (18b) (based on a widely-discussed example originally due to Sano 1985). The potential –(ra)re, glossed here as ‘can’, is a member of the class of stative predicates, which assign nominative
case to their object. In the restructuring configuration, (18a), the potential assigns nominative to the object, which in turn is forced to scope over the matrix predicate.\(^{12}\) That is, the interpretation of (18a) is that it is only his right eye that John can close (he cannot close his left eye). The sentence cannot describe a situation in which John can close both eyes but also has the ability to wink with his right eye, that is, to close his right eye alone, while leaving his left eye open. This reading is however allowed for (18b), which admits a parse as an NRI in which the accusative case on the object is licensed in the lower clause.

\[(18)\]  
\begin{align*} 
\text{a. } & \text{John-ga migime-dake-ga tumu-re-ru.} \\
& \text{John-NOM right.eye-only-NOM close-can-PRES} \\
& \text{John can only close his right eye.} \quad \text{only » can; *can » only} \\
\text{b. } & \text{John-ga migime-dake-o tumu-re-ru.} \\
& \text{John-NOM right.eye-only-ACC close-can-PRES} \\
& \text{John can close only his right eye.} \quad \text{OK can » only} 
\end{align*}

The following examples from Takano (2003) make the same point with an existential quantifier.\(^{13}\)

\(^{12}\) We present the judgments from the majority of the literature, though we note a dissenting opinion in Nomura (2003a, b) who presents examples structurally similar to (18a) but in which the narrow scope reading of the nominative DP is available for some speakers. We will return briefly to this issue in section 3.3, see fnns. 18 and 20 below.

\(^{13}\) Takano proposes an analysis of these constructions whereby the nominative object is base-generated in the matrix VP and co-indexed with a pro in the embedded clause (see also sections 4 and 5, below). Takano’s principal criticism of the case-/movement-based approaches that we largely follow is precisely the fact that they offer no account of why A-reconstruction should be unavailable in these constructions, even though reconstruction with A-movement
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    John-TOP something-NOM long.way throw-can-PRES

John can throw something a long way.
∃ can; *can » ∃

    John-TOP something-ACC long.way throw-can-PRES

John can throw something a long way.
OK can » ∃

The scope facts in (18) and (19) thus show that Japanese patterns with German: the base position is not a possible LF position for underlying objects in restructuring infinitives—i.e., in cases where the object checks Case in the higher predicate.

At this point, the question to ask is what accounts for this generalization. More specifically, what is the difference between restructuring configurations and simple predicates, such that Agree is sufficient to license nominative Case and agreement in the latter but not in the former?

Side-by-side comparison of the environment which allows Agree in situ without movement in German ((14a), repeated as (20a)) with the passive restructuring case ((14b), repeated as (20b)) leaves little room for maneuver.

is generally possible. Since our proposal addresses this very point, this criticism does not extend to our approach. We are indebted to Kazuko Yatsushiro for pointing out that our analysis of the German anti-reconstruction effects extends to the Japanese cases (left as an open question in Wurmbrand 2001b: 53) in the manner developed in the text above.
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(20) a. Simple predicate, VP* reconstructed       b. Restructuring infinitive (passive)

Since German lacks the EPP and admits of Case-checking under Agree in principle, it must be that Agree fails in the restructuring cases. A plausible candidate for explaining the failure of Agree would be a locality condition, and this is the direction we pursue. One difference between (20a) and (20b) is that the latter, where Agree fails, involves a VP complement to a lexical verb, whereas the former involves only a single lexical predicate. We therefore tentatively offer the induced domain generalization in (21).

(21) The (verbal) complement to a lexical verb delineates an agreement domain.\(^\text{14}\)

Our use of the term agreement domain is intended in part to capture the claim that this locality

\(^{14}\) The qualification “verbal” is included here simply to remain agnostic as to whether a DP complement to a verb constitutes a domain boundary. We return to truncated clausal complements in section 5. This formulation in terms of domains, rather than phases, supplants our earlier formulations in terms of phases (as in Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2003) and follows more closely the proposal in terms of thematic domains in Wurmbrand (2000, 2001a) (see the text below (22)). We thank an anonymous reviewer for comments leading us to revisit the merits of the proposal in Wurmbrand (2000, 2001a) over a phase-based implementation.
condition constrains only the Agree relation and not the movement relation. This distinguishes our proposal from the phase-based model suggested in Chomsky (2000) and related proposals in which locality domains are held to be constant for all syntactic operations (such as Uriagereka 1999, cf. Grohmann 2003 which countenances differing locality domains but does not, as formulated, admit of differences between Agree and movement for the same type of feature-checking). In addition, we must reject that part of phase theory whereby the Move relation is parasitic on the prior establishment of an Agree relation (Chomsky 2000). The proper characterization of the examples presented here, we have argued, is that Move happens precisely when an Agree relation fails to be established due to locality but where the DP has features to check.\footnote{The idea that A-movement for Case checking is required when Agree in situ is blocked by locality considerations is pursued by Lidz & Williams (2002, to appear) for resultative and other constructions in Kannada. This convergence looks promising, and we clearly expect anti-reconstruction effects to arise in the relevant configurations in Kannada, all else being equal.} We pick up this thread again in section 3.3.3 below.

The structure we assign to the restructuring examples can now be given as in (22), with relevant agreement domain boundaries indicated. The structure in (22a) represents the active RI constructions, in this particular case (15b) prior to remnant extraposition (or after reconstruction). The passive and unaccusative RIs have a structure as in (22b), which corresponds to the long passive example in (15a). Parallel structures would be given for the Japanese cases, modulo a stand being taken on which functional head is responsible for nominative Case on objects. The active RIs are reminiscent of a raising-to-object construction and the passive of raising-to-
The status of the RI VP as an agreement domain makes a DP within that domain inaccessible for Agree with a functional head outside that domain. Movement is thus forced, for Case licensing of the embedded DP. Note that we are making no new assumptions here about locality conditions on A-movement. Specifically, we do not assume that A-movement is unconstrained—thus, it cannot escape a finite clause or an adjunct island, or the like. The agreement domain boundary forces a DP to move for case, but the derivation will be good just in case that DP respects the standard locality conditions on A-movement, whatever those may be. We assume that licensing configurations must be met at LF, hence, reconstruction is impossible—the reconstructed DP would not be in the domain of its licensor at LF if it were to reconstruct.  

16 We qualify this part of the proposal in section 6. To anticipate somewhat, the locality condition is stated over (ef-
A crucial aspect of our proposal is that the status of VP as an agreement domain is determined contextually, by (21). It is not the case that a VP projection always constitutes a locality domain, even for Agree. This is seen clearly in comparing again (14a)/(20a) and (14b)/(20b). If VP always constituted a locality domain, blocking Agree, then it would be impossible to establish an Agree relation between T° and a VP-internal DP in the unaccusatives in which the nominative DP is frozen inside the VP. Instead, a VP constitutes an agreement domain only when that VP is the complement to a lexical verb. If we understand the lexical vs. functional distinction (for verbal heads) as the distinction between thematic and non-thematic verbs, our suggested formulation of (induced) agreement domains will correspond somewhat to the notion of extended projection in Grimshaw (1991). A lexical (i.e., theta-assigning) verb and the functional projections dominating that verb count as a single agreement domain. In the case of full clausal complementation, the lower clause constitutes one agreement domain, and the higher clause another. In the restructuring cases, which involve a truncated complement (i.e., just a VP), the lower VP nevertheless constitutes its own agreement domain, as the higher verb begins a new thematic domain. For additional discussion of the lexical versus functional distinction (and some intermediate cases) along with other diagnostic criteria, see Wurmbrand (2001b: Chapter 3). Confirming evidence that the lexical versus functional distinction in (21) is on the right track as the formula-
tion of agreement domains comes from a comparison of lexical with functional restructuring contexts, to which we now turn.

