
This is the **published version** of the article:

Jassim, Quitaf H.; Gavarró, Anna, dir.; Solà i Pujols, Jaume, dir. Relative clauses in Iraqi Arabic and the status of resumptive pronouns. 2011. 50 p.

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/102255>

under the terms of the  license

Relative Clauses in Iraqi Arabic and the Status of Resumptive Pronouns

Quitaf H. Jassim
MA thesis

Supervisors:

Prof. Anna Gavarró Algueró

Prof. Jaume Solà Pujols

Master in *Cognitive Science and Language*

Departament de Filologia Catalana

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

September 2011

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	6
ABSTRACT	7
0. INTRODUCTION	8
0.1. Introduction to Relative Clauses in Arabic	8
1. RELATIVE CLAUSES IN IA AND THE RESUMPTIVE STRATEGY	13
1.1 Exceptions to the Resumptive Strategy	17
1.1.1 Subject Position	17
1.1.2 Time relative clauses	19
1.2 Comparison with Interrogatives	21
2. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE STATUS OF RESUMPTIVE PRONOUNS	27
2.1 Resumptive Pronouns do not Behave Like Gaps	27
2.1.1 Gapped Relatives	27
2.1.1.1 Strong Islands	28
2.1.1.2 Weak Islands	30
2.1.2 Resumptive Relatives	32
2.1.2.1 Strong Islands	32
2.1.2.2 Weak Islands	33
2.2 Resumptive Pronouns Behave Like Gaps	35
2.2.1 Weak and Strong Cross Over	35
2.2.2 Reconstruction	39
2.2.2.1 Weak Pronouns do not Ban Reconstruction	39

2.2.2.2 Strong Pronouns Ban Reconstruction	41
2.2.3 Scope Binding of Quantifiers in Relative Clauses	43
2.3 Summary	45
3. CONCLUSION	46
3.1 Why Resumptive Pronouns are so Similar to Traces	46
3.2 Strong and Weak Resumptive Pronouns	47
REFERENCES	49

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the help of many people. First I would like to thank my family, and especially my mother Eman Khamas, for their constant support and encouragement and also for being highly useful judges of the data provided as they are native Iraqi and Standard Arabic speakers. I would also like to thank my supervisors Anna Gavarró and Jaume Solà for their persistence, guidance and for their powerful insights.

I would also like to thank Professor Hamida Demirdache for her kind help in providing me with studies done on other Arabic varieties that were crucial for my study. I also want to thank Mr. Bruce Wallace and Professor Michael Hassan, for their editorial observations.

Finally I would like to thank my university, the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, for providing me with a masters course that has really met my needs and interests, and the professors of the masters for being extremely helpful and understanding and also for being willing to share their wisdom with us.

ABSTRACT

Not much has been said about the grammar of Iraqi Arabic. There is important work on wh- movement, which Basilico (1998) and Wahba (1991) discuss in depth. This research is an attempt to shed light on another, yet equally important, issue concerning Iraqi Arabic: the nature of relative clauses. The research focuses on the behavior of the resumptive strategy as opposed to the gap strategy that is often found in wh-interrogatives. We establish a comparison with other Arabic varieties such as Lebanese and Jordanian, as well as other languages such as Hebrew. In this research we consider (i) islandhood, (ii) Weak and Strong Cross Over (iii) reconstruction and (iv) scope binding, in order to further understand the behavior of resumption. The final conclusion reached is that in Iraqi Arabic the resumptive strategy is actually related to the gap strategy in several respects; and in those where it differs we propose that gaps (traces) are replaced by trace+pronoun complex which results in a category which preserves the properties of gapping and resumption.

0. Introduction

This study attempts to explain the characteristics of relative clauses in Iraqi Arabic (IA) within the general perspective of relative clause formation, as a specific type of unbounded dependency construction. In order to frame our proposal, we will make some incursions into standard and dialectical Arabic, as well as Hebrew, with English relative constructions as a prototype of *wh* movement constructions featuring a gap in the base position (Chomsky 1977). We will be using the term ‘base position’ for the sake of generality, even when it is spelled as a resumptive pronoun.

More specifically, we will address the issue of what the status of resumptive pronouns is as compared to gaps (traces) in relative clauses (see Guilliot and Malkawi 2011). In fact, what we are actually considering is whether relative clauses are two independent constructions (formed by movement or by base-generated antecedent-resumptive pronoun dependencies), or a universal option, whose outputs can be antecedent-gap or antecedent-pronoun dependencies. One insight into this issue is whether the resumptive pronoun option shows an independent behavior from the movement (gap) strategy. What we will show is that resumptive strategies cover a superset of the gap strategies’ possibilities, so that they are not likely to be an unrelated class of phenomenon.

0.1. Introduction to Relative Clauses in Arabic

Relative clauses in Arabic (and particularly in IA) are characterized by several important features that distinguish them from English relatives (see also: Abu-Jarad 2008 and Al-Momani 2010):

1. Relative clauses in Arabic are divided into two categories: definite relative clauses (i.e., relative clauses immediately dominated by a definite DP) and indefinite relative clauses

(immediately dominated by an indefinite DP)¹. Definite relative clauses must be headed by *allađi* in standard Arabic and its etymological counterparts in all the Arabic dialects, while indefinite relatives cannot be headed by *allađi*: rather they occur with no (visible) complementizer:

- (1) a. Eftaratu al-ketaba **allađi** taħadaθta řan-hu kaθeeran.
 I.bought the-book REL you.talked about-it a lot
 ‘I bought the book which you talked about[it] a lot.’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. Efteret el-ketab **illi** ħetřet řan-ah hwaya.
 I.bought the-book REL you.talked about-it a lot
 ‘I bought the book which you talked about [it] a lot.’ (Iraqi Arabic)
- c. Eftaraitu ketaban taħadaθta řan-hu kaθeeran.
 I.bought book you.talked about-it a lot
 ‘I bought a book which you talked about [it] a lot.’ (Standard Arabic)
- d. Efteret ketab ħetřet řan-ah hwaya.
 I.bought book you.talked about-it a lot
 ‘I bought a book which you talked about [it] a lot.’ (Iraqi Arabic)

As shown in the examples (1a,b) the complementizer *allađi* and its IA counterpart *illi* are obligatory in definite relative clauses. Indefinite relative clauses (1c,d), on the other hand, show the mandatory absence of this complementizer in order to form the relative clause. This fact contrasts with relative clauses of most of the Western languages (e.g. English, Spanish, and Catalan), where no such distinction is made.

It should be stressed that the definiteness/indefiniteness contrast classifies all the determiners into one or the other group (*el-* ‘the’, *hađa /hađak* ‘this’/‘that’ *kul el-* ‘all the’, *kul* ‘every’, etc. as definite; null element -‘a’, *fad* ‘some’, *hwaya* ‘many’, *řwaya* ‘few’, etc. as indefinite). So, for instance in IA one can observe:

- (2) a. El-redřal illi fat menah řostađ-i.
 the-man REL he.walked from-here teacher-mine

1 In traditional Arabic grammar only definite relative clauses are termed ‘relative’, and indefinite relatives, and only those, are considered adjectival phrases.

- ‘The man who walked by here is my teacher.’
- b. Haða hwa el-redʒal illi get-l-ak ʕal-eh.
 this he the-man REL I.told-to-you about-him
 ‘This is the man who I told you about [him].’
- c. Fad redʒal get-l-ak ʕal-eh.
 some man I.told-to-you about-him
 ‘Some man who I told you about [him].’
- d. Redʒal get-l-ak ʕal-eh.
 man I.told-to-you about-him
 ‘A man I told you about [him].’

2. Unlike in other languages, interrogative *wh*-elements (*who*, *when*, *where*, etc.) are not used to form relatives:

- (3) a. *Raʔytu al-radʒula man ʔata.
 I.saw the-man who he.came
 ‘I saw the man who came.’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. *ʕefet el-redʒal meno ʔedʒa.
 I.saw the-man who he.came
 ‘I saw the man who came.’ (Iraqi Arabic)

The *wh*-word *man/meno* cannot introduce a relative clause, although, as we will see later, there is one exception: the *wh*-word *ma* (‘what’) appears in certain relative clauses.

