

# EGG Summer School 2014 – Debrecen

## The syntax of relative clauses

### Resumption

Martin Salzmann, University of Leipzig  
martin.salzmann@uni-leipzig.de

- What is resumption?
- What is the syntax underlying resumptive constructions?
- The distribution of resumptive pronouns
- The distribution of gap- vs. resumptive relatives

## 1 Introduction: What is resumption?

- Terminology: An A'-dependency that does not terminate in a trace, but in a pronoun:

(1) [wh-XP]<sub>i</sub> ... pron<sub>i</sub>

(2) ha-ʔiš Op<sub>i</sub> še raʔiti ʔoto<sub>i</sub>  
the-man that saw.1S him  
'the man that I saw' Hebrew (Shlonsky (1992: 547))

- the operator can be zero (especially in relative clauses)
- the pronoun can be zero in pro-drop languages
- clitic dislocation
- probably for historical reasons, the term resumption is usually not applied to clitic dislocation constructions even though they would seem to fall under the definition above (and often have similar properties as bona fide resumption cases):

(3) Estos libros<sub>i</sub>, Juan los<sub>i</sub> leyó ayer.  
these books Juan them read yesterday  
'These books, Juan read yesterday.' (Spanish)

- Resumption in A-movement?
- a possible candidate: copy-raising (Richard), cf. Potsdam and Runner (2001)

(4) Richard seems like **he** is in trouble.

- intrusive pronouns: resumptives as a non-grammatical device in some languages
- in English a marginal phenomenon that occurs to repair island violations; the result is usually not considered fully grammatical (cf. Chao and Sells (1983: 48):

(5) a. This is the man that Mary couldn't remember if she had seen **him** before.  
b. Which man do they think that if Mary marries **him**, then everyone will be happy?

- processing resumptives: the acceptability of resumptives increases the further away they are from their antecedent (Erteschik-Shir (1992: 89)):

(6) a. This is the girl that John likes \_\_\_/\*her.  
b. This is the girl that Peter said that John thinks that Bob likes \_\_\_/?her.

## 2 The syntax of resumption: Movement or Base-generation?

### 2.1 Base-generation Approaches

- consensus up to 1990: resumption must involve base-generation: the relationship between operator and pronoun is not established in syntax but via binding in semantics; binding is not sensitive to locality

#### 2.1.1 Major Arguments for Base-generation

- in many languages, resumption is insensitive to locality:

(7) hine ha-sendvic še pagašti < ʔet ha-ʔiša še ʔaxla ʔoto/\*\_\_ >  
here the-sandwich that met.1MS ACC the-woman that ate it  
'Here is the sandwich such that I met the woman who ate it.' (Hebrew)

- resumptives generally look like regular personal pronouns so that resumption is simply another case of binding, viz. A'-binding
- like LF-based variable binding, resumption is also possible with epithets, cf. Hornstein and Weinberg (1990: 134), Aoun and Choueiri (2000: 8)

(8) a. John criticized every senator<sub>i</sub> in private while praising the bastard<sub>i</sub> in public. (QR)

b. ʃəft **l-bənt** yalli btiftikro ʔənnə **ha-l-habiile** ma rafi tərbaʃi s-sabaʔ (res)  
saw.1S the-girl that think.2P that this-the-idiot NEG FUT win.3SF the-race  
'I saw the girl that you think that this idiot will not win the race.'

#### 2.1.2 Implementations

- McCloskey (1990): operator is directly merged in Spec, CP and semantically binds a pronoun in an argument position

(9) [<sub>CP</sub> [wh-XP]<sub>i</sub> C ... pron<sub>i</sub> ]

- how can this be transposed into more recent versions of minimalist syntax?
- McCloskey (2002: 203): C does not have any unvalued features that would attract a *wh*-phrase/operator, it only has an EPP-feature, which is then satisfied by the base-generated operator (assumption: uF can only be checked via Agree, but not via Merge):

(10) [<sub>CP</sub> Op<sub>i</sub> C [<sub>island</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [pron<sub>i</sub> V] v ]]]

uCase[acc]  
iPhi[z] EPP iPhi[z] uPhi[z]

- Salzmann (2011): drawback of McCloskey's solution: this will imply that the C-element with resumption differs featurally from the C triggering movement; while plausible for Irish where the two complementizers are phonetically different (*aR* vs. *aL*), this is not the case e.g. in Zurich German where *wo* is used in both cases. → instead, C always bears uOp, which by assumption can be checked via External Merge (furthermore: operator must lack uCase):

(11) [<sub>CP</sub> Op<sub>i</sub> C [<sub>island</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [pron<sub>i</sub> V] v ]]]

iOp[x] uOp[x] uCase[acc]  
iPhi[z] EPP iPhi[z] uPhi[z]

## 2.2 Movement-based Approaches

- Underlying idea: only one mechanism to create operator-variable dependencies

### 2.2.1 Arguments

- in Hebrew, resumptive pronouns can undergo (partial) overt movement, cf. Borer (1984)
- (12) a. ha-sefer še ani xošev še karata **oto**  
the-book that I think that you.read it  
b. hasefer še ani xošev še **oto** karata  
c. hasefer še **oto** ani xošev še karata  
d. hasefer **oto** ani xošev še karata  
'the book that I think you read'
- but: there is reason to believe that pronoun fronting is a separate process, viz. topicalization which unlike resumption is sensitive to locality, cf. Borer (1984: 223)
- resumptives license Parasitic Gaps in some languages → the pronoun = variable at S-Structure, see Engdahl (1985: 7)
- (13) Det var den fången som käkarna inte kunde avgöra Engdahl (1985: 7)  
it was that prisoner that doctors.the not could decide (Swedish)
- om **han** verkligen var sjuk [utan att tala med \_\_ personligen]  
if he really was ill without to talk with in.person
- resumption counts as movement w.r.t. ATB-movement: no CSC violation if one conjunct contains a gap and one a resumptive, Zaenen et al. (1981: 681):
- (14) Där borta går en man som jag ofta träffar \_\_ men inte minns vad **han** heter.  
there goes a man that I often meet but don't remember what he is called
- a caveat: depending on the formulation of the CSC, the argument may vanish
  - Reconstruction (cf. also Aoun et al. (2001), Bianchi (2004), Rouveret (2008), Salzmann (2009b), Salzmann (2011))
  - resumptives behave like traces w.r.t. reflexive binding (Zaenen et al. (1981: 681))
- (15) [Vilken av sina flickvänner]<sub>i</sub> undrade du om det att Kalle<sub>i</sub> inte längre  
which of his girlfriends wonder you if it that Kalle no longer  
fick träffa **henne**<sub>j</sub> kunde ligga bakom hans dåliga humör?  
see her could lie behind this bald mood (Swedish)
- caveat: resumption has become contested as a diagnostic for movement
  - resumptives are sensitive to SCO and WCO (have to be tested with care, cf. Shlonsky (1992: 461); here, the crossed element is an epithet, which cannot function as a resumptive when it occurs in DO-position in Hebrew)
- (16) ze ha-baxur še- yida'ti 'et **ha-?idiot**, še- ha-more yaxšil 'oto<sub>i</sub>  
this the-guy that I.informed acc the-idiot that the-teacher will-flunk him  
lit.: 'this is the guy that I informed the idiot that the teacher will flunk'
- as with other reconstruction effects, the force of this argument is limited

