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(1) a. There are guests who I am curious about what they are going to say.
   b. The only one we could see her figure was Number Two.

(2) a. *There are guests who I am curious about what ___ are going to say.
   b. *The only one whose we could see ___figure was Number Two.

(3) a. *There are guests that everyone wants to invite them.
   b. *The only one who we could see her was Number Two.

(4) a. There are guests that everyone wants to invite ___.
   b. The only one who we could see ___ was Number Two.

(5) a. an ghirseach ar ghoid na síogaí í
   b. Céacu fear ar lahabair tú leis

(6) a. L-kteeb yalli štarayto mbeerí Daa,
   b. ?ayya ra33eel ʔabbartu-ʔonno ...

(7) Surface gaps derived either via movement or deletion of a bound pronoun.
   Dual-route theories
   a. movement the guy who I talked to ___
   b. deletion the guy that I talked to ___
   c. failure to delete the guy that I talked to him
   Single-route theories
   d. movement-then-deletion the guy that I talked to ___

(8) a. What are the licensing environments of RP?
   b. How do those mechanisms relate to movement?
   c. How and why do languages differ?
   d. Is RP a unitary category?
   e. Is RP in any useful sense a ‘last resort’ mechanism?
9) **Immunity to movement constraints**
   a. There are guests who I am curious about what they are going to say.
   b. seachasog ar dócha go bhfuil an táilliúir a dhein sa chré old-jacket C probable C is the tailor who made it in-the earth 'an old jacket that the tailor who made it has probably been in the grave for ages'

10) **Strong crossover**
    a. *she claimed Susan had arrived earliest
    b. *who did she claim [t had arrived earliest]?
    c. *sin an fear ar dhúirt an bastard go maródh sé muid that the man C said the bastard C kill [COND] he us 'That's the man that the bastard said that he would kill us

11) **No weak crossover**
    a. ?the man that [his wife] left __
    b. an fear ar fhág a bhean the man C left his wife him

12) **Highest subject restriction – anti-locality**
    a. *fear nár fhan sé sa bhaile man C NEG-PAST remained he at home
    b. fear nár fhan __ sa bhaile
       ‘a man that didn’t stay at home’
    c. **A-bar-Disjointness Requirement**
       *Analogy to CndB*
       A pronoun must be A-bar-free in the least complete functional complex containing the pronoun and a subject distinct from the pronoun.

13) a. Why are there languages like Irish, in which RPs and gaps are in free variation, and languages like English, in which RPs are a ‘last resort’?
    b. **McCloskey’s Mystery**
       Given the overhead of gap-finding routines ...
       Why are RPs and gaps in free variation at all?
       Why aren’t RPs the strategy for A-bar dependencies *tout court?*
There is also a deep mystery lying at the bottom of it all. It is known that resumptive elements may serve the purpose of marking variable positions in unbounded dependency constructions. It is known that resumptive elements may occur in positions form which movement is impossible (hence apparently allowing greater expressive power than is permitted by movement alone). It is also known that resumption imposes a considerably lighter burden on the human sentence processor than does the production and resolution of syntactic movement configurations. Why, then, is movement used at all in the creation of these structures?” [p.113]

(14) Are the empirical inputs to ‘McCloskey’s Mystery’ more illusory than not?
   a. RPs and gaps are not really be in free variation.
   b. RPs may not in any real sense rescue a violation in English-like languages.
      Alexopoulou & Keller, 2007
      Heestand, Xiang & Polinsky, 2010

(15) RPs could hurt the gap-finding routines more than they help if the generalization is true, as it seems to be, that RPs are just pronouns.
      (see Asudeh, 2004, for similar reasoning)

(16) We are left with an interesting (informative?) asymmetry between comprehension and production. (Ferreira & Swets 2005)

(17) **Non-uniformity of resumption**

   **Swedish**  Vata, Gbadi  :  RP not base-generated pronouns
   (Engdahl 1985) (Koopman, 1982)
   But see Asudeh (2008); Swedish and Vata do not pattern exactly the same.

