

# RESUMPTIVE PRONOUNS IN *WH*-INTERROGATIVES AND OBJECT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN L2 ENGLISH: UG ACCESS OR TRANSFER?

Adela Simoiu\*

**Abstract:** The paper investigates whether resumptive pronouns are attested in the English L2 of Romanian learners and whether their presence can be accounted for in terms of direct access to UG or in terms of transfer hypotheses. The results are also analysed in relation to the Interpretability Hypothesis (Tsimplici and Dimitrakopoulou 2007). Overall, the data provide evidence for transfer of resumptive pronoun use from L1 Romanian to L2 English in the case of object *wh*-interrogatives and relatives. Resumptives are accepted in the L2 in [d-linked] contexts that mirror the Romanian structures. However, resumptives are also accepted in [non-d-linked] contexts as well, in accordance with the target language. One possible account may be that there is an available position associated with resumptives in the verbal field which can be filled by resumptive material and this position remains available in the L2 as well. Learners have access to L1 and L2 parametric options at the same time, so they accept and produce both L1 and L2 structures. The Romanian data provide support in favour of the Interpretability Hypothesis i.e. there are animacy effects in the Romanian data. The subjects accepted more [-animate] than [+animate] resumptives.

**Keywords:** *wh*-interrogatives, relatives, resumptives, L2 English, Interpretability Hypothesis

## 1. Introduction and main questions

The paper focuses on illicit resumptive pronouns in object relative clauses and *wh*-interrogatives in English as L2, of the type in (1) and (2):

- (1) \*...the film that I saw it.
- (2) \*Which student do you think Jane likes him?

The examples show typical errors made by Romanian learners of English as L2, possibly related to transfer of the Romanian structure, considering that the resumptive is in complementary distribution with the trace in English while in Romanian, this constraint does not hold. In Romanian, the resumptive object clitic is obligatory:

- (3) filmul pe care l- am văzut  
film-DEF PE which CL.ACC.3SG.M have.1SG see-PERF  
'the film that I saw'
- (4) Pe care carte ai ales-o?  
PE which book have.2SG choose.PERF CL.ACC.3SG.F  
'Which book did you choose?'

---

\* Road Language Centre, adela@simoiu.ro.

As 3<sup>rd</sup> person Accusative clitics are the only ones subject to optionality in certain contexts (Coene and Avram 2009), the analysis focuses only on English L2 examples with illicit third person clitics.

In terms of L2 learning, transfer hypotheses (Schwartz and Sprouse 1996, Tsimpli and Dimitrakopoulou 2007) argue that L1 structures transfer into L2 in the beginning and subsequently undergo *resetting* as a result of the interaction with L2 input. According to these hypotheses, in the beginning, the L2 English interlanguage of Romanian speakers will include resumptive pronouns (1); at later stages, the values may or may not reset to the L2 ones. Therefore, the analysis looks at whether there is evidence of transfer of such clitic structures in the English L2 of Romanian speakers, i.e. whether Romanian learners of English as L2 make use of resumptive pronouns in object relatives and *wh*-interrogatives at elementary and intermediate levels. However, McKee and McDaniel (2001) show that there are resumptive pronouns in L1 child English. As a result, the presence of resumptive pronouns in L2 data could be accounted for in terms of UG direct access, similarly to L1 acquisition. So, assuming that UG constrains L2 development and mature L2 grammars both in terms of principles and parameters, the paper analyses whether illicit resumptive pronouns in L2 English are to be accounted for by UG direct access (similarly to L1 acquisition) or by L1 transfer.

## 2. The Interpretability Hypothesis (IH)

Within the minimalist framework, this hypothesis argues that after the critical period, uninterpretable features are no longer available to L2 learners and L1 parametric values associated with these features resist re-setting (Tsimpli and Dimitrakopoulou 2007: 224). L2 structures which have uninterpretable features will be misanalysed by L2 learners, resulting in non-target representations and performance even at advanced levels. In order to compensate for this lack of availability of uninterpretable features, L2 learners will exploit interpretable features available in the L2, which are accessible due to their presence at LF.

