

On the nature of the *that*-trace effect: insights from Igbo

Doreen Georgi

(doreen.georgi@uni-potsdam.de)

Mary Amaechi

(amaechi.mc@unilorin.edu.ng)

NELS 54, MIT

January 26, 2024

Introduction

- **That-Trace Effect** (Perlmutter 1968; 1971; Bresnan 1972; 1977):
unlike long non-SU extraction, long SU extraction requires repairs in the C-domain in many languages
 - (1) Long wh-movement in English (Perlmutter 1968: 214):
 - a. What did he say **that** Laura hid ___?
 - b. Who did he say (***that**) ___ hid the rutabaga?
- linear/PF-accounts vs. structural accounts (Pesetsky 2017)

“Even at a relatively broad level of generality, it has proven-frustratingly hard to determine just what kind of phenomenon the complementizer-trace effect is.” (ibid., p.10)
- in-depth studies available only for a few languages

Introduction

- **Aim:** to shed light on the nature of the TTE with new data from Igbo
- **Why Igbo?**
 - rich in repair strategies
 - good understanding of its (\bar{A})-syntax based on our previous work
 - its grammatical profile allows us to apply diagnostics that could not be applied in the other TTE-languages that have been studied so far
- **Claims:**
 - ① the TTE in Igbo is not a PF-phenomenon
→ evidence from the distribution of resumptive pronouns
 - ② Igbo provides new evidence for an anti-locality-based approach
→ evidence: subextraction from subjects

Overview

- 1 Short \bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo
- 2 The Igbo TTE and its repairs
- 3 Arguments against a surface PF-account
 RPs as PF-requirements
 The syntax of the RP-repair of the TTE
- 4 Arguments for an AL-approach
- 5 Conclusions

Overview

- 1 Short \bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo
- 2 The Igbo TTE and its repairs
- 3 Arguments against a surface PF-account
 - RP as PF-requirements
 - The syntax of the RP-repair of the TTE
- 4 Arguments for an AL-approach
- 5 Conclusions

Igbo (Benue-Kwa)

- (2) Ézè hù-rù Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze see-rV Ada P-market
 "Eze saw Ada at the market."

- tones: low (à), high (á); downstep ([!]á) – context: 2 adjacent H-tones
- no morphological case, no agreement, no pro-drop
- rich verbal morphology: TAM, polarity, derivation (-rV: finiteness marker)
- clause structure (Amaechi and Georgi 2019; Amaechi 2020):

- (3) $[_{CP} C [_{TP} DP_{ext} [_{T'} V+V+ASP+T [_{ASPP} <ASP> [_{VP} <DP_{ext} > [_{V'} <V> [_{VP} <V> DP_{int}]]]]]]]]$

- personal pronouns:

	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
(4) DEP	–	i	o	–	–	–
INDEP	ḿ	ǵ	yá	ànyí	únù	há
POSS	!ḿ	!ǵ	!yá			!há

Igbo: short \bar{A} -dependencies

- \bar{A} -dependency investigation: **focus fronting** (Amaechi & Georgi 2019, Georgi & Amaechi 2022); not a cleft! (Amaechi 2020)

- (5) a. Ézè hụ-rụ Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze see-rV Ada P-market
 "Eze saw Ada at the market." *baseline*
- b. Àdá kà Ézé hụ-rụ — n'-áhíá
 Ada FOC Eze see-PST — P-market
 "Eze saw ADA at the market." *non-SU focus*

- focus fronting is derived by \bar{A} -movement (Georgi and Amaechi 2023):

- (6) Movement diagnostics:

	island-sens.	reconstr.	<i>pg</i> -licensing	LSMDs
focus	✓	✓	✓	✓

(LSMD = language-specific movement diagnostic)

Language-specific \bar{A} -movement diagnostics

1. **floating H-tone** (Robinson 1974; Tada 1995; Manfredi 2018):
 \bar{A} -movement triggers a floating H-tone in C; with non-SU \bar{A} -movement the H-tone surfaces on the final TBU of crossed-over subjects

