

On two types of resumption in Igbo and the nature of islands

Doreen Georgi & Mary Amaechi (University of Potsdam)

Claim: Based on novel data from the native speaker co-author we provide evidence that Igbo (Benue-Kwa) has two types of resumptive pronouns (RPs): RPs that occurs at the bottom of (a) a base-generation \bar{A} -dependency and (b) an \bar{A} -movement dependency. While it has been argued before that different kinds of RPs can co-exist in a language (a.o. Borer 1984, Aoun et al. 2001, Bianchi 2004, Sichel 2014), the evidence is usually based on subtle reconstruction effects. Igbo provides additional evidence from morpho-phonol. cyclicity effects. We argue that RPs in movement dependencies surface to fulfill PF-requirements (overt realization of oblique case). Moreover, there is clear evidence in Igbo that islandhood is independent of category but depends on grammatical function (CED and complex NPs (CNP) are always islands); &Ps are only islands for subextraction *from* a conjunct, but not for extraction *of* a conjunct.

\bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo: In Igbo (basic SVO order), wh/focused constituents (followed by the focus marker *kà*) and topics occur in clause-initial position, compare (1-a) vs. (1-b,c):

- (1) a. Ézè hù-rù Úchè b. Úchè kà Ézé hù-rù ___ c. Úchè Ézè hù-rù yá
 Eze see-PST Uche Uche FOC Eze see-PST Uche Eze see-PST 3SG.ACC
 “Eze saw Uche.” (*declar.*) “Eze saw UCHE.” (*DO-focus*) “As for U., E. saw him” (*DO-topic*)

AUTHOR (2019) argues that wh/foc-fronting involves movement because it exhibits all movement properties (island-sensitivity, reconstruction and cyclicity effects, ...), while topicalization involves base-generation + binding of an obligatory RP (= *yá* in (1-c)) because it has none of these properties, see (2-a,b). See (3) and (4) for island effects and strong cross-over data (SCO, other reconstruction tests and parastitic gap data are not shown here due to space limitations) Crucially, movement obligatorily results in a gap at the extraction site, an RP in (1b) is out.

	island-sens.	reconstr.	cyclicity	pg-licens.	bottom	conclusion
(2) a. wh/foc	✓	✓	✓	✓	gap	movement
b. topic.	*	*	*	*	RP	base-gener.
c. wh/foc RPs	(✓)	✓	✓	✓	RP	movement

(3) island-(in)sensitivity, adjunct island (also holds e.g. for CNP-islands):

- a. *Úchè kà Àdá pùrù túpú Ézé àhù ___ b. Úchè Àdá pùrù túpú Ézè àhù yā
 Uche FOC Ada left before Eze saw Uche Ada left before Eze saw 3SG.ACC
 “Ada left before Eze saw UCHE.” (*foc*) “As for U., A. left before Eze saw him.” (*topic*)

(4) SCO (same wh-foc/topic. split found with reconstruction for scope, idiom interpretation)

- a. Ònyé kà ó chère nà Ézé hù-rù ___ b. Àdá, ó chère nà Ézè hù-rù yá
 who FOC 3SG think that Eze see-PST Ada 3SG think that Eze see-PST 3SG.ACC
 *for which x, x thinks that Eze saw x ✓ as for x, x thinks that Eze saw x
 ✓ for which x, y thinks that Eze saw x (*foc.*) ✓ as for x, y thinks that Eze saw x (*topic.*)

We discuss two obligatory cyclicity effects: (i) the rightmost tone-bearing unit of the subject DP becomes high-toned when a XP moves across it (Manfredi 2018). Compare the subject *Eze* in (1a/c) without \bar{A} -movement (final low tone) and in (1b) with \bar{A} -movement (final high tone). (ii) Perfective morphology on the verb must be replaced by past tense morphology (*ru*-suffix) when the verb is crossed by movement, see (5a-d) (similar effect attested in Nupe, Kandybowicz 2002). These effects do not occur with wh/focus in-situ → = movement-induced.

(5) Perfective morphology (cyclicity effect):

- a. Òbí à-gù-ó-lá ákwúkwo b. *Ákwúkwo kà Òbí à-gù-ó-lá ___ (*DO-foc: *perf.*)
 Obi PFX-read-SFX-PFV book c. Ákwúkwo kà Òbí gù-rú ___ (*DO-foc: ✓ past*)
 “Obi has read the book.” (*decl., ✓perf.*) d. Ákwúkwo, Òbí à-gù-ó-lá yā (*DO-topic.: ✓ perf.*)

RPs in movement dependencies: The pattern in (2a,b) is common cross-linguistically (see e.g. McCloskey 2002). However, RPs in Igbo are also found in wh/foc-construction: fronting of the complement of P (see (6)), a conjunct (see (7)) and of a possessor is grammatical with an RP:

- (6) Focus fronting of the complement of P: (7) Focus fronting of a DP-conjunct:
- | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| a. Úchè kwèrè nà Nǵózí
Uche believe P Ngozi
“Uche believes in Ngozi.” | (<i>declar.</i>) | a. Ézè hùrù [Àdá nà Úchè]
Eze saw Ada and Uche
“Ézè saw Àdá and Úchè.” | (<i>declar.</i>) |
| b. Nǵózí kà Úché kwèrè nà * <u> </u> / ✓ yá
Ngozi FOC Uche believe P / 3SG.ACC
“Uche believe in NǵÓZÍ.” | (<i>focus</i>) | b. Úchè kà Ézé hùrù [Àdá nà * <u> </u> / ✓ yá]
Uche FOC Eze saw Ada and / 3SG.ACC
“Ézè saw Àdá and UCHE.” | (<i>focus</i>) |

PPs, DPs, &Ps are often considered to be islands. So are the effect in (6), (7) instances of island repair by resumption? This is not a viable analysis since CED- and CNP-islands cannot be repaired by resumption in Igbo; e.g. the adjunct island in (3a) does not improve with an RP instead of a gap, not even when we extract the complement of P, a conjunct or a possessor from the adjunct. The dependencies in (6), (7) also do not involve base-generation (to circumvent movement out of an island), since they exhibit all the hallmarks of movement, see line (2c): We get the tone change on the subject (in red in (6),(7)); it is also impossible to have perfective morphology in these constructions (not illustrated here); there is sensitivity to CED/CNP-islands and reconstruction effects, see (8) for a SCO-effect e.g. with extraction of a P-complement:

- (8) Nǵózí kà ó chère nà Ézé kwèrè nà **yá**.

Ngozi FOC 3SG.NOM think that Eze believe in 3SG.ACC

*it is x (=Ngozi) that x thinks that Eze believes in x / ✓ it is x that y thinks that E. believes in x

We conclude that RPs in wh/foc-constructions occur at the bottom of a movement dependency, and hence constitute a 2nd RP-type in addition to the base-generation RPs (topicalization).

Analysis: The contexts with movement-related RPs form a natural class; they occur in positions to which oblique case is assigned (case is visible on pronouns; e.g. 3sg-NOM pronoun = *ó*): GEN for possessors (RP-form: *yá*), ACC (syncretic with structural ACC) to complements of P and conjuncts (RP-form: *yá*). Evidence for oblique ACC in &Ps: Conjuncts always surface in the ACC-form, even when the &P is the subject of the clause (assigned NOM); we take this ACC to be assigned by the &-head. Igbo thus provides support for a PF-requirement to overtly realize oblique case, also argued for in Pesetsky 1998, Bayer et al. 2001, Bianchi 2004, Landau 2010 for other languages. We adopt the OT-implementation proposed in Pesetsky (1998) where a general economy constraint (realize no lower copies → gap) is outranked by a recoverability constraint on oblique case (→ must be realized). We follow proposals by Landau (2006), van Urk (2018) a.o. about how a full copy can be pronounced as a pronoun (partial copy deletion).

Implications for islandhood: In the examples with wh/focus movement from PPs/DPs/&Ps these XPs are clearly not islands. Does that mean that these categories are exempt from the list of islands in the language? No, because the same categories *are* in fact islands in other contexts. For example, in the PP-examples above (e.g. (6)) the PP was the complement of the verb, but when the PP is an adjunct, subextraction of the P-complement is out even with a RP, see (9).

- (9) a. Ézè hù-rù Àdá n’-àhíā b. *àhíā kà Ézé hù-rù Àdá nà / **yá**
Eze see-PST Ada P-market market FOC Eze see-PST Ada P / 3SG.ACC
“Eze saw Ada at the market.”(*decl.*) “Eze saw Ada at the MARKET.”(*foc.*)

We conclude that it is the function of an XP in the clause that determines islandhood, not its category. True islands are CED- and CNP-islands. As for &Ps, the generalization is that entire conjuncts can be extracted from &Ps (as e.g. in (7b)); however, &Ps are island for subextraction *from a conjunct*, see (10) with PP-coordination (when the second P is dropped, i.e., when DPs are coordinated [_{PP} P [_{&P} DP & DP]], extraction of a DP-conjunct is grammatical with an RP):

- (10) a. Ézè kwèrè [nà Àdá] nà [nà Òbí] b. *Àdá kà Ézé kwèrè [nà **yá**] nà [nà Òbí]
Eze believe in Ada and in Obi Ada FOC Eze believe in 3SG.ACC and in Obi
“Eze believes in Ada and in Obi.” “Eze believes in ADA and in Obi.”

Igbo thus provides new support for the claim that the two parts of the CSC need to be separated (see a.o. Grosu 1973, Postal 1998, Oda 2017, Boskovic to appear on Slavic, Japanese, Korean).