As a result, there are two main stages of development in L2 learning:

- (i) the L2 learners fail to analyse the input and as a result show true optionality in the use of morphosyntactic elements;
- (ii) the L2 learners misanalyse the input, i.e. they build a non-target feature specification. This non-target feature specification exploits the interpretable features in the L2 and thus the distribution of the problematic elements is constrained and regularize (Haznedar and Gavruseva 2008).

The hypothesis is based on the study of the use of resumptive pronouns in subject and object interrogatives by Greek learners of English as L2 in the case of intermediate and advanced learners. The [+/-animate] feature on the clitic is uninterpretable in Greek (like in Romanian) but it is interpretable in English. The data in the experiments show that resumptive uses of agreement on the clitic pronouns in the L1 are transferred as parametric options to the developing L2 grammar and they are present even at advanced

stages. As a result, Tsimpli and Dimitrakopoulou (2007) argue that the acceptability rate of pronouns in the extraction site is conditioned by the LF interpretability of the features involved in the derivation. Therefore, the interpretable features of animacy and discourse-linking are hypothesized to be involved in the analysis of English pronouns by Greek L2 learners, while the first language (L1) specification of resumptive pronouns as clusters of uninterpretable Case and Agreement features resists resetting. Inanimate resumptive pronouns are favoured significantly more than animate ones, the interpretable feature of animacy is realized on L2 but not on L1 pronouns and it constrains the resumptive strategy in L2, eliminating real optionality (Tsimpli and Dimitrakopoulou 2007: 216).

Romanian is similar to Greek in terms of object resumptive pronouns, so in the present analysis a replica of Tsimpli and Dimitrakopoulou's experiment with interrogatives was carried out, to which I added object relative clauses. In terms of the IH, a preferred use of the [-animate] resumptive pronouns would be expected with Romanian learners of English as L2, such as in the example in (1).

### 3. Resumptive pronouns in English, Greek and Romanian

#### 3.1 Resumptives in English and in Romance languages

McKee and McDaniel (2001: 114) define the resumptive pronoun as a pronominal variable that appears in the position from which movement is proposed to occur.

In English, resumptive pronouns are in complementary distribution with traces:

- (5) a. That's the girl that I like *t*.  
 b. \*That's the girl that I like *her*.

The complementarity is accounted for by the fact that each resumptive – trace pair originates from the same numeration (set of lexical items), i.e. resumptive pronouns and traces are not differentiated in the English lexicon. Kayne (1981) argues that resumptive pronouns are Spell-Outs of traces.

By contrast, for languages such as Romanian, McDaniel and Cowart (1999) state that resumptive pronouns do not alternate with traces; they are distinct lexical items rather than Spell-Outs of traces. The derivation with the trace and the one with the resumptive come from different numerations, so they do not compete.

Suñer (1998) explains that the complementizer *C* has a [pronominal] feature that determines whether the relative pronoun moves or stays *in situ*. With the plus value, it moves to check this feature, resulting in a trace; with the minus value, it stays *in situ* and is spelled out as a resumptive pronoun (the two derivations do not compete because the different values of the pronominal feature entail distinct numerations). In English, only the plus value exists, resulting in obligatory movement of the relative pronoun. Spell-Out could occur only after movement and only when the trace version was ruled out. In languages such as Romanian, where the relative pronoun can remain *in situ*, Spell-Out

could occur without movement and could coexist with the trace version. In terms of the Subset Principle (Pinker 1984), English is the Subset and Romanian the Superset (McKee and McDaniel 2001).