3. As we have seen, standard Arabic and all Arabic dialects have *allaði* (and its dialectal counterparts) introducing relative clauses. This element is specific to definite relative clauses and cannot be used as an interrogative *wh*-word. It can be argued that *allaði* is not a relative *wh*-word, for at least two reasons (also see Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri 2010):

3.1. As is well known, the *wh*-element in relative clauses in Romance and Germanic languages changes according to its function within the clause (*who*, *whom*, *where*, etc.). This is not the case in standard and dialectal Arabic, which suggests *allaði* is just a complementizer which marks the clause as a relative, since it does not change according to the base position:

- (4) a. Al-makanu **allaði** eltaqayna bi-hi džemeelun dzedan.
the-place REL we.met in-it beautiful very
‘The place where we met [in it] is very beautiful.’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. Al-jaumu **allaði** taXarajta bi-hi kana baredun dzedan.
the-day REL you.graduated in-it was cold very
‘The day when you graduated was very cold.’ (Standard Arabic)
- c. Ašteqed **illi** gelt-ah kulef muhem.
I-think REL you.said-it very important
‘I think what you said[it] is very important.’ (Iraqi Arabic)
- d. El-redzal **illi** qabalt-ah tjan kulef lateef.
the-man REL I.met-him was very nice
‘The man who I met[him] was very nice.’ (Iraqi Arabic)

As the examples above illustrate, the relative complementizer in Arabic (standard and dialects) is invariable regardless of whether the base position is a locative, subject or object.

3.2. Furthermore, there is evidence from standard Arabic that *allaði* does not behave like wh-expressions with respect to Case. In standard Arabic *allaði* is inflected for number (singular, dual and plural), gender (masculine and feminine) and Case (Nominative and Accusative, although Case distinctions are only visible in the dual forms). (This morphology is lost in most of the Arabic dialects, specifically in the Iraqi dialect). The important point is that *allaði* agrees in Case with the noun head, not with the base position, as opposed to what happens in English:

- (5) The man_{Nom} whom_{Acc}. I saw t_{Acc} came.
(6) I saw the man_{Acc} who_{Nom} t_{Nom} came.
(7) *I saw the man_{Acc} whom_{Acc} t_{Nom} came.

As we can see in the following example, *allaðaini* agrees in Case with the head noun *waladaini* (which is in accusative), and not with the nominative base position.

- (8) Raʔaytu al-waladaini **allaḏaini** qala ʔena-huma
 I-saw the-two.boys.ACC REL-dual,masc.-ACC they-said that-they-NOM
 talibani.
 student
 ‘I saw the two boys who said that were students.’ (Standard Arabic)

This argument can only be made for classical or standard Arabic, so it is relevant for IA and other modern dialects only to the extent that they may have inherited a similar relative word. As we can see, inflectional morphology has been completely lost in modern dialects:

- (9) a. Raʔaytu al-benta **allati** qalat ʔena-ha taleb.ah.
 I.saw the-girl REL(fem.sing) she.said that-her student.fem
 ‘I saw the girl who said that she was a student.’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. ʔefet el-bnaya **illi** galat ʔena-hu hia taleb.ah.
 I.saw the-girl REL she.said that-it she student.fem
 ‘I saw the girl who said that she was student.’ (Iraqi Arabic)
- c. ʔefet el-waladen **illi** galaw ʔena-hu humma Taleb-een.
 I.saw the-(two)boys REL they.said that-it they student-dual
 ‘I saw the (two) boys who said that they (two) were student(two).’ (Iraqi Arabic)

Having introduced these features of the Arabic relative clause, we will now address another important aspect of Arabic relativization: the resumptive pronoun strategy vs. the gap strategy as the spell-out of the base position.

1. Relative Clauses in IA and the Resumptive Strategy

Guilliot and Malkawi (2011) define resumption as a detachment strategy by which a pronoun occupies the thematic position of the detached constituent. In standard and dialectal Arabic there are two types of resumption: weak and strong. Weak resumptive pronouns are those which are attached to heads (V, N, P) while strong resumptive pronouns are independent words.

In IA, weak resumptive pronouns occur in non subject position in general, while strong resumptive pronouns occur obligatorily in subject position in verbless copulative sentences²:

Strong pronoun of nominal sentences (obligatory):

- (10) El-walad illi neseet ?na-hu hwa Taleb.
the-boy REL I.forgot that-it he student
'The boy who I forgot that he is a student.'

Weak Resumptive Pronouns (obligatory in all non-subject positions):

- (11) el-katab illi ketab-ah chan mamnu?i
the writer REL book-his was forbidden
'The writer whose book was forbidden.'

2 In verbal sentences, the subject is expressed by the subject-verb agreement, therefore strong pronouns are optional in such cases and (if produced) they are only used for focus marking. Focused pronouns may also occur in non subject positions; also for contrastive focus (non-subject strong pronouns are always doubled by a weak pronoun). We disregard these cases in this study, because of their pragmatic interference:

- i. hatha hawa el-nadil illi ?a?teqed ?ena-hu hwa bag el-fluus
this he the-waiter REL I.think that-it he stole the-money
'This is the waiter who I think that he stole the money.'

So the resumptive pronoun is either a weak pronoun, which is an element attached to a verb, a noun or a preposition inside the relative clause (e.g. *getl-ah* ‘I.told-him’, *ketab-ak* ‘book-yours’, *bi-ih* ‘in-it’), or a strong pronoun, which appears as a separated pronoun in subject position of nominal sentences e.g. *hwa mareeD* ‘he sick’.

Weak and strong resumptive pronouns in standard and dialectical Arabic vary according to the following paradigm (also see Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri 2010):

	Singular (strong-weak)		Plural		Dual
	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	
1st Person-	ʔana -(n)i	ʔana-(n)i	naḥnu-na	naḥnu-na	naḥnu -na
2nd Person	ʔanta-ka	ʔanti-ki	ʔantum –kum	ʔantuna-kunna	ʔantuma-kumaa
3rd Person	hwa-hu	hia-ha	hum-hum	hunna-hunna	huma-humaa

Table 1: Pronouns in standard Arabic

The examples below show the usage of various weak resumptive pronouns in standard Arabic:

- (12) a. Al-bintu allati salamtu ʕalai-ha ʔaʕTat-ni al-ketaba.
the-girl REL I.greeted on-her she.gave-me the-book
‘The girl I greeted gave me the book.’
- b. Raʔaytu al-radʒula allaḏi ebnu-hu Sadeeq-ee.
I.saw the-man REL son-his friend-mine
‘I saw the man whose son is my friend.’

IA has a quite similar paradigm. Most of the pronouns have preserved the same form, even though there are some morphological differences:

Singular (strong-Weak)	Plural	Dual
------------------------	--------	------

	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	
1st Person-	ʔani-(n)i/ya	ʔani-(n)i/ya	ʔehna-na	ʔehna-na	ʔehna-na
2nd Person	ʔenta-ak	ʔenti-itʃ	ʔentu-kum	ʔentu-kum	ʔentu-kum
3rd Person	huwwa-əh	hiya-ha	humma-hum	humma-hum	humma-hum

Table 2: Pronouns in Iraqi Arabic

The following are examples of IA resumptive pronouns:

- (13) a. Eħteramet el-bnaya illi etdayanet men-ha fluus.
 I.respected the-girl REL borrowed from-her money
 ‘I respected the girl who I borrowed money from.’
- b. El-walad illi enTeta-ah el-ketab ʃekar-ni.
 the-boy REL I.gave-him the-book thanked-me
 ‘The boy to whom I gave the book thanked me.’

