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1 Introduction

There is an old intuition that resumptive pronouns are only used when necessary, and cannot simply be inserted freely into a derivation (Kroch 1981, Perlmutter 1972, Pesetsky 1998, a.o.). This intuition is borne out by the fact that in many languages, resumptives are only possible in positions where a gap would be ungrammatical.

(1) a. This is the guy, who I saw ____.
   b. *This is the guy, who I saw him.

(2) a. *This is the guy, who I hate everything ____ does.
   b. This is the guy, who I hate everything he does.

[adapted from Kroch (1981):125]

There is a sense in which a gap is preferred, and a resumptive pronoun is only possible in a position where a gap would be impossible. This intuition has lead to several formal proposals that all resumptives (Shlonsky 1992, a.o.), or some resumptives (Sichel 2014) are subject to an economy constraint that prevents them from surfacing, except as a last resort.

There are, however, languages where resumptive pronouns are not the exception, but the rule. One such language is Somali (Cushitic). In this language, arguments are regularly fronted to a clause initial position for information structural reasons, and instead of a gap in their base-generated position, a resumptive pronoun must be used.¹

¹Many thanks to Maziar Toosarvandani, Ivy Sichel, and Ryan Bennett for many hours of illuminating discussion. Their probing questions, constructive criticism, and valuable suggestions substantially improved the quality of this project. Thanks as well to Judith Aissen, Nico Baier, Donka Farkas, Bernardo Gonzalez Torres, Boris Harizanov, Lisa Hofmann, Nick Kalivoda, Filippa Lindahl, Jim McCloskey, Rut Molinuevo Llaria, Erik Zyman, an audience at the Smircle Reading Group at Stanford University, an audience at the 2018 Linguistics at Santa Cruz conference, and the participants of the 290 Research Seminar for judgements, interesting conversations, and helpful recommendations at various points in the development of this project which improved *(it) immensely. All remaining errors are my own.

¹Here and throughout, I use boldface type to indicate a pronoun and its associated DP. Abbreviations used in the glosses are as follow: ACC=Accusative, ADP=Adposition, C=Complementizer, COP=Copula, DAT=Dative, DEF=Definite, DEM=Demonstrative, EXC=Exclusive, F=Feminine, FOC=Focus, FUT=Future, GEN=Genitive, INC=Inclusive, INDEF=Indefinite, M=Masculine, NEG=Negation, NOM=Nominative, PA=Partial Agreement, PL=Plural, POL:NEG=Negative Polarity, POL:POS=Positive Polarity, PREP=Preposition, PROG=Progressive, PST=Past, SCL=Subject Clitic, SG=Singular, VEN=Venitive. Some glosses have been adapted for consistency and clarity. Examples are given in Somali orthography. This deviates from IPA in the following ways: y=[j], dh=[q], j=[f] or [ŋ], sh=[ʃ], kh=[χ], x=[ɛ], c=[s], ’=[ʔ].
In (3), the direct object is fronted to a position immediately preceding a focus particle, and a resumptive pronoun surfaces in the base-position of the object, adjacent to the verb. This pronoun is obligatory. In fact, in Somali, focus fronting from all syntactic positions except the highest subject position will trigger resumption.

This leads to a puzzle: given that in many languages there seems to be a preference for a gap instead of a pronoun whenever possible (Sichel 2014, Shlonsky 1992), why are resumptives always required in Somali?

In this paper, I will argue that there are syntactic constraints that severely limit the development of movement chains in Somali, forcing resumptive pronouns to be bound in nearly all positions where we find gaps in other languages. This constraint, I suggest, is the Phase Impenetrability Condition, which prevents syntactic operations from occurring across the boundaries of certain domains.

(4) **Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC)**

For a phase HP with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside HP, only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

Like other languages, Somali has phases which cannot be penetrated by a higher syntactic probe. What differentiates Somali is that its phases lack an edge to which XPs can move and become visible. Consequently, I propose that all XPs generated within a phase cannot move in the language.

I will argue, based on the behavior of embedded clauses, that the embedding complementizer in Somali does not project a specifier, making all XP within embedded clauses inaccessible to higher probes. As movement is impossible, Somali relies on binding to create dependencies across a phase boundary. Furthermore, I will suggest, based on evidence from main clause objects and the complements of prepositional phrases, that all phases are impenetrable in Somali, and none have an escape hatch through which movement can occur.

The question remains, however: is it possible to square the facts of Somali with a last resort conception of resumptive pronouns? My answer is a qualified yes. The Somali data is consistent with, but does not support an analysis of resumptive pronouns as a last resort element. The analysis presented here shows that gaps are generally impossible in Somali, due to the fact that syntactic operations such as Agree cannot target XPs that are within a phase. This is consistent with the idea that resumptive pronouns are possible when gaps are impossible. I will argue, however, that there is a lack of evidence that the Somali resumptive pronoun strategy is a result of the fact that movement is severely limited by the PIC.

This paper is organized as follows: in §2 I will outline some necessary background on Somali and outline the patterns of resumption that it demonstrates. In §3, I will compare Somali to another language which also displays rampant resumption: Palestinian Arabic (PA). I will show that the analysis offered in Shlonsky (1992) to account for this pattern is, narrowly speaking, not
compatible with the facts of Somali. Specifically, I will argue against an intervention account of resumption in Somali, as suggested for PA by Shlonsky (1992). In §4, I introduce independent evidence that suggests that Somali embedding complementizers do not have a specifier. I argue that this fact, coupled with the PIC, prevents extraction out of embedded clauses, and thus explains the fact that resumption is required. In §5, I consider two hypotheses to explain the facts of main clause objects. I tentatively suggest that the phase-based analysis of embedded clauses can be extended to all phases in Somali. Additionally, I highlight the predictions of this hypothesis and of an alternative hypothesis where resumptive pronouns are the spell out of the tail of a movement chain. In §6, I consider how Somali fits into a larger discussion about resumptive pronouns. I discuss what Somali has to say about the question of last resort resumption, and argue that the analysis presented in §4 is a natural extension of analyses of resumption that rely on variation in the CP layer (McCloskey 1990). Finally, in §7, I consider some further implications that this analysis has in the domain of focus, and offer concluding thoughts.

2 Patterns of resumption in Somali

Somali has a set of particles that must appear in all main clauses (Saeed 1999:117-120). Examples include the positive polarity particle \textit{waa}\textsuperscript{2} (5a), the negative polarity particle \textit{ma} (5b), and the focus particle \textit{baa} (5c).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Baabuur-kii waa yimi.}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  truck-the POL:POS come.PST.3SG
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  ‘The truck came.’
  \end{tabular}
  \item \textit{Baabuur-kii ma iman.}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  truck-the POL:NEG come.PST:NEG.3SG
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  ‘The truck did not come.’
  \end{tabular}
  \item \textit{[Cali] \textit{baa} yimí}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  Cali FOC come.PST.3SG.M
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  ‘[Cali] came.’
  \end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

[Saeed (1999):172, 192]

Polarity particles are used when all referents are known, and the focus particle is used when new information is introduced (Saeed 1999:189). Both wh-words (6a) and XPs that bear narrow focus (6b) must immediately precede the focus particle.\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Y-\textit{baa} yimi?}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  who-FOC come.PST.3SG.M
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  ‘Who came?’
  \end{tabular}
  \item \textit{[Cali] \textit{baa} yimí}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  Cali FOC come.PST.3SG.M
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  ‘[Cali] came.’
  \end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

[Saeed (1999):192]

\textsuperscript{2}I argued in Hedding (2017b) that the particle \textit{waa} is best analyzed as a positive polarity particle and not verbal focus, per pace Lecarme (1999) and Andrzejewski (1975). I will gloss it as a polarity particle throughout this paper, but it should be noted that nothing in the analysis presented here relies on that characterization. To my knowledge, the description of \textit{waa} as a polarity particle is novel, however it has been previously argued by Saeed (1999) that \textit{waa} does not pattern with the other focus particles in the language in terms of its pragmatic distribution, and by Frascarelli and Puglielli (2007) that it doesn’t pattern with the focus particles in terms of its syntactic distribution.

\textsuperscript{3}As shown in (6a), the focus particle routinely undergoes phonological coalescence.
The basic argument order of the language is SOV (Saeed 1999, Gebert 1986). This order is the default when discourse-given arguments are not a topic or a focus. In clauses with the focus particle baa, arguments follow the particle and precede the verb (7). In non-focus clauses, arguments precede the polarity particle (8).  

(7) \[ \text{Shaley}_F \text{ baa } \text{ Cali}_F \text{ Xamar}_F \text{ tegay} \]  
yesterday FOC Cali Xamar go.PST.3SG.M  
‘Cali went to Xamar [yesterday].’  
[Antinucci (1980):14]  

(8) \[ \text{Cali}_F \text{ Maryam}_F \text{ w=(uu)} \text{ arkay} \]  
Cali Maryam POL:POS-3SG.M see.PST.3SG.M  
‘Cali saw Maryam.’  

This basic order is often changed, however, due to the prevalence of focus and topic fronting in the language. In (9), for instance, the direct object which bears narrow focus has been fronted to the position immediately preceding the focus particle. The indirect object is in a sentence-initial topic position.  

(9) \[ \text{Faarax}_F \text{ [b`uugg`aas] } \text{ b=`aan } \text{ siiyey} \]  
Faarax book-that FOC=1SG give.PAST.1SG  
‘I gave [that book] to [Faarax].’  
[Saeed (1993):9]  

The main pattern that I will seek to explain in this paper is the effect that these fronting operations have on the presence of clitic pronouns, which attach to focus and polarity particles, and are used resumptively (Svolacchia et al. 1995:65) to double arguments in left-dislocated positions. Clitic pronouns are required when focus-fronting a main clause object (10a), a embedded clause subject (10b), or an embedded clause object (10c).  

(10) a. \[ \text{Axmed } \text{ [adiga] } \text{ b=ìuu } \text{ *(ku) arkay} \]  
Axmed 2SG FOC=3SG 2SG see.PST.3SG  
‘Axmed saw [you].’  

\*Note that in focus clauses, unlike non-focus declaratives, there is no overt expression of the polarity head. In fact, focus particles and polarity particles are in complementary distribution.  

(1) \[ \text{*Cali baa } \text{ waa } \text{ yimi.} \]  
Cali FOC POL:POS come.PST.3SG.M  
Intended: [Cali] came.  
[Saeed (1984):162]  

As has been noted by Frascarelli and Puglielli (2007), however, the fact that arguments surface on different sides of the polarity particle and focus particle suggests that these particles occupy different syntactic positions. I will not offer a specific analysis for their complementary distribution here, but direct the reader to Frascarelli (2010a) for a possible analysis.
b. \([\text{Cali}]_F b=aan\) \(\text{sheegay} \quad [CP\ in=*(uu)\ buug\ qoray]\)
   Cali FOC=1SG say,PST  C=3SGM book write,PST
   ‘I said that [Cali]$_F$ wrote a book.’

   [Svolacchia et al. (1995):89]

c. \([\text{Aniga}]_F b=aad\) \(\text{sheegtay} \quad [CP\ in=uu\ Cali\ *(i)\ sugay]\)
   1SG FOC=2SG say,PST.2SG C=3SG.M Cali 1SG wait,PST.3SG.M
   ‘You said that Cali waited for [me]$_F$.’

   [Svolacchia and Puglielli (1999):107]

   Additionally, as is many languages with resumption, Somali obeys the Highest Subject Restriction (McCloskey 1990): resumptive pronouns cannot double main clause subject when it is focus fronted. This is the only argument that is not required to be doubled by a resumptive pronoun when it moves to the focus position.

   \((11)\) \([\text{Cali}]_F\ baa(*=uu)\ nin-kii\ lacag-tii\ siinaya\)
   Cali FOC man-DEF money-DEF give,FUT.3SG.M(P.A.)
   ‘[Cali]$_F$ will give the man the money.’

   [Saeed (1984):9]

   Left-dislocated topics, on the other hand, are always doubled by a resumptive pronoun, even if they originate in the highest subject position.

   \((12)\) \([\text{Cali}]_T\ [lacagti-ii]_F\ b=*(uu)\ nink-ii\ siinayaa\)
   Cali money-DEF FOC=3SG.M man-DEF give,FUT.3SG.M
   ‘[Cali]$_T$ will give the man [the money]$_F$.’

   Though not the main subject of inquiry here, I briefly discuss this contrast between topic and focus in §7.1.

   For reference, the full paradigm of clitic pronouns is given in (13). It should be noted that although Somali only has overt local person object clitics, I will show that there is evidence for null 3rd person object clitics as well. Indeed, null 3rd person clitics are a common feature of Cushitic languages (Frascarelli 2010).

   \((13)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Clitic Pronouns</th>
<th>Object Clitic Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>=aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>=aad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>=uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>=ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INC</td>
<td>=aannu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXC</td>
<td>=aynu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>=aydin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>=ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   [Saeed (1999):72-73]
My main goal in this paper will be to explain the pattern in (10-11). In doing so, it will be necessary to discuss another pattern of pronoun copying in Somali. In addition to functioning as arguments and resumptive pronouns, clitics in Somali can also double a DP in argument position. For instance, the subject of a non-focus clause (14a) or the non-fronted subject of a focus clause (14b) can be optionally doubled by a clitic that attaches to the focus particle.