### 2.2.2 Implementation 1: LF-movement: Demirdache (1991)

- resumptive = operator in-situ which moves at LF
- Problems
  - resumptives are often found in languages which are otherwise wh-ex-situ
  - it is unclear how epithets (8b) can be accommodated
  - how can PGs be licensed? – they are usually analyzed as an S-Structure phenomenon
  - unclear how reconstruction can be captured if at LF there is only a copy of the pronoun

### 2.2.3 Implementation 2: Spell-out Approaches: Zaenen et al. (1981), Pesetsky (1998), Bianchi (2004), Alexopoulou (2006)

- the resumptive is the phonetic realization of a trace

#### 2.2.3.1 Pros

- Given the copy theory of movement, resumption can be subsumed under cases where more than one link of a chain is realized
- why a pronoun: the pronoun is the most economical form to realize the features of a copy/trace
- compatible with PG-licensing
- compatible with ATB-facts
- compatible with reconstruction/SCO+WCO facts

#### 2.2.3.2 Potential Problems

- unclear why this process happens at all
- given the copy-theory of movement, one would rather expect full copies to be realized – as in other cases of multiple realization (cf. e.g. Nunes (2004)), cf. German wh-copying, or at least systematic parts of one of the copies (Barbiers et al. (2008))
- some languages use resuming elements with more phonological and descriptive content: strong pronouns, epithets, cf. (8) above; unclear how these can be a spell-out of a trace
- semantic contribution: if resumptives arise in the PF-branch, one would not expect them to have any reflex at LF, but it has been known since Doron (1982) that resumptive relatives are more limited in their interpretive possibilities than gap relatives: while gap relatives allow for both *de dicto* and *de re* readings, resumptive relatives only have the *de re* interpretation; see also, Suner (1998), Sharvit (1999), Boeckx (2003):

- (17) a. Dan yimca et **ha-iSa** Se hu mexapes \_\_\_\_.  
Dan will.find acc the-woman C he look.for √de re; √de dicto
- b. Dan yimca et **ha-iSa** Se hu mexapes **ota**. √de re; \*de dicto  
Dan will.find ACC the-woman C he look.for her  
'Dan will find the woman he is looking for.' Hebrew

- to accommodate such facts, one has to assume that only chains with certain features (e.g. +specific, cf. Bianchi (2004)) can be phonetically realized
- resumptive pronoun fronting: some languages, e.g. Hebrew (but also Alemannic varieties of German) allow resumptives to be fronted; if they arise at PF, pronoun fronting must also apply at PF; while this may perhaps be plausible for Alemannic, it certainly isn't for languages like Hebrew, where pronoun fronting is subject to syntactic locality constraints; at any rate, should such a process be adopted, a lot of care is necessary to accommodate it within current models of grammar

### 2.2.4 Implementation 3: Big-DP Approaches: Aoun et al. (2001), Boeckx (2003)

- The resumptive is the head of a Big-DP from the spec of which the antecedent/operator subextracts:

(18) [CP Op<sub>1</sub> C ... [DP 1 [D' D<sub>res</sub> 1]]

- resumption is basically clitic doubling + A'-movement

#### 2.2.4.1 Pros:

- compatible with parasitic gap-licensing, cf. (13)
- compatible with ATB-movement, cf. (14)
- compatible with reconstruction and SCO/WCO effects, cf. (15), (16)
- the semantic effects of resumption can perhaps be handled, cf. (17)
- since the pronoun is a separate syntactic element, pronoun fronting does not pose a problem
- can, in principle, accommodate strong pronouns and epithets (cf. (8)) if an apposition structure is adopted, cf. Aoun et al. (2001)

#### 2.2.4.2 Cons:

- in many languages, the Big-DP-structure is never instantiated overtly, i.e. without movement of the operator, i.e. resumption does not imply clitic doubling
- How does the operator get case (does it need case at all)?

## 3 Languages where resumption is locality-insensitive

### 3.1 Base-generation Approaches

- McCloskey (1990), Shlonsky (1992), McCloskey (2002), Salzmann (2009a), Salzmann (2011)

### 3.2 Hybrid Approaches: Aoun et al. (2001), Bianchi (2004), Alexopoulou (2006)

- If the resumptive is located in a transparent domain, movement is involved ('apparent resumption')
- If the resumptive is located within an island, base-generation is involved ('true resumption')

#### 3.2.1 Empirical evidence: a Reconstruction Asymmetry

- Aoun et al. (2001): one finds reconstruction effects in apparent resumption, but not in true resumption:

(19) a. təlmiiz-[a]<sub>i</sub> l-kəsleen ma baddna nɣabbir [wala mʔallme]<sub>i</sub> ʔanno l-mudiira  
student-her the-bad NEG want.1P tell.1P no teacher that the-principal.SF

ʃahaʔət-**o** mn l-madraxe >  
expelled.3SF-him from the-school

'Her bad student, we don't want to tell any teacher that the principal expelled him from school.'

b. \*təlmiiz-[a]<sub>i</sub> l-kəsleen ma zəʔlit [wala mʔallme]<sub>i</sub> < laʔanno l-mudiira  
student-her the-bad NEG upset.3SF no teacher because the-principal.SF

ʃahaʔət-**o** mn l-madraxe >

expelled.3SF-him from the-school

'Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.'