### 3.2 Resumptive pronouns in Greek subject and object *wh*-interrogatives

Taking into account that the resumptive strategy in L1 Greek instantiates a cluster of uninterpretable features such as agreement and case, Tsimpli and Dimitrakopoulou (2007) identify several types of resumptives, related to the interpretable features of animacy and discourse-linking, i.e. [d-linked, +animate], [d-linked, -animate], [non-d-linked, +animate], [non-d-linked, -animate]. In particular, as mentioned before, the [+/- animate] distinction is grammaticalized in the pronominal paradigm of English (*it*) but not in Greek (or Romanian) whereas d(iscourse)-linking is available both in English and Greek (and in Romanian). Related to that, Pesetky (1987) shows that *which*-phrases are d-linked in that the set of possible discourse referents is restricted by the noun and the interpretation of the variable in the d-linked chain is derived from the referential properties of its antecedent on a par with the interpretation of pronouns. In contrast, the interpretation of the variable associated with a non-d-linked (quantificational) *wh*-phrase does not presuppose a limited set of referents but is brought about through syntactic LF movement.

The resumptive strategy is the overt manifestation of agreement features on T and light *v*, i.e. resumptives are the result of movement. In object *wh*-interrogatives, the resumptive clitic doubles the features of the extracted object and resumptive object clitics are uninterpretable at LF and interpretable at PF. The uninterpretable status of resumptive elements implies that these elements are not visible at LF.

### 3.3 Resumptive clitics in Romanian

In Romanian, the presence of Accusative clitics is required in left dislocation structures with d-linked direct objects, with both animate and non-animate antecedents, with both definite and indefinite left dislocated DPs (the examples are from Avram and Coene 2009):

- (6) Cartea            am    dat    \*(-o).  
       book-DEF have given CL.ACC.3SG.F  
       ‘As for the book, I have given it.’
- (7) O carte am    dat    \*(-o).    [under specific reading]  
       a book have given CL.ACC.3SG.F  
       ‘As for one book, I have given it.’
- (8) Pe Ion l-                    am    văzut.  
       PE Ion CL.ACC.2SG.M have seen  
       ‘I have seen Ion.’

The clitic must be omitted with dislocated bare NPs, bare Quantifier Phrases or generic DPs:

- (9) Vin (\*I-) am băut.  
 wine (CL.ACC.3SG.M) have drunk  
 ‘As for the wine, I have drunk it.’
- (10) Ceva (\*I-) am citit.  
 something CL.ACC.3.SG.M have read  
 ‘I have read something’
- (11) Un film bun nu (\*I-) am văzut de secole.  
 a movie good not CL.ACC.3SG.M have seen for ages  
 ‘As for a good movie, I have not seen in ages.’

The clitic is also obligatory in direct object relative clauses (both restrictive and non-restrictive) introduced by the relative pronoun *care* ‘who, which’:

- (12) Mărul pe care \*(I-) am mâncat.  
 apple-DEF PE which CL.ACC.3SG.M have eaten  
 ‘The apple which I have eaten.’
- (13) Fata, pe care \*(o) știa, era acolo.  
 girl-DEF PE which CL.ACC.3SG.M knew was there  
 ‘The girl, whom she knew, was there.’

The distinction [+/- animate] does not affect the obligatoriness of the clitic. The same obligatory condition applies in the case of d-linked *wh*-questions:

- (14) Pe care \*(I-) ai ales?  
 PE which CL.ACC.3SG.M have chosen  
 ‘Which one have you chosen?’

However, non d-linked *wh*-questions, both animate and non-animate, disallow resumptives:

- (15) Pe cine (\*I-) ai văzut?  
 pe who CL.ACC.3SG.M have seen  
 ‘Whom have you seen?’
- (16) Ce ai citit (\*-o)?  
 what have read CL.ACC.2.F.SG  
 ‘What have you read?’

Table 1 below summarizes the features of resumptive pronouns in Romanian, Greek and English. As can be seen, with the exception of [non d-linked, +animate] contexts, Greek and Romanian are similar, whereas English disallows clitics altogether.