- (7) a. **Ézè** hù-rù Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze see-rV Ada P-market
 "Eze saw Ada at the market." *declarative*
- b. Àdá kà **Ézé** hù-rù _____ n'-áhíá
 Ada FOC Eze see-PST _____ P-market
 "Eze saw ADA at the market." *DO focus*

2. **ná-particle** (Green and Igwe 1963; Goldsmith 1976; Nwachukwu 1976; Amaechi 2020): \bar{A} -mvt. in a clause with sent. NEG requires the particle *ná*

- (8) a. Ézè **á-[!]hù-ghí** Àdá
 Eze NMLZ-see-NEG Ada
 "Eze did not see Ada." *declarative*
- b. Àdá kà Ézè ***(ná) [!]á-hù-ghí** _____
 Ada FOC Eze PRT NMLZ-see-NEG _____
 "Eze did not see ADA." *DO focus*

Language-specific \bar{A} -movement diagnostics

- note: the floating H-tone + the *ná*-particle are in complementary distribution
 - Amaechi (2020): they realize the same left-peripheral head + \bar{A} -movem.
 - floating H-tone: arises in the context of positive polarity
 - *ná*-particle: surfaces in the contexts of negative polarity
3. perfective islands (Nwachukwu 1976; Amaechi 2020): \bar{A} -movement is blocked in a clause with perfective aspect

- (9) a. $\acute{E}z\grave{e}$ \grave{e} - $r\acute{i}$ - \acute{e} - $l\acute{a}$ $!j\acute{i}$
 Eze NMLZ-eat-OVS-PFV yam.POSS
 "Eze has eaten yam." *declarative*
- b. * $J\acute{i}$ $k\grave{a}$ $\acute{E}z\acute{e}$ \grave{e} - $r\acute{i}$ - \acute{e} - $l\acute{a}$ _____
 yam FOC Eze NMLZ-eat-OVS-PFV
 "Eze has eaten YAM." *DO focus*

(OVS: open vowel suffix, see Amaechi 2020: ch. 4.6.2)

Language-specific \bar{A} -movement diagnostics

These effects diagnose \bar{A} -movement:

- absent with base-generation (topicalization, Georgi and Amaechi 2023)

(10) Movement diagnostics:

	island-sens.	reconstr.	<i>pg</i> -licensing	LSMDs
focus	✓	✓	✓	✓
topical.	*	*	*	*

- absent with A-movement (EPP-movement to SpecT), see (10-a), (11)

(11) Ézè (*ná) á-¹gá-ghí à-hú Àdá
 Eze PRT NMLZ-FUT-NEG NMLZ-see Ada
 “Eze will not see Ada.”

- not triggered by focus-in-situ (Amaechi 2020; Georgi and Amaechi 2023)
- they are cyclic (see below)

Gaps vs. resumptives

- \bar{A} -movement (e.g., focus fronting) of verbal arguments requires a gap
- base-generation (topicalization) of any XP requires an RP

- (12) a. Àdá kà Ézé hụ-rụ _____ / *yá
 Ada FOC Eze see-rV 3SG.DEP
 “Eze saw ADA.” *DO focus*
- b. Àdá, Ézè hụ-rụ yá _____ / *____
 Ada Eze see-rV 3SG.INDEP
 “As for Ada, Eze saw her.” *DO topic*

- \bar{A} -movement also requires an RP in some contexts, e.g., extraction of a conjunct (Goldsmith 1981; Georgi and Amaechi 2023)

- (13) a. Ézè hụ-rụ [&P Àdá nà Òbí]
 Eze see-rV Ada and Obi
 “Eze saw Ada and Obi.” *baseline*
- b. Àdá kà Ézé hụ-rụ [&P yá _____ / *____ nà Òbí]
 Ada FOC Eze see-rV 3SG.INDEP _____ and Obi
 “Eze saw ADA and Obi.” *conjunct focus*

Gaps vs. resumptives

- crucially, short focus fronting with an RP also involves \bar{A} -movement:

(14) Movement diagnostics:

	island-sens.	reconstr.	<i>pg</i> -licensing	LSMDs	bottom
focus	✓	✓	✓	✓	gap
focus	✓	✓	✓	✓	RP
topical.	*	*	*	*	RP