(14) a. **Cali Maryam** w=**(uu)** arkay
    Cali Maryam POL:POS-3SG.M see.PST.3SG.M
    ‘Cali saw Maryam.’

b. **[moos]** F b=**(uu)** *wiilk-ii* cunayaa
    banana FOC(=3SG.M) boy-the eat.PROG.3SG.M
    ‘The boy is eating [a banana]F’
    [Svolacchia et al. (1995):68]

This optionality only applies to R-expressions, however—a pronoun in the same position must be doubled by a clitic.

(15) **[moos]** F b-***(aan)** anigu cunay
    banana FOC-1SG 1SG eat.PAST.1SG
    ‘I ate [a banana]F’
    [Svolacchia et al. (1995):68]

In §3.2, I will argue that this is a type of Clitic Doubling, which is distinct from resumption. I will use the fact that subjects in A-positions can optionally double as a diagnostic to distinguish A and ˘A-positions in the language.5

In the following section, I will compare Somali to Palestinian Arabic, another language that requires resumptive pronouns in all positions except the highest subject position. I will summarize the analysis of Shlonsky (1992), and I will show that the syntactic intervention analysis that is proposed in that paper does not work for Somali.

3 Shlonsky 1992

3.1 An Intervention Account

Like Somali, Palestinian Arabic (PA) is a language with rampant resumption. Resumptive pronouns must be used instead of a gap when forming relative clauses of the matrix direct object (16a), embedded subject (16b), and embedded clause object (16c). However, resumptives are prohibited when extraction takes place from the highest subject position (17).

5Because there are no overt 3rd person object clitics, it is difficult to tell if there is optional object clitic doubling in Somali. As we only see an overt realization of object clitics with local persons—which we might expect to be obligatorily doubled due to the fact that they are pronominal—it is difficult to say whether object clitic doubling is possible in the language. Put differently, if 3rd person object clitic doubling exists, the double is a null pronoun.
In order to account for the contrast in (16), Shlonsky (1992) makes a distinction between A and \( \bar{A} \)-positions, and their behavior with respect to syntactic intervention. Specifically, he proposes that the specifier of CP is an A-position in PA, and thus any movement to that position which passes over the subject of the main clause is subject to an intervention effect. He assumes that the subject will always serve as a potential goal for A-movement, and that, due to Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990), a probe must enter into an Agreement relationship with the first potential goal that it encounters. In PA, he argues, the effect of this is that only the highest subject can undergo movement.
Having hypothesized that all relative clause formation in PA is A-movement, and that only the highest subject can undergo this type of movement, Shlonsky (1992) then argues that resumptive pronouns surface as a last resort in positions where movement is impossible. He claims that resumptive pronouns cannot be freely inserted, but can be merged and bound by a higher DP in the clause, if and only if there is some syntactic constraint which blocks movement.

Despite the fact that resumptives are so prevalent in the language, Shlonsky uses PA to argue that resumptives are a last resort phenomenon. If resumptives could be freely merged, he reasons, we would expect them to show up in the highest subject position as well, where they are in fact ungrammatical. Given Shlonsky’s conception of resumption as a last resort operation, his analysis can straightforwardly predict why subject resumption is prohibited in the highest subject position: there is no higher DP which can act as an intervener to block its movement. As there is no syntactic constraint which blocks movement, a movement derivation can precede. The prohibition of a resumptive in the main clause subject position—a cross-linguistic generalization known as the Highest Subject Restriction (HSR) (McCloskey 1990:210)—is simply a matter of economy. If resumptives are only inserted when movement fails as Shlonsky (1992) suggests, then the analysis predicts that they should be impossible in positions where movement is possible.

In addition to Palestinian Arabic, Shlonsky (1992) also uses data from Hebrew to argue in favor of a last resort nature of resumptive pronouns. In contrast to PA, Hebrew optionally allows resumptives in direct object (19a) and embedded clause positions (19b-c).

\[
\begin{align*}
(19) & \quad \text{a. } \text{ha-}\text{n}\text{ }\text{še-} & \text{-ra\text{?iti } (\text{\itoto})} \\
& \text{the-man that- (I) saw } \text{(him)} \\
& \text{‘the man that I saw’} \\
& \text{b. } \text{ha-}\text{n}\text{ }\text{še-} & \text{-xa\text{šavt }\text{še-(hu) } melamed } \text{\itanglit} \\
& \text{the-man that- (you.F) thought that-(he) teaches English} \\
& \text{‘the man that you thought teaches English’} \\
& \text{c. } \text{ha-}\text{n}\text{ }\text{še-} & \text{-xa\text{šavt }\text{še-Dani } paga\text{s } (\text{\itoto})} \\
& \text{the-man that- (you.F) thought that-Dani met } \text{(him)} \\
& \text{‘the man that you thought that Dani met’}
\end{align*}
\]


Also, like in PA, pronouns are prohibited from the Highest Subject position.

\[
\begin{align*}
(20) & \quad \text{ha-}\text{n}\text{ }\text{še-} & \text{*hu) } \text{?ohev } \text{?et } \text{Rina} \\
& \text{the-man that-(*he) loves } \text{ACC Rina} \\
& \text{‘the man who loves Rina’}
\end{align*}
\]

On its face, optionality is difficult to square with a last resort account of resumption. This hypothesis predicts that resumptive pronouns should only surface when triggered by a syntactic constraint, and thus should never be optional. They can not be freely merged and should only appear when movement fails. So, in order to account for the data in (19), Shlonsky’s proposal requires that there be some syntactic constraint that can block movement to trigger resumption. To that end, Shlonsky argues that in Hebrew the optionality in fact resides in the selection of the complementizer. Hebrew, he proposes, has two homophonous complementizers, one which has a Ā-specifier and one which has an A-specifier. Only movement to the A-specifier triggers intervention effects, and thus resumption only appears when this CP is selected (21). The subject
does not act as an intervener for \( \bar{A} \)-probes, and thus movement without resumption can precede from all syntactic positions (22).

(21) \[
\text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \tilde{s}e \_T \rightarrow \text{DP}_i \\
\text{DP}_j \quad V
\]

(22) \[
\text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \tilde{s}e \_T \rightarrow \text{DP}_i \\
\text{DP}_j \quad V
\]

Shlonsky (1992) claims that the choice between these two complementizers is free, and that there is merely an illusion of resumptive optionality. Thus, Shlonsky argues that the locus of variation between Palestinian Arabic and Hebrew resides within the CP layer—pronouns are not optional, rather they are either required or prohibited based on the properties of the complementizer. If the complementizer has an \( A \)-specifier, there will be intervention by the subject. If, however, it has an \( \bar{A} \)-specifier, there is no intervention.

### 3.2 Application to Somali

Superficially, Somali has the same pattern as PA: focus fronting of a matrix direct object (23a), an embedded subject (23b), or an embedded object (23c) requires a resumptive pronoun instead of a gap in the base-position. Like PA and Hebrew, resumptives are ungrammatical in the highest subject position (24).

(23) a. \( Axmed \ [\text{adiga}]_F b=\bar{u}u \quad ku \ ar\text{ka}y \)
\( Axmed \ 2SG \quad \text{FOC}=3SG \ 2SG \text{see.PST.3SG} \)
‘Axmed saw [you]’

[Saeed (1999):167]

b. \( [\text{Cali}]_F b=aan \quad \text{sheeg}\text{tay} \ [\text{CP in}=uu \quad \text{buug qoray}] \)
\( \text{Cali} \quad \text{FOC}=1SG \text{say.PST} \quad C=3SGM \text{book write.PST} \)
‘I said that [Cali] \_F wrote a book.’

[Svolacchia et al. (1995):89]

c. \( \text{Aniga} \ b=aad \quad \text{sheeg}\text{tay} \ [\text{CP in}=uu \quad \text{Cali i sugay}] \)
\( 1SG \quad \text{FOC}=2SG \text{say.PST.2SG} \quad C=3SG.M \text{Cali} \ 1SG \text{wait.PST.3SG.M} \)
‘You said that Cali waited for [me]’

[Svolacchia and Puglielli (1999):107]
It is worth considering, then, whether Shlonsky’s analysis could be applied to Somali. A direct application would require that the specifier of the focus particle be an A-position, and that focus and wh-movement are types of A-movement in the language. This would cause the main clause subject to trigger intervention effects, which would prevent focus movement without resumption from all other positions in the clause. It is important to note that a narrow application of the proposal crucially depends on the A/Ā distinction. This distinction is necessary in order to account for the apparent optionality of resumptive pronouns in Hebrew. Shlonsky (1992) argues that intervention effects that force resumption only occur in the A-system, not the Ā-system.

In this subsection, I will show that implementation of the specifics of Shlonsky’s proposal to Somali is problematic—the specifier of the focus particle is not an A-position, and thus doesn’t trigger the same movement restrictions that Shlonsky (1992) proposes for PA. Specifically, I will argue in §3.2.1 that focus movement is not restricted to nominals, but can also target entire phrases. Following a diagnostic outlined in van Urk (2015), I argue that this indicates that focus movement is not A-movement. Then, in §3.2.2, I argue that the specifier of the focus particle is an Ā position, by contrasting it with a clause-internal position which I claim is the specifier of TP. Then in §3.3, I will consider whether a more generalized intervention effect that does not rely on the A/Ā distinction can explain the prevalence of resumptives in Somali. I will argue that generalized intervention would require highly specific, and theoretically unmotivated feature geometries to account for the fact that the subject intervenes for all types of movement. Furthermore, I claim that an intervention approach misses a core generalization which I will describe in §4: embedded clauses do not have a specifier position, and this lack of escape hatch prevents movement.

3.2.1 Argument 1: Focus Movement is not restricted to Nominals

A cross-linguistic difference between A-movement and Ā-movement is that A-movement is often restricted to nominals (van Urk 2015, Richards 2016), while Ā-movement is not.

(25)  a. *[P_P To Kim] seemed [CP that it was raining].
      b. [P_P To whom] did it seem [CP that it was raining].

[van Urk (2015):30]

Raising of a prepositional phrase to an A-position is ungrammatical (25a), but wh-movement to an Ā-position can pied-pipe an entire PP (25b). van Urk (2015) derives this difference by arguing that A-movements target ϕ-features, which are intrinsic to nominals, while Ā-movements target optional features, such as [WH] and [TOP]. Consequently, he predicts that A-movements will only target phrases with ϕ-features, and thus only nominals.

If the specifier of the focus particle in Somali were an A-position and movement to that position were A-movement, then we might expect that focus movement would be limited to nominals. In fact, however, the class of phrases that can occupy this position is more broad. For example, the
intensifier \textit{aad} (26a), adverbal clauses (26b), or complement clauses (26c)\textsuperscript{6} can all be fronted to a focus position.

(26) a. \textit{Soomaali-du guur-ka} [\textit{aad}]_F b=ay u tixgelin jirtey
\text{Somalis-DEF marriage-DEF much FOC=3PL ADP value used}

‘The Somalis used to value marriage [very highly]_F’

b. [\textit{In-ta qof-ku nool yahay}]_F, \textit{ay}=uu \textit{awood leeyahay oo wax}
amount-DEF person-DEF alive is \text{FOC=3SG.M potential has and thing}
\text{qabsan karaa}
take can

‘[As long as a person is alive]_F, he has potential and can achieve something.’

c. \textit{Berri [in}=uu \text{soo fufi doono]}_F b=aan ku fekeraa
\text{tomorrow C=3SG.M VEN sprout will FOC=1SG on think}

‘I reflect [that it will sprout back again]_F tomorrow.’

[Saeed (1999):191]

These examples show that movement to the focus position is not reserved merely for narrow constituent focus, but that focus movement in fact targets a large set of syntactic constituents. In (26), I mark constituents in focus following Saeed (1999), and note that the discourse effects of focus movement are varied (see Saeed (1999) chapter 9 for extensive discussion). However, assuming that all of these phrases are fronted by the same syntactic mechanism, then they provide evidence against an A-movement account. I argue that the fact that a wider range of phrases can undergo focus movement to the specifier of the focus particle suggests that it is not a type of A-movement, but is in fact a type of \textae-movement, which cross-linguistically can target non-nominal constituents.

3.2.2 Argument 2: Clitic Doubling

In the previous section I offered an argument against the claim that focus movement is A-movement in Somali, based on the fact that it can target non-nominal constituents. In this section, I make a complementary point: I will argue that the specifier of the focus particle is not an A-position.\textsuperscript{7} I claim that A and \textae positions can be distinguished in Somali by the way in which they double

\textsuperscript{6}van Urk (2015) also notes that A-movement can possibly target CPs, though he doesn’t give examples to support this claim. This may be possible with both raising and passivization in English, though I personally find it fairly unnatural, and in both cases prefer an expletive subject.

\textsuperscript{7}Lecarme (1999) argues, based on the fact that focused subjects appear in non-nominative case, that the specifier of the focus particle is an A-position that is assigned accusative case. Additionally, she notes that movement to that position does not trigger Weak Crossover effects, which she takes to be indicative of A-movement. It should be noted, however, that a focused subject triggers anti-agreement effects in Somali (Mereu 1999, Hedding 2017a, a.o.), including impoverished verbal agreement. Considering that case-impoverishment is a cross-linguistically robust anti-agreement
pronouns. DPs in Â positions obligatorily double resumptive pronouns, while DPs in A-positions optionally double a clitic. I compare this pattern to other languages which distinguish Clitic Left Dislocation and Clitic Doubling, and I propose that this difference in optionality indicates that the two constructions are derived by distinct syntactic derivations. In this, I follow a long line of literature which argues that these two constructions are distinct (Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1991, Anagnostopoulou 1994, a.o.), and literature that proposes that a crucial difference between these two constructions is whether the associate is in an A or Â-position (Harizanov 2014, Anagnostopoulou 2006, a.o.). If Somali indeed does have Clitic Doubling of arguments, then I propose that we can use this as a diagnostic to determine which DPs are in A-positions. Using this diagnostic, I conclude that the specifier of the focus particle is not an A-position, given that DPs in that position are never optionally doubled by a clitic.