**Table 1**  
**Use of resumptive pronouns in Greek, Romanian and English**  
**object relatives and *wh*-interrogatives**

	d-linked, +animate	d-linked, -animate	non d-linked, +animate	non d-linked, -animate
Greek	optional	optional	optional	disallowed
Romanian	obligatory	obligatory	disallowed	disallowed
English	disallowed	disallowed	disallowed	disallowed

#### 4. Predictions for second language learning

Under a transfer approach and according to the Interpretability Hypothesis, assuming that the initial L2 syntax of Romanian learners of English exhibits L1 Romanian structures, the following predictions can be made:

- (i) Romanian learners will accept d-linked resumptive object pronouns, whether animate or not, in English L2.
  - (17) \*Miranda got back the job that she had lost it earlier.
  - (18) \*Which student do you think that Jane likes him?
- (ii) Romanian learners will reject non-d-linked resumptive object pronouns, [+/- animate], in English L2.
  - (19) \*Who do you think that Susan would marry him?
  - (20) \*What did you say that Maria forgot it when she was leaving home?
- (iii) Romanian learners will use [-animate] pronouns more than [+animate] ones, as in (18).

Under a UG direct access approach, considering that English L1 children produce resumptive structures (whereas adults do not), Romanian learners are expected to accept resumptives in the beginning but reject them at more advanced stages.

#### 5. The study

A grammaticality judgement task was used with two groups of learners (n = 25): elementary learners (n = 10) and intermediate learners (n = 15), recruited from a language school in Bucharest. Their levels were determined according to the Oxford Placement Test (Allan 1992). The subjects were asked whether the sentences were correct or incorrect. They were also asked to correct the sentences which they thought were incorrect in order to avoid errors in interpretation of the results (i.e. the subjects may have identified other 'errors' that were not the focus of the experiment).

The task included 34 sentences, as follows:

- (i) 4 [d-linked, +animate] interrogatives (balanced for correctness)
  - (21) Which president have the students decided that they will elect?
  - (22) \*Which student do you think that Jane likes him?
- (ii) 1 correct and 1 incorrect [d-linked, –animate] interrogatives; 3 incorrect [d-linked, –animate] relatives
  - (23) Which parcel did you say that Mary sent yesterday?
  - (24) \*Which book do you remember that Peter read it carefully?
  - (25) \*Miranda looked at the ring which she was wearing it on her finger.
- (iii) 1 correct and 1 incorrect [non-d-linked, +animate] interrogatives
  - (26) Who does Peter think that Mary should meet?
  - (27) \*Who do you think that Susan would marry him?
- (iv) 2 correct and 2 incorrect [non d-linked, -animate] interrogatives
  - (28) What has John decided that he should buy for Christmas?
  - (29) \*What did you say that Maria forgot it when she was leaving home?
- (v) 6 correct and 12 incorrect subject interrogatives that were used as distractors (see the Appendix at the end of the paper for all the test sentences used in the study).

## 6. Results

### 6.1 Elementary learners

Table 2 below presents the results obtained in the case of elementary learners with resumptive pronouns in general. Table 3 presents the acceptability rates across categories.

**Table 2**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns**

Incorrect sentences	53%
Correct sentences	57%

**Table 3**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns across categories**

	[d-linked, +animate]	[d-linked, -animate]	[non-d linked, +animate]	[non d-linked, -animate]
Incorrect sentences	55%	60%	30%	65%
Correct sentences	65%	50%	50%	60%

Recall that Romanian has obligatory resumptives in [+d-linked] contexts and disallows them in [non d-linked] contexts (as the *wh* pronouns in Romanian do not have *phi*-features that the resumptive would agree with). Also, the transfer prediction was that learners would accept resumptives in [+d-linked] contexts and would reject them in [non d-linked] contexts. The data show high degrees of acceptability in [d-linked] contexts and lower in [non-d-linked contexts], as predicted, with the exception of [non d-linked, -animate] contexts which should have been rejected according to the prediction. Also, it can be seen that there were higher degrees of acceptability of [-animate] resumptives in English L2, which is consistent with the predictions of the Interpretability Hypothesis.

The results for [d-linked] compared with [non d-linked] contexts are summarized in Table 4.