### 3.2.2 Problems

- resumptives always look the same, whether they are located inside an island or in a transparent domain; this is not necessarily to be expected if they arise via two fundamentally different processes
- it is contested whether reconstruction should serve as a diagnostic for movement
- the reconstruction asymmetry is contested, i.e. it has been claimed that reconstruction into islands is also possible; for instance, Guillot and Malkawi (2006: 170) argue that the Jordanian Arabic equivalent of (19b) is grammatical and provide the following data from French:

(20) Quelle photo de lui<sub>i</sub> es-tu fâché < parce que chaque prof<sub>i</sub> l' a déchirée?  
which picture of him are-you furious because every prof it has torn

- absence of cyclicity effects irrespective of locality
- Irish: under movement, all Cs between trace and root-C have the same complementizer *aL*; under resumption, only the root-C has a special complementizer, viz. *aR* while the intermediate Cs are occupied by the complementizer *go* normally found in declarative complement clauses; importantly, resumptive relatives behave the same irrespective of whether the resumptive is within an island or not (McCloskey (2002: 185, 190, 196):

(21) a. an t-ainm **a** hinnseadh dúinn **a** bhí\_\_ ar an áit  
the name aL was-told to-us aL was on the place  
'the name that we were told was on the place'

b. An t-ór seo **ar** chreid corr-dhuine **go** raibh sé ann  
the gold DEMON aN thought some-people go was it there  
'this gold that some people thought was there'

c. achan rud **a** rabh < dóchas aca **go** dtiocfadh sé >  
every thing aN was hope at-them go come[cond] it  
'everything that they hoped (that it) would come'

(CNPC)

### 3.3 Movement only Approaches

- Some authors have argued that resumption always involves movement, cf. Demirdache (1991), Pesetsky (1998), Boeckx (2003)
- Why would one want to come up with a movement approach at all if the most reliable diagnostic for movement, viz. locality, is missing?
- perhaps one would like to have only one mechanisms that establishes operator-variable relationships
- if some kinds of resumption involve movement (where the resumptive is located inside an island), it is most plausible that all resumptives involve movement, given the arguments in the previous subsection



- in some languages, resumption is barred from all islands, viz. Vata (Koopman and Sportiche (1986) and Serbo-Croatian (Goodluck and Stojanovic (1996):

(27) a. \*Čovek što se sećam < gde sam **ga** upoznala >.  
 man that REFL remember where AUX him met  
 ‘The man that I remember where I met him.’

b.\* Čovek što si otišao < zato što **ga** je Petar otpustio >.  
 man C are left because that him is Petar fired  
 ‘The man that you left because Peter fired (him).’

*Serbo-Croatian*

#### 4.1 Challenges for Movement Approaches

- 1. How to distinguish between languages where resumption is sensitive to locality and languages where it is not?
- 2. How to distinguish languages with different degrees of island-sensitivity?

##### 4.1.1 Hybrid Approaches (e.g. Aoun et al. (2001), Bianchi (2004))

- ad 1: have to stipulate that base-generation is not a possibility in some languages
- ad 2: remains unclear

#### 4.2 Pure Movement Approaches

##### 4.2.1 LF-movement (Demirdache (1991))

- ad 1: would have to stipulate that LF-movement is subject to stricter constraints in some languages (e.g. is sensitive to Subjacency)
- ad 2: even more fine-grained differences in the island-sensitivity of LF-movement

##### 4.2.2 Spell-out (e.g. Pesetsky (1998))

- ad 1: would have to stipulate that resumptives are subject to stricter locality constraints in some languages
- ad 2: even more fine-grained differences in the PF-theory of locality (it is not a priori clear why PF should distinguish between strong and weak islands)

##### 4.2.3 Big-DP-approaches (Boeckx (2003))

- ad 1: languages differ as to whether Agree is involved in resumption:
  - if Agree is involved, resumption is sensitive to strong islands
  - if Agree is not involved, resumption is insensitive to islands
- How do we know that Agree is involved?
  - Agree is involved if C is “agreeing”, i.e. has phi-features that need to be valued → works well in case there is an overt wh-operator that bears phi-features (e.g. a relative pronoun)
  - problem: both in Greek and Serbo-Croatian, the complementizer is invariant (pu and što), Boeckx is forced to treat it as an agreeing complementizer ...
- Ad 2: Agree is (by assumption) only blocked by strong islands, but not by weak islands → resumptives inside weak islands are expected
  - if resumptives are blocked from weak islands, this must be due to some independent property of the language. Serbo-Croatian: it has no DPs so that movement from weak islands becomes difficult (under the assumption that only referential/D-linked XPs can escape from weak islands and that NPs cannot be D-linked) ...

#### 4.3 Base-generation + Agree

- Welsh: Rouveret (2008: 170, 179)
  - movement (with C-*a*) for SU and DO, resumptive (with C-*y*) for other positions
  - Welsh resumptives are subject to Subjacency; the structures improve if an additional so-called auxiliary pronoun is added (normally, inflected prepositions do not co-occur with overt pronouns)), however, the result still does not seem to be perfect

(28) a. y dyn y soniais amdano  
 the man C I.talked about.**3sM**  
 ‘the man I talked about’

b. Dyma ‘r dyn y cusaiaist ti <‘r ddynes a siaradodd ??amdano/?amdano **ef** >.  
 here the manC kissed you the woman rel talked about.**3sM**/about.**3sM** him  
 ‘Here is the man that you kissed the woman who talked about him.’

- cyclic Agree: features of the resumptive are passed up to the Rel-C
  - C bears {*u*-phi, *i*Rel, EPP};
  - empty base-generated operator in Spec, CP
  - v: *u*-phi, *u*Rel; intermediate Cs bear *u*-phi and *u*Rel: this is the regular declarative complementizer (homophonous with the relative-C that appears with resumptives)
  - resumptive: *i*-phi, *u*Rel

(29) [<sub>CP</sub> OP *y* ... [v ... [*y* ... [v ... [*y* ... resumptive]]]]]]  
*u*-phi *u*-phi *u*-phi *u*-phi *u*-phi *i*-phi  
*i*Rel *u*Rel *u*Rel *u*Rel *u*Rel *u*Rel

- in what sense is this analysis superior to a movement analysis?
  - unclear; intention: there are no reconstruction effects for Principle C effects, which can be explained under the NP-ellipsis theory of resumption; but given that Condition C effects are generally absent in relativization, this is not a particularly strong argument
- problems
  - postulating Rel-features on intermediate C- and v-heads without a morphological reflex is unsatisfactory (there are certain reflexes in written Welsh, cf. Rouveret (2008: 174)
  - even though the resumptives seem to be normal pronouns, they bear special features under resumption → given this special feature make-up, one could expect there to be a special resumptive pronoun set, but this is not what one finds, the pronouns are homophonous
  - the locality facts seem to be disputed, cf. Willis (2000)

## 5 Resumptives and the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy

### 5.1 Various proposals

#### 5.1.1 Keenan and Comrie (1977: 66)

(30) SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

- 2 parameters: a) position on the hierarchy and b) +/- case strategy:
  - [+ case] = Rel-Pron-strategy + resumptive pronoun strategy
  - [- case] = gap strategy
- higher functions are easier to relativize than lower ones → why?
- + case strategies, especially with resumptives, can occur in the lower positions → why?

