Case and resumptive clitics in Czech
Knut Tarald Taraldsen, CASTL, Tromsø

1. In Czech (and a number of other Slavic varieties), a relative clause need not have a wh-word corresponding to *which* (nor one of the series *jenz* etc.) following the head noun:

(1) ten hrad co jsem videl
       this castle what I saw

But if the relativized position is associated with oblique case, a resumptive clitic must appear:

(2) ten typek co jsem *(mu) pomohl
     this guy what I-am *(him-DAT) helped

This fact has attracted some attention in the literature. For example, it is suggested in work by Pesetsky that the obligatoriness of the resumptive clitic in (2) reflects a constraint to the effect that oblique case must be spelled out at PF: When relativized DP assigned an oblique case is raised to Spec-CP, but not pronounced, a resumptive clitic must host the spell-out of the oblique case..

2. The OT-inspired analysis by Pesetsky is not committed to any particular view as to the derivational source of the resumptive clitics. However, one might think of (2) as taking the option of spelling out the foot of the chain created by movement to Spec-CP, in line with many recent accounts of resumptive pronouns. But both this general approach and its application to the case at hand would raise a number of questions that appear to lack principled answers within currently available frameworks; cf. Abels (2005). In particular, assuming a copy theory of traces, why is the copy spelled out as a clitic rather than, say, the (inflected) noun contained in the copy, a choice which wouldn't seem disfavored by any plausible economy consideration relating to PF-spell-out. Also, since the clitic allegedly spelling out the copy must in fact appear in a position inside the clitic cluster, generally inaccessible to full DPs, this analysis would in fact force the further assumption that clitic placement is itself a PF process, arguably a rather unfortunate consequence, for a number of reasons.

3. A different view of the structural origin of resumptive pronouns is suggested by Abels (op.cit.): Resumptive pronouns correspond to fragments of the D-layer of a "big DP" from which a more deeply embedded constituent has been extracted. Combining this with the head-raising analysis of relative constructions originating from Vergnaud's early work and more recently adopted by Kayne and others, we arrive at an alternative account of (2): (a) a relative construction is derived by raising a nominal projection into a position embedded directly under a D, and (b) deviating now from Kayne's proposal, we take this position not to be a category-insensitive Spec-CP, but rather the highest position in the nominal functional sequence under the lowest head in the D-layer, so that (c), taking oblique cases and nominative/accusative to be associated with different levels of the nominal functional sequence, it becomes possible to say that the oblique Cases live on heads too high up in the nominal functional sequence for there to be room for them under the D of the relative construction, Hence, a head carrying oblique case has to strand under relativization, giving rise to a resumptive clitic. More specifically, we assume that Czech associates the oblique cases with elements in the D-layer of the nominal functional hierarchy, taking their

morphological reflexes on nouns to be secondary, as they would have to be in a head-raising approach anyway:

(3) ... D [_ [C .... [D+obl [NP ...
         |_____|

By contrast, we develop an account of accusative/nominative as "NP-level case".
This account has the advantage of predicting what the resumptive element will spell out as. In particular, we adopt an element of Starke's theory of "peeling", i.e. remnant creating movement out of noun phrases: Only the sister of the highest head can extract at any given stage of the derivation. Given iindependently motivated assumptions about the D-layer, this will enable the NP in (3) to reach its final destination only via an intermediate remnant creating movement to the clitic position, where the lowest D-head is stranded, along with its oblique case feature.
Our account also has a competitive edge when it comes to capturing certain comparative facts.
4. In fact, the idea that the apperance of resumptive pronouns in cases like (2) is forced by a requirement that oblique case be PF-visible, leads to the question why no resumptive pronoun appears when an oblique DP is raised to Spec-CP and "deleted" in certain other languages with a rich system of morphologically visible case. For example, although the Icelandic verb *hjálpa* "help" selects an object bearing dative case, no element spelling out dative case appears in (4) or any other relative with a silent relativized oblique argument (*sem* does not bear case inflection):

(4) ma∂urinn sem ég hjálpa∂i
    man-the-NOM that I helped

Of course, an OT-based analysis might handle Icelandic by ranking the constraint that trace be not pronounced, above the constraint favoring pronounciation of oblique case. But this arguably fails to capture an important correlation. Icelandic also allows that-clauses, themselves unable to spell out (oblique) case, to be directly embedded under prepositions and verbs assigning oblique case, i.e. again oblique case is not represented at PF. But Czech and (other Slavic languages) needs to use a determiner-like element to carry case inflection when a that-clause is in an oblique case position, although no such element generally appears in non-oblique positions:

(5) Mluvili jsme o *(tom) ze bude prset
    we talked aboutr that-LOC that it will rain

But this second cross-linguistic contrast certainly cannot be accounted for in terms of the relative ranking of "oblique case recoverability" and a constraint disfavoring copy spell-out. On the other hand, it can easily be made to follow from the assumption that while oblique case is at the D-level in Czech, it is not in Icelandic, an assumption which will also account for (2) vs (4). More interestingly, this assumption also feeds into an account of why oblique DPs generally may appear in accusative/nominative positions in Icelandic, e.g. as oblique subjects, but not so in Czech or other Slavic varieties