3.3 Further evidence for Agreement Domains

3.3.1 Lexical versus functional restructuring

The first point to note is that not all restructuring constructions display the anti-reconstruction effect. In German, modal and raising constructions (which involve obligatory restructuring) freely allow a reconstructed interpretation of embedded arguments. This is illustrated in (23) and (24). The examples in (23) involve subject raising constructions, and in both cases, the embedded subject can be interpreted either with wide or narrow scope with respect to the matrix verb (in fact, the narrow scope interpretation is the more readily available interpretation in (23b)).

(23) a. weil ein Außenseiter gewonnen zu haben scheint
   since an.NOM outsider won to have seems
   since an outsider seems to have won
   i. It seems that an outsider won.
   ii. There is a (specific) outsider and he seems to have one.

b. Ein Österreicher muß das nächste Rennen gewinnen
   an Austrian must the next race win
   (damit Österreich die Führung im Weltcup übernimmt).
   (so.that Austria the leadership in.the World Cup takes.over).
   An Austrian must win the next race (for Austria to take the lead in the World Cup).
i. It is necessary that an Austrian (any Austrian will do) win the next race.

ii. (#) There is a certain Austrian and it is necessary that he win the next race.

Similarly, in (24), the embedded object can be interpreted with narrow scope, as indicated by the paraphrases (again, depending on the context and world knowledge, the narrow scope interpretation is sometimes even preferred, as, for instance, in (24a)). These examples, thus, contrast sharply with the restructuring constructions in (2), involving the matrix verb *forget*.\(^\text{17}\)

(24) a. weil vor der Habilitation ein Buch publiziert werden muss / *müssen
   since before promotion a book published become must.3SG / *must.3PL
   since one book must be published before promotion

i. It is necessary to publish one book before promotion.

ii. (#) There is a (specific) book and it must be published before promotion.

b. weil zwei neue Mitarbeiter eingestellt werden müssen / *muss
   since two new employees hired become must.3PL / *must.3SG
   since two new employees must be hired

i. It is necessary to hire two new employees.

ii. There are two new employees and they must be hired.

It can be shown moreover that modal and raising constructions, in contrast to *forget*-type RIs, allow Case/agreement checking via Agree. The examples in (25) make the point in a manner

\(^{17}\) Standard diagnostics for thematic versus athematic positions show that (non-dynamic) modals do not assign theta-roles and hence fit our thematic classification as functional restructuring predicates (see Bhatt 1998, Wurmbrand 1999).
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analogous to the examples discussed in section 3.1. Since the nominative arguments are embedded in the fronted infinitival VPs, they are trapped there at LF (recall that fronting results in scope freezing). The low LF position is evidenced by the lack of the wide scope interpretation of the indefinites in (25) (in contrast to the examples just above; (25a) is from Meurers 1999). Just as the nominatives in (12) must check their Case features via Agree, so too must the subjects in the fronted infinitival VPs in (25).


an.NOM outsider to win seems here actually never

It never seems to be the case that an outsider wins here.

i. It never seems to be the case that an outsider wins here.

ii. *There is a (specific) outsider and he never seems to win here.

b. [Ein Außenseiter gewinnen]VP darf hier auf keinen Fall.

an.NOM outsider win may here on no case

Under no circumstances may an outsider win here.

i. It is not permitted under any circumstances for any outsider to win here.

ii. *There is a (specific) outsider and he may not win here under any circumstances.

The availability of Agree in (25), however, now raises the question of why the infinitives do not constitute agreement domains in these examples (in contrast to the RIs discussed in the previous sections). The answer is straightforward once we recognize that two kinds of restructuring predicates have to be distinguished—lexical vs. functional restructuring predicates (see Wurmbrand 2001b, 2004a, contra Cinque 2001, 2002). While verbs like try, forget are lexical verbs, modals and raising verbs are functional heads in German. As shown by Wurmbrand, this distinction is
not entirely arbitrary and correlates with a number of thematic and syntactic properties. In particular, since modals and raising constructions involve functional heads, the configurations they instantiate (given in (26)) are in relevant respects similar to the simple VP predicates embedded under other functional heads, such as auxiliaries, as in (14a)/(20a). Whatever the ultimate source of the classification (semantic or diacritic), it is the phrase structural difference between the two types of predicates that provides a basis for understanding the induced domain generalization.

We now see the reason for the restriction to lexical verbs in our formulation of the induced domain generalization in (21). Since the complements of modals and raising verbs are not agreement domains, they do not block Agree, and hence arguments embedded in the infinitives are free to stay in their base positions (or to move and then reconstruct) without violating the locality conditions on Case/agreement checking.\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\) Note that the distinction between lexical and functional restructuring predicates might be subject to cross-linguistic variation. As the reader will recall, the Japanese RI example in (18a)/(28a) involves the potential suffix -(ra)re, which corresponds to a modal in German. Nevertheless, an anti-reconstruction effect arises in Japanese for many speakers. However, Nomura (2003a, b) judges examples such as (i) as non-contradictory, which is only possible if the nominative object is interpreted as in the scope of the potential.

(i) Taro-ga vodka-dake-ga nom-e-ru no wa yuumei-da-ga,

\(\text{Tar-o-NOM vodka-only-NOM drink-POT-PRES NOMINALIZER TOP famous-CPL-but,}\)

(kare-ga) gin-dake-ga nom-e-ru no mo yoku sir-arete-iru.

\(\text{(he-NOM) gin-only-NOM drink-POT-PRES NOMINALIZER also well know-PASS-PRESS.}\)

It is famous that Taro can drink vodka straight (lit. only vodka), but he can also drink gin straight.

Nomura argues that the reported judgments in the literature represent (apparently strong) preferences but that reconstructed readings are available for nominative objects in the potential construction, contrary to what is claimed in the
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(26) a. Active modal construction

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{SUBJ-NOM} \\
\text{DO} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V°} \\
\text{AGREE}
\end{array}
\]

b. Passive under modal/raising verbs

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DO-NOM} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V°} \\
\text{AGREE}
\end{array}
\]

RIs selected by lexical verbs prohibit Agree between a functional head in the matrix predicate and an argument in the infinitive, and therefore display anti-reconstruction effects. RIs selected by functional verbs, on the other hand, permit Agree and reconstruction. This system is thus incompatible with approaches to restructuring such as the one suggested by Cinque (2001, 2002), according to which all restructuring verbs are functional heads. Rather, our account supports the distinction argued for in Wurmbrand (2001b, 2004a). The fact that modal and raising constructions (which systematically differ from restructuring predicates such as try, forget) freely allow reconstruction provides a further piece of evidence for the assumption that only complements of literature cited above. Since we cannot settle the empirical issue here, we simply point out that if anti-reconstruction effects arise, we would assume that the potential is a lexical head in Japanese (in contrast to the corresponding modal in German). If, on the other hand, the judgments are as in (i), the potential is a functional head like its analogue in German.
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lexical verbs constitute a distinct agreement domain, as in (21), as well as against a Cinquean unification of restructuring predicates.

3.3.2 Restructuring versus non-restructuring

Further evidence that it is the syntax of restructuring that is at the core of the locality restrictions on Agree and hence of the explanation of the anti-reconstruction effects, is shown by minimal pairs such as (15a) vs. (17a) and (18a) vs. (18b), repeated here as (27) and (28). In the (b) examples, low scope of the object is possible in constructions that contain the same lexical items as the anti-reconstruction examples but differ only whether or not the infinitive is a restructuring infinitive.