As mentioned in §2, a discourse-given subject that is neither a topic nor a focus in Somali can optionally be doubled by a clitic. In focus clauses, this position immediately follows the focus particle (27a). In non-focus clauses, it precedes the polarity particle (27b).

(27) a. [moos]_F b=(uu) wiilk-ii cunayaa
    banana  FOC(=3SG.M) boy-the eat.PROG.3SG.M
    ‘The boy is eating [a banana]_F’

    [Svolacchia et al. (1995):68]

b. Cali w=(tuu) yimid
    Cali  POL:POS=(3SG.M) come.3SG.PST
    ‘Cali came.’

    [Svolacchia and Puglielli (1999):112]

Though this clitic appears in the same surface position as subject resumptive pronouns, I believe there are two main reasons to believe that this optional clitic is not a resumptive pronoun, but is in fact a doubled clitic. First, resumption pronouns which double a topic or focus are always obligatory in Somali (except in the highest subject position, where they are prohibited)—however, these doubles are optional. Second, unlike resumptive pronouns, doubled clitics can double the highest subject in the clause (as in 27a). This indicates that they are not subject to the Highest Subject Restriction, which is an active constraint on resumptive pronouns in Somali.

I argue that these clitics are not resumptives, and are in fact doubled clitics. Clitic Doubling is a cross-linguistically robust phenomenon in which an argument is doubled by a co-referential clitic elsewhere in the clause (see Anagnostopoulou (2006) for an overview). I assume, following Uriagereka (1995) that doubled clitics are merged as part of a complex DP.

(28)    DP
       /   \
      D  DP
     Clitic  Associate

effect (Baier 2014), it does not follow that the specifier of the focus particle must be an A-position based on the fact that subjects have non-standard case when moved there. Additionally, as I will argue in §5.1, lack of WCO is consistent with a base-generation approach to resumption, thus I don’t believe the claim that the specifier of the focus particle is an A position follows from these facts.
Crucially, Clitic Doubling needs to be distinguished from other types of pronoun doubling, which display similar, but slightly different patterns. Importantly for Harizanov (2014), true clitic doubling requires the associate to be in an argument position.

(29) **True clitic doubling**

...clitic[φ]+host ... associate[φ] ...

(where the associate is in argument position)

[Harizanov (2014):1034]

This requirement is needed to distinguish clitic doubling from other types of pronoun copying of DPs in non-argument positions, such as Clitic Left Dislocation, where a left-dislocated topic is resumed by a clitic in the position where it is interpreted lower in the clause. One piece of evidence that these two constructions are distinct is that there are many languages that allow one construction but disallow the other (Anagnostopoulou 2006). In Italian, for instance, Clitic Doubling a DP in argument position is ungrammatical (30a), but doubling a left dislocated DP in an A-position is required (30b).

(30) a. *Lo vendò domani Gianni
   3SG.M see.FUT.1SG tomorrow Gianni
   ‘I will see Gianni tomorrow.’


   b. Gianni, *(lo) vendò domani
   Gianni 3SG.M see.FUT.1SG tomorrow
   ‘I will see Gianni tomorrow.’

   [Cinque (1990):71]

This fact suggests that these two phenomena are distinct, despite their superficial similarity.

I argue that Somali is a language like Spanish, where Clitic Doubling is optional, and doubling a left-dislocated phrase is obligatory. In Spanish, doubling an indirect object in its base-generated position is generally optional (Anagnostopoulou 2006).

(31) **Aureliano (le) dio un regalo a Pilar.**
Aureliano 3SG.DAT give.PST.3SG INDEF gift PREP Pilar
   ‘Aureliano gave a gift to Pilar.’

   [Rut Molinuevo Llaria, p.c.]

However, in a context that introduces contrastive topicalization, the left-dislocated phrase must be doubled by a pronoun. For instance, in response to the question *What did Rene give his brothers for Christmas?*, each left-dislocated topic must be doubled by a pronoun.

(32) A Hugo, *(le) dio un balón de fútbol. A David, *(le)
PREP Hugo 3SG.DAT give.PST.3SG INDEF ball of soccer PREP David 3SG.DAT
dio un videojuego.
give.PST.3SG INDEF videogame
   ‘To Hugo, he gave a soccer ball. To David, he gave a video game.’

   [Rut Molinuevo Llaria, p.c.]
Compare this pattern to Somali, where a low subject can optionally be doubled by a clitic (33a), but a left-dislocated topic must be doubled by a clitic (33b).

(33)  a. \([\text{moos}]_{F} b=(uu)\) \(\text{wiilk-i} \text{ cunayaa}\)
     \begin{align*}
     \text{banana} & \quad \text{FOC}(=3\text{SG.M}) \quad \text{boy-the} \quad \text{eat.PROG.3SG.M} \\
     \text{‘The boy is eating \([\text{a banana}]_{F}’}\n     \end{align*}

     b. \(\text{wiilk-i} \ [\text{moos}]_{F} b=(uu)\) \(\text{cunayaa}\)
     \begin{align*}
     \text{boy-the} \quad \text{banana} & \quad \text{FOC}=3\text{SG.M} \quad \text{eat.PROG.3SG.M} \\
     \text{‘The boy, he is eating \([\text{a banana}]_{F}’}\n     \end{align*}

[Svolacchia et al. (1995):68]

I argue that this pattern is expected if these two types of pronoun doubling are formed from distinct syntactic derivations, as in other languages.

A final similarity between the pattern in Somali and other clitic doubling languages is that clitic doubling is that otherwise optional doubling is often obligatory when the argument is a pronoun (Anagnostopoulou 2006). This is the case in Somali as well. Even if a strong pronoun is in a position where optional clitic doubling occurs, it must be doubled by a clitic.

(34) \([\text{moos}]_{F} b-*(aan)\) \(\text{anigu cunay}\)
     \begin{align*}
     \text{banana} & \quad \text{FOC-1SG} \quad 1\text{SG} \quad \text{eat.PAST.1SG} \\
     \text{‘I ate \([\text{a banana}]_{F}\’}\n     \end{align*}

[Svolacchia et al. (1995):68]

If this analysis of optional doubling in Somali is on the right track, and the generalization about Clitic Doubling and A-positions in Harizanov (2014) is correct, then the positions in which doubling is possible must be an A-position. Recall the positions in which a DP can be optionally doubled by a clitic. I will refer to this as the low-subject position.

(35) Position of Optional Clitic Doubling

\begin{align*}
\text{Focus clause:} & \quad [\text{XP}]_{F} \quad baa \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{Non-focus clause:} & \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{waa/ma} \quad \text{V}
\end{align*}

I propose that this is the specifier of TP. This functions as a position below the focus particle, yet above the polarity particle, where subjects surface if they are neither a topic nor focus. I propose that subjects obligatorily move to this position, and can optionally be doubled by a clitic when they surface there.
Previous analyses of Somali have consistently argued that non-clitic DPs cannot surface in A-positions (Svolacchia and Puglielli 1999, a.o.). However, Somali can have sentences without any clitics at all. Thus, I consider the proposal that clitics are required to fill all argument positions to be untenable. Given standard assumptions about the assignment of θ-roles, the subject must be an argument position in order to be assigned an agentive role in (38).

(38) \{moos\}_F baa wiilk-ii cunayaa
    banana FOC boy-the eat.PROG.3SG.M
    ‘The boy is eating [a banana]_F’

[Svolacchia et al. (1995):68]

The most compelling alternative hypothesis to the low-subject position being an A-position is that it is an ‘internal topic’ position. Frascarelli and Puglielli (2009) note that, given the articulated left-peripheral structure proposed in Rizzi (1997), we expect to find topics on both sides of a focus phrase.
Thus, Somali might be a language with multiple topic positions, on either side of the focus particle. In fact, this is what is proposed in Frascarelli and Puglielli (2009). They conclude, then that the low-subject position (which I argue is the specifier of TP), is in fact an A-position for ‘familiar topics’—discourse-linked DPs which are background information and are used for topic contiguity (Givón 1983). They contrast this with left-dislocated topics, which they argue are ‘aboutness topics’—broadly speaking, what the sentence is about (Reinhart 1981, Chafe 1987). Though they attempt to motivate this distinction using the different pragmatic effects of these two positions, the claim that the low position must be an A-position for topics follows directly from the hypothesis that no DPs can surface in argument positions in the language.

I argue that there are three main reasons to believe that this position is not a topic position, besides the obvious difference that clitics optionally double DPs in these positions (in contrast to left-peripheral topics which obligatorily double a resumptive pronoun). If this is not an internal topic position, and DPs that surface there receive case and are assigned a θ-role, then I believe the null hypothesis is that it is an A-position.

First, ‘topical’ DPs are generally restricted from that position. For instance, in response to the question in (40), Cali can surface as either a left (41a) or right (41b) dislocated topic, but cannot immediately follow the focus particle (41c).

(40)  
\textit{Cali m-ux=uu} sameeyay?  
Cali Q-thing=3SG.M do.PST.3SG.M  
‘What did Cali do?’
This is surprising if the clause-internal position is in fact an internal topic. As Frascarelli and Puglielli (2009) note, familiar topics are used to maintain contiguity, while aboutness topics are used for "newly introduced, newly changed or newly returned to" (Givón 1983:8). Thus, the fact that the low-subject position cannot be used to maintain topic contiguity from the question is unexpected. The question in (40) introduces a topic (in a left-dislocated position), and asks the respondent to comment about him. Thus, the fact that Cali cannot surface in the low-subject position is suggestive of the fact that topics cannot appear in that position, even familiar topics. If, however, as I claim, that position is a non-topical subject position, then the restriction is understandable: topical DPs must surface in a peripheral position, and thus they are infelicitous in the spec-TP, which has no special information structural status.

Second, there are definiteness restrictions on the DP in the low position. Somali has two definite articles, the semantics of which are are subject to some debate (see e.g., Lecarme 2008, Özyildiz and Ivan 2017). One is generally described as a near-definite determiner, whose allomorphs include -ka, -ga, -da, and -ta. The other is generally described as a remote definite that is used when the referent is far from the speaker in space and time (Saeed 1993). DPs marked with the near-definite article are restricted from the low position. Indefinites, which are unmarked morphologically, can appear in the low-subject position i (42a), but near-definite entities, which are by their nature topical, cannot (42b).
Thus, if the familiar topic position is used to for topic contiguity, we would the opposite pattern. We expect definites to be good in that position, as they allow referential contiguity, and we expect indefinites to be worse.

This can be contrasted with the left-dislocated topic position, which cannot be filled by an indefinite (44a) but can contain a near-definite (44b).

(44) a. *Hadiyad ma Cali baa keenáy?
   present Q Cali FOC bring.PST.3SG.M
   Intended: As for a present, did [Cali]$_F$ bring it?

   b. Hadiyad-da ma Cali baa keenáy?
   present-DEF Q Cali FOC bring.PST.3SG.M
   ‘As for the present, did [Cali]$_F$ bring it?’

   [Frascarelli and Puglielli (2009):328]

This restriction can be explained by claiming that near-definites are topical, and thus must surface in the clausal-periphery. Indefinites, which cannot be topical, must appear in the low-subject position, further suggesting that that position is not a topic.

Third, Lecarme (1999) claims that negative quantifiers cannot be topics in Somali (as in many other languages). They can, however, function as the subject of a non-focus clause.

(45) Cid-na ma iman.
    person-NEG POL:NEG come:NEG
    ‘Nobody came.’

   [Frascarelli (2010:2135)]

Crucially, they can function as the subject of a non-focus clause without being doubled by a clitic (as in 45), indicating that they indeed are in an argument position. Like other DPs in that position, they can optionally be doubled by a clitic pronoun, further indicating that they are in an A-position.

(46) Qof-na u m=uu iman in=uu qaato shahaadadiisii
    person-NEG for POL:NEG-3SG.M come:NEG COMP-he pick.up degree.his
    ‘Nobody came to pick up his degree.’

   [Saeed (1984:111)]
Though Frascarelli and Puglielli (2007) argue that there are different types of topics in Somali, an ‘aboutness topic’ at the left and right edge, and a ‘familiar’ topic integrated into the clause, I argue, based on the evidence presented above, as well as the description in Saeed (1999) that \textit{waa}-clauses are only possible when all referents are known, that this position is reserved for DPs that are discourse-given, but that are not the topic or focus of the sentence. This is consistent with the proposal that this position is the specifier of TP.

Having established that DPs in at least one A-position in the language can optionally be doubled by a clitic, if the specifier of the focus particle were an A-position, then we might expect the same doubling to occur. This is not borne out by the evidence. Subject R-expressions in that position cannot double a pronoun that attaches to the focus particle.

\begin{align*}
\text{(47) } & [\text{Cali}]_F \ baa/(^*b-uu) \ nin-kii \ lacag-tii \ siinaya \\
\text{Cali} & \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{man-DEF money-DEF give.FUT.3SGM(P.A.)} \\
\text{‘[Cali]}_F & \text{ will give the man the money.’}
\end{align*}

[Saeed (1984):9]

This is unexpected if the specifier of the focus particle is an A-position, assuming that DPs in all A-positions can be doubled by a clitic. However, the restriction is understandable if the specifier of the focus particle is an Ā-position. The fact that a clitic is prohibited in this position is simply an example of the Highest Subject Restriction. Additionally, as we have seen, pronouns that do double the focused constituent are never optional.

