Resumptive pronouns and stranded Case
Knut Tarald Taraldsen

1. Resumption looks like a special case of doubling, and, in fact, most accounts instantiate one or another of the approaches taken to doubling in general, i.e. (a) no syntactic relation between the displaced phrase and the resumptive pronoun, (b) trace spell-out or (c) premovement generalized Spec/head configurations of some sort (as in Kayne (2000) or Sportiche (1995)). However, a different way of looking at things emerges from Abels (2005), who takes the core instances of resumption to result from stranding a high portion of a structure which would otherwise surface as a regular (non-doubled) DP, i.e. resumptive pronouns spell out remnant DPs. In this paper, we will look at data from Northern Norwegian varieties that strongly supports this view.

2. Fiva (1991) discusses Northern Norwegian resumption data based on a field-work on the Bodø dialect. In particular, she shows that this dialect has a sharp that-trace effect which a resumptive subject pronoun seems to repair:

(1) Kem trudde du (*at) _ kom tel å vinn ?
     who thought you (*that) _ was going to win
(2) Kem trudde du *(at) han kom tel å vinn ?
     who thought you *(that) he was going to win

Of course, the fact that the resumptive subject pronoun allows the *at* to stay would follow from any analysis that either takes resumption not to involve movement (analyses instantiating approach (a) above), or keys the that-trace effect to the phonologically null status of the subject trace (consistently with approach (b)). However, no account along these lines would seem to have anything enlightening to say about the anti-that-trace effect seen in (2): In fact, Fiva's field-work documents that leaving out the *at* preceding a resumptive pronoun is perceived as at least as bad as keeping it in front of a trace.

An analysis taking resumption not to involve movement, would treat the *han* of (2) as just another weak pronoun, as far as syntax is concerned, but weak subject pronouns, like other subject DPs, regularly allow the complementizer to drop:

(3) Koffor trudde du (at) han kom tel å vinn ?
     why   thought you (that) he was going to win

But saying that the resumptive *han* spells out the trace of *kem* doesn't seem helpful either.

3. As it turns out, Pesetsky & Torrego's (xx) account of the that-trace effect also provides an elegant account of the anti-that-trace effect in (2) provided we adopt Abels's analysis of resumptive pronouns. On their account, *at* reflects movement of T to C, triggered by an unvalued tense feature on T. When a nominative wh-phrase raises to Spec-CP, that wh-phrase values the tense feature on C (in addition to its wh-feature), since Pesetsky & Torrego equate nominative Case with a tense feature, preempting movement of T to C, and so, no *at* appears. The optionality of *at* in (3) would reflect the optionality of raising the non-wh subject *han* to Spec-CP.

Assuming now that (2), like (1), involves movement of *kem* through the embedded Spec-CP, we are forced to assume that unlike the *kem* of (1), the *kem* of (2) has no tense feature which could value the tense feature of C (leaving T-to-C as the only option for licensing C's tense feature), i.e. the *kem* of (2) cannot be a nominative, although it definitely seems to be the subject of the embedded clause. Thus, we are led to say (a) that nominative Case (or the tense feature of the DP) is uniquely associated with a high projection within a DP, in particular higher than wh, so that (b) wh-movement can strand that projection ("remnantification"),

and (c) when stranding occurs, a (resumptive) weak pronoun (obligatorily) spells out the stranded projection. This analysis not only allows the *at* to appear in (2), but also predicts that it must appear, since only T-movement to C can value the tense feature of T in any derivation of (2). (We assume that wh-movement cannot strand the top layer of the DP after the wh-phrase has pied-piped it to the embedded Spec-CP, for reasons similar to the reasons why prepositions don't strand in Spec-CP.)

4. The analysis just outlined ultimately rests on some specific assumptions regarding spell-out, akin to those suggested in recent work by M. Starke. In particular, we need to make our analysis consistent with the grammaticality of full doubling cases like (4):

(4) Han trudde vi at han kom tel å vinn
     he   thought we that he was going to win

We will show that "weak" and "strong" pronouns in fact lexicalize different portions of the full DP structure in a way which is consistent with (4) and predicts that the Northern Norwegian resumptives must be weak pronouns.

5. Concerning the question how to characterize the difference between the Northern dialects and those varieties of Norwegian that do not have resumptive subject pronouns, we should first point out that those varieties fall into two groups,i.e. one which, like Northern Norwegian, has a sharp that-trace effect, and another one which does not show a that-trace effect at all. Now, according to our analysis, there are in principle two possible ways in which a language could fail to produce resumptive subject pronouns. Either it doesn't allow the wh-part of the DP to move without pied-piping the entire DP, or it actually does allow the wh-phrase to subextract leaving higher DP-projections in situ, as in Northern Norwegian, but, unlike Northern Norwegian, has a phonologically null spell-out of the stranded remnant. In the former case, we get a variety without resumptive subject pronouns, but with a sharp that-trace effect, while the second scenario gives rise to varieties that show no that-trace effect at all.

REFERENCES

Abels, K. (2005), Resumptive pronouns and the copy theory of movement, talk presented at CGG XV, Barcelona, 2005

Fiva, T. (1991), Resumptive pronouns and binding theory, in H. Sigurdsson (ed), *Papers from the 12th Scandinavian Conference of Linguists*, University of Iceland, Reykjavík

Kayne, R.S. (2000), A note on clitic doubling in French, in R.S. Kayne, *Parameters and universals*, Oxford University Press, New York

Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego (2001), T-to-C movement: Causes and Consequences, In M. Kenstowicz (ed), Ken Hale. *A Life in Language*, MIT Press

Sportiche, D. (1995), Clitic constructions, in L. Zaring & J. Rooryck (eds), *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, Kluwer, Dordrecht