With the preceding characterization of resumptive pronouns in Arabic as background, now we can proceed to a topic that will be central in this paper: the nature of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in comparison with gaps. Actually, relative clauses in Arabic (whether definite or indefinite) can be built with two strategies: the base position of the relativized element can appear as a gap (as in English relatives) or (in most cases) as a resumptive pronoun:

- (14) a. Al-radʒula allaði raʔaytu --.
 the-man REL I-saw --
 ‘The man who I saw [gap].’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. Radʒulun raʔaytu-hu.
 a man I.saw-him (Standard Arabic)
 ‘A man I saw.’
- c. El-radʒal illi ʃeft-ah. (Iraqi Arabic)
 the-man REL I-saw-him
 ‘the man who I saw.’ (Iraqi Arabic)

- d. El-walad illi ṣabalak ʔena-hu hwa mareeD.
 the-boy REL you.thought that-it he sick
 ‘The boy who you thought that he was sick.’ (Iraqi Arabic)

Standard and dialectal Arabic vary in their distribution of resumptive pronouns. Standard Arabic, for example, does not allow resumption in object position in definite relative clauses, whereas object resumption is obligatory in indefinite relative clauses. The following examples are taken from Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010: 166):

Object gap in definite relative clauses:

- (15) a. Al-kitaabu allaḏi sa-yaṣṭari -- saami mawdʒudun fi-l-maktabati.
 the-book REL will-he-buy Sami exists in-the-library
 ‘The book that Sami will buy is found in the bookstore.’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. Raʔaytu al-lawḥata allati qulta ʔana-ka sa-taṣṭari --.
 I.saw the-painting REL you-said that-you you.will-buy
 ‘I saw the painting that you said that you will buy.’ (Standard Arabic)

Object resumptive pronoun in indefinite relative clauses:

- (16) Raʔaytu lawḥatan qulta ana-ka sataṣṭari *(-ha).
 I.saw painting you.said that.you you.will-buy *(-it)
 ‘I saw a painting that you said you will buy’ (Standard Arabic)

IA, on the other hand, makes general use of resumption in relative clauses, to the exclusion of the gap option. However, there are some exceptions, apparent or real, which are illustrated in the following section.

1.1. Exceptions to the Resumptive Strategy

As we have explained earlier, the resumptive strategy is the dominant strategy in relative clauses. However, there are exceptions in which the gap strategy is used instead:

1.1.1 Subject Position

In all Arabic varieties, resumptive pronouns in relative clauses are generally absent from subject position. This is only an apparent exception, for which we can assume that there is a *pro* resumptive pronoun, since Arabic is a Null Subject Language. Importantly, strong pronouns (unless used as focus marker) are generally disallowed as resumptive subjects:

- (17) a. *El-walad illi hwa waguf be-l-bab Sadeeq-ee.
the-boy REL he he.standing in-the-door friend-mine
'The boy who is standing at the door is my friend.' (Iraqi Arabic)
- b. Al-radzulua allađi yaqefu hunaka Sadeeq-ee.
the-man REL stands there friend-mine
'The man who's standing there is my friend.' (Standard Arabic)

However in nominal sentences³ where there is no verb production, strong pronouns are the only option allowed in this position:

- (18) Zena illi hia Sadeeq-ee mareeDa.
Zena REL she friend.mine sick
'Zena, who is my friend, is sick.' (Iraqi Arabic)

2) Subject NP in existential clauses

In some Arabic dialects, the subject of an existential construction behaves differently from the standard subject. We explained earlier that Arabic (standard and dialectal) does not allow for resumption in subject positions in relative clauses due to facts related to verb

³ Arabic in general is one of the languages which can produce sentences with null verbs. Such sentences (copulative sentences in the present tense) are called Nominal sentences in traditional grammars.

agreement. However, in Lebanese existential sentences, there is no resumptive pronoun in subject position despite the fact that the verb does not agree with it (Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010): 166):

- (19) (Kəll) l-kəṭub illi keen fii ʕa-T-aawle Saaro ʕa-r-raff halla?
 (all) the-books REL was in-it on-the-table they.became on-the-shelf now
 ‘(All) the books that there were on the table are now on the shelf.’
 (Lebanese Arabic)

As illustrated in (19), the head noun of the relative (‘books’) is plural, whereas the verb in the relative clause *keen* ‘be’ is in the unmarked 3rd person singular with lack of subject-verb agreement. Therefore, the resumption strategy is to be expected, however a gap is used instead:

- (20) * (Kəll) l-kəṭub illi henne keen fii ʕa-T-aawle Saaro ʕa-r-raff
 (all) the-books REL they was in-it on-the-table they.became on-the-shelf
 halla?
 now
 ‘(All) the books that there were on the table are now on the shelf.’

IA, on the other hand, presents subject-verb agreement in existential sentences. Let us consider whether the subject in this position behaves like the standard subject or has the behavior of a gap:

- (21) Kul el-kutub illi tʕanaw ʕa-l-Mez Saraw ʕa-r-raf hasa.
 all the-books REL were on-the-table they.became on-the-shelf now
 ‘All the books that there were on the table are now on the shelf.’ (Iraqi Arabic)

To conclude, relative clauses of existential subject behave, unlike Lebanese Arabic, in the predicted pattern in Iraqi Arabic; we will address this issue in section 2.

1.1.2. Time Relative Clauses

As we have explained above, standard and dialectal Arabic have a specific relativiser which (in the case of standard Arabic) carries case, gender, and number, while in IA the relativiser *illi* is not inflected. We argued these forms are not relative wh- expressions, but rather C heads marking the clause as relative. One strong argument in this sense, as we have shown, comes from standard Arabic, where the relativiser *allaḍi* agrees in Case with the antecedent, not with the base position. In standard Arabic there is another set of relativisers *ma* ‘what’ and *man* ‘who’ which are called *Al-asma’ a Al-mausula Al-mushtaraka* (‘the shared relativizers’). They are called shared because they are uninflected for Case and gender –hence all head nouns “share” their unique form. Interestingly enough, this set of relativizers are also wh-words: *man* ‘who’ and *ma*⁴ ‘what’:

(22) Man hunak?
who there
‘Who is there?’ (Standard Arabic)

(23) Ma raʔayta?
what you.saw
‘What did you see?’ (Standard Arabic)

The wh-word *man* refers to humans whereas *ma* refers to non-humans in interrogatives as well as in relative clauses. They are used in headless relative clauses:

(24) (ʔela man tab wa ʔaman.)
only REL repented and believed
‘Only who repented and believed.’ (Holly Quran: Al-Furqan: 70)

(25) (La ʕelma la-na ʔela ma ʕalamta-na.)
Neg knowledge for-us only REL you-taught-us
‘We know nothing, only what you taught us.’ (Holly Quran: Al-Baqara: 32)

⁴ *Ma* is also used as a past tensed negative element in standard Arabic and as a negative element in IA.

It must be mentioned that *man* and *ma* as relatives (in standard Arabic and their counterparts in dialectical Arabic) allow for resumption as an optional strategy instead of the gap strategy:

(26) haDara jameeʕ al-Tulabi ʔela man raʔaytu (-hu) fi al-malʕab.
 came all the-students only REL I-saw (him) in the-stadium
 ‘All the students came except who I saw [him] in the stadium.’

(27) Samiʕtu al-kaθir ʔela ma qulta (-hu) kan muheman.
 I.heard the-a lot only REL you-said (it) was important
 ‘I heard a lot, but only what you said is important.’

The relativizers *man* and *ma* are interchangeable with *allaði* as in (28):

(28) a. ʔela allaði tab wa ʔaman
 only REL repented and believed
 ‘Only who repented and believed.’
 b. La ʕelma la-na ʔela allaði ʕalamtana.
 Neg knowledge to-us only REL you.taught-us
 ‘We know nothing only what you taught us.’

In IA, the use of *man* as a relativizer is obsolete and the use of *illi* is dominant in sentences where *man* would be used in standard Arabic. *Ma*, on the other hand, is obsolete as a wh-word in IA and it has been replaced by *feno* ‘what’ (used only as an interrogative). Most importantly for our concerns, the wh- word *ma* has shifted its relative use to time adjunct only:

(29) WeSalna l-el-bet waket ma tʕanaw yaklun.
 we-arrived to-the-house time REL they-were eating
 ‘We arrived to the house when they were eating.’

In its use in relative clauses, *ma* is interchangeable with the IA relativiser *illi*:

- (30) WeSalna le-el-bet waket illi tʃanaw yaklun.
we-arrived to-the-house time REL they.were eating
'We arrived to the house when they were eating.'

There is a difference, however: time adjuncts introduced by *illi* allow for both gap and resumptive strategies; while if the relative clause is introduced by *ma*, then the gap strategy is the only strategy allowed:

- (31) WeSal-na l-el-bet waket ma tʃanaw yaklun (*bi-ih).
we-arrived to-the-house time REL they.were eating (*in-it)
'We arrived home when they were having dinner.'