(27) a. weil alle Fenster zu schließen vergessen wurden

\[since\] all windows \(\text{(NOM)}\) to close forgotten were

\[since\] they forgot to close all windows \(\forall \rightarrow \text{forget}; *\text{forget} \rightarrow \forall\)

b. weil alle Fenster zu schließen vergessen wurde

\[since\] all windows \(\text{(ACC)}\) to close forgotten was

\[since\] they forgot to close all windows \(\text{OK} \rightarrow \text{forget} \rightarrow \forall\)


\text{John-NOM} \hspace{1em} \text{right.eye-only-NOM} \hspace{1em} \text{close-can-PRES}

John can only close his right eye. \(\text{only} \rightarrow \text{can}; *\text{can} \rightarrow \text{only}\)


\text{John-NOM} \hspace{1em} \text{right.eye-only-ACC} \hspace{1em} \text{close-can-PRES}

John can close only his right eye. \(\text{OK} \rightarrow \text{can} \rightarrow \text{only}\)
As noted in section 3.2.1, the difference between the (a) and (b) examples in (27) and (28) is their status as restructuring vs. non-restructuring infinitives. Lexical restructuring predicates in German are systematically compatible with both RIs and NRIs (this is yet another point of difference between lexical and functional restructuring predicates, see the previous section). Importantly, it is the selection of an RI or an NRI complement that is optional and not the independent properties that diagnose restructuring (such as long Case movement). This can be shown by implication tests. Although a given string may be ambiguous between a restructuring and a non-restructuring structure, this is a straightforward case of a structural ambiguity—a given infinitive will either be an RI or an NRI, either passing or failing all relevant restructuring diagnostics.\footnote{This statement must be qualified by noting that the restructuring versus non-restructuring distinction is not binary; there are intermediate cases corresponding to projections that are, for example, larger than VP but smaller than a full clause. Once it is understood which restructuring diagnostics pick out which level of functional structure, the implication relations among these grades of restructuring become apparent (see Wurmbrand 2001b: Chapter 5).}

The structural difference between RIs and NRIs is as follows. Whereas RIs involve truncated clauses, containing no projections higher than a VP (modulo fn. 5), an NRI is at least a \(vP\), possibly also projecting TP and CP. From the structural difference between RIs and NRIs, it follows that in restructuring configurations, the Case of the embedded object is determined by the properties of the matrix predicate (voice in German and stativity in Japanese) as detailed above. Furthermore, in contexts with passive or unaccusative matrix predicates, the embedded object agrees with the matrix verb. In non-restructuring contexts, on the other hand, the embedded object gets Case inside the infinitive and does not agree with the matrix verb. Since the embedded
object satisfies all Case/agreement licensing within the infinitive, it does not have to (and depending on the size of the NRI, it in fact cannot) move to the matrix predicate to establish a feature matching relation, and hence no anti-reconstruction effect arises. The structural differences between (27a,b) are shown in (29). (Note that in (29b), movement to Spec, vP is not required; accusative Case can also be checked via Agree.)

(29) a. RI: high scope of object  
   b. NRI: low scope of object

To conclude, anti-reconstruction effects arise in restructuring clauses, and not in non-restructuring clauses. The fact that RIs and NRIs differ minimally in their scope properties has

20 We thus predict that non-stative restructuring constructions in Japanese (i.e., constructions which do not license nominative objects) should show a scope ambiguity between the accusative object and the matrix restructuring verb, to the extent that such predicates are compatible with an NRI as well as an RI complement even though there is no morphological signal of the distinction. In the absence of morphological cues, the structures are potentially ambiguous, and accusative could come from the lower or the higher predicate. This accords with judgments reported in the literature, at least for verbs like -hazime ‘begin’, while other verbs including -oe ‘finish’, and -wassure ‘forget’ behave unambiguously as (lexical) restructuring predicates (see Koizumi 1995: 60-65). Here too, though, there may be
led us to posit that whatever forces movement of the embedded object out of RIs is some property related to Case/agreement licensing. That property, we have suggested, is (21)—the VP complement of a lexical verb (the defining characteristic of a lexical restructuring configuration) is an induced agreement domain, shielding the object from an Agree relation in its base position and forcing movement. In sections 4 and 5 we will turn to an extension of our proposals to the domain of long distance agreement. Before doing so, one additional aspect of our proposal for German can be made clear, in particular, as it provides further support for the distinction between our approach and Chomsky’s phase-based framework.

3.3.3 Further technicalities: A-movement is not-successive cyclic

The previous sections have presented and defended a proposal that explains why the object obligatorily moves away from its base position in RIs even though Case/agreement licensing in situ (via Agree) is an option permitted by UG and independently attested in German. In lexical RIs, the span between the relevant functional head and the object in its base position is not sufficiently local. Movement is therefore forced. In the analysis we have presented, the object moves directly to its checking position, namely, the specifier of the relevant functional head. At this point, we would like to return to the question of the landing site, and consider the question of possible intermediate positions. As shown in (30), there are at least four potential positions the speaker variation (Masashi Nomura, personal communication 2004). In the worst-case scenario, we would have to stipulate selectional restrictions (whether an NRI complement is possible) on a predicate-by-predicate basis in Japanese.
object could occupy: the base position ①; the specifier of the checking functional head ④; an intermediate position in the higher domain ③, or the edge of the lower VP domain ②.

(30) a. Active RI (5a) [w/o extraposition] b. Passive RI: (5b)

Now, on the conception of phases presented in Chomsky (2000), all elements with unchecked features inside a phase will accumulate in the edge of that phase (for XPs, this will be multiple specifiers of the phase head), and from this position they are accessible to probes in the next higher phase without violating the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC). As we will incorporate the idea of domain overlap at the edge into our definition of agreement domains (see section 5), it is important to examine the similarities and differences with Chomsky’s system at this point. 21

21 Chomsky (2001: 12-14) introduces a distinction between “strong” and “weak” phases. Since all conditions such as the PIC are then relativized to strong phases (and hence only strong phases constitute locality barriers), we use phase
Adopting Chomsky’s proposal that movement cycles through the edges of each locality domain would leave us with no account of the scope facts, even if we were to cast the agreement domains, including the effects of (21), as *phases*. The lower VP (the RI) in (30), is the phase that blocks Agree with the object’s base position. If the object raises in that phase to position ₂, it will be accessible to a probe in the next higher phase, and will not be forced to undergo further movement by (21). From that point on, the derivation should mimic the simple VP derivations, such as (14a)/(20a) and the object should be able to remain in position ₂ at LF (although nothing prevents subsequent movement, such as QR, nothing forces it either).²² But position ₂ is asymmetrically c-commanded by the verb *forget*, and hence we know on the basis of the scope facts that this is not the final LF-position of the object. For theoretical reasons, then, we must assume that A-movement does not proceed successive cyclically through the edge of the agreement domain. This leaves us with two questions, that we address in turn. Can independent evidence be found to support this conjecture, and why might successive cyclic movement be prohibited?

²² As Željko Bošković points out (personal communication 2003), certain mechanisms in Chomsky’s implementation of *phase* theory are designed to force elements that start to move to continue moving, for example, the suggestion that a phase head can have an EPP feature it would not otherwise have, just in case that feature is necessary to facilitate successive cyclic (A’) movement (see Chomsky 2000: 34-35). These assumptions could be incorporated in order to force an object that moves to position ₂ because of (21) to continue moving. This will not avoid the problem with successive cyclic movement as described in the text, however, since the problem is with the LF position of the object. Reconstruction to intermediate positions in A-movement is in general available (see especially Fox 1999), hence this option would still run afoul of the observed scope facts.
We have already provided an answer to the first question in section 3.2.1, where constituency tests pointed to a high position ① for the underlying object. We will return to these findings below after having established an answer to the second question. Successive cyclic movement will be blocked if we assume that A-movement is subject to a feature-checking requirement at the point in the derivation at which it occurs (cf. *Greed* and related formulations of *Last Resort* in Chomsky 1995 and elsewhere). Movement of the object to Spec,VP is not motivated since placing the object in Spec,VP does not lead to a legitimate Agree relation *at that point*. That is, assuming that structures are built cyclically, movement of the object to position ② would have to occur *before* the matrix v or T are merged into the structures in (30). Thus, although the object in position ② would be in an appropriate Agree configuration with the matrix v/T *after* those functional heads are merged, movement does not feed Agree in the cycle in which it occurs. Successive cyclic A-movement of this sort is hence not licensed.23

Now, the reasoning we have just given makes a narrower prediction than what the scope facts tell us, a prediction which leads to independent support for our proposal. The scope facts

