
(19)

\[
\text{Deir sé } \begin{cases} \text{goN dtuigeann} \\
\text{nachN dtuigeann} \end{cases} \text{ sé an scéal} \\
\text{gurl θuig} \\
\text{nárL θuig}
\]

\text{\texttt{\textup{‘He says that he } \begin{cases} \text{understands} \\
\text{doesn’t understand} \\
\text{understood} \\
\text{didn’t understand} \end{cases} \text{ the story’}}}
(20) an fear thuigeann
the man thug

‘The man that understands
understood
didn’t understand
the story’

an scéal
the story
we have here a three-way distinction of clauses that involve no A-binding at all, clauses that involve an $\bar{A}$-binding that terminates in a gap, and clauses that involve an instance of $\bar{A}$-binding that terminates in a pronoun.
(2a) Shíl mé goN mbeadh sé ann
thought I COMP would-be he there
‘I thought that he would be there’.

(b) an fear aL shíl mé aL bheadh – ann
the man COMP thought I COMP would-be there
‘the man that I thought would be there’
(3a) Duirt mé gur L shíl mé goN mbeadh sé ann
said I COMP thought I COMP would-be he there
‘I said that I thought that he would be there’.

(b) an fear aL duirt mé aL shíl mé aL
the man COMP said I COMP thought I COMP
bheadh — ann
would-be there

‘the man that I said I thought would be there’.
(4a) an fear aL shíl — goN mbeadh sé ann
the man COMP thought COMP would-be he there
‘the man that thought he would be there’

(b) an fear aL dúirt — gurL shíl sé goN mbeadh
the man COMP said COMP thought he COMP would-be
sé ann
he there

‘the man that said he thought he would be there’

(c) an fear aL dúirt sé aL shíl — goN mbeadh
the man COMP said he COMP thought COMP would-be
sé ann
he there

‘the man that he said thought he would be there’
We must allow for two patterns:

(21) \( \overline{\bar{X}}_j [\overline{s} aL \ldots [\overline{s} aL \ldots [\overline{s} aL \ldots t_j \ldots ]] ] \)

(22) \( np_j [\overline{s} aN \ldots [\overline{s} goN \ldots [\overline{s} goN \ldots Proj \ldots ]] ] \)

<<McCloskey doesn't actually illustrate (22), but very strongly implies that it exists.>>