**Table 4**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns in [d-linked]  
vs. [ non d-linked] contexts**

	[d-linked]	[ non d-linked]
Incorrect sentences	58%	47.5%
Correct sentences	63%	55%

Even though the acceptability rates are higher in [+d-linked] contexts, the percentage for [non d-linked] is fairly high; in addition, the percentages of acceptability in the case of correct sentences are fairly low. As a result, the data seem inconclusive. One possible explanation may be that the sentences in the experiment may have been too difficult for elementary students to understand and so a randomness effect may have occurred.

## 6.2 Intermediate learners

The overall results obtained with the intermediate-level learners of English are presented in Table 5 below, while Tables 6 and 7 present the results across categories of resumptives.



**Table 5**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns**

Incorrect sentences	57%
Correct sentences	73%

**Table 6**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns**  
**in [d-linked] vs. [non d-linked] contexts**

	[+d-linked]	[ non d-linked]
Incorrect sentences	62%	46.5%
Correct sentences	70%	81.5%

As can be seen, there was a higher degree of acceptability of resumptives in [d-linked] contexts, as well as a higher degree of acceptability of correct sentences in [non d-linked].

**Table 7**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns in *wh*-interrogatives**  
**and object relatives across categories**

	[d-linked, +animate]	[d-linked, -animate]	[non-d-linked, +animate]	[non d-linked, -animate]
Incorrect sentences	60%	64%	40%	53%
Correct sentences	67%	73%	93%	70%

In terms of the transfer prediction, resumptive pronouns in [non- d-linked] contexts should be rejected. However, as Table 7 shows the acceptability of [non-d-linked] sentences is still quite high. There is higher acceptability of [non d-linked, -animate] incorrect sentences (53%) as opposed to [non-d-linked, +animate], consistent with the predictions of the Interpretability Hypothesis (see Table 8 as well).

**Table 8**  
**Acceptability of resumptive pronouns**  
**in [+ animate] vs.[ - animate] contexts**

	[+ animate]	[ -animate]
Incorrect sentences	50%	58.5%
Correct sentences	80%	71.5%

As Table 8 shows, learners accepted illicit [-animate] resumptives, in more contexts than for [+animate] resumptives. This may indicate that they exploit the interpretable feature of animacy in English to make up for the lack of accessibility to the uninterpretable features in L2.

### 6.3 Discussion

Related to the results provided by the Elementary group, as mentioned before, the results show that they accept both incorrect and correct contexts in somewhat similar percentages, so a randomness effect may have occurred due to the difficulty of the experiment sentences for their level of knowledge of the L2. In the case of intermediate learners, the data show that they accept resumptive object pronouns in *wh*-interrogatives and relatives in 57% cases (incorrect sentences), in line with the predictions made by the transfer hypotheses. Intermediate learners also accept correct counterparts (73%). This suggests either that they are aware of the correct structures or that both L1 and L2 parametric options may be present in their interlanguage and learners sometimes resort to the L1 one.

Related to the d-link constraint, the results point to higher acceptability in the case of [d-linked] contexts (62%) as opposed to [non-d-linked] contexts (46.5%) as predicted by the transfer hypotheses. However, since Romanian disallows resumptives in [non-d-linked] contexts, their acceptance in L2 runs counter to the predictions and it does not seem to be accounted for by a strict transfer approach but rather it seems to indicate indeterminacy in the interlanguage of intermediate learners. In addition, in the case of [non-d-linked] contexts, there is higher acceptance with [-animate] contexts (53% as opposed to 40% for [+animate] contexts) (\*What did you say that Maria forgot it when she was leaving home). Again, this is counter to the strict transfer predictions, since animacy plays no role in Romanian and resumptives are disallowed in [non-d-linked] contexts but the result supports the Interpretability Hypothesis, i.e. intermediate learners make use of the interpretable feature of animacy to compensate for the lack of accessibility of the relevant uninterpretable features.

