

When movement and base-generation compete – on the definition of the Reference Set, the typology of resumption, and parameterized economy constraints

Martin Salzmann, Universität Konstanz
martin.salzmann@uni-konstanz.de

- Abstract
- Zurich G relatives show that gap and resumptive relatives compete
- Zurich G relatives show that movement and base-generation derivations can compete
- as a consequence: reference set must be based on identical LFs
- ZG: preference for gaps over resumptives → for movement over base-generation
- the preference for movement over base-generation is not universal: in some languages, both strategies exist side by side in identical environments
- as a consequence, one cannot penalize resumption by means of a universal MP-economy constraint (Last Resort, Fewest Steps, Avoid Pronoun)
- rather: cross-linguistic variation is the result of different rankings of interacting and violable constraints, both movement and resumption can be penalized
- ban against resumption subsumed under *MERGE

1 Introduction: Zurich German relativization

- General form of Swiss German relatives (Zurich G. cf. Weber 1964, 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;
- (1) a) d Frau, wo **(*si)** immer z spaat chunnt (subject: *wo* + gap)
the woman C (she) always too late comes
'the woman who is always late'
- b) s Chuchichäschkli, woni **(*s)** i de Ikea kchauft 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.)

- islands: resumptives in all positions
- (2) 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)
- corresponding wh-extractions are sharply ungrammatical (even with resumptives)
- (3) ***[Wele Autor]₁** chauft d Marie < jedes Buech, wo ₁ schriibt >?
Which author buys the Mary every book C writes
lit.: 'Which author does Mary buy every book that writes?' (CNPC: rel)
- no repair flavor! in relatives (unlike intrusive pronouns in English, cf. Chao & Sells 1983):
- (4) a)%I'd like to meet the linguist that Mary couldn't remember if she had seen **him** before.
b)%the man that Mary just that Sue had told her that Cynthia likes **him**.

2 Explaining the distribution of resumptives in ZG relatives

- islands: resumptives amnesty violations of locality
 - datives: resumptives realize oblique case (Salzmann 2006, to appear a)
 - dative as an oblique case requires phonetic realization (Bayer et al. 2001)
- (5) a) Wir bestritten, _{acc}[dass wir verreisen wollten].
we denied that we travel.away wanted
'We denied 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):
- (6) a) [_{acc}] Hab' ich schon gesehen b)* [_{dat}] 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
- gaps for subjects and direct objects: resumptive not necessary → gaps "more economical"
 - resumptives are a "last resort"
- consequences:
 - Since there is a mechanism that produces resumptive structures, we have to explain why resumptives are ruled out for local SU/DO
 - Resumptive derivations arguably converge for local SU/DO, but the gap derivation is selected as optimal/grammatical
 - Which principle favors gaps over resumptives?
 - gap and resumptive derivations compete → belong to the same reference set
 - What are the implications for the definition of the reference set?

3 Is the reference set based on identical numerations?

3.1 Movement accounts of resumption

3.1.1 Spell-out approaches: Pesetsky 1998, Bianchi 2004, Alexopoulou 2006:

- The trace is (optionally) phonetically realized at the end of the derivation
 - gap- and resumptive-derivation can be based on the same numeration
 - SU/DO: both converge, gap-derivation is selected as optimal – why? more economical?
 - representational economy (translocal PF-constraint):
 - SILENTTRACE (Pesetsky 1998)
 - AVOID PRONOUN (Chomsky 1982: 63f., Heck & Müller 2000: 44, probably also the interpretation in Müller & Sternefeld 2001: 60)
- (7) John₁ preferred [PRO₁/his_{1/2} going to the movies].
- parallelism not perfect: no A'-dependency
 - or derivational economy: the additional realization operation is costly (Fewest Steps?)
 - What about the Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky 1995)?

