

surface instead of \circ (see the discussion below); but \circ can only ever occur with referential subjects (a property of pronouns, Baker & Kramer 2014) and receives a pronominal interpretation in declaratives, indicating that *is* the subject pronoun in these cases (cf. Baker 2003). Summary of exponents in extraction sites: non-referential ones – gap for objects, PF-expletive (=syntactic gaps) ε for subjects; referential ones – overt RP for subjects (\circ) and objects (*no*).

2. Optionality of \circ and ε : Gaps and RPs are in complementary distribution in AT, with one exception: Under local subject extraction of referential NPs (e.g. ‘It is Kofi who runs.’), there is optionality between \circ and ε , whereas in any other context (long subject extraction or short/long object extraction of any XP) we find complementary distribution (Korsah 2017). This optionality with local subjects has been analysed as an anti-agreement effect (AAE, Korsah 2017, KM 2019) viz., as the use of a less specific exponent under subject extraction (assuming that \circ encodes animacy, while ε is underspecified for animacy), following the classic view of the AAE (a.o. Ouhalla 1993, Baier 2018). However, given that \circ and ε are not the same kind of element (RP vs gap/PF-expletive), one cannot be a less specific version of the other – no matter which AAE-approach one adopts. Thus, the optionality under local subject extraction must have a different source.

2. Formation of \bar{A} -dependencies: In AT we see that *one and the same* extraction type, e.g. focus movement, can in principle leave behind a gap or an RP (depending on the referentiality of the extractee), supporting Postal’s (1994) finding that the choice between gap/RP is not necessarily related to different extraction types. Moreover, apart from the gap/RP-optionality with local subject extraction mentioned above, AT has a preference for RPs over gaps: Whenever the conditions for the use of an RP are met, it has to be used, see the example with long subject extraction in (3) (the same holds for the extraction of referential objects):

- (3) Kofi na me-nim sɛ * ε/\circ -káń-n kʔataá nó.
 K. FOC 1SG-know COMP 3.NHUM/3SG.HUM-read-PST book DEF
 ‘I know that KOFI read the book.’ (Korsah 2017:120)

This is in conflict with the widely assumed Avoid Pronoun Principle and related constraints (Chomsky 1981, 1982, Montalbetti 1984) that take RPs to be a repair that only applies when gaps are blocked (gaps are more economical). Cross-linguistic variability in the gap vs. RP-preference shows that a parametric choice of preferences must be possible (see also Salzmann 2017).

Analysis: That referential XPs leave behind RPs while non-ref. ones leave behind gaps can be derived from two independently proposed ideas: (i) RPs spell-out the D-head of movement copies from which the NP-part has been deleted (= partial copy deletion, Landau 2006, van Urk 2018; cf. Postal 1969, Elbourne 2001). (ii) Ref. XPs are structurally bigger (DPs, Stowell 1991) than non-referential ones (no D-layer, NPs; cf. a.o. Higginbotham 1987, Rullmann & Beck 1998, Chierchia 1998, Lopez 2012). When partial copy deletion applies to a referent. copy [$_{DP}$ D NP], the remaining D-head is realized as an RP. When partial deletion applies to non-referential XPs [$_{NP}$...], nothing remains and we get a gap. If partial deletion leads to a gap in subject position, a violation of the phonological EPP-requirement is circumvented by adding an expletive (ε) at PF (no such requirement holds for objects \rightarrow gap). Given the general preference for RPs over gaps in AT, partial copy deletion in the language seems to be obligatory and not motivated by PF-filters (unlike in other languages with partial copy deletion). Partial deletion applies to all copies but the highest one in the chain. In addition, full copy deletion (Nunes 2004) applies *after* partial deletion to all copies except for (a) the topmost one (fully pronounced) and (b) the highest A-position from which the argument takes an \bar{A} -movement step (SpecTP for subjects, base position for objects – the positions in which we potentially find RPs). The application of full copy deletion explains why we only get one RP per chain in AT (not more than one). To account for the optionality between RP and gap/PF-expletive under local ref. subject extraction, partial copy deletion needs to make reference to an intermediate \bar{A} -movement step. Any first \bar{A} -step for objects (i.e. to Spec v P) and long-distance moved subjects (to SpecC in the embedded clause) is intermediate, hence partial deletion applies and there is no optionality. For local subject extraction, the first \bar{A} -step is also the final one; thus, partial deletion does not have to apply (though it still may), resulting in optionality.