#### 5.1.2 Lehmann (1984), Lehmann (1986)

- distinction between arguments and adjuncts, separates adnominal from adverbial functions, coordination and embedded clauses form their own hierarchies

(31) a. SU/ABS > DO/ERG > IO (incl. local /temp. complements) > other compl. > adjuncts

- b. Poss/GEN > OComp > other DP-modifiers (*a building, the dwellings in which ...*)
- c. adverbial clauses > adnominal clauses

#### 5.1.3 Cole et al. (1977), Stahlke (1976): Extended accessibility hierarchy: islands

- Cole: SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OC > **SentSU > ComplNP > CoordNP > CoordVP/S**
- Stahlke: SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OC > **CoordNP > ComplNP**

#### 5.1.4 Maxwell (1979)

- Maxwell (1979: 364ff.): distinguishes the Rel-Pro strategy from the resumptive strategy:
  - resumptives reach further down on the hierarchy than Rel-Pro
  - resumptive strategy can reach into islands, Rel-Pro cannot

### 5.2 Explanations

#### 5.2.1 Some attempts to explain the hierarchy/the distribution of resumptives

- psychological ease of comprehension: resumptive structures are closer to the logical form of relative clauses and therefore aid in comprehension (Keenan and Comrie (1977: 88)
- Processing: Hawkins (1999)
- functionally: the strategy which most clearly codes the relation of the head NP will be most successful for the lower positions → does not explain the Rel-Pro/Res-Pro contrast
- Lehmann (1984/1986): argument vs. adjunct: predictability (explicit encoding is more likely with unpredictable roles/functions = adjuncts)
- Maxwell (1979): asymmetry Rel-Pro/Res-Pro in island contexts: presence/absence of mvt

#### 5.2.2 What this still leaves unexplained

- Lehmann (1986: 669): „It (the AH) does not tell us at which point a given strategy will break off or start inserting representatives (~ resumptive pronouns)“ – and: **why?**

- resumptives: remarkable cross-linguistic differences (Keenan & Comrie 1977: 93) – why?
  - from the SU on downwards           Urhubo
  - from the DO on downwards       Palestinian Arabic (Shlonsky 1992)
  - from the IO on downwards       Welsh
  - from the OBL on downwards etc.   Minang-Kabau

#### 5.2.3 What follows from the perspective of modern linguistics

- Locality: the lower positions on the hierarchy tend to be intransparent for extraction and thus favor strategies that do not employ movement, i.e. resumption
  - resumption is more flexible than Rel-Pro because only the latter involves movement
- the achievement on the AH of the Rel-Pro strategy depends on the possibility of pied-piping where there are large cross-linguistic differences
  - but: pied-piping will always be more restricted than resumption
- the gap-strategy is the least flexible one because it involves movement and cannot circumvent islands by means of pied-piping
  - but:
    - Can differences in the distribution of resumptives be reduced to cross-linguistic differences in locality (cf. Cole et al. 1977 vs. Stahlke 1976)? Is locality the only source?

### 5.3 Accounting for the distribution of resumptive pronouns

#### 5.3.1 Relatively straightforward cases

- resumptives within islands (adjunct, CNPC, sentential subject) can be accounted for if resumption involves base-generation and thus helps prevent locality violations
- resumptives for possessors (GEN) and as complements of prepositions (OBL) can be subsumed under the same generalization since they usually cannot be extracted (LBC, PPs are islands in most languages, or P-stranding is disallowed)

#### 5.3.2 The challenging cases

- what about resumptives for IOs, DOs, SUs?
- In some languages, resumptives are only possible if they are separated from their antecedent by a clause-boundary; more generally, clause-boundaries play a role, e.g. in Welsh where matrix SU/DO require gaps, but embedded SU/DO require resumptives
- in some languages, unexpected patterns emerge, e.g. Serbo-Croatian: resumption seems to be sensitive to weak and strong islands, but resumptives *can* occur within PPs
- The issue of distribution of resumptives is to some extent related to the questions surrounding optionality vs. complementary distribution of gaps and resumptives, cf. below

## 6 Case study: Resumption in Swiss German

- General form of Swiss German relatives (Zurich G. cf. Weber (1987), Van Riemsdijk (1989))
  - postnominal, head-external
  - introduced by the invariant complementizer *wo* (*won* before vowels)
  - no relative pronouns (except for some adverbial relations: *reason, why; manner, how*)
  - resumptive pronouns for oblique positions (Comrie & Keenan 1977), not SU/DO
  - resumptives behave like regular pronouns: either cliticize onto prepositions, front to Wackernagel position/cliticize onto C; OCOMP: strong pronoun; inanimate: R-pronoun;
- (32) a. d Frau, wo **(\*si)** immer z spaat chunt (subject: *wo* + gap)  
 the woman C (she) always too late comes  
 ‘the woman who is always late’
- b. s Chuchichäschтли, won i **(\*s)** i de Ikea kchaufft han  
 the kitchen\_cupboard C I it in the Ikea bought have.1SG  
 ‘the kitchen cupboard I bought at Ikea’ (object: *wo* + gap)
- c. de Bueb, wo mer **(\*em)** es Velo versproche händ  
 the boy C we (he.DAT) a bike promised have.1PL  
 ‘the boy we promised a bike’ (indir. object: *wo* + res.)
- d. d Frau, won i von **(\*ere)** es Buech überchoo han  
 the woman C I from (she) a book got have.1SG  
 ‘the woman from whom I got a book’ (P-object: *wo* + P + res.)
- e. d Frau, won i mit **(\*ere)** is Kino ggange bin  
 the woman C I with her in.the movie went am  
 ‘the woman that I went to the movies with’ (P-adjunct: *wo* + P + res.)
- f. s Tuech, won i s Broot **(\*dr)**uf gläit han  
 the cloth C I the bread it.on put have.1SG  
 ‘the cloth that I put the bread on’ (P + inanimate Pro: *wo* + P + R-pronoun)
- g. de äinzig Bueb i de Klass, won i gröösser bin als **(\*ëer)**  
 the only boy in the class C I bigger am than he  
 ‘the only boy in my class that I am bigger than’ (Ocomp: *wo* + *als* + res.)
- islands
- (33) de Autor, wo d Marie < jedes Buech, won **(\*er)** schriibt >, sofort chaufft  
 the author C theMary every book C he writes immediately buys  
 ‘the author such that Mary immediately buys every book he writes’ (CNPC: rel)
- no repair flavor! (unlike intrusive pronouns in English)
  - corresponding wh-extractions are sharply ungrammatical (even with resumptives)
- (34) \* **[Wele Autor]**<sub>1</sub> chaufft d Marie < jedes Buech, wo **er**<sub>1</sub>/\_\_\_ schriibt >?  
 Which author buys the Mary every book C writes  
 lit.: ‘Which author does Mary buy every book that writes?’ (CNPC: rel)