3.1.2 Big-DP-approaches (e.g. Boeckx 2003): resumptive part of numeration

- The resumptive is the head of a Big-DP from the spec of which the antecedent subextracts: Op-NP_[DP] Op-NP [D' res Op-NP]
- For gap- and resumptive derivations to compete one has to assume that the gap-derivation is based on a resumptive derivation + deletion
- SU/DO: both gap and resumptive-derivation converge, gap selected as optimal – why?
- again representational economy (Avoid Pronoun)?
- problem: gap-derivation is arguably more complex in that it involves an additional deletion operation (Nunes 2004: deletion relevant for economy computation) → structural economy apparently more important than derivational economy – ranking???
- further problems: cf. on van Riemsdijk (1989) below

3.1.3 Resumptive = operator in-situ (Demirdache 1991)

- Demirdache: resumptive = operator in-situ (moves at LF)
- for gap- and resumptive derivations to compete one has to assume that the gap-derivation is based on a resumptive derivation + deletion
- favoring gaps: representational economy (Avoid Pronoun)

3.2 Against movement-based accounts of resumption

- One type that will be ignored here: Resumptives that are sensitive to locality
 - In some languages, resumptives cannot appear in Strong/Weak islands (Boeckx 2003 on Swedish, Vata, Goodluck & Stojanovic 1996 on Serbo-Croatian; Georgopoulos 1991 on Palauan, Rouveret 2008: 179 on Welsh, Alexopoulou 2006: 85 on Greek restr. rel):
- (8) *to pedi pu xerume < ton tipo pu (to) emplexe me tis palioparees >
 the kid C know.1p the.ACC guy C it got.involved with the dodgy_friendships
 'the kid who we know the guy that got him into dodgy friendships'

3.2.1 Locality (McCloskey 2002): Why should resumptive alleviate violations of locality?

3.2.1.1 Against LF-movement (Demirdache 1991)

- LF-movement is not completely insensitive to locality (cf. Aoun & Li 1993), but resumptives in ZG (and in many other languages) can appear in any kind of island

3.2.1.2 Against Big-DP (Boeckx 2003)

- idea: movement can take place under pure Match (i.e. without Agree) → C can probe into islands if phi-features of operator (i.e. the goal) are not activated
- this is exactly possible under resumption: entire Big-DP checks phi-features of v → operator can subextract under pure Match:

- (9) C ... [ISLAND v [DP D_{res} [Op]]]
 Big-DP checks case-/phi-features on v.
 C attracts operator under pure Match

- only possible with non-agreeing Cs (≈ invariant C + zero operator), but impossible with agreeing Cs (those that allow overt phrasal relative operators)
- problems:
 - analysis essentially tailored around the facts ...
 - notion agreeing/non-agreeing complementizer not well-defined/circular: non-agreeing tend to be those that co-occur with resumptives → no independent definition
 - Operator an NP? (cf. Bianchi 2008 for criticism)
 - Big-DP-structure arguably not independently available in the language

3.2.1.3 Against Spell-out (Pesetsky 1998)

- locality redefined: prohibits chains with unrealized bottom copies inside islands (cf. Perlmutter 1972): *β [island β] – but why???
 - approach crucially depends on overtness of resumptive, but possessor rel. shows that island violations can also be amended by empty resumptives (Salzmann, to appear c):
- (10) Das deet isch de Schüeler, woni geschter **pro** sin Vatter kâne gleert han.
 that there is the student C I yesterday his father got.to.know have
 'Over there is the student whose father I met yesterday.'
- empty resumptives are widespread, cf. Georgopoulos (1985), McCloskey (1990) and 4.1.3.