   Swedish RPs ...
   (i) license parasitic gaps
   (ii) **give rise to weak crossover effects**
   (iii) satisfy the ATB exception to the CSC
   (iv) **worsen subjacency violations**
   (v) “are used systematically only in the subject position of tensed clauses”
      to void COMP-t violations (Engdahl)

(18) Vilken fänge var det läkarna inte kunde avgöra om han verkligen
      which prisoner was it the-doctors not could decide if he really
      var sjuk utan att tala med ___ personligen?
      was ill without to talk with in-person

(19) ?*Vilken bil åt du lunch med någon som körden den?
      Which car ate you lunch with someone that drove it
(20) a. \( \text{àlɔ̀ əlè sáká là} \) Vata (Koopman, 1982) who \( \text{he} \) eat rice WH

b. \( * \text{àlɔ̀ ___ lè sáká là} \) who ___ eat rice WH 'Who is eating rice?'

(21) Unlike Irish, LA, & Hebrew-type RPs, resumptives act just like traces, but those with phonetic content.

(22) *Intuition.* Swedish and Kru-type resumption reflect something about the operation of the PF routines for pronouncing copies.

(23) **Reconstruction in Lebanese Arabic** (Aoun, Choueiri & Hornstein 2001)

a. \( \text{t̬̄lmiiz-[a]̱ l-k̬̄sleen ma baddna ɲabbir [wala m̥allme], ?əno huwwə student-her the-bad NEG want told-1.PL no teacher that he zaʃ̬̄bar b-l-fahş cheated.3SM in-the-exam} \)

b. \( *\text{t̬̄lmiiz-[a]̱ l-k̬̄sleen ma ħkiina ma} ə [wala m̥allme], ?abl-ma huwwə student-her the-bad NEG talked.1.PL with no teacher before he yuuʃ̬̄al arrived} \)

(24) \( \text{ʕaleemit karim fakkarto əno ɬabbarna k̬̄l ʔasteez əno leezim titrayyar grade.} SF \text{ Karim thought.2P that told.3SM each teacher that should change.3SF} \text{ 'Karim’s grade, you thought he told each teacher that it should be changed.'} \)

(25) **No island**

a. \( \text{ha-l-muttahame ʕraʃto əno hiyye nhabasit this-the-suspect.} SF \text{ know.2P that she imprisoned.3SF} \) ‘This suspect, you know that she was imprisoned.’

b. \( *\text{k̬̄l muttahame ʕraʃto əno hiyye nhabasit each suspect.} SF \text{ know.2P that she imprisoned.3SF} \) ‘Each suspect, you know that she was imprisoned’

(26) **Adjunct island**

a. \( \text{ha-l-muttahame tʃe3aʔo la}\text{amma/laʔanno ʕraʃto əno hiyye this-the-suspect.} SF \text{ surprised.2P when/because know.2P that she nhabasit imprisoned.3SF} \) ‘This suspect, you were surprised when/because you knew that she was imprisoned.’
b. koll muttahame tfeeʔaʔo lamma/laʔanno ʕrəfto ʔanno hiyye
   each-suspect.SF surprised.2P when/because know.2P that she
nhabasit
imprisoned.3SF
‘Each suspect, you were surprised when/because you knew that she was
imprisoned.’

(27) Aoun et al.’s account:
   (i) resumption outside of islands – ‘apparent resumption’ is generated via
       movement
       a. the RP is adjoined as an appositive to the moved XP
       b. quantificational phrases cannot have appositives
          ("each student, the idiot, ...")
   (ii) resumption inside islands is simply an A-bar-bound pronoun

(28) L.A. seems to have a mixed strategy: it is like Irish, for RPs in islands; but like
     Swedish for RPs not in islands.

(29) **MECHANISM**
    Ā- bound pronoun               x    v    x    v
    Movement (with leftovers)      x    x    v    v

    **Example**                     English(?) Irish Swedish Lebanese
                                   Vata Arabic
                                   Gbadi

(30) **Question:** have we only seriously tested Irish-like RPs in English?
     Maybe English has Vata-type RPs (i.e. ECP rescuers only)