## 7 The distribution of resumptives – and the implementation

- resumption as a last resort: only when necessary
- (35) a. Er isch de **[glicch Idiot]**, wo scho sin Vatter \_\_\_/(\*das) gsii isch.  
 he is the same idiot C already his father that been is  
 ‘He is the same idiot his father already was.’
- b. Isch de Hans würckli de **[Trottel]**, won en all **\*(de)**füür haltet?  
 is the John really the idiot C him all there.for hold  
 ‘Is John really the idiot everyone regards him as?’
- resumption avoids violations of locality (islands, PPs, possessors)
  - resumption makes oblique case visible

### 7.1 Intransparent positions: resumptives amnesty island violations

- resumption amnesties island violations: movement fails → *base-generation*
  - base-generation is the only option to relate operator to positions inside islands
  - the locality argument can be extended to complements of P (and OComp), irrespective of whether the PP is an argument or an adjunct; PPs are islands in ZG:
- (36) **\*[Vo wem]**<sub>1</sub> häsch < an e Schwöschter \_\_\_ > tänkt?  
 of who.DAT have.2SG at the sister thought  
 lit.: ‘Who did you think of a sister of?’
- The same goes for possessors (pronoun licenses an empty *pro*, cf. Salzmann (2011))
- (37) a. de Schüeler, wo de Peter geschter [*pro*; **sin** Vatter] käne gleert hät.  
 the student C the Peter yesterday his father got.to.know has  
 ‘the student whose father Peter met yesterday.’
- b.??[Wem]<sub>1</sub> hät de Peter geschter [\_\_\_ sin Vatter] käne gleert?  
 who.DAT has the Peter yesterday his father got.to.know  
 ‘Whose father did Peter meet yesterday?’

### 7.2 Dative resumptives realize (morphologically) oblique case

- Cannot be due to locality: datives can be extracted:
- (38) a. **Welem Maa/ Dem Maa** häsch **(\*em)** es Buech ggëë?  
 which.DAT man that.DAT boy have.2s he.DAT a book given?  
 ‘To which man did you give a book?/To that man, you gave a book’
- b. de Maa, won t \_\_\_/ **em** es Buech ggëë häsch  
 the man C you he.DAT a book given have.2s  
 ‘the man to whom you gave a book’

#### 7.2.1 A special licensing condition (cf. Pesetsky 1998)

- Case system in ZG: genitive has been lost, Nom/Acc have collapsed → direct vs. oblique, dative being the only oblique case (only on D/A, no longer on N)
- independent motivation in the grammar of German (dialects): like genitives, datives are subject to special morphological licensing conditions: *require overt case morphology*

- complement CPs cannot directly fill slot of a dative argument, a DP has to be inserted:

- (39) a. Wir bestritten (die Behauptung),<sub>acc</sub>[dass wir verreisen wollten].  
we denied the claim that we travel.away wanted  
'We denied (the allegation) that we wanted to go away.'
- b. Wir widersprachen **\*(der Behauptung)**, [dass wir verreisen wollten].  
we objected the.DAT claim that we travel.away wanted  
'We rejected the allegation that we wanted to go away.' Bayer et al. (2001: 471)

- Topic Drop is only possible with SU and DO, but not with DAT, Bayer et al. (2001: 489):

- (40) a. [<sub>acc</sub>] Hab' ich schon gesehen b.\* [<sub>dat</sub>] Würde ich nicht vertrauen  
have I already seen would I not trust  
'I have already seen (it).' 'I wouldn't trust (him)'

- dative resumptives are just another reflex of that constraint
- explains absence of resumptives for SU/DO: direct cases → resumption unnecessary

### 7.2.2 (Probably) The same pattern in Colloquial Czech (Toman (1998: 305))

- (41) a. To je ten nůž, co \_\_ byl na stole. b. To je ten nůž, co Petr našel \_\_ na stole.  
this is the knife C was on table this is the knife C Peter found on table  
'This is the knife that was on the table.' 'This is the knife that P. found on the table.'
- c. To je ten chlap, co **\*(mu)** každéj pomáhá. d. To je ta váza, co **\*(jí)** zatřás.  
this is the guy C he.DAT everyone helps this is the vase C it.INSTR shook  
'This is the guy everyone helps.' 'This is the vase that he shook.'

- also: no resumption with temporal accusatives (Toman 1998: 312f.)

- (42) a. **Tu noc** nejezdilo metro. b. **Ta noc**, co \_\_ nejezdilo metro  
the.ACC night didn't\_run subway the.NOM night C didn't\_run subway  
'In the night the subway didn't run.' 'the night that the subway didn't run'

- Interesting exception: animate masc. singular: DO-resumptives (Toman 1998: 310)

- (43) To je ten chlap, co **ho** viděli v tramvaji.  
this is the guy C him.ACC saw in streetcar  
'This is the guy they saw in the street car.'

- an. masc. have acc formally identical to genitive → oblique case (cf. Pesetsky 1998: 375)!

### 7.2.3 Matching as independent evidence: resumption linked to recoverability

- dative resumptives become optional in matching configurations (Salzmann (2006b):

- (44) Ich han em Bueb, wo t (em) es Buech  
I have.1SG the.DAT boy C you (he.DAT) a book  
versproche häsch, es schööns Exemplar ggëë.  
promised have.2SG a beautiful copy given  
'I gave the boy who you promised a book a beautiful copy.'

### 7.2.4 Other varieties of German

- Fleischer (2006: 223, 225): expression of Nom/Acc is often not necessary, but dative is → dative relative pronouns/resumptives become obligatory (cf. also Bayer (1984))

Palatinate (Rhine Franconian)	Wissembourg (Rhine Franconian)
relative pronoun optional for SU/DO	that-relatives for SU/DO
relative pronoun obligatory for dative	relative pronoun (+ pdm) for dative relatives

- Fischer and Pfeleiderer (1904: 6. Halbband: 912): correlatives instead (attractio inversa)

- (45) **Denere** Frau, wo \_\_<sub>DAT</sub> des Haus ghört, (die) hat s verkauft  
the.DAT woman C this house belongs.to she has it sold  
'The woman to whom this whose belongs sold it.' (Swabian)

### 7.2.5 Against previous alternatives

- 7.2.5.1 An alternative: realize *inherent* case (Bianchi 2004: 96, Boeckx 2003: 80ff.)