### 6.4 Conclusions so far

Overall, the predictions are confirmed partially, i.e. there is evidence for transfer of resumptive pronoun use from L1 Romanian to L2 English in the case of object *wh*-interrogatives and relatives and the data show that resumptives are used in the L2 in [d-linked] contexts that mirror the Romanian structures. However, resumptives are used in [non-d-linked] contexts as well. One possible account may be that there is an available position associated with resumptives in the verbal field which can be filled by resumptive material and this position remains available in the L2 as well. Learners have access to L1 and L2 parametric options at the same time so they accept and produce both L1 and L2 structures.

Considering that resumptives occur when it is possible to have co-reference and agreement between the *wh*-word and the resumptive pronoun and that there is no agreement mismatch between [-animate] *wh*-words and the [-animate] pronoun *it* in English, one can argue that a resumptive *it* may theoretically occur in the English interlanguage of Romanian speakers (assuming that a position is available).

## 7. No Transfer?

### 7.1 Evidence from English L1 data

McKee and McDaniel (2001) looked at whether the child grammar differs from the adult grammar with respect to resumptives on the basis of data from a production experiment and a grammaticality judgement one. According to the Subset Principle, children should assume the most restrictive grammar in the beginning and English is assumed to be the Subset, as a result one does not expect resumptives in child L1 English.

Some of the sentences that were included as test types in the production experiment are given below:

- (30) Pick up the cat that Goofy is petting (it). – object relative
- (31) Pick up the girl that the giraffe is sitting on (her). – object of preposition
- (32) Pick up the baby that (her) teddy bear is riding in the wagon. – genitive subject
- (33) Pick up the robber that Dorothy is swinging (his) rope – genitive object.

The data from the production experiment showed that children produced object resumptives in very few situations (less than 5%) and the highest use was recorded in the case of unextractable positions (genitive object and subject). Children also produced full resumptive NPs (more in the cases where resumptives are disallowed by the grammar), such as *the lion that Grover saw the lion*. None of the 89 child participants produced more than 3 resumptive pronouns in the nine opportunities to produce relative clauses.

The grammaticality judgement experiment used the same structures as in the production data:

- (34) This is the woman that Bert kissed her.
- (35) This is the baby that Cookie Monster played with her.

Object resumptives were accepted in approx. 5% cases and as in the production experiment, there were higher acceptability rates with less extractable structures. Younger children accepted more resumptive pronouns than older children. i.e. 7 participants ranging in age from 3;5 to 3;10 (M = 3;7) accepted resumptive pronouns in the extractable cases 64% of the time while the same group produced resumptives in 8% cases.

Overall, the experiment results are that adults produced and accepted resumptive pronouns in unextractable sites, but not in extractable sites, while children did accept resumptives in extractable sites. Also, children's and adults' judgments of unextractable resumptives and control items were similar. The fact that children accepted resumptive pronouns in extractable sites is accounted for by parsing problems: children's parsers sometimes shunt on reaching a second clause – children acquiring English-type languages might allow resumptive pronouns in certain parser-determined situations without damaging their English grammars. For adults, shunting occurs when a third clause is reached, whereas for children shunting might occur one clause earlier.

## 7.2 Conclusions

Romanian intermediate L2 learners of English show L1 transfer effects in terms of resumptive pronouns in *wh*-interrogatives and object relatives. The data from the elementary level were inconclusive in terms of the properties tested, possibly due to subjects' insufficient L2 knowledge. The learners accept resumptives in all four contexts investigated, with higher degrees in terms of mirror Romanian structures and lower degrees in the other ones.

However, the relatively high degree of acceptance of structures that are not present in Romanian pose problems for the transfer hypotheses and favour an interpretation according to which there might be indeterminacy in the L2 interlanguage, i.e. if there is an available position for resumptive material in L1, the learner might make use of it in L2, especially in [-animate] contexts, relying on the interpretable feature of animacy.

In addition, the fact that subjects accept L2 correct sentences as well may indicate that the syntax of these learners may not consist of L1 structures alone but they may indicate direct access to L2 ones as well. This interpretation is supported by the view that UG constrains L2 development from the very beginning.