If, as I have argued, the position following the focus particle and preceding the polarity particle is an A-position, then it is necessary to consider whether the specifier of the focus particle shares similar characteristics. I argue, based on the fact that DPs in the focus position cannot optionally double a clitic, that it is not the same. If the specifier of the focus particle is not an A-position, then the specific analysis proposed in Shlonsky (1992) cannot account for the resumptive pattern in Somali. Recall that the A/Ā-distinction is crucial for Shlonsky (1992), as it is what accounts for the “optional” resumptives in Hebrew.

3.3 Generalized Intervention Effects

In §3.2, I argued that the specific implementation of the analysis in Shlonsky (1992) faces problems when applied to Somali. Specifically, the analysis crucially relies on the A/Ā distinction as a way of contrasting Hebrew and Palestinian Arabic. Application of this analysis to Somali would require concluding that the specifier of the focus particle is an A-position. However, this position contrasts with other A-positions in the language with respect to Clitic Doubling. Specifically, DPs in the specifier of TP can always optionally be doubled by a clitic. DPs in the specifier of the focus particle either must bind a pronoun (if it is a main clause object or embedded argument), or are prohibited from binding a pronoun (if it is the main clause subject). I take optional doubling to be a diagnostic for an A-position, and I take obligatoriness as a diagnostic for Ā-binding of a resumptive.

While the specific implementation for Shlonsky (1992) relies on the A/Ā distinction, a more general way of viewing his proposal is one of intervention triggered by Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990). A probe which is relativized to a specific feature must Agree with the most local XP in its c-command domain which bears that feature—it cannot skip or ignore any potential goal. I
will argue that a more generalized theory of intervention will also not work for Somali, due to the fact that resumption is triggered by both focus and wh-movement. I will show that fine-grained feature geometry proposed by Abels (2012a) predicts that a non-focus, non-wh subject should not intervene for focus or wh-movement.

For Shlonsky, the intervention effect is triggered due to the fact that the probe is triggering A-movement, and the subject is always a candidate for A-movement. Thus, the subject will always act as an intervener for most distant DPs. Within the Minimalist Framework, a generalized intervention proposal could be stated as follows: a probe which is searching for some unvalued feature must value that feature by establishing an agreement relationship with the closest DP in its c-command domain. Because the probe is relativized, any DP that bears the relevant feature will be a potential goal. If the main clause subject bears that feature, it will block agreement with all other DPs in the sentence.

(48)

![Diagram]

The task then, for this analysis, is to define the feature to which the probe is relativized. If it is a feature for which the subject has a value, then we expect the subject to act as an intervener for other DPs in the clause.

There are two main types of dependencies that terminate in a resumptive pronoun in Somali: focus fronting and wh-movement. Thus, the question is whether it is feasible for a non-focus, non-wh subject to act as an intervener. I argue that it is not. Consider the example in (49). Here, the subject of the embedded clause is a wh-word and the subject of the main clause is a clitic pronoun.

(49)  
[**Kum**]_{\text{FOC}}=\text{ay } \text{u maleynaysaa in}=\text{uu} \quad \text{Amina arkay?}  
\text{who.FOC=the to think that=3SG.M Amina see.PST.3SG.M}  
\text{‘Who does she think saw Amina.’}  

[Saeed (1984):144]
In order to correctly predict the fact that a resumptive pronoun surfaces in the embedded clause using intervention as a syntactic constraint on movement, we would have to say that the subject has a value for whatever feature the probe in the main clause is searching for. Assuming a standard analysis of wh-movement that involves a probe relativized to a wh-feature, an intervention analysis would be forced to claim that a non-wh subject can function as an intervener for wh-movement. For a language like English, a non-wh subject intervening for wh-movement would make incorrect predictions. It would over-generate and incorrectly predict that a non-wh subject could move to the specifier of CP instead of a wh-word (50a). Additionally, it would under-generate, incorrectly predicting that moving a wh-object across a subject would be ungrammatical (50b).

(50) a. *Rupert saw who?
    b. Who did Rupert see?

So, a coarse-grained approach to intervention, where the probe is merely seeking to value \([\text{uWH}]\) will not be able to capture the facts of Somali, assuming that non-wh subjects have no value for \([\text{WH}]\) and thus will not act as an intervener.

Abels (2012a) argues that a more fine-grained approach to Relativized Minimality is necessary to account for the position of left-peripheral DPs in Italian. He argues that probes can be relativized to feature geometries, and that XPs with a more specified set of features can act as interveners for members of the superclass. For example, he argues that Operators (a set that includes focus, wh-words and quantificational adverbs) are a subclass of the Modifiers (which includes all adverbs). That is, all OPERATORS also have the \([\text{Mod}]\) feature. The complete feature geometry he proposes is in (51).

(51) ©Abels (2012a):249

Abels (2012a) argues that a subclass can intervene for a superclass, but not vice-versa. Thus, given the feature geometry he proposes, we do not expect arguments to act as interveners for wh- or focus movement, as ARGUMENTAL is not a subclass of OPERATOR.

Additionally, we see that topics in Somali require resumptive pronouns. For instance, when we have a topicalized subject and a focused object, we find that the topic must be resumed by a pronoun.

(52) {[Cali]\_F [lacagt-ii]\_F b=*uu) nink-ii siinayaa
cali money-DEF FOC=3SG.M man-DEF give.FUT.3SG.M
    ‘[Cali]_{F} will give the man [the money]_{F}.’
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If we thought that all resumption in Somali was due to effects of intervention, we would be forced to conclude that a focused DP can act as an intervener for topic movement, as the only intervening DP between Cali and the resumptive pronoun is the focus-fronted object lacagtii. According to the feature geometry in (51), this is unexpected, as topics are not a subclass of the operators.

In the following section I will present an alternative analysis for Somali that captures the facts, and that relies on independent evidence about the structure of embedded clauses. Though distinct from Shlonsky’s analysis, if correct, my proposal confirms a central claim of Shlonsky’s paper: the locus of variation for resumptive patterns lies within the CP layer. I will argue that Somali does not have a complementizer with an A-specifier, but instead has an embedding complementizer with no specifier.

4 The Proposal

In this section, I present the core proposal of this paper: resumptive pronouns in Somali surface in positions where movement is blocked. This is broadly speaking consistent with the analysis presented in Shlonsky (1992), although the specific constraint which prevents movement is distinct. In order to explain the resumption pattern, I argue that embedded clauses are impenetrable phases in Somali. Because probes cannot search into embedded clauses, focus and wh-dependencies that cross into embedded clauses must terminate in a pronoun. This analysis requires a conception of resumption that is insensitive to islands, which I will sketch in the second subsection.

4.1 Embedded Clauses are Islands in Somali

4.1.1 Background

As we have seen, focus fronting of an embedded subject to the main clause focus position requires the insertion of a resumptive pronoun.

(53) \([Cali]_F\ b=aan \ sheegay in=uu \ buug qoray.\)
    Cali  FOC=1SG say.PST  C=3SG.M book write.PST
    ‘I said that [Cali] wrote a book.’


This requirement additionally holds for long distance movement of a wh-phrase—a gap is ungrammatical in the embedded clause.

(54) a. \([Nin-kee]_F\ b=aad \ sheegay \ in=uu \ ku caayey?\)
    man-which FOC=2SG report.PST.2SG C=3SG.M 2SG insult.PST.3SG
    ‘Which man did you say insulted you?’

[Stoyanova (2008):80]

b. \([Kum]_F=ay \ u \ maleynaysaa \ in=uu \ Amina \ arkay?\)
    who.FOC=sh to think that=3SG.M Amina see.PST.3SG.M
    ‘Who does she think saw Amina.’
Additionally, there is no ameliorating effect of d-linking, as there is for extraction out of weak islands (Szabolcsi and Lohndal 2017)—both D-linked (54a) or non-D-linked (54b-c) wh-phrases must be resumed by a pronoun in embedded clauses. It is well known that in many languages, resumptive pronouns can be used grammatically within islands, where a gap would be ungrammatical (Ross 1967, McCloskey 2007).

In Somali, resumptives are indeed island insensitive—that is, they can be employed in positions where a gap would be expected to be impossible due to island constraints. For instance, extraction out of a relative clause (55a and 55b) as well as a complex-NP (55c) is fully grammatical, as long as a resumptive pronoun is used.

(55) a. [Qoraa-gée]\textsubscript{F} ay=aad jecésjajay biugga *(uu) qoray?
   writer-which FOC-2SG like.PRES.2SG book-the 3SG.M write.PST.3SG.M
   ‘[Which author]\textsubscript{F} do you like the book he wrote?’
   [Lecarme (1999):292]

b. [Gabadh-ee]\textsubscript{F} ay=ay\textsubscript{j} walaalahay\textsubscript{j} akhristeen buuga *(ay) keentay?
   girl-which FOC=3PL brothers-my read.PST.3PL book-the 3SG.F bring.PST.3SG.F
   ‘[Which girl]\textsubscript{F} did my brothers read the book which she brought?’

c. [Kum]\textsubscript{F}=aad rumaysantahay hadal-ka ah in*=%(uu) imaan-kii la kulmay?
   who.FOC=2SG believe talk-the be that=3SG.M imam-the with met
   ‘Who do you believe the claim that he met with the imam?’
   [Saeed (1984):148]

I argue that these two types of resumption—within embedded clauses and within islands—are in fact related. Specifically, I will argue that there is no specifier position on the embedding complementizer in Somali, rendering all embedded clauses inaccessible to higher probes. If correct, this analysis offers an appealing and relatively simple explanation for why resumptive pronouns are so prevalent in the language—the language severely restricts the development of movement chains due to the fact that embedded clauses lack specifiers, and thus successive cyclic movement cannot proceed.

4.1.2 Bridge Verbs

Though extraction out of an embedded clause in English is acceptable, it has been noted that the degree of acceptability depends on the embedding verb (Erteschik-Shir 1973, Weir 2014, a.o.).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{8}}\text{The degree of this ameliorating effect is the subject of ongoing debate and seems to be somewhat language specific. See, for instance, Alexopoulou and Keller (2013) for evidence that resumption does not improve the acceptability of whether islands in Greek. See also Meltzer-Asscher (2018), Morgan et al. (2018) and Hammerly (2018) for recent discussion of this issue.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{9}}\text{This is briefly suggested as a possible analysis, in different terms, by Svolacchia et al. (1995)}\]
The general claim is that extraction is only possible out of the complements of so-called ‘bridge verbs,’ such as say, think, tell, believe (56a). Extraction out of the complements of non-bridge verbs, such as manner-of-speaking verbs (56b) and factive predicates (56c), is degraded.

(56)  
   a.  Who did she think that he saw ____?
   b. ??Who did she mumble that he saw ____?
   c. ??Who did she realize that he saw ____?


One possible hypothesis to explain this phenomena is the ‘CP-Recursion’ hypothesis (de Haan and Weerman 1986, Iatridou and Kroch 1992, de Cuba and Ürögdi 2010, Weir 2014), which posits that the distinction between bridge and non-bridge verbs is the complexity of the complement that they select for. Bridge verbs select a recursive CP complement, while non-bridge verbs select a non-recursive CP.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(57)} & \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{BRIDGE VERB} \\
& \quad \text{CP}_1 \\
& \quad \text{C} \\
& \quad \text{CP}_2 \\
& \quad \emptyset \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(58)} & \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{NON-BRIDGE VERB} \\
& \quad \text{CP}_2 \\
& \quad \text{C} \\
& \quad \text{TP} \\
& \quad \emptyset \\
\end{align*}
\]

The central intuition behind this hypothesis is that bridge verbs select for a more articulated complement, and this added structure licenses various patterns they demonstrate. Perhaps counter to expectations, however, this additional structure must also facilitate extraction, as it is non-bridge verbs which must prevent movement out of their complement. In order to account for the extraction asymmetry between these two constructions, one would have to propose that the higher CP has a specifier that can act as an escape hatch. If the lower CP has no escape hatch, then extraction out of non-bridge verbs will be impossible.

In addition to the fact that their complements license extraction, bridge verbs have been observed to share several other properties which support an analysis of the distinction based on CP recursion. For instance, in German, verb second order is possible in embedded clauses only under bridge verbs. Bridge verbs, such as say (59a), allow the verb to appear in second position (a structure associated with main clauses). V2, on the other hand, is impossible with know, a non-bridge verb (59b). Instead, non-bridge verbs require verb-final order (59c).
(59)  

a. **Maria sagte, Hans hat das Buch gelesen**  
María said Hans has the book read  
‘Maria said Hans has the book read’  

b. * **Maria weiß, Hans hat das Buch gelesen**  
María knows Hans has the book read  
Intended: María knows Hans has read the book.  

c. **Maria weiß, daß Hans das Buch gelesen hat**  
María knows that Hans the book read has  
‘Maria knows that Hans has read the book.’  

[Weir (2014):239]

The contrast in (59) suggests that the CP layer is relevant to the difference between bridge and non-bridge verbs. Given the standard analysis of V2 as movement of the verb to C following a topic in Spec-CP (den Besten 1983), the fact that V2 is impossible under non-bridge verbs is understandable. There is no specifier of the embedded CP for a topic to move to, and thus V to C movement cannot take place.

In Standard German, however, V2 is in complementary distribution with an overt embedding complementizer.