- supposed to subsume datives, possessors and complements of P
- problems with Bianchi's/Boeckx's proposal:
  - status of datives, possessors and objects of P w.r.t. "inherentness" controversial in German + all datives require resumptives (but cf. Salzmann 2006 for qualifications)
  - inherent accusatives do NOT require resumptives (47):

- (46) a. Ich ha di öppis gfröögt.  
I have you.ACC something.ACC asked  
'I asked you something.'

- b. Du bisch öppis gfröögt worde. c.\*Öppis isch dich gfröögt worde.  
You are something.ACC asked become Something is you.ACC asked become  
'You were asked something.' Lit.: 'Something was asked him.'

- (47) di vile Sache, won er **(\*si)** mi di ganz Ziit fröögt  
the many things C he them me.ACC the whole time asks  
'the many things that he asks me the whole time'

- the same goes for accusative marked predicates (not terribly natural, though)

- (48) a. Er schimpft sich **en** Profässer.  
he scolds self a.ACC professor  
'He calls himself a professor.'

- b. Er isch also nöd de Profässer, won er sich **(\*en/\*das)** gschumpfe hät.  
he is really not the prof. C he self he.ACC/THAT scolded has  
'He is definitely not the professor he called himself.'

- it is not about inherent vs. structural, it is just about morphological case!  
→ the importance of morphological case is reminiscent of constraints on free relatives

- 7.2.5.2 Datives as a PP (van Riemsdijk 1989, Bayer et al. 2001)

- van Riemsdijk (1989): base-generation, resumptives move to Comp to get deleted
- works for SU/DO → gap, but:
- impossible with datives: they are composed of locative P + NP → irrecoverable deletion

- but: Dialects with prepositional dative marking (Seiler 2003)
- (49) Ich han s Buech **i/a** de Muetter ggää.  
I have.1SG the book PRP the.DAT mother given  
'I gave the book to the mother.'
- implausible that there are two dummy prepositions to express dative
- Alternative: is this dummy marker simply the overt realization of the silent P?
- (50) [<sub>PP</sub> i/a [<sub>NP</sub> em]]
- There are systematic asymmetries between the overt and (alleged) silent P:
  - P governing a dummy P is impossible, P governing silent P is fine (Seiler 2002: 251):
- (51) [mit \*(i/a) de Frau]  
with PRP the.DAT woman  
'with the woman'
- if dative pron. *em* = loc P + NP, it is unclear how it can occur after P: *mit em* 'with him'
- the dummy P requires the strong form of the pronoun, not the clitic (Seiler 2002: 251)
- (52) häd=mer=em=s gsëid? vs. \*häd=mer=**i=em**=s gsëid? vs. i **ire**  
häd=mer=s i **imm** gsëid? P here  
has=one=he.DAT=it told has=one=it PRP he.DAT told '(to) her'  
'did they tell it to him?' (dialect of Lucerne)
- with the alleged silent P, the dative pronoun is weak (*em, ere*)
- PP-extrapolation is generally available; extrapolation of datives is degraded, but improves with prepositional dative marking, cf. Seiler (2002: 257f.), Seiler (2003: 176ff.)
- (53) die händ immer no nüt zalt [für di Arme]/ ?[a de Arme]/\*[de Arme]  
they have.3p still nothing paid for the poor P the poor the poor
- no extrapolation of dative resumptives as opposed to real PPs:
- (54) de Bueb, wo mer es Velo kchaufft händ **\*em / füen**  
the boy C we a bike bought have he.DAT for him  
'the boy we bought a bike (for)'
- variation in dative resumption (8.3) argues against unification: no variation with PPs
- 7.2.5.3 Rouveret (2002) on Welsh: Phase Impenetrability Condition
- Only elements that are accessible to C can be attracted by movement: Spec, vP and above
  - Subjects are no problem, as for objects, only those that undergo Object Shift
  - IOs are PPs → they don't undergo object shift and therefore are not accessible for C
  - problems:
  - the DP/PP-distinction does not really work for German (see previous subsection)
  - DOs do not differ from IOs in their propensity to undergo scrambling (in German)

- 7.2.5.4 Rouveret (1994)/Willis (2000): A'-disjointness
- A'-version of Principle B: resumptives barred from positions where they would be (too) locally bound, cf. e.g. Rouveret (1994: 408)
- (55) *A'-Disjointness Requirement (Welsh)* (definition from Rouveret (1994: 408))  
A pronoun must be A'-free in the functional projection, or, if it exists, in the extended projection, of the head L to which the site of the pronoun is lexically linked.
- extended projection for SU/DO = CP → resumptives for SU/DO blocked
  - for DPs/PPs: the functional (agreement) projection: PPs/AgrDPs → resumptive possible
  - problem: does not work for ZG since datives cannot easily be analyzed as PPs

## 8 The problem: no resumptives with SU and DO

- Given that the possibility of resumption/base-generation exists, what blocks resumption for SU and DO?
  - Furthermore, when located inside an island, SU and DO do require resumptives
- (56) de Autor, wo d Marie < jedes Buech, won **\*(er)** schriibt >, sofort chauft  
the author C theMary every book C he writes immediately buys  
'the author such that Mary immediately buys every book he writes' (CNPC: rel)

### 8.1 Resumptives blocked by an independent constraint?

- McCloskey (1990: 215); Willis (2000: 547): A'-disjointness
- the formulations differ in each language with different coverage:
- McCloskey rules out resumptives for SU, Willis for SU and DO;
- as pointed out in the previous subsection, this approach does not readily work for ZG
- more generally: it would be more interesting to have a more principled solution, and since the notion oblique case makes the right cut for ZG, this seems more promising.

### 8.2 Movement blocks base-generation – Globally or locally?

- Intuitively: resumption is not necessary because nothing requires overtness (nom/acc are direct, non-oblique cases) → gap-derivation is more economical
- one has to find a constraint that favors movement over base-generation → they compete, i.e. are part of the same *Reference Set*
- A major question: can the choice be made locally?
- a complication: when located inside an island, resumption for SU/DO must be possible → this would have to be taken into account, i.e. this would have to override the local decision in favor of movement ... → Economy seems to be at work





### 8.3 Variation in dative resumption: Salzmann (2013)

- Alemannic varieties spoken in Germany show the same pattern as ZG except that there are no dative resumptives, cf. Noth (1993: 418ff.)