1.2. Comparison with Interrogatives

The alternation between resumption and the gap strategy is not characteristic of relative clauses only, but also it takes an enormous part in interrogatives. However, they do not behave in the same way as they do in relative clauses.

In all the Arabic dialects that have both the gap strategy and the resumptive strategy, it is clear that there are differences between wh-words which relate to a gap within the wh-interrogative and wh-words which relate to resumption within the wh-interrogative. In general, all wh-words can occur in a wh-question which includes a gap, whereas there are restrictions on wh-elements which occur in wh-questions using the resumptive strategy (see Basilico 1998 and Wahba 1991 for IA & Alazzawie (1990) and Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010) for other Arabic dialects).

- (32) a. Man/ʔyan raʔayta?
who/which you-saw
'Who/which did you see?' (Standard Arabic)
- b. Meno/ʔay wahed jefet

- who/ which one you.saw
 ‘Who/which one did you see?’ (Iraqi Arabic)
- c. ?yna đahabta?
 where you.went
 ‘Where did you go?’ (Standard Arabic)
- d. Wen rehet?
 where you.went
 ‘Where did you go?’ (Iraqi Arabic)
- e. Kayfa řudta?
 how you.came back
 ‘How did you come back?’ (Standard Arabic)
- f. řlon redzařet?
 how you.came back
 ‘How did you come back?’ (Iraqi Arabic)

The examples above show that all the wh-words in standard and IA allow for the gap strategy; however, *man/meno* (‘who’) and *?ay-a*+NP (‘which’+NP) can also occur with the resumptive strategy:

- (33) a. Man/?aya radřulin qabalte-hu al-yaom?
 who/which man you.met-him the-today
 ‘Who/which man did you meet today?’ (Standard Arabic)
- b. Meno/ ?ay redřal qabalet-ah el-yom?
 who/Which man you-met-him the-today
 ‘Who/which man you met today?’ (Iraqi Arabic)

Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010) argue that the resumptive pronoun for *man* and *miin* in standard and Lebanese Arabic is always the third person masculine singular, while the resumptive pronoun of *?aya* varies according to the NP complement of *?aya*:

(2010) argue that in Lebanese Arabic the interrogatives *ʔaya* NP ‘which NP’ and *ʔu* ‘what’ differ in the sense that the latter cannot pick up a discourse referent as antecedent, therefore it is ungrammatical in the following context (Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri 2010: 140):

(37) S: Fii kaliila wa dimma w fii n-nabi.
 in-it Kaliila and Dimma and in-it the-prophet
 ‘There is Kaliila and Diima and there is the prophet.’ (Lebanese Arabic)

(38) ʔu baddak tʔra b-l-ʔawwal?
 what you.want you.read in-the-first
 ‘What do you want to read first?’

(39) ʔaya kteeb baddak teʔra b-l-ʔawwal?
 which book you.want you.read in-the-first
 ‘Which book do you want to read first?’

Example (38) is infelicitous in the sense that *ʔu* ‘what’ is unable to pick up a discourse referent as antecedent, while *ʔaya* NP ‘which NP’ can refer to a member of presupposed set. In IA there is no difference between *ʔaya* NP ‘which NP’ and *ʔenu* ‘what’ in the sense that both of them are able to pick up a discourse referent as antecedent:

(40) Aku fustan o aku banTarun.
 there dress and there trousers
 ‘there is a dress and there is trousers.’

(41) ʔenu treedeen telbaseen b-el-ʔawwal?
 what you.fem.wand you.fem.wear in-the-first
 ‘What do you want to wear first (referring to the above two options)?’

(42) ʔay waʔed treedeen telbaseen b-el-ʔawal?
 which one you.want you.wear in-the-first

‘Which one do you want to wear first?’

ʔaya NP ‘which NP’ and *fenu* ‘what’ are different in that the former allows for resumption whereas the latter does not. Hence, one can conclude that in IA the wh-interrogatives which allow for resumption must be referential while not all the referential wh-interrogatives allow for resumption since the gap strategy is the preferred strategy within interrogatives (also see Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri 2010)⁵.

Relative clauses, on the other hand, seem to make use of resumption more than of the gap strategy; this use does not depend on whether the relative clause is definite or indefinite: rather on the position of the pronominal element inside the relative clause. The gap strategy is only allowed in object positions in standard Arabic, whereas it is only allowed in existential subject position and adjunct position in most of the Arabic dialects (the standard subject position being only an apparent exception to the resumptive strategy) – see 1.1.

After introducing the main empirical facts about relative clauses in Arabic in general and IA in particular, in the next section we will consider to what extent the resumptive strategy differs from the gap strategy (which is standardly analyzed as generated by movement). We will use several tests (such as island sensitivity, Weak Cross Over, Reconstruction and Quantifier Binding) in order to establish whether or not resumptive pronouns in IA relative clauses differ from movement structures.

5 Similar contrasts can be found in colloquial Catalan:

- i. Quin llibre dius que vols comprar?
what book you-say that you-want to-buy
‘What book you say that you want to buy?’
- ii. Quin d’aquests dos llibres dius que el vols comprar?
which of these two books you-say that it-you-want to-buy
‘Which book of these two you say that you want to buy?’

Within each of these domains, we will further distinguish between strong and weak resumptive pronouns, as there is evidence from other dialects that the distinction is relevant (Guilliot and Malkawi 2011).

2. Empirical Evidence for the Status of the Resumptive Pronouns

In order to establish to what extent the resumptive strategy is different from the gap strategy, we will classify evidence into two types: evidence that suggests that resumptive pronouns differ from gaps, and evidence suggesting that resumptive pronouns do not differ from gaps.

2.1. Resumptive Pronouns Do Not Behave Like Gaps

Resumptive pronouns do not behave like gaps with respect to islands. Szabolcsi & den Dikken (2003) define islands as nodes which obstruct syntactic movement, understood as an antecedent-trace dependency. Islands are divided into two types: strong (absolute) and weak (selective), as their names suggest the former block movement in all phrase types, whereas the latter block extraction of some specific phrase types. Weak islands usually allow for PP-gaps, while strong islands are those which can contain a DP-gap. Wh-islands, Negative Islands, Relative and Factive Islands are all weak islands. On the other hand, Adjunct and Complex NP islands are both strong islands.

Next, we will proceed to analyze gapped relatives and their behavior with both strong and weak islands; then relatives which use resumption and their behavior within strong and weak islands are analyzed.

2.1.1 Gapped Relatives

As mentioned earlier, the gap strategy in IA is optional in time adjunct position (with *illi* and *ma* relatives only). We will also consider the subject of existential sentences, since, even if it involves agreement in IA, it doesn't in other dialects and might be a case of gapping.

First we illustrate these three cases in a non-island context:

Subject position of existential sentence

- (43) El-redʒal illi _tʃan be-l-madrasa raħ le-l-bet.
the-man REL was in-the-school he.went to-the-house

‘The man who was in the school went home.’

Adjunct position (*illi* time relative)

- (44) WeSal-na le-l-bet wakt illi ?aðan _/ bi-h.
we.arrived to-the-house time REL prayer-calling *gap*/in-it
‘We arrived at home when the Athan was calling.’

Adjunct position (*ma* time relative)

- (45) WeSal-na le-l-bet wakt ma ?aðan _.
we-arrived to-the-house time REL prayer-calling *gap*
‘We arrived at home when the Athan was calling.’

In the following we will proceed to check gapped relatives with relation to island sensitivity then compare them to relatives which use the resumptive strategy.

2.1.1.1 Strong Islands

First we will consider relative clauses of existential subject in relation to strong islands (46)-(47):

Adjunct island

- (46) *Kul el-kutub illi Dedztu le?ana-hu tʃanaw ʃa-l-Mez
all the-books REL you.upset because-it they.were on-the-table
Saraw ʃa-rr-a-f hasa.
they-become on-the-shelf now
‘All the books that you were upset because there were on the table are now on the shelf.’

Complex NP island

- (47) *El-ketab illi ʃendi el-fekra ?enna-hu mawdzud be-l-maktaba.

the-book REL I.have the-idea that-it it.exist in-the-library
'The book that I have the idea that there is in the library.'