- Hebrew: only one relativization strategy: *that*-relatives; gaps and resumptives vary (apparently freely) in some positions, matrix and embedded DO and embedded SU:

(27) ha-ʔiš še raʔiti (**ʔoto**) DO
 the-man that saw.1s him
 'the man that I saw' (Shlonsky 1992)

- movement + resumption in absolutely transparent position: matrix DO
- intransparent position: only resumption:

(28) hine ha-sendvic še pagašti < ʔet ha-ʔiša še ʔaxla **ʔoto**/*__ >
 here the-sandwich that met.1ms ACC the-woman that ate it
 lit.: 'Here is the sandwich such that I met the woman who ate it.' Shlonsky (2004)

4.4 Intermediate conclusion

4.4.1 Markedness relationships

- The crosslinguistic facts suggest that resumption must not be treated as universally more marked than movement:
 - in some languages, resumption is the only option (e.g. Palauan)
 - in other languages, the choice between resumption and gaps is free (Irish, Hebrew)
 - in others, movement is the default and resumption is a last resort (ZG, Welsh)
- How to capture these cross-linguistic differences?

4.4.2 Economy constraints

- Representational Economy like Avoid Pronoun and Last Resort do not work
- Derivational Economy might work
- major problem: MP-economy constraints predict a universally consistent markedness tendency, which is at odds with the typological facts/cross-linguistic variation

5 Pseudo-optionalty?

- If the optionality in Irish, Hebrew etc. could be explained away, an account in terms of economy might still be possible

5.1 Different numerations

- Shlonsky (1992): gap and resumptive derivations for matrix DO based on 2 different C (even though phonetically identical) → different Reference Sets → no competition:
 - C1: turns Spec, CP into A-position → relativization = A-mvt → gaps for SU; not possible for DO/IO because SU (in A-position) intervenes → resumption for DO/IO etc.
 - C2: turns Spec, CP into A'-position → relativization = A'-mvt → gaps for all relations⁵

- McCloskey (2002: 205): resumptive (aN) and movement-C (aL) differ in features:
 - aN: EPP
 - aL: EPP + Op_[-int]
- But:
 - the ZG facts show that this cannot be correct: mvt and base-generation compete!
 - How can we account for both patterns – optionality vs. mvt as the default?

5.2 The role of scope

- Resumptives block scope reconstruction (trigger specific interpretation of external head)
 - no multiple-individual readings, no de dicto readings, no amount readings
- Doron (1982), Suñer (1998), Sharvit (1999), Boeckx (2003), Bianchi (2004, 2008), Guillot (2007)
- since Reference Set is based on the same LF → differences in scope should have consequences for competition
- Narrow Scope (= scope reconstruction)
 - only with a gap/mvt-derivation
 - resumptive/base-generation: in a different Reference Set (only specific interpretation)
 - So does this solve the optionality problem from 4.3.2.2 above?
 - gap: non-specific (cf. e.g. the fact that amount relatives do not tolerate resumptives)
 - resumptive: specific
 - Optionality = pseudo-optionality: different Reference Sets → no competition
 - resumptives could still be treated as a last resort:
 - occur for reasons of locality
 - occur to express specificity (for whatever reason, cf. Boeckx 2003)
 - but does not work:
 - gap-relatives allow specific/wide-scope interpretations (cf. (14)b), Bianchi 2004, 2008!

(29) a) Dani yimca 'et ha-iša še hu mexapes __ (Doron 1982: 25)
 Dani will.find acc the-woman that he seeks
 'Dani will find the woman he is looking for' √ de dicto, √ de re

b) Dani yimca 'et ha-iša še hu mexapes **ota**
 Dani will.find acc the-woman that he seeks her
 'Dani will find the woman he is looking for' * de dicto, √ de re

- there will be competition between resumptive/gap for *specific* interpretations in languages like Irish, Hebrew etc.
 - the optionality problem remains in Irish/Hebrew:
- both gap and resumptive derivations have the same LF and are both grammatical
 - the variation problem remains:
- resumption is sometimes treated as a last resort (ZG) and sometimes not (e.g. Irish)

⁵ Perhaps the two derivations do belong to different reference sets as they involve A-mvt vs. A'-mvt?