(60)  

a. **Er sagte, er würde kommen**  
he said he would come  
‘He said he would come.’  

b. * **Er sagte, daß er würde kommen**  
he said that he would come  
Intended: He said that he would come.  


So, even though the V2 can be used as a diagnostic for the existence of an embedded specifier, the language doesn’t provide any direct evidence for a recursive CP structure. If bridge verbs have a recursive CP layer, and V2 involves movement of the verb to C, then we should expect to find languages where V2 can co-occur with overt complementizers.

In another Germanic language, Frisian, V2 optionally occurs under bridge verbs, even with an overt complementizer (61).

(61)  

a. **Pyt sei dat hy my sjoen hie**  
Pyt said that he me seen had  
‘Pyt said that he had seen me.’  

b. **Pyt sei dat hyie my sjoen**  
Pyt said that he had me seen  
‘Pyt said that he had seen me.’  

Thus, Frisian provides more direct evidence that there is, in fact, a recursive CP structure under bridge verbs (Iatridou and Kroch 1992).

This contrasts with non-bridge verbs, which, like German, cannot have have verb second order in their complement.

(62)  a. Pyt betreuret dat er my sjoen hie
    Pyt regrets that he me seen had
    ‘Pyt regrets that he had seen me.’
    b. *Pyt betreuret dat hy hie my sjoen
    Pyt regrets that he had me seen
    ‘Pyt regrets that he had seen me.’


This supports the hypothesis that the crucial distinction between these verbs is the size of the CP complement that they select for.

Another commonality among bridge verbs, noted by Weir (2014), is that sentence fragments can serve as their complements (63a). This contrasts with non-bridge verbs, under which embedded fragments are degraded (63b-d).

(63)  Q: What did John eat?
    a. Mary thinks/believes/was told/suspects/said/hopes/supposed/heard the cookies.
    b. *Mary whispered/sighed/quipped the cookies.
    c. ??Mary found out/confirmed/remembered/realized the cookies.
    d. *Mary is proud/is surprised the cookies.

[Weir (2014):235]

Weir argues that embedded fragments are a type of clausal ellipsis that is only licensed by the presence of the higher CP layer. It is the higher CP, selected for by bridge verbs, which triggers ellipsis. He proposes that this accounts for the contrast between bridge and non-bridge verbs.

A third distinction between bridge and non-bridge verbs, noted by Maki et al. (1999), is that fronting for information structure reasons is generally more acceptable under bridge verbs than non-bridge verbs. For instance, in English, there is a contrast between bridge and non-bridge verbs in terms of whether they allow topicalization in their complement. Bridge verbs such as believe (64a) allow topicalization, while non-bridge verbs such as regret do not (64b).

(64)  a. John believes that this book, Mary read.
    b. *John regrets that this book, Mary read.

[Maki et al. (1999):3]

A similar pattern is found in Japanese: bridge verbs allow topicalization within their complement (65a), while non-bridge verbs do not (65b).

---

10Though they note that this judgement is subject to inter-speaker variation.
In order to explain this contrast, Haegeman (2006) argues that bridge verbs take a recursive CP complement with a more articulated left-peripheries, including projections for topics and foci, while non-bridge verbs do not.

As we have seen, even verbs which cross-linguistically function as bridge verbs, such as say and think, cannot have a gap inside their complement in Somali. I argue that this is because there is no bridge/non-bridge distinction in Somali—all verbs act like non-bridge verbs. This proposal has three components, which conspire to predict the extraction facts. First, I argue that embedded clauses in Somali do not have a recursive CP structure. Second, I assume that the embedded complementizer is a phase head (Chomsky 2001), meaning its complement is inaccessible to higher probes. Third, I argue that the embedded CP has no specifier position through which successive cyclic movement could take place, analogously to non-bridge verbs in other languages. As there is no driver of movement to the phase-edge, extraction out of the embedded clause is impossible, which forces resumption.¹¹

4.1.3 Argument 1: Lack of extractability from complements of cross-linguistic bridge verbs

One key generalization about bridge verbs is that they tend to allow extraction out of their complement. The analysis of this generalization that I have sketched so far is that bridge verbs select for a recursive CP structure. The outer layer of this recursive structure has a specifier, through which successive cyclic movement can take place. However, in Somali, even verbs which cross-linguistically are bridge verbs do not allow extraction out of their complement without leaving a resumptive pronoun.¹²

¹¹This raises the question: why is resumption not used within the complement of non-bridge verbs in English? ¹²Unfortunately, I do not have access to data to confirm that the complements of verbs that typically are non-bridge also cannot be extracted out of. Based on descriptions in the literature, however, I expect that they also would require a resumptive. Indeed, it would be odd if Somali had the inverse extraction pattern as other languages (i.e. bridge verbs are islands and non-bridge verbs are not).
I note that this fact closely resembles the behavior of non-bridge verbs in other languages, such as English, which also disallow movement out of their complement without degradation. Additionally, as I will argue in the following subsections, there is reason to believe that the complement of verbs in Somali is not a recursive CP. Thus, the lack of extractability is understandable, when considered in the context of the bridge/non-bridge distinction.

4.1.4 Argument 2: Lack of Root Phenomena in Embedded Clauses

Another main generalization about bridge verbs cross-linguistically is that they tend to allow phenomena associated with main clauses (Main Clause Phenomena). Recall, for instance, that V2 order is possible under bridge verbs in German. Additionally, embedded clauses under bridge-verbs can be fragments, and in some languages, topicalization is possible in embedded clauses under bridge verbs.

Following Lecarme (1999) (and given the outline of the left-periphery proposed in Rizzi 1997), I assume that the Somali focus particle is in C, and focus fronting involves movement to its specifier. Given that embedded clauses in Somali are introduced with an overt complementizer, the proposal put forward here predicts that focus particles should be ungrammatical in embedded clauses, due to the fact that there is only one CP layer. This is borne out by the data:

(67)  \[\text{[Cali]}_F \text{ baa sheegay in=uu buug qoray} \]

Cali FOC=1SG say.PST C=3SG.M book write.PST

‘I said that [Cali]$_F$ wrote a book.’

[Stoyanova (2008):80]

Instead, foci in embedded clauses are fronted to the left-periphery of the main clause, leaving a resumptive pronoun behind. This observation seems to fit the general pattern that the CP selected for by Somali verbs is less articulated than main clause CPs. As there is no CP recursion in embedded clauses, there is no position to host topics or foci along with the overt complementizer.

4.1.5 Argument 3: Lack of Embedded Questions

If the analysis that I propose is correct, then we should expect to find no cases where something shows up in the specifier of the embedded CP. One type of construction that we might expect
this to happen is embedded questions. Assuming that embedded question involve movement of a wh-phrase to the specifier of the embedded CP, the analysis that I am proposing for Somali then predicts that embedded questions should not be possible in the language. This is, in fact, the case:

(68) a. *Ma garanayo kuma=uu raadinayo
    NEG know who=3SG.M look.for
    Intended: I don’t know who he is looking for.

b. Ma garanayo cid-da=uu raadinayo
    NEG know person-the=3SG.M look.for
    ‘I don’t know the person he is looking for.’

(69) a. *Weydii hal-kee=uu tegayo
    ask.IMP place-which=3SG.M go
    Intended: Ask him where he is going.

b. Weydii hal-ka=uu tegayo
    ask.IMP place-the=3SG.M go
    ‘Ask him the place he is going.’

(70) a. *Wax=aan la yaaban ahay max=ay u guursatay
    FOC=1SG at wondering be.1SG what=3SG.F for marry.PST.3SG.F
    Intended: I wonder why she married him.

b. Wax=aan la yaaban ahay sabab-ta ay u guursatay
    FOC=1SG at wondering be.1SG reason-DEF for marry.PST.3SG.F
    ‘I wonder the reason she married him.’

Instead of an interrogative embedded clause, the same meaning is conveyed in Somali by a noun modified by a relative clause. This is consistent with the analysis presented here. As there is no embedded specifier position, wh-words can not remain in embedded clauses.

4.2 Interim Summary

I have offered an explanation for why resumptive pronouns are obligatory in embedded clauses in Somali: embedded CPs are impenetrable phases in the language. To support this claim, I have drawn a parallel to non-bridge verbs in other languages, which also select for CP complements which prevent extraction. Following de Cuba and Ürőgdi (2010) and Weir (2014), among others, I have suggested that this pattern can be accounted for if verbs which resist extraction also select for a non-recursive CP complement. Additionally, I have offered three arguments from Somali to suggest that this is the right analysis. First, gaps are always prohibited in Somali embedded clauses. That is, they pattern like non-bridge verbs in other languages. Second, there is no embedded topic or focus position in Somali, suggesting a less articulated CP structure in embedded clauses. Third, I have found no evidence that there is an embedded specifier position which could function as an escape hatch. One construction in which we might expect the embedded specifier to host material—embedded questions—is not possible in the language. This lack of an escape hatch explains why resumption is required in long distance wh-movement. As embedded subjects are
across a phase boundary from the focus position, resumptive pronouns in that position are bound by a base-generated DP in focus position.

4.3 Resumption

Since at least Ross (1967), it has been observed that resumptive pronouns are able to fill a position in which a gap would be ungrammatical. There are several distinct theories, however, of how resumptive pronouns surface in that position. In the base-generation approach (McCloskey 1990, a.o.), pronouns are externally merged and obligatorily bound by a higher element within the clause.

(71)

There are several appealing aspects of this characterization of resumption. First, it can easily explain why resumptives cross-linguistically have the same phonological shape as regular pronouns. Resumptive pronouns are externally merged from the lexicon, like other pronouns, and only differ in the fact that they must be bound by another element in the clause. Second, this approach offers an explanation as to why resumptives (in many languages) can “save” structures that would be ill-formed with a gap in the same position, such as resumptives within islands or in weak crossover constructions. Under this characterization of resumption, there is no movement chain, and thus movement constraints are not violated.

Another well established proposal for resumptives is that they spell out the tail of a movement chain, under certain conditions. Intuitively, this approach is appealing because it easily accounts for the fact that resumptive pronouns appear in positions where we might otherwise “expect” a gap. More importantly, using reconstruction effects as a diagnostic, Sichel (2014) shows that for Hebrew there is good evidence that a movement chain is established between some resumptive pronouns and their antecedents. Crucially, Sichel demonstrates that Hebrew has both base-generated resumptive pronouns, as well as pronouns which spell out the tail of a movement chain. Using reconstruction as a diagnostic, she argues that optional pronouns arise from base generation and
that obligatory pronouns form a movement chain. In Sichel’s view, the tail of the movement chain is spelled-out in circumstances where a gap would be ungrammatical.\(^{13}\)

(72)

One key difference between these two resumption approaches, is the role that competition plays. In the spell-out approach, there is either a gap or a resumptive pronoun at the tail of a chain. This choice is not free, however. There is a preference for a gap whenever possible and resumptives appear as a “last resort” (Shlonsky 1992, Sichel 2014, a.o.). More formally:

(73) The tail of a movement chain is realized as a null copy when possible; a pronoun is possible only if a null copy is impossible.

[Adapted from Sichel (2014):678]

In the base-generation approach, there is, in a sense, also competition between gaps and resumptive pronouns. They both occupy the same positions, and are in complementary distribution. However, it is more apt to say that the base-generation approach relies on competition between derivations. Either a pronoun is merged and is bound by something else in the clause, or a DP is merged which undergoes movement and leaves a gap. The task, then, for the base-generation approach is to explain the circumstances under which resumption is not optional (either prohibited or obligatory), given that the two derivations are in principle possible.

In the previous section, I argued that Somali embedded clauses are islands for extraction, and alluded to the fact that this offers an explanation for the rampant resumption that we find in the language. The question remains however: what type of resumption do we find in Somali embedded clauses?

\(^{13}\)These are not the only approaches to resumption, of course. Boeckx (2003) argues that resumptive pronouns are the result of stranding; Demirdache (1991) argues that resumptives are a type of in-situ operator that undergoes LF movement. See chapter 3 of Salzmann (2017) for a recent overview.
Based on standard assumptions about islandhood and extraction, I argue that the base-generation approach can most straightforwardly account for island-insensitive resumption (see Saltzmann (2017) for the same point). As no movement occurs, constraints on movement are not expected to be violated. Given certain assumptions about islands however, a movement derivation is expected to be impossible.

A movement analysis of resumption, on the other hand, would be forced to explain why spelling out a low copy on a chain would ameliorate the island violation. Salzmann (2017) suggests one possibility: spell-out approaches could reframe islands as a type of PF constraint—the two derivations are distinguished solely on the basis of whether the tail of the chain is pronounced.

(74) Island Constraints
\[\alpha \ldots [\text{island} \ldots \beta] \text{ where } \beta \text{ is the trace of } \alpha \text{ and unpronounced.}\]

[Salzmann (2017):212]

This reanalysis of islands as a type of PF constraint has some appeal, especially considering the well-known fact that ellipsis can ameliorate islands (Merchant 1999, Ross 1969). However, as Salzmann notes, many languages with island-insensitive resumption also ameliorate islands with null pronouns. This is the case in Irish, for example.

(75) [amharc áilleachta] \ldots nachN bhfaca mé \langle mórán riamh aL bhéarfadh bua \quad \text{air} \quad \text{pro} \rangle
a.sight of.beauty \quad \text{NEG} \text{ saw} \quad \text{I much ever} \quad \text{C would.take victory on.it}
‘a sight of beauty that I have never seen much that would surpass it’

[McCloskey (1979):34]

McCloskey (1979) interprets the inflected preposition \textit{air} in (75) to indicate that there is a silent resumptive pronoun which amnesties the potential island violation.\(^{14}\) This seems to suggest that phonological overtness is not a necessary condition for island-ameliorating pronouns, thus weakening the argument that island constraints can be reduced to a constraint on phonological outputs.