23 Formulations of *Last Resort* having the desired consequences for A-movement include the one in Bobaljik (1995); essentially the same definition and associated assumptions are used by Abels (2003) to block fronting of TP to Spec,CP, a result we make use of in section 3 and again immediately below. This obviously raises the familiar question as to why *wh*-movement may proceed successive cyclically, to which we have no answer. For other arguments that A-movement does not (necessarily) proceed successive cyclically, see Castillo, Drury & Grohmann (1999), Bošković (2002) and Grohmann (2003). Recall from the discussion at (22) that this Last Resort requirement is in addition to whatever independently motivated locality constraints A-movement may be subject to. Failing to be licensed in situ does not permit a DP to wander freely throughout the tree in search of a licensor.
tell us that the object occurs (at LF) in position $\Theta$ or $\Upsilon$ in (30) but do not tell us which. The non-
successive cyclic movement proposal which we offered in order to exclude movement to posi-
tion $\Theta$ has the additional effect that it will also exclude movement of the object to the higher in-
termediate position, position $\Theta$ in (30). This leaves position $\Psi$, the specifier of the “probe” head,
as the only remaining position—Spec,$vP$ for the active restructuring configuration and Spec,TP for the passive one. In section 3.2.1, we argued based on constituency tests for obligatory move-
ment of the underlying object in restructuring constructions. Importantly, however, the facts pre-
sented there not only provide an argument for movement in these constructions but they also 
provide an argument for movement to the specifier of the responsible functional head and against 
successive cyclic movement. Let us summarize again why this is the case and how it follows 
from our account.

The argument for movement was based on the claim that fronting of TPs is excluded. As 
we have argued in section 3.2.1, whenever the embedded object in a restructuring configuration 
is in a Case and/or agreement relation with the matrix T that object cannot be part of a fronted 
XP. Relevant examples illustrating this fact are given in (31).$^{24}$

$^{24}$ We thank Lisa Travis for identifying relevance of these examples (personal communication, 2001). As far as we 
know, no other theory predicts or even suggests the difference in (31) vs. (32). In part, this may be because some 
approaches exclude the fronting of a subject (i.e., nominative) DP in VP-topicalization contexts but as Haider and 
many other researchers have repeatedly demonstrated, this claim is not correct.
(31) a. *[Jeder Wagen zu reparieren vergessen ]TP wurde erst gestern.
   every NOM car to repair forgotten was just yesterday
   It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair every car.

   b. *[Blaue Autos zu reparieren vergessen ]TP wurden noch nie
   blue cars NOM to repair forgotten were never
   It never happened that they forgot to repair blue cars.

In contrast, the embedded object can be part of the fronted XP in non-restructuring contexts (diagnosed by accusative Case on the embedded object or lack of agreement with the matrix T in matrix passive contexts; cf. (32)).

(32) a. [Jeden Wagen zu reparieren vergessen ]VP wurde erst gestern.
   every ACC car to repair forgotten was just yesterday
   It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair every car.

   b. [Blaue Autos zu reparieren vergessen ]VP wurden noch nie.
   blue cars ACC to repair forgotten were never
   It never happened that they forgot to repair blue cars.

The account presented here now provides an explanation for these facts. In the NRIs in (32), fronting of the sequence [OBJ + embedded V + matrix V] is possible since the fronted constituents can be the matrix VPs—NRIs do not involve any Agree relations between the embedded object and the matrix predicate and hence no movement to Spec,TP occurs (see the structure in (29b)). In the RIs in (31), on the other hand, the fronted constituents have to be TPs since, according to our account, the nominative arguments have to move to Spec,TP. This movement is forced as follows: (i) the infinitives (i.e., the complements of forget in these examples) are
agreement domains which block Agree (excluding position 1 as an LF-position for the object in (30b)); (ii) movement to the intermediate positions 2 and 3 is excluded by cyclicity. If one were to allow successive cyclic movement, it would not be clear how (31) could be excluded. That is, if the object could occupy position 3 in (30b), it would correctly take scope over the matrix verb; however, fronting should then be able to apply to the matrix VP—i.e., (31) should receive the same grammaticality as the examples in (33) (which do involve fronting of VP in exactly these contexts). However, this is not the case.

(33) a. [Zu reparieren vergessen ]VP wurde erst gestern jeder Wagen.

\textit{It just happened yesterday that they forgot to repair every car.} \quad \forall \rightarrow \text{forget}

\begin{align*}
\text{to repair} & \quad \text{forgotten} & \text{was} & \text{just yesterday} & \text{every.NOM car} \\
\end{align*}

b. [Zu reparieren vergessen ]VP wurden nur blaue Autos.

\begin{align*}
\text{to repair} & \quad \text{forgotten} & \text{were} & \text{only blue cars (NOM)} \\
\end{align*}

The only thing they forgot to repair were blue cars.

To conclude, (31) vs. (32) differ only in terms of Case/agreement. This difference is predicted by our analysis of agreement domains as presented here together with the constraint against TP-fronting. In particular, admitting successive cyclic A-movement would not only fail to make the correct predictions regarding scope (option 2), it would also run afoul of the TP-fronting facts, which demonstrate that the position occupied by the nominative DP in long passive construction is Spec,TP as we have suggested. Hence the phrase structural difference forced by our analysis of the scope facts finds independent support from a canonical phrase structure diagnostic—the constituency test of fronting.
3.4 Section summary

At this point, we have an account of the anti-reconstruction effects in German and Japanese. The object in an RI checks Case/agreement with a functional head in the higher predicate. When the restructuring predicate is a lexical verb (as opposed to a functional head), the RI constitutes a barrier for the operation Agree (by (21)). The Case checking in this configuration must therefore be achieved by movement. Movement for Case-checking does not proceed in a successive cyclic fashion but rather the moved object undergoes movement in a single step—when a functional head is introduced with appropriate Case-features, the object moves to the specifier of that head. Since Case-checking relations are evaluated at LF, the object must remain in that position at LF and cannot reconstruct. Moreover, in the long passive examples, since the Case checking head is the matrix T, the nominative DP in a long passive (unlike nominatives in other passives) will be prohibited from being contained inside a fronted predicate phrase.

In sum, the three key proposals of our analysis are (i) the induced domain generalization; (ii) Agree is evaluated at LF, and thus locality is respected there; and (iii) agreement domains are specific to Agree and do not constrain A-movement. The second assumption runs counter to the conclusion reached in Bruening (2001b) on the basis of LDA facts in Passamaquoddy, and we will return to a qualification of the assumption in section 6. In assumptions (i) and (iii) our proposals diverge from the theory of locality developed in Chomsky (2000) in which locality domains are termed *phases*. In particular, whereas *phases* constitute absolute locality domains via the PIC, our agreement domains are relativized locality domains in two senses. First, agreement domains constrain Agree but not A-movement and second, whether a maximal projection is a
locality domain depends in part on its syntactic context; in particular a VP is not a domain if it is the complement of a functional head but is a domain if it is selected by a lexical verb. To the extent that our characterization of the relevant generalizations are correct, the results of the previous sections thus constitute an argument against the phase-theoretic perspective on locality.

In the next sections, we present evidence from long distance agreement that converges with, and hence supports, the analysis we have offered here.

4. Object agreement and restructuring

In the previous sections, we have focused almost exclusively on the German and Japanese examples. This has meant that our discussion has centered primarily around Case licensing and subject agreement. The core of the account was that movement for Case/agreement licensing is required for DPs in RI complements of lexical restructuring predicates, and that such movement cannot reconstruct. Movement is required, since the lower VP is an (induced) agreement domain, and the anti-reconstruction effect is a direct consequence of the LF locality condition on Agree. The anti-reconstruction effects are clearest in those constructions where the source of Case on the relevant DP is unambiguously in the matrix clause, such as the German long passive and long unaccusative and the Japanese potential construction. The active transitive cases in German, such as (5) (= (22a), repeated here as (34)), also fall under the account, though these are complicated by the fact that lexical restructuring verbs are typically also compatible with non-restructuring infinitival complements, which provide an alternate source for accusative case internal to the lower predicate (the example in (5) controlled for this by using remnant extraposition to ensure we were dealing with a restructuring example).
This complication can be avoided by looking at languages which have object agreement, on the assumption that accusative case and morphological object agreement reflect the same abstract relationship, i.e., feature checking/licensing with $v$. The analysis discussed above thus makes a set of interrelated predictions for languages with object agreement. First, apparent “cross-clausal” object agreement should be possible in restructuring configurations. Such long distance agreement (LDA) would constitute exactly the same structural configuration as (34), that is, movement for licensing, forced by the induced domain generalization in (21). Second, when the higher predicate bears agreement, anti-reconstruction effects are predicted to emerge, just as they do in German and Japanese. Observationally, the obligatory nature of the movement may be obscured in the same way that the obligatory Case relation is obscured in German, namely, by the possibility for a lexical restructuring verb to combine with an NRI (where the object is licensed...
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infinitive-internally). However, the combination with an NRI should correlate with the absence of movement to the higher predicate, and thus, in a language with morphological object agreement the NRI configuration should lack agreement in the higher predicate. Thus, we predict specifically that while morphological LDA in restructuring contexts may appear to be optional, when it occurs, it will correlate with an anti-reconstruction effect. We may call this the agreement-scope correlation.