The Romanian data provide support in favour of the Interpretability Hypothesis (Tsimplici and Dimitrakopoulou 2007), i.e. there are animacy effects in the Romanian data, as in the Greek ones. The subjects accepted more [-animate] than [+animate] resumptives.

Related to the data from child L1 use of resumptives, children produced very few object resumptives and accepted them in approximately 5% of cases. In contrast, intermediate L2 learners accepted them in 57% cases overall, with 64% acceptance in the case of [d-linked, -animate] contexts. Parsing effects may not help account for the data in L2, the L2 learners are adults. Acceptance of resumptives by children English L1 speakers and Romanian L2 learners may be different phenomena. The presence of resumptives in child L1 data may not be enough to suggest a direct UG access approach to the L2 data. However, this provides support for an interpretation according to which both parametric options may be available in the beginning of both L1 acquisition and L2 learning. While the optionality is removed in L1 faster, in L2 learning L1 structures remain present and resist resetting, possibly also due to the fact that L1 is already in place when L2 learning begins.

## References

- Allan, D. 1992. *Oxford Placement Test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Avram, L., Coene, M. 2009. Null objects and Accusative clitics in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* XI (1): 223-252.
- Haznedar, B., Gavrusseva, E. (eds.) 2008. *Current Trends in Child Second Language Acquisition: A Generative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kayne, R. 1981. ECP extensions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 93-133.
- McDaniel, D., Cowart, W. 1999. Experimental evidence for a minimalist account of English resumptive pronouns. *Cognition* 70: B15-B24.
- McKee, C., McDaniel, D. 2001. Resumptive pronouns in English relative clauses. *Language Acquisition* 9 (2): 113-156.

Schwartz, B.D., Sprouse, R. 1996. L2 cognitive states and the Full Transfer/Full Access model. *Second Language Research* 12 (1): 40-72.

Suñer, M. 1998. Resumptive restrictive relatives: A crosslinguistic perspective. *Language* 74: 335-364.

Tsimpli, I. M., Dimitrakopoulou, M. 2007. The Interpretability Hypothesis: Evidence from *wh*-interrogatives in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 23 (2): 215-242.

### Appendix: Test sentences

Order in the task	Test sentences grouped by type
	<b>Non d-linked, -animate</b>
1	*What did you say that Maria forgot it when she was leaving home?
33	*What have you insisted that students should read it before the exam?
7	What has John decided that he should buy for Christmas?
29	What do teachers insist that pupils should read before the exams?
	<b>Non d-linked, +animate</b>
2	Who does Peter think that Mary should meet?
22	*Who do you think that Susan would marry him?
	<b>D-linked, -animate</b>
3	*Miranda looked at the ring which she was wearing it on her finger.
4	*Which book do you remember that Peter read it carefully?
9	*Miranda got back the job that she had lost it earlier.
14	*The monument, which thousands of people visit it every year, is 50 m tall.
32	Which parcel did you say that Mary sent yesterday?
	<b>D-linked, +animate</b>
5	Which president have the students decided that they will elect?
6	*Which student do you think that Jane likes him?
8	*Which girl do you think that John wants to kiss her?
27	Which animal do people believe that children love?
21	Which president have the students decided that they will elect?
	<b>Subject interrogatives</b>
10	Which athlete does John think can win the Olympics?
11	*Who do you think that he met Katerina?
12	Which politician has Mary said will support the bill?
13	*Who have you suggested that he should not resign?
15	*Which car did you say that it was sold very cheap?
16	Who does Kathryn think is a good painter?
17	*What do you think that it makes the book very interesting?
18	Who did John say kissed Susan?
19	*Which tiger did they say that it escaped from the Zoo?
20	*Who did the students think he would be the best president?
23	*Which party does John think it was very popular?
24	What did John suggest should be announced at the meeting?
25	*What do people think it makes American cinema popular?
26	*Who did Mary say he wanted to study abroad?
28	*Which actress does Peter think she can play this role?
30	*Which politician did Jane say he is very honest?
31	*Which book do you remember that it was full of pictures?
34	Which animal did the television announce ran away from the Zoo?