Additionally, many languages do not allow reconstruction into islands, even if they contain a resumptive pronoun. This suggests that in these languages, resumptive pronouns within islands are not derived via a movement derivation. For instance, in Brazilian Portuguese, a pair-list reading is not possible when the resumptive pronoun bound by the wh-word is inside an island (76b). This contrasts with (76a), where the resumptive is not inside of an island, and reconstruction is possible.

(76) a. [Qual poema] \_ que o organizador disse que cada um dos professores vai falar
which poem \quad \text{C organizer said that each one of the professors will talk}
sobre ele,?
about it
‘Which poem did the organizer say that each of the professors will talk about?’

\[\text{wh} \quad > \quad \forall; \quad \forall > \quad \text{wh}\]

\(^{14}\)Note that this is not the only possible analysis. If the inflection on the preposition is indeed agreement, than this suggests that there must be null pronominal material for it to agree with. If, however, the inflected preposition is some sort of incorporated clitic, then the argument using Irish as evidence against a PF account of island constraints would weaken.
A similar point is made by Aoun et al. (2001), showing that reconstruction into islands in Lebanese Arabic is impossible. Consequently, these authors argue that resumptive pronouns within islands are not derived via movement, but instead the pronoun is externally merged within the island. The base-generation analysis can not only explain the lack of reconstruction in (76), but it can also straightforwardly explain why resumptive pronouns ameliorate island violations.

The analysis proposed here predicts that that syntactic reconstruction should be impossible inside all embedded clauses in Somali. Unfortunately, very little information about reconstruction in Somali has been reported in the literature, so I leave this as a prediction to be confirmed in future work. Ideally, one would use reconstruction as a diagnostic to confirm that Somali patterns with Lebanese Arabic and Brazilian Portuguese in terms of its reconstruction effects.

5 Direct Objects—Movement or Base-generation?

As we have seen, embedded clauses are not the only position that we find resumptive pronouns in Somali. Like Palestinian Arabic, resumptive pronouns are also obligatory in the direct object position of main clauses.

\[
(77) \quad \text{Axmed} \ [\text{adiga}]_{F} \ b=\u \quad *_{(\text{ku})} \ \text{arkay} \\
\text{Axmed} \ 2\text{SG} \quad \text{FOC}=3\text{SG} \quad 2\text{SG} \quad \text{see.PST.3SG} \\
`\text{Axmed saw [you]}_{F}`
\]

Given that resumptive pronouns can arise from distinct derivations, even within the same language (Sichel 2014, Aoun et al. 2001), there are, in principle, at least two possible hypotheses to explain this pattern. Either direct object resumptive pronouns are derived via the same derivation as embedded clause resumptives (i.e. are externally merged and bound), or they have a distinct derivational source (e.g. as the spell-out of the tail of a movement chain).

In the following two subsections, I will outline these hypotheses more precisely, and I will outline the limited data that I have to adjudicate between them. Additionally, I will sketch the predictions of each hypothesis that could be tested in future work. Ultimately, I will suggest that the current data indicates that a purely base-generation approach is most appropriate for Somali, due to the difficulty in formalizing the conditions under which the tail of a chain must be spelled-out. That said, more diagnostics, such as reconstruction, must be employed in future work to confirm that no movement has taken place.
5.1 Hypothesis 1—Extending the Phase-Based Account

In the previous section, I argued that resumption in Somali embedded clauses is obligatory because there is no specifier position on the embedding CP through which successive cyclic movement can take place. Because a movement derivation is impossible, unvalued features must be valued with an externally merged DP which binds a pronoun. For this type of derivation to extend to main clause objects, we would need to find a way to block movement from the main clause object position, forcing the base generation derivation. One possible way to do this would be to extend the phase-based analysis from §4 to all phases in the language.

Suppose that there are no escape hatches in Somali and all phrases generated within a phase are inaccessible to higher probes. If this were the case, then we would expect movement out of all phases to be restricted. As Somali allows pronouns to be merged and bound in positions where a gap is impossible, we would expect that resumptive pronouns could appear within a phase, while a gap could not. The question then: is the direct object within a phase, which would render it inaccessible to a probe on the matrix C?

It is commonly argued that, in addition to CP, vP is a phase (Chomsky 2001, Boeckx and Grohmann 2004). If vP is a phase in Somali, and if, like embedded CP, it has no escape hatch, then direct objects will be trapped and unable to move to a higher position in the clause. Given that Somali can merge and bind resumptive pronouns in positions where a gap is impossible, then the fact that a resumptive pronouns appears in the main clause direct object position follows from the fact that a movement derivation is impossible.

This hypothesis predicts that all movement out of vP should be obligatorily resumed by a pronoun. As we have seen, this is the case for focus-fronting of an object (77). Additionally, it correctly predicts that an object that appears before a polarity particle will be obligatorily resumed by a pronoun.\footnote{But see Keine (2017) for arguments against this view from Hindi-Urdu.}

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{Axmed} & \quad \text{adiga} \quad w=\text{ùu} \quad \star\text{(ku)} \quad \text{arkay} \\
\text{Axmed} & \quad \text{2SG} \quad \text{POL:POS=3SG.M} \quad \text{2SG} \quad \text{see.PST-3SG.M} \\
& \quad \text{‘Axmed saw you.’}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

\[\text{[Saeed (1999):166]}\]

Note that this hypothesis, though similar, is not identical to the claim I made in §4 about embedded clauses. It is not the case that vP does not have any specifier—that is the position that main clause subjects are base-generated. If, however, there are no derived specifiers of vP in Somali, then we might expect a main clause object to be unable to escape the phase. The trace of the subject will always occupy the only specifier of vP, and thus objects won’t be able to move through that specifier.

Additional support for this hypothesis comes from prepositional phrases, which have also been argued to be a phase (Abels 2012b). As with direct objects, indirect object PPs require require a resumptive pronoun when their complement has been focus fronted.\footnote{This movement is obligatory, however it is unclear what position the object is moving to and what the motivation is. One possibility is that it is moved to a functional projection above the polarity particle but below TP, the hypothesized position of the subject in these constructions (see §3.2.2) I speculate that this is some sort of obligatory object shift, though I note that the specifics are not relevant to the discussion here. The crucial point is that the object is moving out of the vP (evidenced by its position preceding the polarity particle) and is obligatorily resumed by a pronoun.}
(79) a. Axmed [annaga]$_F$ b-uu *(na)=la ordayay  
Axmed 1PL  FOC-3SGM 1PL=with run.PAST  
‘Axmed was running with [us]$_F$’  

[Meru (1999) pg. 233]

b. Aniga b=uu *(i)=la hadl-ay-aa  
1SG  FOC=3SG.M 1SG=with speak-PROG.3SG.M  
‘He is speaking with [me]$_F$’  

[Svolacchia and Puglielli (1999):103]

This further suggests that no phases are escapable in Somali. Dependencies that cross a CP, vP and PP boundary must terminate in a resumptive pronoun.

Matrix subjects, on the other hand, are base-generated at the phase edge and thus are accessible to higher probes. This means that movement, can proceed from the main clause subject position, which in turn can explain why there can be a gap in that position.

(80) Cali, baa t, nin-kii lacag-tii siinaya  
Cali  FOC  man-DEF money-DEF give.FUT.3SGM(P.A.)  
‘Cali will give the man the money.’  

[Saeed (1984):9]

This, along with the fact that direct object resumption is required, lends credence to the hypothesis that all XPs within a phase are inaccessible to higher probes in Somali. As the highest subject is the only DP generated on the phase edge, it is the only DP that can move and leave a gap.

In order to confirm this hypothesis, however, it is necessary to show that no movement has taken place when objects are fronted, and that resumptive pronouns are externally merged in that position and bound. One (imperfect) diagnostic that is available to determine if movement has taken place is Weak Crossover (Salzmann 2017). If a wh-word binds both a pronoun and a trace, and the trace does not c-command the pronoun, then the resulting structure is expected to be ungrammatical. If however, the resulting sentence is grammatical, then one possible explanation is that there is in fact no trace at all, and that the gap site is filled with an externally merged pronoun.

Lecarme (1999) argues that there is no WCO in Somali, based on examples like (81):

(81) Y$_i$-aa hooyad-iis, pro$_i$ jeceshahay?  
who-FOC mother-his 3SG.M loves  
‘Who$_i$ does his$_i$ mother love?’  


Assuming cross-over effects to be a diagnostic of movement, the lack of WCO in Somali supports the view that direct object resumptives (null in this case) are, or can be, bound by a DP that is externally merged higher in the clause. If the wh-word had moved to its fronted position, leaving a trace, then we would expect this configuration to violation WCO. As there is no violation, this suggests that no movement has occurred.

However, as Lasnik and Stowell (1991) point out, WCO is not a uniform phenomenon, and even within English there are sentences which seem to involve the offending structure but where no ungrammaticality arises:

17Recall that 3rd person object clitics are null in Somali.
Thus, the fact that we don’t see a violation of WCO in (81) is not a definitive argument that there is no movement.

An additional challenge to WCO as a diagnostic for movement in the domain of resumption comes from Sichel (2014). Sichel shows that in Hebrew there is evidence that WCO ameliorating pronouns can be derived by a movement chain. She argues, based on the fact that WCO ameliorating pronouns reconstruct in Hebrew, that the pronouns are the spell-out of the tail of a movement chain. Though Sichel does not offer a specific analysis of how the pronouns prevent WCO, her analysis suggests that a phonologically null trace may be the crucial element that creates ungrammaticality in WCO.

Hypothesis 1 has the appealing characteristic of reducing main clause object and embedded clause resumption to a single phenomenon: all DPs generated within a phase are inaccessible to higher probes, and are thus unable to move. Instead, Somali resorts to an alternative derivation: external merge of a pronoun which is bound by a DP higher in the clause. Additionally, using WCO as a movement diagnostic, there is some support for the claim that no movement has taken place from direct object position. However, evidence from Hebrew suggests that WCO ameliorating pronouns can be the result of a movement chain, given that they allow for reconstruction in that language. Though Sichel (2014) doesn’t offer an analysis of how resumptives prevent WCO, she suggests that the crucial difference lies with whether the wh-word binds a phonologically null trace (which triggers WCO) or an overt pronoun (which prevents it) (668:fn 8). Crucially, however, WCO ameliorating pronouns can be phonologically null in Somali (as in 81). Thus, a purely PF analysis of WCO would be forced to conclude that phonologically null pronouns can fix WCO violations, while phonologically null traces cannot. Given that a PF account of WCO would rely crucially on phonological well-formedness, it seems unlikely that a distinction would be made between different types of phonologically null material. This seems to suggest either that they are base-generated in that position, or that crucial contrast between traces and resumptive pronouns with respect to WCO does not lie in the phonology.

5.2 Hypothesis 2—Spell-Out of a Movement Trace

An alternative hypothesis to explain the distribution of resumptive pronouns in main clause object position would be to say that they are derived via spell-out of the tail of a movement chain, as Sichel (2014) argues is the case for obligatory resumptives in Hebrew.

An essential diagnostic for movement are reconstruction effects. If fronted direct objects can reconstruct into their base-generated position, then this suggests that movement has occurred. As far as I am aware, only one piece of data regarding reconstruction in Somali has been reported in the literature. According to Frascarelli and Puglielli (2007), a universal quantifier in a focus fronted position will reconstruct for scope into its base-generated position.

(83)  [Dhamman buugaag-ta]$_F$ b=ay  sadder-das arday gateen
    all  books-DEF  FOC=3PL three-DEF student buy.PST.3PL
    ‘The three students bought [every book]$_F$’
∀ > 3; 3 > ∀

[Frascarelli and Puglielli (2007):174]

This data is at least suggestive that movement has occurred, as each quantifier can take scope over the other. If the direct object *Dhamman buugaagta* is interpreted within the scope of the subject, then one possible explanation is that there is syntactic scope reconstruction.

This is not the only possibility, however. In order to independently confirm that the object is undergoing reconstruction in (83), one would have to rule out the possibility that the subject is undergoing optional quantifier raising to a position above the specifier of the focus particle. If a quantifier can undergo QR to a position above the focus particle, then we expect ambiguity in (83), even without having to appeal to reconstruction.

(84)

In order to compare these two possibilities, it is necessary to look at an example of a quantifier in subject position moving to the focus position, and determine if it is ambiguous. (85) is an untested sentence. I have not confirmed with a speaker that it is grammatical, nor if it is ambiguous.

(85)  

[Dhamman arday-da]₇ baa saddex-da buugaag gateen
all student-DEF FOC three-DEF book buy.PST.3PL
‘[Every student]₇ bought three books’

∀ > 3; (?) 3 > ∀

[Unelicited]

If this sentence is scopally ambiguous, and under one reading it can mean *there are three books that every student bought*, then this would suggest that quantifiers in object position can undergo quantifier raising to a position higher than the focus position. As the scope ambiguity could not be accounted for with syntactic reconstruction, there would have to be some other mechanism which creates the ambiguity. If, however, this sentence is not ambiguous, then it would suggest that reconstruction is in fact what causes the scope ambiguity in (83). This in turn would suggest that movement from the direct object position is possible, and that the tail of the chain is spelled out as a resumptive pronoun in certain circumstances.
The key challenge for a spell-out analysis of main clause resumptive pronouns in Somali, however, is determining the conditions under which the tail of a chain is spelled out. Assuming that the cross-linguistic preference for a gap over a pronoun holds in Somali, there must be some syntactic constraint that would force the tail of the chain to be spelled out.