We have worked to test this prediction against data from Itelmen, a non-configurational language with morphological object agreement. The results (which should still be considered somewhat preliminary) are strikingly consistent with this prediction. We have given a key example already in (2b), and in the following section we will quickly review properties of Itelmen and the controls used to establish that the example does indeed represent confirmation of the predictions.

4.1 Long distance object agreement in Itelmen

Itelmen is a highly endangered Chukotko-Kamchatkan language spoken on the Kamchatka peninsula, in the Russian Far East. Finite verbs in Itelmen agree obligatorily with the subject; transitive verbs also agree obligatorily with an object (direct or indirect, see Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2002 for a discussion of Itelmen agreement). The examples in (35) illustrate morphological agreement (at the suffix position) with the direct object in Itelmen.

\[(35)\quad \text{kma t'-őlēqu-in. b. q-őlēqu-βum kma !} \]

\[1\text{SG-see-2SG.OBJ} 2\text{IRR-see-1SG.OBJ me}\]

I saw you. Look at me! (S1:71,75)
The examples in (36a,b) show that matrix verbs may agree with the object of an embedded, non-finite verb. The contrast between (36b) and (36c) suggests that LDA is optional, unlike local object agreement (which is obligatory). When the matrix verb does not agree with an embedded object, the verb is morphologically intransitive.25

(36) a. t'-utu-z-in әлčqu-al-il.

I am unable to see you.  

b. na әнтxa-βum=nin kma jeβna-s.

He forgot to meet me.  

c. na netxa-in kma jeβna-s.

He forgot to meet me.

Like local agreement, LDA may target either the direct or indirect object of the embedded clause. This is illustrated in (37).

(37) a. әнтxa-βum=nin kәma-nk нәn'ɛ ɬi zәl-es.

He forgot to give me (a) fish.

25 Thus the verb does not appear to agree with the embedded clause, as it does in some languages, for instance, Tsez (see Polinsky & Potsdam 2001).
Two important properties hold of LDA in Itelmen in so far as we can tell from the data available. First, LDA is only attested with non-finite complements. Second, it is further restricted to verbs which are cross-linguistically typical members of the class of restructuring predicates, such as modals, aspectual verbs (begin, stop), causatives (which are affixal) and certain lexical verbs such as try, want, and forget. The pair in (38) illustrates this partly; the verb –ntxa-‘forget’ may take either a finite or a non-finite complement, as in English (and Russian, the language used for elicitation). In response to (Russian) prompts with a non-finite complement as in (38a), examples were given with LDA; in response to prompts with a finite complement, the matrix verb was given in its intransitive form, without LDA.  

(38) a. He forgot to meet me.

na əntxa-βum=nm kma jeβna-s.

he forget-1SG.OBJ=3.CL me meet-INF (S6:8)
b. He forgot that he met me.

\[
\text{na k-netxa-knen kma k'}-\text{je\betana-an.}
\]

\[
he \quad PRT\text{-forget-INTRANS} \quad me \quad PRT\text{-meet-TRANS}
\]

(S6:9)

4.2 Aside: LDA is LDA

Given that Itelmen allows agreement with a dative (or other oblique), it is important at this point to establish that the putative LDA cases do in fact involve agreement with an object in the embedded clause, as opposed to being something like the English ‘about’ construction illustrated in (39), where one could imagine that agreement is with a (possibly null) adjunct in the higher clause, coindexed with an element in the lower clause. (The absence of case marking on the pronoun in (38a) precludes an analysis in which the overt element is an oblique in the higher clause, with \textit{pro} in the lower clause.)

(39) John knew about/of me only that he should meet me at 8:00.

There are three arguments that the Itelmen construction does involve LDA. The first argument concerns the distribution of oblique agreement in Itelmen with intransitive predicates. While it is possible for an intransitive predicate to agree with an oblique element (including the possessor of the subject or a silent benefactive) as in (40a), such agreement is only possible with third person arguments; (40b) demonstrates that with a second person argument, only intransitive agreement is acceptable.
Since LDA allows all persons to trigger agreement (there is second person agreement in (37a) and first person agreement in (36b)), this demonstrates that LDA patterns with true object agreement and differs from agreement with an adjunct in the matrix clause.

A second argument that LDA is really LDA and not an Itelmen analogue of (39) concerns the form of the agreement morphology. Like Romance clitics, Itelmen object agreement is morphologically distinct in the third person (though not in first and second) depending on whether the agreement cross-references a direct object or oblique (dative). The morphological form of the agreement suffix on the matrix verb in (37b) is unambiguously that of agreement with a direct object, not with an oblique. Likewise, the quantified object in (2b) is clearly in the direct (unmarked) case, reserved for subject and direct object. Thus, the expression mit oknoʔn ‘all windows’ cannot be an adjunct in the matrix clause, as it has the wrong morphological form for an adjunct expression.

Finally, we noted above that Itelmen object agreement is only possible out of non-finite complements. This contrasts with the English case, which, if anything, appears more readily accepted when the complement is a finite clause than when the complement is non-finite. Compare
(39) to the following example, which is far less acceptable: *John knew about/of me only to meet me at two.*

On the available evidence, then, Itelmen LDA patterns more closely with the cross-clausal dependencies in restructuring contexts than it does with the English *about* construction.

### 4.3 Testing the agreement-scope correlation

Assuming that the generalizations stated in section 4.1 are correct, we tentatively conclude at this point that LDA in Itelmen is an instance of restructuring. LDA examples such as (38a) (and (36a) and (37)) must thus have the active restructuring structure in (34)—the lexical restructuring verb –*n(e)txa*—‘forget’ takes a VP complement that lacks an accusative Case/object agreement licensor for the embedded object *kma* ‘me’. Since the infinitival VP is an agreement domain, Agree with the matrix vP is not possible without movement. The object therefore undergoes A-movement to the matrix clause (Spec,vP) where it agrees with v, the relationship being manifest as morphological object agreement.

This establishes that Itelmen LDA has the right properties to test the predictions noted at the beginning of this section. The key prediction is the *agreement-scope correlation* stated in (41), parallel to the German anti-reconstruction effect in restructuring constructions.

---

27 The judgment is that of the first author and others we have consulted; a reviewer disagrees, and one speaker we consulted accepts the infinitival clause with a meaning quite different from (39). We leave further inquiry to future work.
When the embedded object agrees with the matrix $v$ (and gets Case in the matrix predicate), it has to be interpreted in the matrix predicate; it cannot take embedded scope.

To test this prediction in Itelmen, we suggested contexts in which, for example, the speaker was going out and expected that it might rain. Therefore, “I” was supposed to close all the windows. In such a context, an example like (2b), repeated here as (42a), was judged acceptable but with the additional comment from the consultant that as a result, all windows remained open. Example (42b) was presented in a similar context, and after judging the sentence acceptable, the consultants were asked whether this could be uttered felicitously if some windows had been closed, and only some forgotten. The sentence was clearly judged inappropriate in that scenario.