- (70) a. *Alli, wun em —<sub>AKK</sub> hab wellá machá, si mr vrgroodá.* (Oberrotweil)  
 All C he.DAT have wanted make are me.DAT failed  
 ‘Of those that I tried to make for him, all turned out badly.’ DO
- b. *Sáli Firma, wu dr Sebb noch —<sub>DAT</sub> ebis schulded, hed scho wider aagruafa.*  
 that firm C the S. still someth. owes has already again called  
 ‘That company who john still owes something has called again.’ IO
- c. *Dr áinzig, wu si vrhandlá mid em, isch dr Aafiärer.*  
 the only.one C they negotiate with him is the leader  
 ‘The only one with whom they negotiate is the leader.’ PP

- can only be captured if
  - a constraint invariably prefers mvt over base-generation to avoid resumpt. for SU/DO
  - REALIZEOBL holds in for 7.2.1 but can be overruled in relativization  
 → implies constraint interaction: \*MERGE >> REALIZEOBL >> \*MOVE

(71) Dative relatives without resumptive pronouns

	*MERGE	REALIZEOBL	*MOVE
a. Base-generation	*!		
b. Movement		*	*

(72) Inversely, a grammar with strict dative resumptives:

	REALIZEOBL	*MERGE	*MOVE
a. Base-generation		*	
b. Movement	*!		*

- For many speakers of ZG (and other Swiss dialects), the use of dative resumptives is essentially optional
- one needs a system that categorically rules out resumptives for SU/DO, but allows them optionally for IO
- a categorial economy constraint favoring mvt over base-generation will not be sufficient as this would block dative resumptives; instead, it will somehow have to interact with the constraint requiring overt realization of datives: REALIZEOBL <> \*MERGE >> \*MOVE

(73) Optional dative resumptive pronouns

	REALIZEOBL	*MERGE	*MOVE
a. Base-generation		*	
b. Movement	*		*

- One potential problem
- the model is too powerful if locality constraints are also taken to be part of the Evaluator: one could model a grammar with dative resumptives in all contexts but no resumptives for SU/DO inside islands (REALIZEOBL >> \*MERGE >> LOCALITY >> \*MOVE)  
 → locality constraints on movement should be built into the Generator, cf. the Derivations and Evaluations Model (Broekhuis (2008))

### References

Aiger, David, and Ramchand, Gillian. 2005. Merge and Move: Wh-Dependencies Revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:161-193.

Alexopoulos, Theodoros. 2006. Resumption in Relative Clauses. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 24:57-111.

Aoun, Joseph, and Choueiri, Lina. 2000. Epitets. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18:1-39.

Aoun, Joseph, Choueiri, Lina, and Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. Resumption, Movement, and Derivational Economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:371-403.

Barbiers, Sjef, Koeneman, Olaf, and Lekakou, Marika. 2008. Syntactic Doubling and the Structure of Chains. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 26:77-86.

Bayer, Josef. 1984. Comp in Slavonic Syntax. *The Linguistic Review* 3:209-274.

Bayer, Josef, Bader, Markus, and Meng, Michael. 2001. Morphological Underspecification Meets Oblique Case: Syntactic and Processing Effects in German. *Lingua* 111:465-514.

Bianchi, Valentina. 2004. Resumptive Relatives and LF Chains. In *The Cartography of syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, ed. Rizzi, Luigi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and chains. Resumption as stranding*. Amsterdam u.a.: Benjamins.

Borer, Hagit. 1984. Restrictive relatives in modern Hebrew. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 2:219-260.

Broekhuis, Hans, and Klooster, Wim. 2007. Merge and Move as costly operations. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 15:17-37.

Broekhuis, Hans. 2008. *Derivations and evaluations. Object shift in the Germanic languages*. Berlin u.a.: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chao, Wynn, and Sells, Peter. 1983. On the Interpretation of Resumptive Pronouns. *Proceedings of NELS* 13:47-61.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Cole, Peter, Sridhar, S. N., Herbert, Wayne, Hashimoto, C., Nelson, C., and Smetana, D. 1977. Noun Phrase Accessibility and Island Constraints. In *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 8, Grammatical Relations*, eds. Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock, 27-46. New York: Academic Press.

Comrie, Bernard, and Kureva, Tania. 2005. Relativization Strategies. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, eds. Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil and Bernard Comrie. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Demirdache, Hamida. 1991. Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives and Dislocation Structures. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Doron, Edit. 1982. On the syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns. *Focus Linguistic Forum* 19:1-48.

Elbourne, Paul. 2001. E-Type Anaphora as NP-Deletion. *Natural Language Semantics* 9:241-288.

Engdahl, Elisabet. 1985. Parasitic Gaps, Resumptive Pronouns, and Subject Extractions. *Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences* 23:3-44.

Ereschik-Shir, Nomi. 1992. Resumptive Pronouns in Islands. In *Island Constraints. Theory, Acquisition and Processing*, eds. Helen Goodluck and Michael Rochemont, 89-108. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Fischer, Hermann, and Pleiderer, Wilhelm. 1904. *Schweizerisches Wörterbuch*. Tübingen: Laupp.

Fleischer, Jörg. 2006. Dative and Indirect Object in German Dialects: Evidence from Relative Clauses. In *Datives and other Cases. Between Argument Structure and Event Structure*, eds. Daniel Hole, Andre Meinunger and Werner Abraham. 213-238. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fox, Danny. 2002. Antecedent-Government and the Copy Theory of Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:63-96.

Georgopoulos, Carol. 1985. Variables in Palauan Syntax. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 3:59-94.

Georgopoulos, Carol. 1991. *Syntactic variables. Resumptive pronouns and A' binding in Palauan*. Dordrecht u.a.: Kluwer.

Goodluck, Helen, and Stojanovic, Danijela. 1995. The Structure and Acquisition of Relative Clauses in Serbo-Croatian. *Language Acquisition: A Journal of Developmental Linguistics* 5:285-315.

Guillot, Nicolas, and Malkaw, Nouman. 2006. When resumption determines reconstruction. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 25:168-176.

Heck, Fabian, and Müller, Gereon. 2000. Repair-Driven Movement and the Local Optimization of Derivations. Ms. University of Stuttgart/University of Mannheim.

