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Resumptive pronouns (RP) can occur across languages only in relative clauses introduced by a complementizer (McCloskey 2002); Serbo-Croatian (SC) adheres to this generalization. RP distribution in SC can be divided into three contexts: disallowed (1), obligatory (2) and optional (3). Keenan&Comrie (1977) propose an account of RP distribution across languages based on the notion of an *NP Accessibility Hierarchy* (4): the higher an NP is ranked on the Hierarchy, the less likely it is to be replaced by an RP under relativization. Although generally adhering to the Hierarchy, the SC facts nonetheless present many puzzles. The hierarchy correctly predicts the impossibility of the subject RP in (1), but it would also seem to predict the same in (5), where the RP is merely optional, and not excluded. Similarly, it sheds no clear light on why a direct object RP is obligatory in (2), but merely optional in (3) with the RP fulfilling the same grammatical function.

This paper argues that RP distribution is based on the case and in some instances the theta-role of the RP and the relative head. Under this view, the following generalizations hold: **Fact I**: nominative RPs are disallowed (1) & (6); **Fact II**: inherent case marked RPs are obligatory (2) & (7b); **Fact III**: optional RPs are either accusative or dative experiencer and require a case and theta-role matching relative head (3) & (5). Graćanin-Yuksek (in press) argues that in Croatian the presence versus absence of a RP signals a difference in a derivation of a relative clause: external merge (presence) vs. movement (absence). She further proposes that the latter is subject to a matching requirement: a relative head must have a form that ‘it would have if it were case-marked by the embedded predicate’. This analysis fails to address two questions: (i) why can nominative RPs never be subject to a matching requirement (1) & (6) and (ii) why datives do not behave uniformly (5) & (7a). The analysis presented in this paper explains all three characteristics of RPs (Facts I, II & III) and motivates some of them as universals, such as I (the ban of nominative RPs). The analysis is set in Pesetsky&Torrego’s (P&T) feature system. To account for **Fact I**, I argue that the disallowance of nominative RPs follows from the obligatory presence of complementizers introducing relative clauses (8). I take the following assumptions from P&T: (i) complementizers undergo T-to-C movement because C has an \([\nuT,EPP]\) feature that needs to be satisfied, (ii) Economy Condition, (iii) nominative is an \([\nuT]\) on D. An obligatorily present relative clause complementizer undergoes T-to-C and satisfies \([\nuT,EPP]\) feature on C. Adhering to the Economy Condition, it is less costly to satisfy this feature on C with the complementizer (already present) than by introducing an RP \((\nu{T})\) on D. As for **Fact II**, inherent case 
\((2 & 7b)\) is uniformly treated as PP. Evidence for PP structure comes from binding data, which show that inherent case marked elements cannot bind (9); signaling that there is an adpositional structure blocking c-command. In P&T’s system, PPs are instances of interpretable features and need to be overtly present in the structure. If inherent case is indeed prepositional, inherent case marked RPs then must be overtly present in the structure, i.e. they are obligatory. With regard to **Fact III**, dative experiencer RPs exhibit behavior that differs crucially from dative indirect object RPs in two ways: (i) dative experiencers can bind (cf. 10 and 9) and (ii) dative experiencers can never co-occur with accusative (11). These facts are taken to be evidence that dative experiencers are in a structural case position, assigned case by V (just like accusatives). This structural case is the only one that the matching requirement can target. If there is a theta- and case-matching relative head, T feature interpretability is not specified in V: it can be either interpretable or uninterpretable; hence an optionality of an RP.

P&T’s feature system thus nicely captures the SC RP data: nominative RPs are disallowed by Economy on a T-to-C account of overt complementizers (universal); inherent case-marked arguments must be overtly present as complements of P, hence their obligatory status; optional
RPs arise from two distinct derivations being possible in terms of feature checking of T in V: it can be interpretable but does not have to.

1. Patuljak što (*onRP) je na panju je velik dwarf.NOM that he.NOM AUX on stump AUX big  'The dwarf that is on the stump is big'
2. Patuljak što *(gaRP) se sećam imao je zelenu kapu dwarf.NOM that him.GEN REFL remember had AUX green hat  'The dwarf that I remember had a green hat'
3. Patuljka što sam (gaRP) videla veverica ne poznaje dwarf.ACC that AUX him.ACC seen squirrel not know  'The squirrel does not know the dwarf that I saw'
4. SUBJECT > DIRECT OBJECT > INDIRECT OBJECT > INHERENT CASE > GENITIVE
5. Patuljku što (muRP) se spava nije dobro dwarf.DAT that him.DAT REFL sleep not- AUX well  'The dwarf that is sleepy does not feel well'
6. Knjiga što se (*onapp) patuljku čita je na stolu book.NOM that REFL she.NOM dwarf.DAT.EXP read AUX on table  'The book that the dwarf feels like reading is on the table'
7. a. Patuljku što * (muRP) se spava posao sam sveću dwarf.DAT.IO that him.DAT.EXP sleep send AUX candle  'I sent a candle to the dwarf that is sleepy'
b. Patuljku što sam *(muRP) dao pismo posao sam sveću dwarf.DAT.IO that him.DAT.EXP given letter send AUX candle  'I sent a candle to the dwarf that I gave a letter to'
8. Patuljak *(što) je šetao šumom imao je velik šešir dwarf.NOM that AUX walk woods have AUX big hat  'The dwarf that was walking through the woods was wearing a big hat'
9. Patuljak, je ispičao zecu o svojim uspehu dwarf.NOM AUX say rabbit.DAT.IO about self success  'The dwarf told the rabbit about his (dwarf's) success'
10. Patuljku se priča o svojim dogodovštinama. dwarf.DAT.EXP REFL talk about self adventures  'The dwarf feels like talking about his adventures’