Second, we consider *illi* time adjunct relative clauses in relation to strong islands (48)-(49):

Complex NP island

- (48) *Haða hwa el-waket illi john neġar el-naDaria enna-hu medzarteen raħ
this he the-time REL John he.published the-theory that-it galaxy.two will
yStadmoon.
they.collide
'This is the time that John published the idea that two galaxies will collide.'

Adjunct island

- (49) *WeSalna le-l-ħafla waket illi tnarfaz ġali le-?ana-hu ?ahl-ah
we-arrived to-the-party time REL he.upset Ali for-because.it parents-his
raħau.
they.left
'We arrived to the party when Ali got upset because his parents left.'

Third, we consider *ma* time adjunct relative clause in relation to strong islands (50):

Adjunct island

- (50) * WeSalna le-l-ħafla waket ma tnarfaz ġali le-?ana-hu ?ahl-ah
we-arrived to-the-party time REL he.upset Ali for-because-it parents-his
raħau.
they.left
'We arrived to the party when Ali got upset because his parents left.'

According to the examples above, gapped relatives are sensitive to strong islands.

2.1.1.2 Weak Islands

Now we turn to check the sensitivity of gapped relatives in relation to weak islands, we first consider relative clauses of existential subject (51)-(52):

Negative island

- (51) *El-kutub illi ma ?aʃruf-hum tʃanaw ʃa-l-mez Sarau
the-books REL Neg I.know-them were on-the-table they.became
ʃa-l-raf hasa.
on-the- shelf now
'The books which I don't know [them] were on the table are now on the shelf.'

Wh-island

- (52) *Kul el-kutub illi treedun tʃorfun meno gal ?na-hu tʃanaw mawjudeen
all the-books REL you.want you.know who said that-it they.were existing
ʃa-l-mez lazem ynħaTun ʃa-l-raf.
on-the-table must be put.they on-the-shelf
'All the books that you want to know who said that they were on the table must be put on the shelf.'

Below we consider *illi* time adjunct relative clause in relation to weak islands (53)-(54):

Negative island

- (53) *WeSal le-l-ħafla waket illi ma ?aʃteqid ?na-hu chan Saħi.
he.arrived to-the-party time REL Neg I.think that.it he.was sober
'He arrived to the party when I don't think that he was sober.'

Wh island

- (54) *WeSalna le-l-ħafla waket illi days?al ʃali eða rahaw ahl-ah.
we.arrived to-the-party time REL is-asking Ali whether left parents-his
'We arrived to the party when Alli is asking whether his parents left.'

Finally, we consider *ma* time adjunct with relation to weak islands (55)-(56):

Negative island

- (55) *WeSalna le-l-ħafla waket ma daysʔal ʕali eða raħaw ahl-ah.
we.arrived to-the-party time REL is-asking Ali whether left parents-his
'We arrived to the party when Alli was asking whether his parents left.'

Wh island

- (56) *WeSalna le-l-ħafla waket illi daysʔal ʕali eða raħaw ahl-ah.
we.arrived to-the-party time REL is-asking Ali whether left parents-his
'We arrived to the party when Alli is asking whether his parents left.'

As mentioned earlier, strong and weak islands are a good test to see whether a certain dependency is generated by movement; if so, it should be sensitive to islands. Sensitivity to islands, then, indicates whether we are dealing with movement or base generation. Clearly from all the examples above, both the subject of existential construction and time adjuncts are sensitive to strong and weak islands.

For time adjuncts, sensitivity to weak islands is expected from the literature. For our purposes in this paper, the important fact is to see whether these cases contrast with cases with a resumptive pronoun.

Having discussed weak and strong island sensitivity for relative clauses with a gap we now address island sensitivity with the resumptive strategy.

2.1.2 Resumptive Relatives

It is well known (see also Alexopoulou and Keller 2003, Aoun, Choueiri and Hornstein 2001) that, in any language that uses both the gap and the resumptive strategy, the gap strategy is usually sensitive to islands while the resumptive strategy is not. Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010) argue otherwise for Lebanese Arabic, in which resumptive adjunct relatives of manner show some sensitivity to islands. However, this cannot be said about the IA resumptive relative clauses of manner, where no such sensitivity is detectable. Below, strong and weak islands and their effect or lack of effect in relation to resumption are examined.

2.1.2.1 Strong Islands

In this section, first we test for resumption sensitivity (of weak and strong resumptive pronouns) in relation to strong islands (57)-(58):

Adjunct island

(57) a. **Weak resumptive pronoun**

El-redʒal illi tʃasub eða jeft-ah.
the-man REL you.angry if I.see-him
‘The man who you get angry if I meet him.’

b. **Strong resumptive pronoun**

El-bnaya illi tfadʒaʔtu leʔana-hu hia najħa.
the-girl REL you.surprised because.it she passed
‘The girl who you were surprised because she passed.’

Complex NP island

(58) a. **Weak resumptive pronoun**

Haðee hia el-bnaya illi ʃendatʃ el-taʒaur el-dʒenuuny ʔena-hu
this she the-girl REL you.have the-impression the-crazy that-it
zawdʒe-tʃ ħab-ha.
husband-yours loved-her
‘This is the girl who you had the crazy idea that your husband loved.’

b. Strong resumptive pronoun

El-bnaya illi ʕendak el-taʕaur el-dʒenuuny ʔena-hu hia najħa.
the-girl REL you.have the-impression the-crazy that.it she passed
‘The girl who you have the crazy idea that she passed.’

We should clarify that, like in Lebanese Arabic, IA uses resumption in manner adjunct relative clauses as the only strategy possible. However, according to Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010), even though there is resumption in Lebanese Arabic, manner relative clauses are sensitive to islands, whereas in IA they are not, as shown in (59):

- (59) a. El-surʕa illi furaħtu le-ʔana-hu ʕali yʕtoghul bi-ha hia el-maTluba.
the-speed REL you.happy to-because-it Ali works with-it it the-required
‘The speed with which you were happy because Ali works with is the required one.’
- b. El-surʕa illi tuʕorfoon meno yʕtoghul bi-ha hia el-maTluba.
the-speed REL you.know who works with-it it the-required
‘The speed with which you know who works is the required one.’
- c. El-surʕa illi tuʕurfoon el-muwaDaf illi yʕtoghul bi-ha hia el-maTluba.
the-speed REL you.know the-employee that works with-it it the-required
‘The speed with which you know the employee who works with it is the required one.’

2.1.2.2 Weak Islands

Now we turn to resumption sensitivity (with weak and strong pronouns) in relation to weak islands (60)-(61):

Wh island

(60) a. **Weak resumptive pronoun**

El-redʒal illi seʔalit-nee wen eltiqeet-ah.
the man REL you.asked-me where I.met-him
‘The man who you asked where I met.’

b. Strong resumptive pronoun

El-walad illi seʔalit-nee etha hwa zaʕlan.
the-boy REL you.asked.me whether he upset
‘The boy who you asked whether he is upset.’

Negative island

(61) a. Weak resumptive pronoun

El-redʒal illi ma ʔaʕorf-ah qabal-na.
the-man REL Neg I.know-him he.met.us
‘The man who I don’t know [him] met us.’

b. Strong resumptive pronoun

El-mraya illi ma getl-ee hia maXTuba.
the-woman REL Neg you.told-me she engaged
‘The woman who you did not tell me she is engaged.’

***illi* time adjunct**

As we have mentioned earlier *illi* as a time adjunct allows both for resumptive and gap strategies. Here, *illi* will be examined in relation to resumptive pronouns.

- (62) a. Haða hwa el-waqet illi mary kulesh tefraħ [eða john weSal bi-ih].
this it the-time REL Mary very happy [if John he.arrives in-it]
‘This is the time in which Mary is very happy if John arrives [in-it].’
- b. *Haða hwa el-waqet illi mary kulesh tefraħ [eða john weSal_].
this it the-time REL Mary very happy [if John he.arrives_]
‘This is the time which Mary is very happy if John arrives’
- c. *Telaʕna bara waqet illi baʕadni metfajeʔ le-ʔana-hu chanat dateðledʒ_.
we.went out time REL I.still surprised to-because-it it.was snowing_
‘We went out when I am still surprised because it was snowing.’
- d. Waket illi baʕadni metfajeʔ leʔana-hu chanat dateðledʒ bi-ih, Telaʕna.
time REL I.still surprised because-it it.was snowing in-it we.went out.