(42) a. t’-əntxa-čeʔn [miɬ okno-ʔn sop-es].

\[
1SG\text{-}\text{forget-3PL.OBJ} \quad \text{all} \quad \text{window-PL} \quad \text{close-INF}
\]

I forgot to close all the windows. \hfill (S6:6-7)

b. na k’-əntxa-aʔn=niʔn miɬ okno-ʔn sop-es.

\[
\text{he} \quad \text{PART\text{-}forget\text{-}TRANS.PL=CLITIC} \quad \text{all} \quad \text{window-PL} \quad \text{close-INF}
\]

He forgot to close all the windows. \hfill (S6:2)

As one independent control, we established that the universal quantifier miɬ ‘all’ does enter into scope interactions and is not, for example, restricted to taking widest scope (however that might be achieved). The sentence pair in (43) establishes this. The continuation in (43b) was offered by the consultant as a clarification of the meaning of (43a). Note that the clarification, which implies that some people were given fish, would have been inconsistent with (43a), if that sentence
were to have been intended as having wide scope of the universal over negation.

(43) a. qaʔm mil-an-eʔnk nәnʲ-ʔiʔn zәl-aq iʔ-neʔn...

  \textit{NEG all-AUGM-PL.DAT fish-PL give-NEG AUX-3>3PL}

  He didn’t give fish to everyone…

b. qolaʔnk i k’-әntxa-an zәl-es.

  \textit{other-PL.DAT INTERJ PART-forget-TRANS give-INF}

  …to other people, he forgot to give (fish).

  \textit{(S6:13)}

  i.e.: He didn’t give fish to everyone, (to some people, he gave fish) but to others, he forgot.

It should be noted at this point that the Itelmen results should be considered preliminary. Testing these with more speakers may, sadly, prove impossible as the language is extremely endangered (though the test should be replicable in other languages with restructuring LDA). Results with the LDA verb -\textit{utu}– ‘beunable’ (e.g., \textit{Pasha can’t pick up all of his toys}) proved inconclusive for irrelevant reasons (such as confusions regarding distributive and collective readings). What is fair to say is that all of the clear judgments we were able to obtain were consistently for wide scope of the universal over the matrix verb in LDA contexts. Our optimism that this is indeed systematic is supported by the fact that this interpretation involves inverse scope with respect to both the underlying hierarchical relation and the surface word order. Moreover, no readily apparent pragmatic influences would seem to favor this reading over the surface scope ordering, corresponding to the more natural reading of the English paraphrase. An alternative account would have to explain this in terms of obligatory QR over ‘forget’ (but not over negation) or some such,
which we consider to be implausible.

4.4 Summary

Our account of long A-movement in restructuring in German and Japanese holds that the relationship between the embedded object and the matrix predicate must be established by movement, as the lower VP constitutes a locality domain for Agree. As this movement spans agreement domains, the LF locality condition on Agree blocks reconstruction. Our account forces us to make a specific and surprising prediction about long distance object agreement in languages that have it, namely, the agreement-scope correlation presented in (41). The data from Itelmen had the clear potential to refute this prediction—it would be surprising to find that readings corresponding to surface scope would be consistently unavailable in this very particular construction, the LDA configuration. Nevertheless, this is what we have found. We hope that further research will replicate this result in other languages.

5. LDA at the edge

Thus far, we have examined the consequences of two assumptions about locality and the Agree relation. The first assumption is that the (verbal) complement of a lexical verb always constitutes an agreement domain (see (21)). The consequence of this is that VP (or InfP) constitutes an agreement domain when it combines with a lexical restructuring verb but not otherwise. The second assumption is that Agree is evaluated at LF. The consequence of this premise is that cross-domain Case and agreement dependencies must involve movement; this was shown to be detectable in scope facts, in particular the anti-reconstruction effect manifest in German, Japa-
nese and Itelmen. To this point, we have treated agreement domains as discrete. Yet a recurring theme in other approaches to locality, including the Barriers model Chomsky (1986) and the Phase model Chomsky (2000), is the proposal that elements at the high periphery of one locality domain are accessible to the next higher domain. In Chomsky (2000), this is codified as the edge condition, where the head H of a phase HP and its specifier(s) are accessible to operations both in the phase defined by HP and in the next higher phase. However, the complement of H is inaccessible to elements in the higher phase (by the PIC). The relevant configuration is shown in (44).

(44) The edge effect

The edge effect plays no role in our analysis above, and we have argued specifically that A-movement for (case-)licensing does not proceed successively cyclically through domain edges. This does not mean, however, that there is no overlap at domain edges. The relevant configuration to look at is one in which some operation independent of agreement might move an NP to the edge of its domain. If there is domain overlap at the edge, we would predict that the specifier
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of the complement of a lexical verb should be accessible for matrix agreement. More narrowly, we would thus predict then that a matrix verb should be able to show agreement with the topmost specifier of its complement, without forcing movement (overt or covert) into the matrix clause, and hence without triggering the agreement-scope correlation relative to the matrix verb. We would, though, still predict an anti-reconstruction effect such that the agreeing NP must remain in the high specifier at LF (recall that we assume that agree relations are evaluated at LF). Converging evidence from previous studies of LDA in languages other than Itelmen strongly suggests that this prediction is largely borne out (though with a twist, as we shall see in section 6.1), and thus that the edge effect should be incorporated into the definition of agreement domains.

5.1 Tsez

The edge effect is particularly interesting since it looks initially to be falsified by examples such as the Tsez LDA construction presented in Polinsky & Potsdam (2001) (henceforth P&P) as illustrated in example (45). In this example, the matrix verb agrees with the absolutive argument magalu ‘bread’ which is not in any obvious way at the periphery of the embedded clause.28

28 Both Case and agreement in Tsez follow an ergative-absolutive alignment; agreement (in noun class) is restricted to absolutive DPs (hence direct objects and intransitive subjects). We take no particular stand on the syntactic representation of ergativity—beyond assuming with P&P that subjects c-command objects—though ultimately this interacts with the issues raised in the previous footnote. If absolutive agreement reflects a relationship with a designated functional head, that head must be able to Agree with direct objects and with (intransitive) subjects, even if agentive. If vP constitutes an agreement domain, then no single head in Chomsky’s functional architecture clearly meets these criteria, though technical solutions are available (see Bobaljik & Branigan, to appear for one approach).
Bobaljik and Wurmbrand

Despite the surface word order, P&P argue convincingly that the agreeing object in the embedded clause must occupy a high specifier position at LF, in particular, that an agreeing DP carries an obligatory topic interpretation which they take to involve (covert) movement to the specifier of a high functional projection, TopicP. Although they invoke movement, they provide a series of arguments to show that the agreeing argument cannot raise into the matrix clause at LF (indeed, they argue that cross-clausal movement whether overt or covert is blocked in Tsez). In particular, the agreeing object in Tsez cannot enter into scope interactions with the matrix predicate, as (46) indicates.

(46)  sis  učiteler      [ šibaw  uži     ik’ixosiži ]  Ø-iyxo.

    one  teacher      every  boy     (I)  goes     I-know

Some teacher is such that he knows that every boy is going. surface: ∃ » ∀

*Every boy is such that some teacher knows that he is going. * inverse: ∀ » ∃

Strikingly similar facts obtain in Algonquian languages, see in particular Bruening (2001b) on Passamaquoddy and Branigan & MacKenzie (2002) on Innu-aimûn. We will present the Tsez facts as representative of these languages (but see section 6 for some qualifications).

The specific structure that P&P propose (p.585) for Tsez is given in (47). 29

29 Bruening (2001b) has a different structure for Passamaquoddy but shares with P&P the view that the agreeing
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(47) \[ \text{CP specifier } [C' C^* \text{TopP specifier } [\text{Top'} \text{Top}^* [\text{IP S O V } ] ] ] ] \]

It should not be immediately apparent that this solves the problem at hand. Recall that only the edge of a domain will be accessible to agreement in the next higher domain. Spec,TopicP may be high but it is only the specifier of the highest projection that should be visible. Given our theory of induced domains, then, movement to Spec,TopicP in (47) should allow an embedded object to undergo LDA only if the CP projection is absent. Thus, we must claim that (45) has the truncated structure in (48b).