6 Resumptivity as a kind of parameter

6.1 Why an MP-like economy approach fails

- Resumption
 - a last resort in some languages
 - an optional strategy equal to movement in other languages
- resumption seems less economical than mvt only in some languages
- resumption seems equally economical in others
- Problems for any MP-approach:
 - the translocal constraint that favors mvt over base-generation in ZG must be an economy constraint, and since economy constraints are taken to be universal:
 - mvt is predicted to be preferred over base-generation in all languages, contrary to fact
- One way out: parameterization of the definition of the reference set (Sternefeld 1997)
 - Zurich German: same LF → mvt and base-generation compete
 - Irish/Hebrew/Romance dialects: same numeration → mvt and base-generation belong to different Reference Sets → no competition → optionality
 - more plausible for Irish (2 phonet. different complementizers), but Hebrew, Romance dialects? compl + operator phonetically identical in mvt/base-generation – but still in 2 types: case-marked/case-unmarked (like ZG)⁶

6.2 Penalizing resumption by means of violable, ranked constraints

- language variation can be handled quite easily by means of violable/ranked constraints:
 - *MOVE: penalizes movement
 - *RES: penalizes resumptives/base-generation
- Deriving the two language types that have both mvt and base-generation
 - mvt as a last resort (ZG): *RES >> *MOVE
 - optionality (Irish, Hebrew): *RES <> *MOVE
- Criticism
 - brute force approach that basically restates the observational facts
- alternative: use the elementary operations underlying movement and base-generation:
 - *Movement*: Merge (operator) + Copy (operator) + Merge (operator)
 - *Resumption*: Merge (operator) + Merge (pronoun) + Binding
- Zurich German: *BINDING >> *COPY
- Irish/Hebrew: *BINDING <> *COPY
- alternatively: Merge vs. Move (cf. Broekhuis & Klooster 2007, Broekhuis 2008)
 - English: *MOVE >> *MERGE
 - Zurich German: *MERGE >> *MOVE
 - Irish/Hebrew: *MERGE <> *MOVE

⁶ See Nakamura (1998: 297) who argues that differences in uninterpretable features like case do not make a derivation distinct and thus do not lead to a different reference set.

- potential independent evidence (cf. Broekhuis & Klooster 2007): negative sentences:
- (30) a) Jan is [_{NEG}P over niemand]₁ ___₁ tevreden. b) John is [_{NEG}P not] satisfied with anybody.
 John is about no.one happy
 'John is not satisfied with anybody.'
- assumption: [+neg] feature checked in Spec, NegP, either
 - via Move: Dutch
 - via Merge (of negative adverb): English
 - more evidence (Gärtner 2002: 103, fn. 236): scope marking (under direct dependency)
 - scope-marker inserted at the end of the derivation, Move of the wh-operator preferred:
- (31) **Was** glaubst du, **wen**₁ Maria ___₁ geküsst hat?
 what believe you whom Mary kissed has
 'Who do you believe Mary kissed?'
- note: two different notions Merge over Move/Move over Merge:
 - representational view (Broekhuis, approach here): how many traces altogether?
 - derivational view (expletives in Chomsky 1995, scope-marking): which operation is preferred at a specific point in the derivation?

6.3 Parameterizing economy constraints?

- normally not possible in MP, cf. e.g. Müller & Sternefeld (2001: 29, 59, fn. 22)
 - would it work for the case at hand? → ties are normally not thought to be possible in MP
 - evidence for OT-type system: interaction with other constraints:
 - again dative relativization (cf. (5)–(6)):
 - REALIZEOBL >> *MERGE >> *MOVE → dative resumptive obligatory
 - also follows under classical MP-approach: derivation crashes without resumptive (RealizeObl = representational PF-constraint)
 - problem (Salzmann to appear b): dative resumptives in Swiss G are optional for many
- (32) solution: REALIZE OBL <> *MERGE > *MOVE

| | | | REALIZEOBL | *MERGE | *MOVE |
|---|----|-------|------------|--------|-------|
| ☞ | a. | + res | | * | |
| ☞ | b. | - res | * | | * |