- ⇒ 2 types of RPs: RPs in base-generation and in \bar{A} -movement dependencies
- ⇒ RPs in focus fronting construction are (partial) realizations of low copies
- ⇒ &P (+ PPs, DPs) are not (absolute) islands in Igbo

Overview

- ① Short \bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo
- ② The Igbo TTE and its repairs
- ③ Arguments against a surface PF-account
 - RP as PF-requirements
 - The syntax of the RP-repair of the TTE
- ④ Arguments for an AL-approach
- ⑤ Conclusions

The TTE in Igbo (Uwalaka 1991, Amaechi & Georgi 2019)

- embedded declaratives are introduced by an overt complementizer; default declarative C: **nà**; further option: **sí**

(15) Úchè chère-rè **nà** / **sí** / *Ø Ézè hù-rù Àdá n'-áhíá
 Uche think-rV C / C / C Eze see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that Eze saw Ada at the market.”

- Long non-SU focus fronting applies as expected; no change in C-forms:

(16) Àdá kà Úché chère-rè **nà** / **sí** / *Ø Ézé hù-rù n'-áhíá
 Ada FOC Uche think-rV C / C / C Eze see-rV P-market
 “Uche thought that Eze saw ADA at the market.”

- **Long subject focus** across the *nà*-C (with a gap) is ungrammatical:

(17) *Ézè kà Úché chère-rè **nà** hù-rù Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.”

The TTE in Igbo (Uwalaka 1991, Amaechi & Georgi 2019)

(18) **3 repair strategies for long SU focus** (Uwalaka 1991):

- a. **Ézè kà** Úché ché-ré **Ø** — ¹hụ-¹rụ Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C — see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.” *zero C*
- b. **Ézè kà** Úché chè-rè **sị** — ¹hụ-¹rụ Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C — see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.” *special C*
- c. **Ézè kà** Úchè chè-rè **nà ọ** hụ-rụ Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C 3SG.DEP see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.” *C + RP*

Similar repairs in other languages:

- Ø-C: Levantine Arabic (Kenstowicz 1989), Scandinavian varieties (Lohndal 2009)
- special C: French (Perlmutter 1971), Nupe (Kandybowicz 2006), Wolof (Martinović 2017)
- C+RP: Levantine Arabic (Kenstowicz 1989), Vata (Koopman and Sportiche 1982)

Overview

- ① Short \bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo
- ② The Igbo TTE and its repairs
- ③ Arguments against a surface PF-account
RPs as PF-requirements
The syntax of the RP-repair of the TTE
- ④ Arguments for an AL-approach
- ⑤ Conclusions

RPs as PF-repair

- PF-account of the TTE: **PF-filter: *<C,t>**
 - blocks linear adjacency of C and t (e.g., Perlmutter 1968; Chomsky and Lasnik 1977, see also Bresnan 1972; 1977)
 - embedded SU position must be overt
- argument from language-internal variation based on the distribution of RPs:
 - some RPs in Igbo surface because the positions in questions must be overt
 - the RP used to repair the *that*-trace violation is different in nature (different syntactic derivation)

RPs as PF-repair

- recall: short focus fronting sometimes leaves an RP in the extraction site;
analysis: RP results from partial copy spell-out

(19) Àdà kà Ézé hù-rù [&P yá nà Òbí]
 Ada FOC Eze see-rV 3SG.INDEP and Obi
 “Eze saw ADA and Obi.”

conjunct focus

- Georgi and Amaechi (2023):
 - these RPs surface because the positions in questions are prosodically strong and thus cannot be null (other, non-prosodic explanations fail)
 - PF-overtness requirement for conjuncts: pro-drop of a conjunct is impossible in pro-drop languages (even under the right pragm. conditions)
 - We will now add a new Igbo-specific argument for a PF-account.

