

**One Cycle to Rule Them All**  
**Ian Roberts**  
**Downing College, University of Cambridge**  
[igr20@cam.ac.uk](mailto:igr20@cam.ac.uk)

In this talk I suggest that a range of phenomena (“dependent” object-subject agreement, dependent case, the Final Over Final Condition (FOFC) and further “contiguity effects”) are all cases of a single generalization:

(1) *Contiguity/dependency generalisation*

In a given local domain, if featural property P holds of  $H_1$  where  $H_1$  is asymmetrically c-commanded by  $H_2$ , then featural property P of  $H_2$  is known.

In turn, (1) derives from the Strict Cycle:

(2) *Strict Cycle Condition:*

No rule R can apply to a domain dominated by a node A in such a way as to solely affect B, a proper subdomain of A.

(2) requires all rule applications R to apply to the smallest piece of structure they can, i.e. to A before B in (3), assuming the structural description of the rule is met in both domains:

(3) ... [A ... [B ... ] ... ] ...

Here, if R can apply to B rather than A then it must do so. Once R has applied to B then A becomes the smallest piece of structure for it to apply to, and so on.

Concerning FOFC, and following an antisymmetric account as in Biberauer, Holmberg & Roberts (2014), if rollup applies in vP first, moving VP around v without moving O around V, we get the standard FOFC violation  $V > O > \text{Aux}$  (assuming Aux is in v):

(4) [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> V O ] v (VP) ]

It emerges that FOFC is the result of the LCA and the Cyclicity Condition in (2): rollup of complements must be maximally local and maximally cyclic.

Concerning dependent agreement (if a language has object agreement, then it has subject agreement (Moravcsik 1978:364, Corbett 2006:59)), applying agreement in domain B of (3) entails it must apply in domain A (but not conversely as the structural description for agreement can fail to hold in domain A). Similarly for dependent case, B is the domain of accusative or ergative case, assigned before the “elsewhere” nominative/absolute cases. Other instances of (2) include Bobaljik’s (2012) \*ABA constraint on adjectival suppletion in comparatives and superlatives, aspects of binding theory (Pesetsky 2011) and, possibly, improper movement (van Urk 2016). More speculatively, I will suggest that (2) constrains different ways of labelling a category, with interesting cross-linguistic consequences for word-order variation.

The conclusion is that generalized dependency relations (including FOFC, seen as dependent linearization) follow from strict cyclicity. Cyclicity is thus more “granular” than has recently been thought (since the proposals for phases in Chomsky 2000): it holds everywhere, not just at the phase level (which is a special case of the more general constraint): cyclicity holds of derivational *stages* as well as derivational *layers* (Song 2018).