- optionality requires global tie (cf. Müller 2000)

7 What if only one strategy? – absolute ungrammaticality

7.1 Resumption-only languages

- Solution 1: mvt-derivations are ruled out by GEN (cf. Broekhuis 2008):
 - in those languages, there are no operators that can check both case and peripheral features: such languages do not have case-marked operators
- Solution 2: Move is less economical than Merge: *MOVE >> *MERGE (or: *MOVE >> *RES)

7.2 Movement-only languages

- What about Standard German, which disallows resumption even under extraction from islands (cf. e.g. Müller 2000: 82ff.)?
- (33) * [Welcher Autor]₁ glaubst du, dass Maria <jedes Buch liest, das ___₁/ er₁ schreibt>? which author believe you that Mary every book reads which he writes lit.: 'Which author do you believe that Mary reads every book that writes?'
- solution 1: resumptive structures cannot be generated by GEN
 - evidence: wh- and relative operators are always case-marked → cannot be base-generated (→ resumption should be possible with comparative deletion, cf. Bayer 2002)
 - solution 2: there is an alternative that blocks (33) (with resumption)
 - resumptive prolepsis (Salzmann 2006):
- (34) [Von welchem Autor]₁ glaubst du, dass Maria<jedes Buch liest, das er₁ schreibt>? of which author believe you that Mary every book reads which he writes lit.: 'Which author do you believe that Mary reads every book that writes?'
- Problem 1: are the two based on the same LF?
 - 2 chains vs. 1 (in mvt derivation)
 - lower copy in the matrix clause – may be LF-relevant, cf. Salzmann (2006)
 - Problem 2: Why should (34) be preferred over (33)? Both seem to involve 1 binding-chain
 - Problem 3: optionality in transparent contexts:
- (35) a) Wen₁ hast du vermutet, ___₁ dass Maria ___₁ mag? who.ACC have you suspected that Mary likes 'Who did you suspect that Mary likes?'
- b) [Von wem]₁₂ hast du ___₂ vermutet, dass Maria ihn₁ mag? of who.DAT have you suspected that Mary him likes
- Given *MERGE >> *MOVE, one would expect the long-movement derivation to be preferred
 - solution 1 seems to be the only option

8 Conclusion

- ZG provides evidence that gap and resumptive derivations can compete
- ZG provides evidence that movement and base-generation derivations can compete
- the reference set must not be based on identical numerations, but on identical LFs
- ZG shows a preference for gaps over resumption, i.e. for movement over base-generation
- the preference for movement over base-generation is not universal: in some languages, both strategies exist side by side in identical environments
- → one cannot penalize resumption by means of a universal MP-economy constraint
- rather: cross-linguistic variation is the result of different rankings of interacting and violable constraints
- both movement and resumption can be penalized: *MERGE (penalizes resumption), *MOVE
- ban against resumption can be subsumed under *MERGE