‘When I was still surprised because it was snowing, we went out.’

After extensively examining the resumptive strategy in relation to island sensitivity, it is clear that resumption definitely lacks island sensitivity. Since sensitivity is an indication for movement, as already mentioned above, then it is safe to say that gapped restrictive relatives in IA, similar to wh-interrogatives involving gaps, are generated by movement in the syntax. In other words; the relationship between the gap and its antecedent in the relative clause is a relationship generated by movement.

2.2. Resumptive Pronouns Behave Like Gaps

2.2.1. Weak and Strong Cross Over

This section is based on Shlonsky’s (1992) research on Hebrew and Palestinian Arabic, in which he applies McCloskey’s (1990) test on Weak and Strong Cross Over in relative clauses in Irish. By running this test on IA, we attempt to determine whether resumption in IA shows movement effects or not. Following Shlonsky’s steps, this section will be divided into two sections; the first section will test for Strong Cross Over while the second will test for Weak Cross Over.

Strong Cross Over

Before we take a look at IA, let us give a brief introduction to Shlonsky’s analysis of Hebrew. It has been claimed that resumption differs from gaps in the effect they produce in Strong Cross Over in sentences like (63) (Shlonsky 1992: 460):

- (63) a. *Ze ha-baxur je- yidafti ?oto_i je- ha-more yaxfil *t_i*.
this the-guy that- (I) informed him that-the-teacher will flunk
‘This is the guy that I told him that the teacher will flunk him.’
- b. Ze ha-baxur je- yidafti ?oto_i je- ha-more yaxfil ?oto_i.
this the-guy that- (I) informed him that-the-teacher will flunk him
(same meaning)

Shlonsky argues that this example, in itself, does not indicate any difference between resumptive and gap strategy: the grammaticality of (63b) is due to the fact that the second pronoun can be interpreted as coreferential rather than bound by the null operator in C, which leads to both pronouns to be coindexed without violating Condition C. Such reading is not available in (63a) because there is one pronoun which c-commands the trace and this violates Condition C.

No such contrast can be detected in IA, where a gap is ungrammatical, and the resumptive strategy is always obligatory. As expected, the resumptive strategy gives a grammatical result, for weak and strong resumptives⁶:

(64) a. **Weak resumptive pronoun**

Haða el-walad illi Xabbart-ah_i ?ena-hu el-muʕalema raḥ traseb-ah_i
 this the-boy REL I.told-him that-it the-teacher will flunk-him
 ‘This is the boy that I told him that the teacher will flunk him.’

b. **Strong resumptive pronoun**

El-bnaya illi gelet-ha_i ?ena-hu hia_i nadʒħa.
 the-girl REL I.told-her that-it she passed
 ‘The girl whom I told her that she passed.’

It is quite likely, on the other hand, that, like in Hebrew, IA cases like (64a,b) can be grammatical with the upper pronoun being the resumptive one (since there is no formal difference between resumptive and anaphoric pronouns). The result is apparent insensitivity of resumptive pronouns to Strong Cross Over or, more precisely, the impossibility to check Strong Cross Over effects with resumptive pronouns.

Weak Cross Over

Shlonsky uses the same argument to test for the differences between the gap strategy and the resumptive strategy in Weak Cross Over. The same comparison will be made between

⁶ Due to the special nature of subjects of existential clauses and time adjuncts, it seems impossible to test for Crossover in these cases.

strong/weak resumptive pronouns and gapping; As we can see in the Hebrew examples from Shlonsky (1992: 461):

- (65) a. *Ze ha-baxur fe- yidafti ?et ha-horim fel-o_i fe-ha-more
 this the-guy that- (I) informed ACC the-parents of-him that-the-teacher
 yaxfil *t_i*
 will flunk
 ‘This is the guy that I informed his parents that the teacher will flunk.’
- b. Ze ha-baxur se- yidafti ?et ha-horim sel-o_i fe-ha-more
 this the-guy that- (I) informed ACC the-parents of-him that-the-teacher
 yaxfil ?oto_i
 will flunk him
 ‘The same meaning.’

Applying this argument on IA strong and weak resumptive pronouns, we can observe the following:

- (66) a. Haða hwa el-walad illi gelet el-ahl-ah_i ?ena-hu el-muʕalema rañ traseb-ah_i
 this he the-boy REL I.told to-parents-his that-it the-teacher will flunk-him
 ‘This is the boy that I told his parents that the teacher will flunk him.’
- b. Haði hia el-bnaya illi gelet el-ahal-ha_i ?ena-hu hia_i nadzha.
 this she the-girl REL I.told to-parents-her that-it she passed
 ‘This is the girl whom I told her parents that she passed.’

The reason which holds (65b) grammatical is also the reason which makes (66a,b) grammatical as well; since the possessive pronoun (in ‘his/her parents’) is bound and the second pronoun (him/she) is co-referential with it, there is no way to establish whether there is a Weak Cross Over configuration.

To conclude, the tests used above cannot tell us whether resumptive pronouns are sensitive to Weak or Strong Crossover. Shlonsky proposes a different empirical test that overcomes this problem: using an epithet instead of a pronoun in the non resumptive position.

The epithet plays the crucial role for creating a Cross Over configuration, and is not reanalyzable as the resumptive element itself.

In the following, we will observe the behavior of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses that includes epithets in relation to Strong Cross Over (67) and Weak Cross Over (68):

(67) a. **Weak resumptive pronoun**

*Haða hwa el-ħaramii_i illi gelet le-el-ghabii_i ?ena-hu raħ alezm-ah_i
this he the-thief REL I.told to-the-idiot that-it I.will catch-him
‘This is the thief that I told the idiot that I will catch-him.’

b. **Strong resumptive pronoun**

* Haða hwa el-Talib_i illi qenaʕet el-ghabii_i ?ena-hu hwa_i ʕabqari.
this he the-student REL I.convinced the-idiot that-it he genius
‘This is the student who I convinced the idiot that he is a genius.’

(68) a. **Weak resumptive pronoun**

*Haða hwa el-ħaramii_i illi ebn el-ghabii_i ketal-ah_i
this he the-thief REL son the-idiot killed-him
‘This is the thief that the son of the idiot killed him.’

b. **Strong resumptive pronoun**

*Haða hwa el-Talib_i illi qenaʕt abu el-ghabi_i ?ena-hu hwa_i ʕabqari.
this he the-student REL I.convinced father the-idiot that-it he genius
‘This is the student who I convinced the father of the idiot that he is genius.’

Judging from the IA data one can conclude that weak and strong pronouns are in fact sensitive to Weak and Strong Cross Over, which leads to the conclusion that they behave like gaps in this respect.

2.2.2. Reconstruction

Guilliot and Malkawi (2011)⁷ define reconstruction as the interaction between displacement structures (dislocation, topicalization, interrogation and relativization) and structural constraints on sentence interpretation, i.e. quantifier scope and binding conditions. Although reconstruction as such is not related to relative clauses immediately, the use of reconstruction in this section will help examine how it interacts with resumption as well as with the strong and weak character of resumptives.

As this section follows, it will be noted that strong and weak resumptive pronouns behave differently with respect to reconstruction. Reconstruction, if allowed, usually indicates movement, hence, if the resumptive pronoun (strong or weak) allows for reconstruction, then it can be argued that it is behaving like a gap.

The paper of Guilliot and Malkawi (2011) tests for the distinction between strong and weak resumptive pronouns in Jordanian Arabic. Reconstruction is one of the tests applied in their paper which we will examine with strong and weak pronouns in IA.

2.2.2.1 Weak Pronouns Do Not Ban Reconstruction

Guilliot and Malkawi (2011) show that, in Jordanian Arabic left dislocation constructions, weak pronouns do not restrict reconstruction even within an island (69a)-(70a) which is positioned between the weak resumptive pronoun and its antecedent. The same observation can be made for IA (69b)-(70b). The Jordanian examples are taken from Guillot and Malkawi (2011: 405):

Non island contexts

- (69) a. Talib-ha_i l-kassoul_j ma baddna nxabbir wala mʕallmih_i ʔinnu-uh_j (hu) zaʕbar
student-her the-bad neg we.want we.tell no teacher that-it (he) cheated
b-l-faħiʕ.