RPs as PF-repair

- recall: topicalization requires RPs
- but the absence of the RP is tolerated if no pro-form is available for the topic XP (e.g., if it is a PP)

- (20) a. Órú, Ézè rù-rù *(yá)
 work Eze work-rV 3SG.INDEP
 “As for work, Eze did it.” *NP topic*
- b. Ézè hù-rù Àdá n’-áhíá
 Eze see-rV Ada P-market
 “Eze saw Ada at the market.”
- c. [PP n’-áhíá], Ézè hù-rù Àdá
 P-market Eze see-rV Ada
 “As for the market, Eze saw Ada there.” *PP topic*

RPs as PF-repair

- The absence of an RP is not tolerated in all positions, however, e.g., not for conjuncts → this position must be overt (pronunciation requirement)

- (21) a. Ézè kwù-rù [&P [PP màkà órú] nà [PP màkà ùmụá'ká]]
 Eze talk-rV about work and about children
 “Eze talked about work and about the children.”
- b. * [PP màkà órú], Ézè kwù-rù [&P (yá) nà [PP màkà ùmụá'ká]]
 about work Eze talk-rV 3SG.INDEP and about children
 “As for work, Eze talked about it and about the children.”

RPs as PF-repair

- the same holds for focus fronting of a PP-conjunct:

(22) *_[PP màkà oru] kà Ézé kwù-rù [_{&P (yá) nà}] _{[PP}
 about work FOC Eze talk-rV 3SG.INDEP and
 màkà úmụá'ká]
 about children
 “Eze talked ABOUT WORK and about the children.”

- note: PP-focus fronting is fine from a position where it leaves a gap:

(23) _[PP màkà oru] kà Ézé kwù-rù _____
 about work FOC Eze talk-rV
 “Eze talked ABOUT WORK.”

⇒ Positions in which RPs must surface under focus fronting (e.g., conjuncts) must be phonologically overt

The RP-repair of the TTE

- (24) **Ézè** kà Úchè ch̀è-r̀è **nà ọ̀** h̀ù-r̀ù Àdá n'̀-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C 3SG.NOM see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.” *C + RP*

- argument: If the RP in the TTE-repair in (24) is required because the embedded SU position must be overt, it should pattern like the RPs found under short \bar{A} -movement, which realize a low copy
- result: the RP in (24) does not pronounce a low copy in a movement dependency; (24) rather involves **prolepsis** – the pronoun is the argument of the embedded verb

Overview

- 1 Short \bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo
- 2 The Igbo TTE and its repairs
- 3 Arguments against a surface PF-account
 - RP as PF-requirements
 - The syntax of the RP-repair of the TTE
- 4 Arguments for an AL-approach
- 5 Conclusions

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

procedure: application of the LSMDs to each clause (**Matrix Cl.**, **Embedded Cl.**)

(25) Long SU focus, RP-repair, NEG in EC:

- a. Úchè chère-rè nà Ézè á-¹hụ-ghị Àdá
 Uche think-rV C Eze PFX-see-NEG Ada
 “Uche thought that Eze did not see Ada.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà Úché chère-rè nà ọ (*ná) hụ-ghị Àdá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C 3SG.DEP PRT see-NEG Ada
 “Uche thought that EZE did not see Ada.” *long SU focus*

(26) Long SU focus, RP-repair, NEG in MC:

- a. Úchè é-chè-ghì nà Ézè hụ-rụ Àdá
 Uche PFX-think-NEG C Eze see-rV Ada
 “Uche did not think that Eze saw Ada.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà Úchè *(ná) é-chè-ghì nà ọ hụ-rụ Àdá
 Eze FOC Uche PRT PFX-think-NEG C 3SG.DEP see-rV Ada
 “Uche did not think that Eze saw Ada.” *long SU focus*

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

(27) Long SU focus, RP-repair, perfective in EC:

- a. Úchè chère-rè nà Ézè è-rí-é-lá !jí
 Uche think-rV C Eze NMLZ-eat-OVS-PFV yam.POSS
 “Uche thought that Eze has eaten yam.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà Úché chère-rè nà ó rí-é-lá !jí
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C 3SG.DEP eat-OVS-PFV jam.POSS
 “Uche thought that EZE has eaten yam.” *long SU focus*

(28) Long SU focus, RP-repair, perfective in MC:

- a. Úchè à-mà-rà-lá nà Ézè rí-rí jí
 Uche PFX-know-OVS-PFV C Eze eat-rV yam
 “Uche has known that Eze ate yam.” *declarative*
- b. *Ézè kà Úché à-mà-rà-lá nà ó rí-rí jí
 Eze FOC Uche PFX-know-OVS-PFV C 3SG.DEP eat-rV yam
 “Uche has known that EZE ate yam.” *long SU focus long SU focus*