References

- Adger, David And Gillian Ramchand (2005): Merge and Move: Wh-Dependencies Revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 161–193.
- Alexopoulou, Theodora (2006): Resumption in Relative Clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24, 57–111.
- Aoun, Yoseph and Yafei Li (1993): Wh-Elements in Situ: Syntax or LF? *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 199–238.
- Aoun, Yoseph; Choueiri, L. & Hornstein, N. (2001): Resumption, Movement, and Derivational Economy. *LJ* 32, 371–403.
- Asudeh, Ash (in prep.): Toward a unified theory of resumption. Ms. Carleton University.
- Bayer, Josef (1984): Comp in Bavarian Syntax. *The Linguistic Review* 3, 209–274.
- Bayer, Josef (2002): Dative Pertinacity. *Handout workshop on pertinacity*: Freudental.
- Bayer, Josef; Markus Bader & Michael Meng (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 Luigi Rizzi (ed): *The Cartography of syntactic Structures. Volume 2*. OUP: New York/Oxford. (= Oxford Studies in comparative Syntax), 76–114.
- Bianchi, Valentina (2008): Some notes on the "Specificity Effects" of optional resumptives. Ms. University of Siena.
- Boeckx, Cedric (2003): *Islands and Chains. Resumption as Stranding*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Broekhuis, Hans 2008. *Derivations and Evaluations: object shift in the Germanic languages*. Mouton: Berlin etc.
- Broekhuis, Hans and Joost Dekkers 2000. The Minimalist Program and Optimality Theory: Derivations and Evaluations. In Joost Dekkers, Frank van der Leeuw and Jeroen van der Weijer (eds): *Optimality Theory, Phonology, Syntax, and Acquisition*. OUP: New York/Oxford, 386–422.
- Broekhuis, Hans and Wim Klooster 2007. Merge and Move as costly operations. *GAGL* 45, 17–37.
- Chao, Wynn and Peter Sells (1983): On the Interpretation of Resumptive Pronouns. *NELS* 13, 47–61.
- Collins, Chris (2001). Economy conditions in syntax. in Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.) *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Blackwell: Oxford, 45–61.
- Chomsky, Noam 1982. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Comrie, Bernard (1998): Rethinking the typology of relative clauses. *Language Design* 1, 59–86.
- Comrie, Bernard & Edward E. Keenan (1977): Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar. *LJ* 8:1, 63–99.
- Comrie, Bernard and Tanja Kuteva (2005): Relativization Strategies. In: Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil und Bernard Comrie (eds.): *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. OUP: New York/Oxford, 494–501.
- Domirdache, Hamida (1991): Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives and Dislocation Structures. Ph.D. Dissertation: MIT.
- Doron, Edith (1982): On the syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 19, 1–48.
- Elbourne, Paul (2001): E-type anaphora as NP-deletion. *Natural Language Semantics* 9, 241–288.
- Fox, Danny (2002): Antecedent-Contained Deletion and the Copy Theory of Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33 63–96.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin (2002): *Generalized transformations and beyond. Reflections on minimalist syntax*. Akademie Verlag: Berlin..
- Georgopoulos, Carol (1985): Variables in Palauan Syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 59–94.
- Georgopoulos, Carol (1991): *Syntactic Variables: Resumptive Pronouns and A' Binding in Palauan*. Kluwer: Dordrecht/Boston/London..
- Goodluck, Helen & Daniela Stojanovic (1996): The Structure and Acquisition of Relative Clauses in Serbo-Croatian. *Language Acquisition* 5, 285–315.
- Guilliot, Nicolas (2006): A top-down analysis for reconstruction. *Lingua* 116, 1888–1914.
- Guilliot, Nicolas (2007): Reconstructing resumption. *Handout from the workshop on 'resumption at the interfaces'*.
- Guilliot, Nicolas und Malkawi, Nouman (2006): When resumption determines reconstruction. *WCCFL* 25, 168–176.
- Heck, Fabian and Gereon Müller (2000): Repair-Driven Movement and the Local Optimization of Derivations. Ms. University of Stuttgart/Mannheim.
- Heck, Fabian; Müller, Gereon; Fischer, Silke; Vikner, Sten and Schmid, Tanja (2002): On the nature of the input in optimality theory. *Linguistic Review* 19, 345–376.
- Hornstein, Norbert (2000): *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Blackwell: Oxford. (= Generative Syntax 5).
- Kayne, Richard S. (2002): Pronouns and their antecedents. In: Samuel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seely (eds.): *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Blackwell: Oxford, 133–166.
