

DOUBLING AND RESUMPTIVE PRONOUNS IN TYROLEAN WH-EXTRACTION
BIRGIT ALBER

Long extraction of relative and interrogative pronouns in the Tyrolean dialect of Meran (a Southern Bavarian variety) is characterized by (a) the presence of doubling of pronouns in intermediate [Spec,CP] positions and (b) apparent optionality between the doubling structure and a resumptive pronoun structure limited to relatives in certain contexts. Similar structures have been discussed for Gaelic languages in McCloskey (1990, 2002), Rouveret (2002) and Adger & Ramchand (2005). I will follow McCloskey in treating the doubling structure as movement, rather than agreement (Rouveret 2002, Adger & Ramchand 2005).

The core of my proposal, cast in the framework of Optimality Theory, is that doubling is triggered by a constraint requiring the path of extraction to be visible (i.e. phonologically realized). When other constraints force a violation of this requirement, the resumptive pronoun strategy is employed.

With bridge verbs like *glaabm* 'believe', which select either Verb-second subordinate clauses or subordinate clauses introduced by the complementizer *dass*, long extraction of relative pronouns displays two distinct patterns: the relative pronoun is doubled in every intermediate [Spec, CP] between the extraction and the landing site and is accompanied by the relative complementizer *wos* (1a) or, alternatively, intermediate complementizer positions are occupied by the complementizer *dass* and the relative pronoun is linked to a resumptive pronoun in the base position (1b):

- (1a) I kenn es Haus, **des_i** **wos** du glapsch, **des_i** **wos** die
 Maria **t_i** gekaaft hot
 I know the house, Relpron_i C-rel you think, Relpron_i C the
 Mary **t_i** bought has
- (1b) I kenn es Haus, **des_i** **wos** du glapsch, **dass** die Maria 's_i
 gekaaft hot
 I know the house, Relpron_i C-rel you think, C the Mary it_i
 boughthas
 'I know the house, which you think Mary bought'

With verbs like *megn* 'want', which select only for subordinate clauses introduced by the complementizer *dass*, the resumptive pronoun strategy is the only possible one:

- (2) I kenn es Haus, **des_i** **wos** du mechesch, **dass** die Maria 's_i kaaft
 I know the house, Relpron_i C-rel you want, C the Mary it_i buys
 'I know the house, which you would want Mary to buy.'

In interrogatives, both with clauses embedded under *glaabm*-type and *megn*-type verbs, the extraction of interrogative pronouns follows the doubling strategy (3a), while the resumptive pronoun strategy is impossible (3b). The intermediate complementizer, if present, is always *dass*. The scope marker *wos* is preferably used in the highest [Spec, CP] position:

- (3a) **Wos** glapsch/meschesch du, **wen_i** dass die Maria **t_i** onruaft?
 Scope marker think/want you, who_i that the Mary **t_i** calls
 'Who do you think Mary saw?', 'Who do you want Mary to call?'
- (3b)* **Wos/wen_i** glapsch/meschesch du, dass die Maria **ihn_i**
 onruaft?
 Scope marker/who_i think/want you, that the Mary him_i
 calls?

The above patterns will be interpreted as follows: the extraction of relative pronouns out of subordinate Verb-second clauses, which are not selected according to the type of complementizer, displays the doubling strategy. In extractions out of subordinate *dass*-clauses the resumptive pronoun strategy is employed. Interrogative pronouns follow the doubling strategy in both cases:

	<i>type of C not selected</i>	<i>“dass”-clauses</i>
<i>relative pronouns</i>	doubling strategy	resumptive pronoun strategy
<i>interrogative pronouns</i>	doubling strategy	doubling strategy

Tyrolean does not use the resumptive pronoun strategy in short extraction of wh-elements. This means that movement is preferred as a default strategy over the insertion of a resumptive pronoun which would repeat morphological features already present on the relative or interrogative pronoun. Following Legendre et al. (1995, 1998) I interpret this fact as evidence for the ranking of the faithfulness constraint DEP over the anti-movement-constraint *T: DEP >> *T

- (4) a. DEP: every lexical element or morphological feature present in the output must also be present in the input – no expletives or doubling of elements. (cf. McCarthy & Prince 1995 for the role of DEP in phonology and Grimshaw 1997 for a similar constraint called FULLINTERPRETATION)
 b. *T: no movement

DEP itself, however, is dominated by a constraint requiring the path of extraction to be visible.

- (5) MARK PATH (MP): the path of extraction is phonologically marked

The ranking of MP over DEP explains the presence of doubling structures in relatives and interrogatives. MP could be grounded in a functional tendency to facilitate processing of the sentence by the hearer. In a language where MARK PATH outranks DEP we will find doubling structures even though the doubled elements are meaningless and thus have no correspondents in the input. Analyzing doubling structures with a constraint like MP furthermore explains why the foot of the chain is never overt, a fact not readily explained by an agreement approach. Finally, a constraint that dominates MP and requires spec-head agreement (AGREE) blocks doubling in relatives, when the relative pronoun would have to pass a CP headed by the complementizer *dass*. Interrogatives use only the doubling strategy, since an interrogative pronoun is compatible with the complementizer *dass*, as we can see in embedded questions:

- (6) I woas net, wen_i dass er t_i gsehn hot
 I know not who_i that he t_i seen has
 'I don't know whom he has seen'

REFERENCES

- Adger, D. & G. Ramchand 2005. Merge and Move: Wh-Dependencies Revisited, *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 161-193.
 Grimshaw, J. 1997. Projection, Heads and Optimality, *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, pp. 373-422.
 Legendre, G., C. Wilson, P. Smolensky, K. Homer & W. Raymond 1995. Optimality in wh-chains. In J. Beckman, L. Walsh Dickey & S. Urbanczyk (eds.), *UMOP 18: Papers in optimality theory*. GLSA, Amherst, 607-636.
 Legendre, G., P. Smolensky & C. Wilson 1998. When is Less More? Faithfulness and

- Minimal Links in wh-Chains. In: P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. McGinnis & D. Pesetsky, *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 249-289.
- McCarthy, J., & A. Prince 1995. Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. In J. Beckman, L. Walsh Dickey & S. Urbanczyk (eds.), *UMOP 18: Papers in optimality theory*. GLSA, Amherst, pp. 249-384.
- McCloskey, J. 1990. Resumptive pronouns, A-bar binding and levels of representation in Irish. In: Hendrick, R., *The syntax of the modern Celtic languages*, Syntax and Semantics 23. Academic Press, San Diego.
- McCloskey, J. 2002. Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In: D. Epstein & T. DanielSeeley (eds.) *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell, Oxford, 184-226.
- Rouveret, A. 2003. How are resumptive pronouns linked to the periphery? *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2*, 123–184.