⇒ evidence for \bar{A} -movement in the MC but not in the EC

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

- conclusion: prolepsis + \bar{A} -movement of the proleptic object

(29) **Ézè** **kà** Úchè chère-rè **nà ọ́** hụ-rụ Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C 3SG.DEP see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.” *C + RP*

(30) a. Uche thought **about Eze** that **he** saw Ada.

b. [_{CP} C ... [_{VP} V ... **XP_i** [_{CP} ... [_{TP} **pro_i** [_{.vP} ...]]]]]
 ↑ focus fronting ↓

- In fact, the baseline in (30-a) is available in Igbo:

(31) Úchè chère-rè **màkà Ézè** **nà ọ́** hụ-rụ Àdá
 Uche think-rV about Eze C 3SG.DEP see-rV Ada
 “Uche thought about Eze that he saw Ada.”

- note: focus fronting of the proleptic PP requires the absence of P *màkà*
 - P is optional under PP-fronting in Igbo
 - loss of P under PP-fronting attested in other languages (Dinka, van Urk 2015)

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

further prolepsis diagnostics: (Takano 2003; Davies 2005; Salzmann 2006; 2017; Deal 2018; Aremu et al. 2022; Lohninger et al. 2022):

- ☑ not restricted to pronouns in SU position (variable GF)
- ☑ no island-sensitivity
- ☑ no scope interaction between the proleptic object and material in the EC
- ☑ compatible with all matrix predicates that can take a clausal complement
- ☑ proleptic object: must be referential (no idiom parts); interpreted as specific
- ☑ pro: can be replaced by an epithet; does not exhibit phi-mismatches (language-specific diagnostic)
- ☑ evidence that the proleptic PP originates in the MC, not at the edge of the EC from adverb placement

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

no island-sensitivity:

(32) Relative clause island:

- a. Úchè chère-rè **màkà Ézè** nà Àdá nà Òbí mà [DP úmụá'ká [CP
 Uche think-rV P Eze C Ada and Obi know children
 OP_i ọ hụ-rụ ____i n'áhíá]]
 3SG.DEP see-rV P-market

“Uche thought about Eze_i that Ada and Obi know the children that he_i saw at the market.” *baseline*

- b. **Ézè kà** Úché chère-rè ___ nà Àdá nà Òbí mà [DP úmụá'ká [CP
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C Ada and Obi know children
 OP_i ọ hụ-rụ ____i n'áhíá]]
 3SG.DEP see-rV P-market

“Uche thought about EZE_i that Ada and Obi know the children that he_i saw at the market.” *focus fronting of proleptic PP*

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

language-specific diagnostic (Georgi and Amaechi 2023):

the RP in the prolepsis construction does *not* behave like the (partial) realization of a copy wrt. phi-mismatches and epithet replacement:

	RP = copy spell-out	RP in base-gen.
(33) can be replaced by an epithet	*	✓
phi-mismatch (3sg default) with pronominal antecedent	✓	*

- (34) a. Ézè kà Úché chère — **nà òfèkè** hù-rù Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C idiot see-rV Ada P-market
 Lit.: “(It’s) Eze; (that) Uche thought that the idiot; saw Ada at the m.”
- b. **Únù** kà Úché chère — **nà únù** / ***ó** hù-rù
 2PL.INDEP FOC Uche think-rV C 2PL.INDEP 3SG.DEP see-rV
 Àdá
 Ada
 Lit.: “(It is about) you (that) Uche thought that you(pl) saw Ada.”

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

- Summary:
 - There are RPs in Igbo that occur because of an overtiness requirement (e.g., RPs in conjunct position); these RPs spell out low copies
 - The RP in the TTE-construction, however, is not the realization of a copy, but the argument of the embedded verb in a prolepsis construction \Rightarrow the RP here is not due to a PF-requirement
- Objection: Maybe long \bar{A} -movement is impossible in Igbo?
No, it is possible, even across the complementizer $n\grave{a}$!