- Labelle, Marie (1990). Predication, wh-movement, and the development of relative clauses. *Language acquisition* 1, 95–119.
- McCloskey, (1990): Resumptive Pronouns, A-Binding and Levels of Representation in Irish, in *The Syntax of the Modern Celtic Languages* ed. Randall Hendrick, Volume 23 of *Syntax and Semantics*. Academic Press: 199–248.
- McCloskey, James (2002): Resumption, Successive Cyclicity, and the Locality of Operations. In: Samuel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seely (eds.): *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Blackwell: Oxford, 184–226.
- Merchant, Jason (2004): Resumptivity and Non-Movement. In: *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 24, 471–481.
- Montalbetti, Mario (2004): After Binding: On the Interaction of Pronouns. Ph.D. Dissertation: MIT.
- Müller, Gereon 2000. *Elemente der optimalitätstheoretischen Syntax*. Stauffenburg: Tübingen.
- Müller, Gereon und Wolfgang Sternefeld 2001. The Rise of Competition in Syntax: A Synopsis. In Gereon Müller und Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.): *Competition in Syntax*. De Gruyter: Berlin/New York, 1–68.
- Nakamura, Masanori (1998): Reference set, minimal link condition, and parametrization. In: Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Martha McGinnis and David Pesetsky (eds.): *Is the best good enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*. MIT Press: Camb., Massachusetts, 291–313.
- Nunes, Jairo (2004): *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*. MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Pesetsky, David (1998): Some Optimality Principles of Sentence Pronunciation. In P. Barbosa, D. Fox, M. McGinnis & D. Pesetsky (eds): *Is the best good enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*. MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass., 337–383.
- Perlmutter, David (1972): Evidence for shadow pronouns in French relativization. In: Paul M. Peranteau, Judigh N. Levi and Gloria C. Phares (eds.): *The Chicago Which Hunt. Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*. CLS: Chicago, 73–105.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van (1989): Swiss Relatives. In Dany Jaspers, Wim Klooster, Yvan Putseys & Pieter Seuren (eds): *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon*. Studies in Honour of Wim de Geest. Foris: Berlin, 343–354.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van (2008). Identity Avoidance. Robert Freidin, C. Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.). *Foundational Issues in linguistic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rouveret, Alain (2008): Phasal agreement and reconstruction. In: Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero und Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.): *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 167–195.
- Salzmann, Martin (2006): *Resumptive Prolepsis. A Study in indirect A'-dependencies*. LOT: Utrecht.
- Salzmann, Martin (to appear a): Different notions of variation and their reflexes in Swiss German relativization. to appear in Andreas Dufter, Jürg Fleischer & Guido Seiler (eds): *Describing and Modeling Variation in Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Salzmann, Martin (to appear b): Variation in resumption requires violable constraints. *Linguistics in Potsdam*.
- Salzmann, Martin (to appear c): Null pronominals in Zurich German possessor relativization. to appear in Peter Gallmann & Melanie Wratil (eds): *Null pronouns*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.
- Sharvit, Yael (1999): Resumptive Pronouns in Relative Clauses. *NLLT* 17, 587–612.
- Shlonsky, Ur (1992): Resumptive Pronouns as a Last Resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:3, 443–468.
- Shlonsky, Ur (2004): Resumptive Pronouns in Hebrew. *handout*: University of Geneva.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang (1997). Comparing Reference Sets. In Chris Wilder, Hans-Martin Gärtner und Manfred Bierwisch (eds): *The Role of Economy Principles in Linguistic Theory*. Akademie-Verlag: Berlin, 81–114.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang (2000). Semantic vs. Syntactic Reconstruction. SFS-Report-02-00
- Suñer, Margarita (1998): Resumptive Restrictive Relatives: A crosslinguistic Perspective. *Language* 74, 335–364.
- Toman, Jindrich (1998): A discussion of resumptives in Colloquial Czech. In Zeljko Boskovic, Steven Franks & William Snyder (eds): *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*. Michigan Slavic Publications: Ann Arbor, 303–318.
- Weber, Albert (1964): *Zürichdeutsche Grammatik: Ein Wegweiser zur Guten Mundart*. Schweizer Spiegel Verl: Zürich.