I argued in §3.2.2 that intervention is not adequate to explain the fact that embedded clause resumption is obligatory. In (86), for instance, we would have to say that a non-focused subject intervenes for focus fronting of a direct object. Thus, the explanation for direct object resumption cannot be the same as Palestinian Arabic.

\[\text{Axmed} [\text{adiga}]_F b=\ddot{u}u *(\text{ku}) \text{arkay} \]
\[\text{Axmed} 2SG \quad \text{FOC}=3SG \quad 2SG \quad \text{see.PST.3SG} \]
\[\text{‘Axmed saw [you]}_F\text{’} \]

[\text{Saeed (1999):167}]

We don’t expect a non-focus subject to act as an intervener for a focused object (see discussion in §3.2.2). So, we would have to find some other constraint which forces the spell-out of the tail of a chain.

Additionally, this constraint would have to trigger spell-out in direct object position (86), but not in subject position (87).

\[\text{Adiga} baa moos \text{ cunaya} \]
\[2SG \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{banana eat.PROG.2SG} \]
\[\text{‘[You]}_F\text{ are eating a banana.’} \]

[\text{Mereu (1999):231}]

Finally, the constraint would have to force spell-out after extraction of a PP complement. In this sense, Somali is similar to Hebrew, another language that requires resumption when extracting out of a PP.

\[\text{Dani yimca et } \text{ha-iša, } \text{še-hu xolem aleya} \]
\[\text{Dani will.find ACC} \quad \text{DEF-woman C-3SG.M dreams of.3SG.F} \]
\[\text{‘Dani will find the woman he is dreaming of.’} \]

[\text{Sichel (2014):660}]

Similarly to the case of WCO, Sichel (2014) suggests that this constraint may be phonological. Preposition stranding is in fact quite rare typologically (van Riemsdijk 1978), and thus it may be the case that the requirement for this pronoun in Hebrew is a need for a preposition to have a phonological complement. However, in Somali, prepositions can have phonologically null complements, if the indirect object is 3rd person.\footnote{See Hoekstra (1995) for a similar analysis of preposition-stranding in Frisian.}

\[\text{Kumà}=ad \quad \text{pro}=lá \quad \text{joog-tay} \]
\[\text{who.FOC}=2SG \quad 3SG=\text{with stay.PST-2SG} \]
\[\text{‘Who did you stay with?’} \]

[\text{Saeed (1999):110}]

Once again, this suggests that an spell-out analysis could not rely on phonological well-formedness to trigger resumption of the complement of PPs.
5.3 Adjudicating Between the Two

In this section, I have made an empirical claim: focus-fronting of DPs that are generated within vP and PP requires resumption. Coupled with the facts of §4, this suggests that DPs within phases must be resumed by a pronoun. I sketched two potential analyses to explain this pattern. The first proposed that the fact that we always get resumption within phases is not a coincidence—in fact, if we suppose that Somali does not allow any movement out of a phase then the resumption pattern is expected. This hypothesis extended the analysis of embedded clauses to all phases, and proposed that there are simply no escape hatches on any phase in Somali. This forces resumption in all cases, except the highest subject.

This hypothesis was supported by one diagnostic which suggested that there is no movement from direct object position. Because we get no violations of WCO in Somali, a natural conclusion is that there is no movement. I noted however, that this diagnostic is not without its flaws—Sichel (2014) argues convincingly that WCO ameliorating pronouns in Hebrew are derived via movement.

I contrasted this with an alternative hypothesis which proposed that main clause resumptives are the spell-out of the trace of a movement chain. This proposal was supported by the fact that focus-fronting of a quantifier in direct object position leads to scope ambiguity, suggesting syntactic reconstruction. This diagnostic was also inconclusive, however, as the relevant data to distinguish reconstruction from quantifier raising is not present in the Somali literature.

In my view, however, this second hypothesis faces a larger challenge: what is the constraint or constraints which force the spell-out of the tail of the movement chain in all cases. It cannot be intervention (see §3.2), and it cannot be purely phonological, as 3rd person object clitics in Somali are phonologically null. It can’t, however, be a constraint which forces the spell-out of all local person pronouns, as local person subject dependencies terminate in a gap (87).

All in all, this evidence leads me to favor the first hypothesis, for two main reasons. First, the analysis offers an explanation for the empirical generalization that all dependencies across a phase boundary must terminate in a pronoun. Under this theory, this fact is not accidental, but is indicative of an underlying constraint which severely limits the development of movement chains. Second, it unifies all resumption in Somali as a single phenomenon. Though we see that some languages have multiple ways of deriving resumptive pronouns (Sichel 2014, Aoun et al. 2001), I continue to believe that a unified account is preferable on the grounds of simplicity, absent specific evidence to suggest that there are multiple resumptive strategies.

Of course, it cannot be stated enough that this analysis was formulated with limited data, and without data that would more conclusively argue for a movement or binding derivation. I leave to future work the testing of this hypothesis using diagnostics such as reconstruction. The predictions, however, are clear: if this analysis is on the right track, then all resumptive pronouns in Somali should block reconstruction.

6 General Discussion

6.1 Last Resort Resumption

A central debate in the study of resumptive pronouns is whether they only surface as a last resort (Shlonsky 1992, Pesetsky 1998 a.o.), or whether the choice between a movement derivation and a binding derivation is free (McCloskey 1990, a.o.). What does Somali, a language with obligatory
resumption in all positions except the highest subject position tell us about this question? In what sense can we say that a syntactic derivation is a last resort in a language, when that derivation is forced in almost all cases.

As we have seen, Shlonsky (1992) argues in favor of a last resort conception of resumption, using data from Hebrew and Palestinian Arabic. One of the most interesting things about his analysis is that he argues in favor of resumptive pronouns being a last resort not using a language like English, where resumption is marginal even in island contexts, but by using two languages which superficially seem to suggest that resumption is not last resort. In Hebrew there is optionality, and in PA resumption is required in all positions except one. Neither of these patterns seem to suggest that resumptive pronouns are dispreferred.

However, Shlonsky (1992) argues that both languages are consistent with, and in fact support a last resort conception of resumption. In both languages, according to his analysis, resumption is required when movement is blocked by some syntactic constraint. In broad terms, I have offered the same analysis for resumption in Somali—resumption is forced due to the fact that a movement chain can not be established across a phase boundary.

I do not believe, however, that Somali or Palestinian Arabic have much to say about whether resumption is a last resort. That argument requires a case where both a movement and a binding derivation are in principle possible, and the grammar demonstrates a preference for a gap over a pronoun. While this seems to be the case in Hebrew, it is not the situation in Somali and Palestinian Arabic. In both of these languages, movement chains are severely restricted in their distribution, due to variation in the CP layer. Shlonsky successfully demonstrates that resumption is used in the cases that movement is blocked, but he does not show that resumption is triggered as a result of movement being blocked. He claims that resumptive pronouns cannot be freely merged from the lexicon like other pronouns, and only surface when a movement derivation has failed. However, if binding of a resumptive pronoun was an equally valid way of establishing an A-dependency (as suggested in McCloskey 2002), then we would expect that derivation to be employed obligatorily in situations where movement is impossible. So, the very fact that movement is blocked in PA weakens the claim that Shlonsky (1992) makes about last resort resumption.

In order to support his argument, Shlonsky (1992) relies on the fact that resumptives are disallowed in the highest subject position—a fact that he attributes to a lack of an independent base-generation derivation available to the grammar and economy constraints. However, this conclusion is only holds if there are no independent grounds on which resumptive pronouns can be prohibited from the highest subject position. If however, there is independent reason to believe that resumptive pronouns cannot occur in the highest subject position, then the conclusion that Shlonsky (1992) draws is unfounded.

In the following section, I will consider one such proposal in the context of Somali.

6.2 Constraints on Resumptives

It has been noted for many languages that resumptive pronouns are not possible in the highest subject position (McCloskey 1990, McCloskey 2007). This is the case, for example, in Hebrew (90a) and Irish (90b).
Though both of these languages optionally allow resumptives in the main clause direct object, as well as embedded clause positions, they are categorically restricted from appearing in the main clause subject position.

The same holds for Somali, both in relative clauses\(^\text{(91)}\) and focus constructions (92).

\[\text{(91)}\]
\[
\text{gabar-ta} (*\text{ay}) \quad \text{muus-ka } \text{cuntay } \text{waa } \text{wala-ashay}
\]
\[
girl-\text{DEF} (*\text{3SG.F}) \quad \text{banana-DEF eat.PST.3SG.F POL:POS} \quad \text{sister-my}
\]
\`
The girl who ate the banana is my sister.
\`

\[\text{(92)}\]
\[
[Cali]_F \quad \text{baa}(*=\text{uu}) \quad \text{nin-kii } \text{lacag-tii } \text{siinaya}
\]
\[
[Cali]_F \quad \text{FOC}(*=\text{3SG.M}) \quad \text{man-DEF money-DEF give.FUT.3SG.M(PA)}
\]
\`
[Cali]_F will give the man the money.
`

It is clear then that, whatever the mechanism that produces resumptives, they are restricted from the highest subject position, even in a language in which they are obligatory in all other positions.

In Shlonsky (1992), he argues that the resumptives are restricted from the highest subject due to economy constraints. Shlonsky proposes that resumptives are prohibited from occurring, due to their last resort nature, as there is no syntactic constraint that prevents movement from the highest subject position. In fact, Shlonsky uses this fact to argue in favor of his analysis of pronouns as a last resort. He interprets the impossibility of resumptive pronouns in the highest subject position as demonstrating that there is no independent binding derivation. That is, if we believed that movement and binding were both equally possible derivations, then we would expect a binding derivation to be possible for the highest subject as well, and we would expect a pronoun is possible. However, as that configuration is impossible, Shlonsky views this as evidence that the binding derivation in Palestinian Arabic must only arise as a last resort—it can only take place when movement is impossible.

This argument in favor of the last resort status of resumptives only holds, however, if there is no independent reason that we might expect pronouns to be impossible in the highest subject position. McCloskey (1990) (following Aoun and Li (1989)) suggests another possibility: extend Condition B of binding theory to include \(\AA\)-binding. The central intuition being that, pronouns in general are subject to anti-locality requirements, and that this resistance to bind a pronouns too locally also describes the pattern of the HSR. Following McCloskey (1990), this restriction is formalized in (93):

\(\text{Note that there is no relative pronoun in Somali.}\)
(93) **THE Ā DISJOINT REQUIREMENT**
A pronoun must be Ā-free in the least complete functional complex containing the pronoun and a subject distinct from the pronoun.


This definition relies on the concept of a domain in which a pronoun must be free, here defined as the CFC, following Chomsky (1986).

(94) **COMPLETE FUNCTIONAL COMPLEX**
An $X^{max}$ which contains a subject. A subject is a DP which occupies the specifier of vP, TP or DP.

The Ā-disjoint requirement prevents resumptives from appearing in the highest subject position by preventing binding from occurring within the CFC.

To see how this constraint can be applied to Somali, consider the contrast in (95):

(95) a. [CFC Adiga baa moos cunaya]
   2SG FOC banana eat.PROG.2SG
   ‘You are eating a banana.’
   [Mereu (1999):231]

b. Axmed adiga [CFC b=ìu * (ku) arKay]
   Axmed 2SG FOC=3SG 2SG see.PST.3SG
   ‘Axmed saw you’
   [Saeed (1999):167]

Because the subject focus involves movement within the CFC, it cannot bind a pronoun in the highest subject position (95a). However, when the direct object is fronted to a position higher than the subject, it crosses the boundary of a CFC and thus can (and in fact must) bind a resumptive (95b).

Thus, the fact that there is another reason that resumptive pronouns may be prohibited in the highest subject position substantially weakens the argument in Shlonsky (1992) that PA demonstrates that resumptive pronouns are a last resort. I don’t mean to suggest that this constitutes evidence against the claim that resumptive pronouns are a last resort, merely that it is not positive evidence to support that claim.

### 6.3 Locus of variation in the CP layer

Though I believe that the main claim of Shlonsky (1992) is not supported by the data in that paper, I believe that a comparison between PA and and Somali further supports an ancillary point made in that paper: patterns of resumptive pronouns cross-linguistically often depend not on properties of the pronouns themselves, but on variation within the CP layer. Shlonsky (1992) claims, based on his conception of resumption as a last resort operation, that apparently optional pronouns actually represent optionality within the CP domain. Under this view, Hebrew has two homophonous specifiers, one of which has an Ā-specifier (and triggers intervention effects) and one of which has an Ā-specifier (which does not).
Though I have argued against the specific implementation of resumption proposed in Shlonsky (1992), the proposal that I put forward in the previous section is broadly consistent with the core ideas of his analysis: resumptive pronouns surface in Somali when a movement derivation is impossible and movement is blocked by a property of the CP layer. In the case of Somali, I have argued that the CP layer does not have a specifier, and thus embedded clauses are inaccessible phases in the language.

This connection between resumption and the CP layer is by no means restricted to Somali and Palestinian Arabic. Perhaps the most well known case is Irish, which has a different complementizer depending on the type of \(\lambda\)-dependency that it mediates. If there is no \(\lambda\)-dependency across the CP, the complementizer is realized as \(go\) (96a). If there is a movement dependency with a gap in the embedded clause, the complementizer is realized as \(aL\) (96b). If there is a resumptive pronoun in the embedded clause, the complementizer is realized as \(aN\) (96c).