(35) Summary of \bar{A} -movement diagnostics:

long focus fronting	H-tone		$n\acute{a}$ -PRT		perf-island		island- sensit.	result
	MC	EC	MC	EC	MC	EC		
non-SUs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	long \bar{A} -movement
SUs: \emptyset -C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
$s\grave{i}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
$n\grave{a}$ +RP	✓	*	✓	*	✓	*	*	prolepsis

The syntax of the RP-repair strategy

Example: long SU-focus with \emptyset -C and sentential NEG

(36) NEG in the EC:

- a. Úchè chère nà Ézè á-¹hù-ghí Àdá
 Uche think-rV C Eze PFX-see-NEG Ada
 “Uche thought that Eze did not see Ada.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà Úché chère \emptyset — ^{*}(ná) ¹á-hù-ghí Àdá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C — PRT PFX-see-NEG Ada
 “Uche thought that EZE did not see Ada.” *long SU focus*

(37) NEG in the MC:

- a. Úchè é-chè-ghí nà Ézè hù-rù Àdá
 Uche PFX-think-NEG C Eze see-rV Ada
 “Uche did not think that Eze saw Ada.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà Úchè ^{*}(ná) ¹é-chè-ghí \emptyset — ¹hù-¹rù Ada
 Eze FOC Uche PRT PFX-think-NEG C — see-rV Ada
 “Uche does not think that EZE saw Ada.” *long SU focus*

Overview

- ① Short \bar{A} -dependencies in Igbo
- ② The Igbo TTE and its repairs
- ③ Arguments against a surface PF-account
 - RP as PF-requirements
 - The syntax of the RP-repair of the TTE
- ④ Arguments for an AL-approach
- ⑤ Conclusions

Structural accounts of the TTE

- a recurring ingredient in current approaches to the TTE: **anti-locality** – movement from SpecT to SpecC is too short (a.o. Bošković 1997; Ishii 1999; Erlewine 2016; 2020; Brillman and Hirsch 2016; Douglas 2017; Pesetsky 2021)
- evidence: no TTE with additional material between SpecT and SpecC

(38) $[_{CP} \quad [_{C'} C [_{YP} \boxed{WP} [_{Y'} Y [_{TP} XP \dots]]]]]]$

(39) **Adverb effect** (Bresnan 1977; Culicover 1993; Kandybowicz 2006):
 Robin met the man who Leslie said **that** for all intents and purposes
 was the mayor of the city. (Culicover 1993: 557)

- potential problem: Short SU \bar{A} -movement as in (40) should also be out – variation; debated for English (overview: Bošković 2016)

(40) Who left?

The Igbo AL-signature

Igbo provides evidence for AL from local SU (sub)extraction:

- (41) No local SU \bar{A} -movement: (42) Subextraction from the local SU:
- [CP [C' C [TP **XP** [T' ...]]]] [CP [C' C [TP [*DP* ... **XP** ...] ...]]]]
- ↑ | ↓ | ↓
- x** ✓

- Amaechi and Georgi (2019): no local SU \bar{A} -movement; evidence: absence of the focus marker with local \bar{A} -SUs only

- (43) a. Sòósò Ézè (*kà) hù-rù Àdá
 only Eze FOC see-rV Ada
 “Only Eze saw Ada.” *short SU focus*
- b. Àdá *kà* Ézé hù-rù ___ n'-áhíá
 Ada FOC Eze see-PST P-market
 “Eze saw ADA at the market.” *short non-SU focus*
- c. Ézè *kà* Úché ché-ré Ø ___ ¹hù-¹rù Àdá n'-áhíá
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C[∅] see-rV Ada P-market
 “Uche thought that EZE saw Ada at the market.” *long SU f.*

The Igbo AL-signature

- new evidence against short SU \bar{A} -movement: absence of LSM effects

(44) No *ná*-particle with sentential negation:

a. Ézè á-[!]hụ-ghị Àdá

Eze PFX-see-NEG Ada

“Eze did not see Ada.”

declarative

b. Sòòsò Ézè (*ná) á-[!]hụ-ghị Àdá

only Eze PRT PFX-see-NEG Ada

“Only Eze did not see Ada.”