(48) a. Agreement with SpecCP/*SpecTopP  b. Agreement with SpecTopP

---

Put differently, our theory, incorporating the edge effect, predicts that the CP projection (or material in it) should block LDA with an embedded topic (see (48a)). This is precisely what P&P argue to be one condition on LDA in Tsez. Two configurations illustrate this effect. First, if there is a wh-word in the embedded clause, CP will be projected and Spec,TopP will no longer be visible to the matrix v, as illustrated in (49a); agreement in this example is with the embedded elements must be at the Edge of the embedded clause, for him, adjoined to CP, hence at LF higher than wh-phrases.
clause as a clausal object. Second, if there is an overt complementizer, even in the absence of
material in Spec,CP, CP must be projected and hence will block LDA (see (49b); see P&P for
arguments that -ƛin is a complementizer).

(49) a. enir [ nā c’ohorā micxir bok’āk’ruli ] r/*b-iixo.
   mother [ where thief money.III.ABS stole ].IV IV/*III-know
   The mother knows where the thief stole the money. (P&P: 634)

   mother boy bread.III.ABS ate-COMP III-know
   The mother knows (that) the boy ate the bread. (P&P: 635)

Finally, our analysis leads us to expect that though CP should block LDA with a topic in
Spec,TopP, an element in Spec,CP should be eligible for LDA, subject to independent morpho-
logical constraints on agreement in Tsez (such as the restriction to absolutive DPs). Again, this is
something which P&P argue holds in Tsez, as the following example demonstrates (see their fn.
20 for qualifications).

(50) enir [ šebi yāk’iruli ] y-iyxānu.
   mother [ WH.II.ABS went ].IV II-know
   The mother doesn’t know who left. (of women) (P&P: 638)

In sum, the proposals we have developed on the basis of German, Japanese and Itelmen, taken
together with the general idea of locality domain overlap at the edge, led us to expect that LDA
should be possible between a verb and the highest specifier of its complement—CP when the
complement is a full clause, or whatever projection constitutes the top projection of the embedded complement when the CP projection is absent. Importantly, such examples should be found even where movement into the higher clause is prohibited, and are therefore not expected to show the obligatory wide scope effect seen in German, Japanese and Itelmen. These expectations dovetail quite neatly with recent analyses of Tsez and of Algonquian languages in P&P, Bruening (2001b) and Branigan & MacKenzie (2002).

5.2 Differences between Itelmen and Tsez

At this point, it is prudent to go back to the German and Itelmen cases and check to see that the edge condition, which allows us to extend the analysis to Tsez and Algonquian, does not undermine our previous analysis. Common elements of the analysis of Itelmen and Tsez are given in (51).

(51) a. Agreement is restricted to a single domain at LF.
    b. Movement may feed agreement but then cannot reconstruct.
       (hence locality domains for agreement ≠ barriers for movement)
    c. A complement of a lexical V is a domain, even when truncated (by (21))

The differences between the languages may lie in whether or not LDA is connected to what we may call the primary licensing of the object. \(^{30}\) In Itelmen, LDA is restricted to restructuring configurations. The embedded object occurs in the configuration in (34), i.e., it is contained in (and not at the edge of) a VP (or slightly larger InfP) complement to a lexical verb. This complement

\(^{30}\) Our thanks to Benjamin Bruening for suggesting licensing as the key difference.
lacks an (abstract) accusative Case/object agreement licensor and the domain boundary prevents an Agree relation with the matrix Case assigner ($v$) in situ. On the basis of German, we know that successive cyclic movement to the edge of the phase is impossible in this configuration. Instead, A-movement occurs in a single step to the specifier of the appropriate functional head for feature checking. We have suggested that the reason for this is that A-movement is only licensed by immediate feature checking (last resort). Since successive cyclic movement to an intermediate specifier will not result in feature checking at that point in the derivation, such movement is impossible. The underlying object must move to the specifier of the matrix $vP$, a position from which it cannot reconstruct, and the scope effects obtain. Thus, A-movement, on our analysis, is obligatory—the appearance of optionality (as in (36b-c)) arises since, as in German and Japanese, lexical restructuring verbs may also combine with NRIs, in which case there is a case-assigner in the embedded clause and hence movement is not required to license Case/agreement.

LDA in Tsez (and Passamaquoddy), on the other hand, is not limited to restructuring contexts, nor is it limited to non-finite complements (the verb know in the sense of knowing a proposition/fact is not a restructuring verb, and the complements in the Tsez examples are clearly finite). More to the point, the embedded object is licensed in the embedded clause, receiving

---

31 Tsez may have restructuring-like LDA as well. While LDA appears optional with finite predicates (reducing, by hypothesis, to the optionality of topicalizing the absolutive DP in the embedded clause), Tsez also has LDA with non-finite complements; this LDA is obligatory with predicates meaning ‘must’, ‘can’, and ‘be difficult (for)’ but optional with ‘want’ (Eric Potsdam, Masha Polinsky, personal communications 2003), tracking neatly the optional/obligatory nature of restructuring with functional versus lexical predicates in German (see section 3.3.1). We expect that movement from the RIs in Tsez should be possible (in contrast to the finite clauses) but since the agree-
Case and checking agreement in that clause. Since there is no motivation from licensing for movement, we expect that movement will happen only where motivated on independent grounds, such as wh-movement to Spec,CP and topic movement to Spec,TopP. LDA is, as we expect, only possible when such independent operations bring a morphologically appropriate (absolutive) DP into the range of a potentially agreeing head, where the range of a head is its domain, including the edge of the next domain down. Even in Tsez, then, LDA is local, just as P&P (and Bruening) suggested. (Indeed, Polinsky 2003 argues that the edge effect constitutes the maximal span for agreement cross-linguistically.) We do not know why the languages differ in this way (Itelmen lacking—so far as we know—LDA with the edge of a finite complement). However, once this prior difference is recognized, the properties of LDA in the two types of languages fall into place, clustering in very much the manner predicted by the theoretical tools which we have made use of.

6. Directions for future research

Before concluding, there are two potential complications that we are aware of, which we will mention here. Limitations do not permit us to address these in the detail they deserve but we will speculate on the direction we hope to pursue in resolving them.

ment-scope correlation holds only for lexical restructuring (but see fn. 18), we would expect that the anti-reconstruction effect should arise, to the extent testable, only with the predicate meaning ‘want’.
6.1 Reconstruction in Passamaquoddy

In Tsez and Pasamaquoddy (and Innu-aimûn) the object which triggers agreement in the higher predicate must occupy the specifier of the highest projection of the complement clause. We have suggested that agreement is with an LF-domain-mate—if the topic status is read off the LF configuration, then the obligatory topic interpretation of a LDA object in these languages can be assimilated to the anti-reconstruction effect. Complete reconstruction of the object to a lower position in the embedded clause would render it inaccessible to the matrix v. At least some part of the DP, with features accessible to agreement, must remain in the high position at LF. Nevertheless, unlike German, Japanese and Itelmen, Bruening (2001b) argues that the LDA objects in Passamaquoddy may undergo reconstruction for binding purposes (and possibly scope) into a lower position. The examples in (52) display LDA between the matrix verb and the DP *nisiwîhtîc-il* ‘his spouse’ in the lower clause. Importantly, this DP contains a variable which may be bound by the quantifier in the lower subject position, indicating that for the purposes of binding theory, the object is not in the highest specifier of the embedded clause.