⁷ See also: Guilliot and Malkawi (2007, 2009).

in-the-exam

‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated on the exam.’
(Jordanian Arabic)

b. ʕala telmeeḏ-ha_i el-kaslan_j ma nreed ngul el-wala ʔay muʕalema_i
about student-her the-lazy Neg we.want we.tell to-Neg any teacher
ʔena-hu_j ghaf be-l-emtehan.
that-it he.cheated in-the-exam

‘Her lazy student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’
(Iraqi Arabic)

Adjunct Island

(70) a. talib-ha_i l-kassoul_j ma ziʕlat wala mʕallmih_i la-ʔann-uh l-mudiirah
student-her the-bad neg she.upset no teacher to-because-it the-principal
kaḥʕat-oh_j (hu_j) mn l-madrased.
expelled.him (he) from the-school

‘Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.’
(Jordanian Arabic)

b. ʕala Telmeeḏ-ha_i el-kaslan ma ʔenqehrat wala muʕalema_i le-ʔan
about student-her the-lazy Neg she.upset Neg teacher for-because
el-mudeerah Terdat-ah_j men el-madrased.
the-principle expelled-him from the-school

‘Her lazy student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from the school.’
(Iraqi Arabic)

The examples (69) and (70) illustrate the possibility of reconstruction with or without island, allowing the covariant reading for one different student for each teacher.

2.2.2.2 Strong Pronouns Ban Reconstruction

In contrast with weak pronouns, which make no distinction between a non island and an island context in reconstruction, strong pronouns (which are optional) make a clear distinction between these two contexts. In non island context, strong pronouns behave like weak pronouns in the sense that they allow for reconstruction; see (71).

Non Island context

- (71) a. ṭalib-ha_i l-kassoul_j ma baddna nxabbir wala mṣallmih_i ʔinn-u huwwe_j
 student-her the-bad Neg we.want we.tell no teacher that-it he
 gash b-l-faḥiṣ.
 he.cheated in-the-exam

‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated on the exam.’

(Jordanian Arabic)

- b. Ṣala telmeeḏ-ha_i el-kaslan_j ma nreed ngul el-wala ʔay muṣalema_i ʔena-hu_j
 about student-her the-lazy Neg we.want we.tell to-Neg any teacher that-it
 (hwa_j)ghaf be-l-emtehan.
 (he) he.cheated in-the-exam

‘Her lazy student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’

(Iraqi Arabic)

Reconstruction, on the other hand, is banned in the contexts when a strong island (e.g. an adjunct island) occurs between the moved DP and the resumptive strong pronoun, as shown in (72):

- (72) a. *ṭalib-ha_i l-kassoul_j ma ḥakjan maṣ wala mṣallmih_i gabl ma hu_j yesal.
 student-her the-bad Neg we.talked with no teacher before he he.arrive

‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he arrives.’

(Jordanian Arabic)

- b. *telmeeð-ha_i el-kaslan_j ma hechena wja wala ʔay muʕalma_i qabel ma (hwa)
 student-her the-lazy Neg we.talked with Neg any teacher before that_j (he_j)
 yoSal.

he.arrive

‘Her lazy student, we did not talk to any teacher before he arrives.’

(Iraqi Arabic)

The ungrammaticality in (72) is clear in the sense that the occurrence of a strong island bans the reconstruction reading where the bound variable *ha* ‘her’ refers to *wala ʔay muʕalma* ‘any teacher’ in both JA and IA.

The previous is an application to IA of what Guilliot and Malkawi (2011) have concluded so far. In the following, and for the purpose of our research, we will include relative clauses to the reconstruction structure and test whether strong and weak resumptive pronouns are sensitive to reconstruction within relative clauses. First we will test for reconstruction with relation to weak resumptive pronouns:

- (73) a. el-Sura malat john illi teʕejb-ah
 the-picture of John REL he.likes-it

‘The picture of John that he likes it.’

- b. El-Sura malat-ah illi el-kul yfaDelu-ha akθar ʕii.
 the-picture of-him REL the-all prefere-it more thing

‘The picture of himself that everybody likes the most.’

Second we will test for reconstruction with relation to strong resumptive pronouns:

- (74) El-Sura malat zawedʒt-ah illi kol redʒal yʕteqed ʔena-hu hia el-aħla.
 the-picture of wife-his REL all man thinks that.it it the-nicest
 eb-dʒeb-ah.

in-pocket-his

‘The picture of his wife that every man thinks that it nicest is in his pocket.’

Although the resumptive strategy bans reconstruction as such, however, within relative clauses, resumption does not ban to reconstruction at all. Gaps, on the other hand, are insensitive to reconstruction as well. Therefore, we can conclude that the resumptive strategy behaves like gapping here, in the sense that neither resumptives nor gaps are sensitive in relation to reconstruction in relative clauses.

2.2.3. Binding Scope of Quantifiers in Relative Clauses

This section is based on Sharvit's (1999) research on resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in Hebrew. Sharvit's important insight is that resumptive pronouns do not trigger the same interpretation as gaps (traces) in languages which alternate the resumptive strategy with the gap strategy, like Hebrew.

His argument is based on Doron's (1982) observation that when the gap in a relative clause follows a quantified expression, the interpretation of the sentence is ambiguous in the sense that it triggers both 'single- individual' and 'multiple- individual' interpretations. In addition, and surprisingly, the quantifier in 'multiple- individual' interpretation can bind a pronoun that is outside its syntactic scope, i.e., its c-command domain (Sharvit, 1999: 588):

- (75) Ha-iSa Se kol gever hizmin_ hodeta lo.
 the-woman Op every man invited thanked to-him
- a. 'The (single) woman every man invited thanked him (=someone else).'
 - b. 'For every man x, the woman that x invited thanked x.'

The reading in (75a) is single-individual, which means that there is only one woman, say Mary, who is associated with all the men who invited her and the pronoun in the matrix VP is a free variable e.g. the woman all men invited thanked a certain man, say John. On the other hand, the reading in (75b) is multiple- individual, which means that a woman was invited by every man and that she thanked every one of them, hence the pronoun in the matrix VP is bound by 'every man'.

The sentence is no longer ambiguous if the gap is replaced by a resumptive pronoun: single- individual is the only reading possible in this case, where the pronoun in the matrix VP is a free variable (Sharvit, 1999: 588):

- (76) Ha-iSa Se kol gever hizmin ota hodeta lo.
 the-woman OP every man invited her thanked to-him
 ‘The woman every man invited thanked him.’

We can take Sharvit’s insight as a test for distinguishing gap-relatives from resumptive relatives. If we apply this test on IA, it becomes obvious that there are important differences with Hebrew: the gap strategy in object position is not allowed in IA, therefore the construction we have in the Hebrew example (75) is ungrammatical in IA:

- (77) *El-mraya illi kol redʒal deʒa_ʃekrat-ah.
 the-woman REL every man invited thanked- him
 ‘The woman every man invited thanked him.’

Since that gap strategy is not permitted in object position, the resumptive strategy appears to be the only alternative construction to form the same structure as in Hebrew:

- (78) El-mraya illi kul redʒal deʒa-ha ʃekrat-ah.
 the-woman REL every man invited-her thanked-him
 ‘The woman every man invited thanked him.’

Nevertheless, resumptive pronouns in IA do not behave like their Hebrew counterparts. Example (78) has the same ambiguity as example (75) in Hebrew, where the gap strategy was used, triggering two interpretations. The resumptive pronoun, in IA, can be interpreted as a free variable or as bound by ‘every man’.

It can be concluded that, according to this test, resumption in IA behaves like a gap in Hebrew, as if it was derived by movement rather than base generation.

This test can also be applied to IA strong pronouns, and strong pronouns in IA are found to behave like weak pronouns in resumption. Unlike strong pronouns in Hebrew, strong

pronouns in IA behave like gaps in Hebrew in the sense that they also allow for two interpretations; a free and bound variable interpretation. We said earlier that strong pronouns only occur (obligatory) in subject position of nominal sentences, therefore we suggest the following analogue to Sharvit's example:

- (79) El-mraya illi kul redʒal yʃteqed ʔena-hu hia el-aḥsan mo be-l-Darura
the-woman REL all man thinks that-it she the-nicest Neg in-the-necessity
raḥ tetzawadʒ-ah.
will marry-him
'The woman that every man thinks that she is nicest will not necessarily marry
him.'