(96) 

a. *Creidim gu-r inis sé bréag.*
believe.1sg go-pst tell he lie
‘I believe that he told a lie.’
b. *an ghirseach a ghoid na síogaí*
the girl aL stole the fairies
‘the girl that the fairies stole away’
c. *an ghirseach a ghoid na síogaí í*
the girl aN-pst stole the fairies her
‘the girl that the fairies stole away’


McCloskey (2002) argues that the difference between (96b) and (96c) depends on whether Spec-CP is filled via internal or external merge. In the case that a movement derivation proceeds and the specifier is filled with an internally merged copy of an XP within the embedded clause, \(aL\) is spelled out as the head of C. If however, the there is no movement and Spec-CP is filled with an operator via external merge, \(aN\) is spelled out. Finally, if nothing occupies the specifier of C then the default \(go\) complementizer is spelled out.

(97)  

\(C\) whose specifier is filled by \(MOVE\) is realized as \(aL\).
\(C\) whose specifier is filled by \(MERGE\) is realized as \(aN\).
\(C\) whose specifier is not filled is realized as \(go\).

[McCloskey (2002):22]

Like the Somali complementizer, \(go\) does not project a specifier, but resumptive pronouns can be bound within its complement, as long as there is a binder in a higher clause (98). Additionally, like the Somali complementizer, CPs headed by \(go\) cannot contain a gap.

(98) *An t-ór seo ar chreid corr-duine go raibh sé ann*
the gold DEM aN thought some-people go was it there
‘this gold that some people thought was there’

Thus, in addition to the general claim that resumptive patterns are affected by the CP layer, a more direct link between Somali and Irish can be drawn. Somali fits within the expected range of complementizer variation that we expect. It just so happens that Somali only has one complementizer, which forces a specific resumptive pattern, while Irish has three.

6.4 Multiple Specifiers and the Effect on Resumption

The analysis presented in this paper proposes that movement out of a phase is restricted in Somali due to the Phase Impenetrability Condition. That is, because focus probes can only target the the phase head and the edge position, only the highest subject is able to undergo focus movement without resumption. Given the assumptions of the Minimalist Program, however, we expect that multiple specifier positions are possible, and that this configuration is used to allow for multiple extractions out of a phase (Chomsky 1995). One domain where we see evidence of multiple specifiers is in multiple wh-questions. In Bulgarian, for instance, move than one wh-word will be fronted to the specifier of CP.

(99) Koj kogo vižda?
    who whom sees
    ‘Who sees whom?’

[Rudin (1988):449]

This can be contrasted with English, where one wh-word will move, but a second wh-word will remain in situ.

(100) a. Who sees whom?
    b. *Who whom sees?

Presumably, this contrast depends on the possibility of multiple specifier positions, or on the ability of the grammar to check features covertly.

In addition to multiple wh-movement, multiple specifiers have been used to explain multiple nominal arguments in Japanese (Vermeulen 2005), differences in scrambling between Japanese and German (Grewendorf and Sabel 1999), multiple subject constructions in Icelandic (Mulders 1997), among other phenomena.

If the analysis presented here is on the right track, then the pattern of resumptive pronouns of resumptive pronouns in Somali is related to two (presumably independent) properties of the language. First, the embedding complementizer in Somali does not project a specifier. As argued in §4, this fact can explain why resumptive pronouns are always required in embedded clauses. I argue that this is due to a property of the lexical item itself. The embedded complementizer in Somali simply is not merged with a feature that drives movement to its edge.

Second, multiple specifier constructions are not possible in the language, which prevents the direct object from escaping vP. According to Chomsky (1995), the ability to project multiple specifiers could be due to a parameterized property of whether a feature is deleted after it is checked. Languages which don’t immediately delete features could have them checked multiple times, leading to multiple movements to specifier position to check the same feature. If Somali simply doesn’t allow this possibility, then no multiple specifier constructions will be possible. Specifiers will only
appear due to selectional requirements (such as the specifier of vP), or via checking of a single feature (such as the specifier of the focus particle).

Once again, Somali falls well within the range of expected variation among languages, yet a particular confluence of facts forces the rampant resumption pattern that it displays. Importantly, it is not the case that Somali categorically lacks specifiers. We see, for instance from focus-fronting that the focus particle projects a specifier. Additionally, I assume that the subject is merged as the specifier of vP. However, because vP cannot have multiple specifiers, the direct object cannot move to an edge position to escape the phase.

This hypothesis additionally predicts that unaccusative verbs should pattern the same as unergative verbs in the language. If there is no argument base-merged into the specifier of vP, then a subject merged as the complement of VP should still be able to move to the vP edge and then escape the phase. This prediction seems to be correct. Focusing the subject of an unaccusative verb does not trigger resumption.

(101)  
Cali baa dhintay shaley  
Cali FOC die.PST.3SG.M yesterday  
‘[Cali]F died yesterday.’

[Saeed (1999):241]

This seems to support the idea that vP can have one, and only one specifier in Somali. This restriction, coupled with the PIC, contributes directly to the rampant resumption in the language.

7 Implications and Conclusion

7.1 Focus and Resumption

Cross-linguistic study of topic and focus construction has revealed a robust generalization about how these positions differ with respect to pronouns (Rizzi 1997, Neeleman and Van de Koot 2016, Skopeteas et al 2017, Aissen to appear):

(102)  
RESUMPTIVE GENERALIZATION  
In many languages, topics antecede an associated pronoun/clitic and foci do not.

This pattern is apparent in Italian (103), English (104), and many other languages.

(103)  
a.  
[Il tuo libro]T, *(lo) ho comprato  
DEF 2SG.POSS book *(it) have.1SG bought  
‘[Your book]T, I bought it.’

b.  
[Il tuo libro]F *(lo) ho comprato, (non il suo)  
DEF 2SG.POSS book *(it) have.1SG bought NEG DEF 3SG.POSS  
‘[Your book]F I bought, (not his).’

[Rizzi (1997):289-290]

(104)  
a.  
As for [Ursula]T, *(she) became a famous writer.

b.  
It was [Ursula]F who *(she) became a famous writer.
In languages where this generalization holds, left-dislocated topics must be doubled by a coreferential pronoun. This contrasts with left-dislocated foci, which cannot be doubled by a resumptive pronoun. An important task, then, for the study of information structure and research into the nature of pronouns is to offer a hypothesis to explain the robustness of the pattern. Why is it the case that it appears in so many languages of the world, including those which are not genetically related to one another?

Recall that this generalization also holds in the main clauses of Somali. Left-dislocated topics must double a pronoun (105a) and left-dislocated foci cannot (105b):

(105) a. \[\text{Cali}_T \text{[lacagt-ii]}_F b=*(uu) \text{ nink-ii siinaya}a\]
Calī money-DEF FOC=3SG.M man-DEF give.FUT.3SG.M
‘[Calī]ₚ will give the man [the money]ₚ.’

b. \[\text{Cali}_F \text{bad(=*uu)} \text{ nin-kii lacag-tii siinaya}\]
Calī FOC man-DEF money-DEF give.FUT.3SG.M(PA)
‘[Calī]ₚ will give the man the money.’

[Saeed (1984):9]

Many previous analyses of this contrast rely on semantic differences between topic and focus. Rizzi (1997), following Cinque (1990), explains the contrast in Italian by arguing that focus is quantificational and must bind a syntactic variable. Because he assumes that syntactic variables must be non-pronominal, it follows that a clitic cannot be bound by a focus. That is, he claims there is a fundamental incompatibility between the semantics of resumption and the semantics of focus focus.

However, as we have seen, in Somali, focus is not incompatible with resumptive pronouns. Focus fronting out of an embedded subject triggers resumption in the embedded clause:

(106) \[\text{Cali}_F b=aan sheegay [CP in=uu buug qoray]\]
Calī FOC=1SG say.PST C=3SG.M book write.PST
‘I said that [Calī]ₚ wrote a book.’

[Svolacchia et al. (1995):89]

In fact, as I have argued in §4, the fact that resumptive pronouns are bound by a focused constituent is expected, given the structure of embedded CP. As there is no escape hatch out of phases in the language, focus fronting out of an embedded clause is impossible, and therefore a resumptive pronoun is used.

I argue that this fact, as well as the broader distribution of clitics in the language, casts doubt on the hypothesis that there is a fundamental semantic incompatibility between focus and resumption, as proposed by Rizzi (1997). As there is no reason to expect that a semantic restriction on focus resumption would be clause-bounded, an alternative hypothesis is required to explain the contrast between topic and focus in (105).

So far, I have offered an explanation for why a resumptive pronoun would be required with focus out of an embedded clause, and why it would be prohibited in the main clause. Why don’t topics follow the same pattern? I claim that this follows from the analysis presented here, by making three assumptions. First, following Lecarme (1999), I assume that the focus particle is the head of the matrix CP. This is consistent with the articulated CP proposed in Rizzi (1997), and is
consistent with the generalization that wh-words move to the specifier of CP cross-linguistically. Second, I assume that the matrix CP headed by the focus particle is a phase. Third, I assume that, like other phases in Somali, the matrix CP does not allow derived specifiers—that is, there is only one edge position through which movement can occur.

Given these assumptions, then we expect that topics—which are structurally higher than foci—will obligatorily bind a resumptive pronoun within the CP. Because the topic phrase is outside of the phase, its probe will only be able to find the phase head (i.e. the focus particle) or the phase edge (i.e. the constituent in focus). XPs with the feature [TOP] generated within a phase, which could in theory undergo topic movement, will not be able to undergo movement to the phase edge, and thus will be inaccessible to a higher probe.20

A crucial difference, then, between focus and topics in Somali is that focus movement is phase-internal, and topic movement would cross a phase boundary. Given the specific constraints on movement across phase boundaries present in Somali, topic movement is impossible and a resumptive pronoun is bound.

Thus, I speculate that an alternative cross-linguistic generalization that distinguishes topics and foci (Rizzi 1997, Neeleman and Van de Koot 2016) may explain the contrast between topic and focus resumption in Somali:

(108)  STRUCTURAL GENERALIZATION

Topics appear in a structurally higher position than foci.

I argue that the relative position of topics and foci within the Somali clause forces them to enter into different syntactic dependencies, which can explain the contrast in (105). Specifically, I argue that—because topics are in a structurally higher position than foci—movement of a subject to a topic position violates syntactic constraints on movement. Specifically, topic movement is, for all intents and purposes, impossible due to the PIC. Because the matrix CP has only one specifier, which is filled by a constituent in focus, any XP generated within the main clause will be inaccessible to a topic probe above the focus particle. As movement is not possible, topics bind a resumptive pronoun within the main clause instead.

20I assume that no XP can be marked both as a foci and as a topic, given the pragmatic incompatibility of these two categories. Thus, if an XP moves into the specifier of the focus particle, it will have a focus feature, and consequently will not have the necessary feature to interact with the topic probe.
Of course, this explanation of the contrast, while promising for Somali, may have trouble capturing the larger cross-linguistic generalization that topics must be resumed by a pronoun. Other languages without the same restriction on movement would not force resumption with topics. However, we see that many languages do require topic resumption, even languages like English which does not seem to have a particularly robust resumption strategy. It may be the case, however, that other factors influence the presence or absence of doubled pronouns. Other researchers point to semantic requirements of topics to explain the contrast: topics are specific and pronouns are required to induce the requisite specificity effects (Arregi 2003, Callegari 2017). If correct, then this implies that it is not a restriction on focus resumption, but instead a requirement for topic resumption, which may explain the robustness of the Resumptive Generalization.

While I leave the precise formulation of how Somali fits into the broader typology of topic-resuming languages, I note that Somali can join a growing list of languages that apparently allow resumptive pronouns to be co-referential with focused constituents (following Skopeteas et al 2017, Drubig and Schaffer 2001; pace Neeleman and Van de Koot 2016). If this analysis is correct, then it implies that there is no fundamental incompatibility between focus and resumption, and thus some other explanation is needed to explain the robustness of the generalization in (102).

7.2 Conclusion

The central goal of this paper was to offer an analysis to explain the pattern of resumption in Somali, a language where resumptive pronouns are not the exception, but the rule. The analysis that I have presented here argues that resumptive pronouns are required in Somali as a consequence of its syntactic structure: the embedding complementizer does not project a specifier, and thus all XPs within an embedded clause are inaccessible to higher syntactic operations, due to the Phase Impenetrability Condition. Additionally, I have suggested, albeit with limited direct evidence, that no movement out of any phase is possible in Somali, triggering resumption of direct objects within vP and indirect object complements of PPs.

I argued for this analysis over an alternative, based on Shlonsky (1992), where resumption is triggered due to the effect of intervention from the main clause subject. Ultimately, I argued against the specific implementation of Shlonsky’s analysis that relied on the A/Â distinction, as well as a more generalized intervention effect. I showed that, because resumption applies to both wh- and focus fronting in Somali, an intervention account would be forced to make unmotivated assumptions about the feature geometry.

Despite rejecting the analysis in Shlonsky (1992) as a way of accounting for the facts of Somali, the analysis proposed here does share something with the Shlonsky’s proposal: it identifies the locus of variation for resumptive patterns within the CP layer. Thus, Somali fits squarely within the range of expected variation among languages. Even though resumption may be dispreferred to movement cross-linguistically, the syntactic structure of Somali requires it in all cases but one.
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