(52) a. N-kosiciy-a eli psi=te wen koseloma-t nisiwîhtîc-il.

\[I\text{-}know.TA\text{-}DIR \quad C^* \quad all=EMPH \quad someone \quad love\text{-}3CONJ \quad spouse\text{-}OBV\]

b. N-kosiciy-a nisiwîhtîc-il eli psi=te wen koseloma-t.

\[I\text{-}know.TA\text{-}DIR \quad spouse\text{-}OBV \quad C^* \quad all=EMPH \quad someone \quad love\text{-}3CONJ\]

both: I know that everyone\textsubscript{1} loves his\textsubscript{1} spouse. \quad (Bruening 2001b: 264)

Examples of this sort are relevant to our claim in (51a) that Agree is sensitive to a locality condition at LF. That assumption explains why reconstruction is impossible in the German, Japanese
and Itelmen cases. Bruening argues instead on the basis of examples like (52) that Agree obeys an ‘anywhere’ phasemate condition. Movement to the high periphery of the embedded clause is required at some point in the derivation in order for LDA to obtain but that movement may subsequently reconstruct. However, Bruening’s assumption is too weak to block reconstruction in the anti-reconstruction cases we have examined. There are at least two ways we see to resolve this tension, and we take no stand at this point on which will prove correct. On the one hand, one could seek to assimilate this to the primary versus parasitic licensing distinction that we have already appealed to in section 5.2; perhaps only primary licensing relations need to be respected at LF, hence Agree as part of licensing obeys an LF-phasemate condition, while parasitic Agree respects the same domain/phase boundaries, yet may be satisfied at any point in the derivation. On the other hand, one could attempt to reduce this instead to the A versus A’-distinction in the movement types involved. Basic examples of reconstruction in A’-movement show that, if topic/focus structure is read off LF positions, a DP may be interpreted in one position as a topic and in a lower position for binding theoretic purposes. Within the copy theory of movement, this is occasionally referred to as feature dispersion.

\[(53)\quad \text{Herself}_1, \text{Sue}_1 \text{likes}\ t.\]

For our proposals, it would be sufficient to maintain that LF-coherence holds across scope-

---

32 This could suggest that it is the feature licensing (what we call Case checking) that respects the locality condition, while morphological agreement is always parasitic; an agreeing head simply Agrees with an accessible DP in its domain, whether or not the head bears any syntactic relation to that DP. See Bobaljik 2004 for an elaboration of this idea.
binding and Case positions (if a DP moves across a phase for Case licensing reasons, it cannot reconstruct), while A'-movement such as topicalization may (at least partially) reconstruct, so long as sufficient features remain in the high position to be visible for agreement. The Hindi facts discussed below point to the same conclusion.

6.2 LDA in Hindi-Urdu

In recent work, Bhatt (2003) examines an LDA construction in Hindi. The salient properties of Hindi LDA place it squarely within the realm of potentially relevant constructions. In particular, this LDA construction is restricted to non-finite complements of restructuring verbs. Since LDA is restricted in this way, the agreement-scope correlation should apply in Hindi as well. As Bhatt presents the facts, they are the following: wide-scope of the object over the matrix predicate is blocked when there is no LDA, and LDA makes this scope interpretation available and “even preferred” (p.22, see also Mahajan 1989 (46)). Nevertheless, Bhatt claims that the wide scope reading is not obligatory—in our terms, reconstruction is possible in these configurations. Bhatt’s own analysis suggests an assimilation of the Hindi facts to the Tsez facts discussed in section 5, rather than to Itelmen. In Hindi, LDA is only possible when the infinitive also agrees with the embedded object. Thus, the embedded object need only move to the specifier of the infinitival projection, rather than all the way into the matrix clause. In this position it will be accessible to object agreement from the matrix verb but will not necessarily scope over that verb (though nothing prevents further QR). This is possible in Hindi (but impossible in German, Japanese, and Itelmen) precisely because it is only in Hindi that the embedded object can enter an agreement relation with the infinitive, a distinction evident in the overt morphology. If this direc-
tion proves reasonable, then the Hindi facts are consistent with our analysis.

6.3 English expletives

The induced domain generalization in (21), crucial to the account of German, Japanese, Itelmen and to a lesser degree, Tsez, leaves us with some puzzles concerning raising in English. It would appear that *seem* in English, unlike its German counterpart (see (23)), is a lexical verb (i.e., English *seem* does not display the properties that characterize German *scheinen* as functional, see Wurmbrand 2001b: 205-215). As English *seem* is lexical, we should expect an English raising complement to constitute an induced domain. This may accord well with the observation reported in Aoun (1982) that reconstruction in English may only lower the quantifier one clause and not two. A sentence like (54a) is ambiguous in a way that (54b) is reportedly not—namely, only (54a) is consistent with the interpretation corresponding to scope of the indefinite under *likely*.33

(54)  a. Someone from New York is likely to win the lottery.  
     b. Someone from New York seems to be likely to win the lottery.

This situation is exactly what we would expect if English, unlike German, has an EPP feature even in infinitives (as proposed in Chomsky 2001: 7, though Chomsky is in fact ambivalent on this point, compare Chomsky 2001: 9). In the system presented here, such a feature would force

33 Thus (54a) but not (54b) may be truthfully uttered in a situation in which no single person has more than one lottery ticket, but the majority of tickets were purchased by New Yorkers. In this context, “being likely to win the lottery” is not true of any one individual, but “someone from NY winning the lottery” is nevertheless a likely event. See Fox (1999) for careful presentation of the various readings involved.
successive cyclic A-movement since, by definition, an EPP-feature cannot be satisfied by Agree. If Agree has to be visible at LF (i.e., the DP *someone from NY* and the finite T have to be in the same domain), reconstruction is possible at most to the edge of the lower domain. Hence, we could explain why reconstruction is possible under *seem*, but not deeper under *likely* in (54b). However, as Aoun (1982) notes, the crucial judgments are not firm (compare Fox 1999: 160 where full reconstruction is reported for (54b)), and we therefore hesitate to draw conclusions either way at this point. If there is variation, we will need to say something special about why *seem* does not induce a domain boundary for speakers who accept reconstruction in (54b).

That there is an agreement domain boundary in raising constructions in English is also suggested by the observation in Postal (1974: 200) that no more than a single infinitival clause boundary may separate *there* from its associate (see (55a) vs. (55b)).

(55) a. There is likely to be a riot. / There seemed to be a riot.

b. *There seems to be likely to be a riot.

However, even with Postal’s observation, we would require the DP in (55a) to raise to the specifier of the infinitive (*to be*) at LF if it is to be licensed by matrix T, something we can achieve at this point only by stipulation.

A reviewer suggests that appealing to a thematic characterization of domains, as offered in Wurmbrand (2000, 2001a), renders the *seem* examples like (55a) unproblematic. On the assumption that *seem* assigns no theta-role, it would not be classed as a lexical predicate in the sense relevant to (21), and would thus have a functional restructuring structure, directly comparable to its German cognate, as discussed in section 3.3. Even in this thematic sense of lexical, though, we worry about the status of the optional experiencer in the matrix clause, which appears to have
a theta-role from *seem*, but does not block agreement, at least not categorically so.\(^{34}\)

(56) There seem to me/Mary to be many unicorns in the garden.

We therefore acknowledge that there remain unanswered questions for us regarding English raising constructions, but take the weight of the generalizations concerning German, Japanese and Itelmen to point to the account presented here as the point of departure for the next stage of this research.

7. **Conclusion**

Anti-reconstruction effects arise in similar structural configurations in three otherwise very dissimilar languages: German, Japanese and Itelmen. We have argued that an account of these effects requires relaxing the assumption that locality domains are isomorphic for all operations, and that these are uniquely determined by the inherent properties of specific heads. Instead, we have argued that locality domains are relativized in two senses. First, Agree and A-movement respect different locality domains, and second, some projections (such as VP) may constitute

---

\(^{34}\) Boeckx (2000: 371) claims that agreement across a full DP experiencer is unacceptable in English, and that this “has gone unnoticed in the literature.” Boeckx’s claim is supported by (i), which, to the first author’s ear, is indeed (somewhat) marked. However, agreement across an experiencer per se is not—the sentence improves dramatically if the associate DP is not a bare plural, as in the minimally different (ii). Hence, we must dispute the validity of Boeckx’s claimed generalization. The fact that the putative generalization is not reported by others suggests that our judgments may be more widely shared.

(i) *There seem to Mary to be men in the room.

(ii) There seem to Mary to be several/many/three men in the room.
agreement domains only in certain contexts—the induced domain generalization. In the course of developing our proposal, we have had occasion to provide further support for, or introduce, a number of ancillary conclusions that are of potential relevance to current topics: the EPP is not universal and is absent in German, accusative Case is licensed by a VP-external functional head, and accusative Case and object agreement are different reflexes of the same structural relationship.
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