Heck, Fabian, Müller, Gereon, Vogel, Ralf, Fischer, Silke, Vikner, Sten, and Schmid, Tanja. 2002. On the Nature of the Input in Optimality Theory. *The Linguistic Review* 19:345-376.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Wexler, Ken. 1990. The Necessity of LF. *The Linguistic Review* 7:129-167.

Keenan, Edward L., and Comrie, Bernard. 1977. Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.

Keenan, Edward L., and Comrie, Bernard. 1979. Data on the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy. *Language* 55:333-351.

Koopman, Hilda, and Stojanovic, Danijela. 1986. A note on long extraction in Vata and English. *CP. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 4:357-374.

Kureva, Tania, and Comrie, Bernard. 2005. The Typology of Relative Clause Formation in African Languages. In *Typological Studies in Language (TSLang)*, ed. F. K. Erhard Voeltz, xiii, 426 pp. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen: Theoretische Funktionen: Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Lehmann, Christian. 1986. On the Typology of Relative Clauses. *Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences* 24:663-680.

Malkawi, Nouman, and Guillot, Nicolas. 2007. Reconstruction & Islandhood in Jordanian Arabic. In *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XX*, ed. Mustafa A. Mughazy, 87-104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Maxwell, Daniel N. 1979. Strategies of Relativization and NP Accessibility. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America* 55:352-371.

McCloskey, James. 1990. Resumptive Pronouns, A-Binding and Levels of Representation in Irish. In *The Syntax of the Modern Celtic Languages*, ed. Randall Hendrick, 199-248. San Diego: Academic.

McCloskey, James. 2002. Resumption, Successive Cyclicity, and the Locality of Operations. In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, eds. Samuel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seuren, 184-226. Oxford: Blackwell.

Noth, Harald. 1993. *Alemannisches Dialektlexikon vom Kaiserstuhl und seiner Umgebung*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Schillinger.

Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: MIT Press.

Perlmutter, David M. 1972. Evidence for shadow pronouns in French relativization. In *The Chicago Which Hunt. Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*, eds. Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi and Gloria C. Phares, 73-105. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Pešatsky, David. 1998. Some Optimality Principles of Sentence Pronunciation. In *In Is the best good enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, eds. Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Martha McGinnis and David Pešatsky, 337-383. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Potsdam, Eric, and Runner, Jeffrey T. 2001. Richard returns: Copy Raising and its Implications. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 38:xxx.

Prince, Ellen F. 1990. Syntax and Discourse: A Look at Resumptive Pronouns. *BLS* 16:482-497.

Rouveret, Alain. 1994. *Syntaxe des gallois: principes généraux et typologie*. Paris: CNRS Editions.

Rouveret, Alain. 2002. How are resumptive Pronouns linked to the Periphery? In *Linguistic Variation Yearbook. Volume 2*, eds. Pierre Pica and Johan Rooryck, 123-184. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rouveret, Alain. 2008. Phasal Agreement and Reconstruction. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 167-195. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Salzmann, Martin. 2006a. *Resumptive prolepsis: a study in indirect A'-dependencies*. Utrecht: LOT.

Salzmann, Martin. 2006b. Resumptive Pronouns and Matching Effects in Zurich German Relative Clauses as Distributed Deletion. In *Leiden Papers in Linguistics 3.1*, eds. Noureddine Elouazi, Frank Lenschberger, Malika Pass and Martin Salzmann, 17-50. Leiden: LUVL.

Salzmann, Martin. 2008. Variation in resumption requires viable constraints - a case study in Alemannic relativization. In *Optimality Theory and Minimalism: Interface Theories*, eds. Hans Broekhuis and Ralf Vogel, 99-132. Potsdam: University of Potsdam.

Salzmann, Martin. 2009a. When movement and base-generation compete: The definition of the reference set and parameterized preferences for elementary operations. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 26:64-77.

Salzmann, Martin. 2009b. When movement and base-generation compete - on the definition of the reference set, the typology of resumption, and ranked economy constraints. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 48:27-63.

Salzmann, Martin. 2009c. Different notions of variation and their reflexes in Swiss German relativization. In *Describing and Modeling Variation in Grammar*, 135-162. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Salzmann, Martin, and Seiler, Guido. 2010. Variation as the exception or the rule? Swiss relatives revisited. *Sprachwissenschaft* 35:79-117.

Salzmann, Martin. 2011. Silent resumptives in Zurich German possessor relativization. In *Null Pronouns*, eds. Peter Gollmann and Melani Wratil, 141-221. Berlin: Mouton.

Salzmann, Martin. 2013. On three types of variation in resumption - evidence in favor of viable and ranked constraints. In *Linguistic Derivations and Filtering*, eds. Hans Broekhuis and Ralf Vogel, 76-108. Sheffield: Equinox.

Seiler, Guido. 2002. Prepositional dative marking in Upper German: a case of syntactic microvariation. In *Syntactic Microvariation*, eds. Sjef Barbiers, Leonie Cornips and Susanne Van der Kleij. Amsterdam: Meertens Institut.

Seiler, Guido. 2003. *Präpositionale Datemarkierung im Oberdeutschen*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Sharvit, Yael. 1999. Resumptive Pronouns in Relative Clauses. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17:587-612.

Silbolsky, Uri. 1992. Resumptive Pronouns as a Last Resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:443-468.

Stahlke, Herbert F. W. 1976. *Which That. Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America* 52:584-610.

Sternfeld, Wolfgang. 1997. Comparing Reference Sets. In *The Role of Economy Principles in Linguistic Theory*, eds. Chris Wilder, Hans-Martin Gartner and Manfred Bierwisch, 81-114. Berlin, Germany: Akademie.

Suner, Margarita. 1998. Resumptive Restrictive Relatives: A Crosslinguistic Perspective. *Language* 74:335-364.

Toman, Jindřich. 1998. A Discussion of Resumptives in Colloquial Czech. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, eds. Zeljko Boskovic, Steven Franks and William Snyder, 303-318. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic.

Van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1989. Swiss Relatives. In *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon*, eds. Dany Jaegers, Wim Klooster, Van Putseys and Pieter Seuren, 343-354. Berlin: Foris.

Weber, Albert. 1987. *Zürichdeutsche Grammatik: ein Wegweiser zur guten Mundart*. Zürich: Schweizer Spiegel Verlag.

Willis, David. 2000. On the Distribution of Resumptive Pronouns and Wh-Trace in Welsh. *Journal of Linguistics* 36:531-573.

Zaenen, Annie, Engdahl, Elisabet, and Maling, Joan M. 1981. Resumptive Pronouns Can Be Syntactically Bound. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:679-682.