Again, the pronoun *him* of the matrix VP triggers two interpretations (i.e. free variable e.g. John or bound variable e.g. everyman). From this data we can safely conclude that strong pronouns in IA behave like weak pronouns, and like gaps in Hebrew.

2.3. Summary

In this section we have provided several tests to establish to what extent resumptive pronouns in IA behave like gaps.

1. First of all, we have shown that the few cases of gaps in IA relative clauses (temporal adjuncts and subjects of existential clauses) behave as expected: they are sensitive to islands and pass all other tests for gaps.
2. As for resumptive pronouns, they behave like gaps in all respects (reconstruction, Weak and Strong Cross Over and Sharvit's (1999) test), except that they are insensitive to islands.
3. We have tested whether strong resumptive pronouns behave differently from weak ones: the only case in IA is the subject of a verbless copulative.

In section 3 we will try to provide some theoretical clues for explaining this set of properties.

3. Conclusion

3.1. Why Resumptive Pronouns are so Similar to Traces

Throughout the previous sections we have observed important empirical evidence concerning the nature of resumption and the resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in IA; we did so by examining evidence from other Arabic varieties such as Lebanese and Jordanian Arabic and evidence from other languages such as Hebrew. From our observations on IA we concluded that in IA resumptive pronouns have the following properties:

1. Resumptive pronouns (both weak and strong) differ from gaps in that they do not obey island conditions. For this property we consider resumptive pronouns to have a larger distributional capacity than gaps.
2. Weak and strong resumptive pronouns do not differ in their capabilities from gaps in relation to Weak and Strong Cross Over, reconstruction and Sharvit's (1999) test.

In one view, the resumptive pronoun strategy is a last resort alternative to movement, whenever conditions on movement are not met. This is Shlonsky's (1992) approach in which he argues that wh-movement (which results in gapping) must convert to the resumptive strategy as a last resort whenever movement (gapping) is not possible, such as what we have observed in the case of islands. Therefore, it is assumed that all resumptive pronouns arise from economy. However, Shlonsky's proposal does not make clear how resumptive pronouns generally keep their trace properties in reconstruction or Cross Over.

An alternative to Shlonsky's proposal would be that the last resort option for traces simply consists in replacing the trace by a trace+pronoun complex category. The result would be a category that preserves all the properties of traces and its additional pronominal property makes it insensitive to islands, as is the general case for pronominal binding:

(80) No wife_i should be content [just because her_i husband loves her_i more than his lover].

As another alternative, let us suppose that resumptive pronouns are disguised traces. If we suppose that traces must be replaced by resumptive pronouns in some circumstances, then they will always have the same shape of an independent pronoun (let us call them resumptive traces). As far as we know, there are no pronominal forms that are only found as resumptive traces. Resumptive traces are exactly like traces, especially in the sense that they are not allowed in islands. Henceforth, we can argue that resumptive traces behave exactly like traces. However in the cases where resumptive pronouns do not behave like traces, we can assume that some resumptive pronouns are not resumptive traces.

3.2. Weak and Strong Resumptive Pronouns

According to the Guillot & Malkawi (2010), in Jordanian Arabic strong resumptive pronouns differ from weak resumptive pronouns in several respects: reconstruction, sensitivity to islands, and possibility of a quantificational head. In section 2.2.2., we showed that the reconstruction facts can be replicated in IA for dislocation. However the ban of a quantificational head with a strong resumptive pronoun (Guillot and Malkawi 2010: 420) cannot be replicated in IA. Weak resumptive pronouns allow a quantified head in Jordanian Arabic:

- (81) Kul bint karim gal ?in -ha (hi) raḥ tinJaḥ.
 every girl Karim he.said that-she (she) will she.succeed.
 ‘Every girl, Karim said that she would pass.’

But strong resumptive pronouns do not allow a quantified head in Jordanian Arabic:

- (82) *Kul bint karim gal ?inn-u hi raḥ tinJaḥ.
 every girl Karim he.said that-it she will she.succeed

‘Every girl, Karim said that she would pass.’

Both weak and strong pronouns allow a quantified antecedent in IA:

(83) a. **Weak pronoun**

Kul bnaya karim gal ?ena-hu el-mudeer raħ yrazel-ha.

all girl Karim said that-it the-principle will he.scold-her

‘Every girl Karim said that the principle will scold her.’

b. **Strong pronoun**

Kul bnaya karim gal ?ena-hu hia najħa.

all girl Karim said that-it she passed

‘Every girl Karim said that she passed.’

Also, Sharvit (1999) provides evidence that resumptive pronouns in Hebrew (which are strong pronouns) do not behave like traces. Therefore, there is evidence for the strong/weak contrast with resumptive pronouns that is not confirmed by IA. Actually, the only strong pronoun in IA that we have identified as relevant is the subject of verbless copulative clauses (nominal clauses). Verbless copulatives in IA only occur in present tense: in other tenses the copulative verb must be present, and no strong resumptive pronoun appears. This very limited usage of strong pronouns in IA may be insufficient to consider these strong pronouns as strong resumptive pronouns. The issue of resumptive pronouns and their relation to traces is yet to be further studied.

References

- Abu-Jarad, H (2008). 'Wh-movement in Palestinian Arabic'. *Journal of Al Azhar University-Gaza*, 10(1B): 49-68.
- Alazzawi, Abdulkhaliq Karim. (1990). *Adjunctional in Arabic: Case and Chain Theory*. Doctoral Disertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Al-Momani, Islam. (2010). 'Direct Object Relative Clauses in Jordanian Arabic: A Minimalist Approach'. *International Journal of Academic Research* 2(3), 226-237.
- Alexopoulou, Theodor and Frank Keller (2003). 'Linguistic Complexity, Locality, and Resumption'. *Proceedings of WCCFL 22*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Anoun E. Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun and Lina Choueiri. (2010). *The Syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aoun, E. Joseph and Lina Choueiri. (1996). 'Resumption as Last Resort'. Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern California.
- Aoun, E. Joseph, Lina Choueiri, and Norbert Hornstein. (2001). 'Resumption, Movement, and Derivational Economy'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3): 371-403.
- Basilico, David. (1998). 'Wh-movement in Iraqi Arabic and Slave'. *The Linguistic Review* 15 (4): 301-340.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1977). 'On Wh-Movement'. In Culicover, P. W., Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian (eds.). *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Doron, Edit. (1982). 'On the Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns'. *Texas Linguistics Forum* 19. Austin, University of Texas: 1-48.
- Guilliot, Nicolas; Nouman Malkawi. (2011). 'Weak Versus Strong Resumption. Covarying Differently' in Rouveret, Alain (ed.), *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Guilliot, Nicolas; Nouman Malkawi. (2009). 'When Movement Fails to Reconstruct'. In Bruccart J. M., A. Gavarró and J. Solà (eds.) *Merging Features*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guilliot, Nicolas; Nouman Malkawi. (2007). 'Reconstruction and Islandhood in Jordanian Arabic'. In Mughazy, M. (ed.) *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XX*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- McCloskey, J. (1991). 'Resumptive Pronouns, A-Binding and Levels of Representation in Irish'. In *The Syntax and Semantics of Modern Celtic Languages*, Syntax and Semantics 23, Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- Postal, Paul. (1971). *Cross-Over Phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, INC.
- Sharvit, Yael. (1999). 'Resumptive Pronouns in Relative Clauses'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17: 587–612.
- Shlonsky, Ur. (1992). 'Resumptive Pronouns as a Last Resort'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(3): 443-468.
- Szabolcsi, Anna; Marcel den Dikken. (2003). 'Islands'. In Cheng, Lisa and Rint Sybesma (eds.). *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book: The Latest in Linguistics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wahba, Wafaa Abdel-Faheem Batran. (1991). 'LF Movement in Iraqi Arabic'. In Huang, C.T. James and Robert May (eds.), *Logical Structure and Linguistic Structure: Cross Linguistic Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 253-276.