local SU focus

(45) No perfective island effect:

a. Ézè è-rí-é-lá [!]jí

Eze NMLZ-eat-OVS-PFV yam.POSS

“Eze has eaten yam.”

declarative

b. Sòòsò Ézè è-rí-é-lá [!]jí

only Eze NMLZ-eat-OVS-PFV yam.POSS

“Only Eze has eaten yam.”

local SU focus

- no tonal effects

The Igbo AL-signature

- Georgi and Amaechi (2020; 2023): **subjects and NP-&Ps are not (absolute) islands**
- new observation: local \bar{A} -movement is possible when it involves subextraction from a complex (e.g., a coordinated) subject; evidence: the LSM effects are triggered

(46) a. [$\&P$ Ézè nà Íbè] hụ-rụ Àdá
 Eze and Ibe see-rV Ada
 “Eze and Ibe saw Ada.”

declarative

b. Ézè **kà** [$\&P$ yá nà Íbè] hụ-rụ Àdá
 Eze foc 3SG.INDEP and Ibe see-rV Ada
 “EZE and Ibe saw Ada.”

Conjunct focus

The Igbo AL-signature

(47) *Ná*-particle with sentential negation:

- a. [_{&P} Ézè nà Íbè] á-¹hù-ghí Àdá
 Eze and Ibe PFX-see-NEG Ada
 “Eze and Ibe did not see Ada.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà [_{&P} yá nà Íbè] *(ná) á-¹hù-ghí Àdá
 Eze foc 3SG.INDEP and Ibe PRT PFX-see-NEG Ada
 “EZE and Ibe did not see Ada.” *1st Conj focus*

(48) Perfective island effect:

- a. [_{&P} Ézè nà Íbè] à-hù-lá Àdá
 Eze and Ibe NMLZ-see-PFV Ada
 “Eze and Ibe have seen Ada.” *declarative*
- b. *Ézè kà [_{&P} yá nà Íbè] à-hù-lá Àdá
 Eze FOC 3SG.INDEP and Ibe NMLZ-see-PVF Ada
 “EZE and Ibe have seen Ada.” *1st Conj focus*

The Igbo AL-signature

- Long subextraction does not trigger repairs in the C-domain:

- (49) a. Úchè ch̀è-r̀è ǹà [&P Ézè nà Íbè] h̀ù-r̀ù Àdà
 Uche think-rV C Eze and Ibe see-rV Ada
 “Uche thought that Eze and Ibe saw Ada.” *declarative*
- b. Ézè kà Úché ch̀è-r̀è ǹà / *Ø [&P yá nà Íbè]
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C C 3SG.INDEP and Ibe
 h̀ù-r̀ù Àdà
 see-rV Ada
 “Uche thought that EZE and Ibe saw Ada.” *long Conj focus*

- but:** (49-b) is ambiguous between prolepsis and long \bar{A} -movement + RP; evidence for movement: the *ná*-particle can surface in the embedded clause

- (50) Ézè kà Úché ch̀è-r̀è ǹà [&P yá nà Íbè] (ná)
 Eze FOC Uche think-rV C 3SG.INDEP and Ibe PRT
 á-¹h̀ù-g̀h́í Àdà
 NMLZ-see-NEG Ada
 “Uche thought that EZE and Ibe did not see Ada.” *long Conj focus*

Conclusions

- Igbo exhibits the TTE and exhibits 3 repair strategies: \emptyset -C, C + RP, different element in C-position (*si*)
- Igbo provides evidence
 - ① against a purely PF-driven account of the TTE that requires the embedded SU position to be overt
 - ▶ comparison between proper “PF-RPs” (e.g., in conjunct position) vs. RPs as a repair of the *that*-trace configuration
 - ▶ PF-RPs pronounce low copies, the TT-RP occurs in a prolepsis construction (= argument of the embedded verb)
 - ② for an anti-locality component in accounts of the TTE
 - ▶ local SU \bar{A} -movement is blocked, too, but short and long subextraction from a SU is possible without repairs

Outlook / open issues

- These facts could be explained along the lines of Ishii (2004):
 - **anti-locality** that blocks movement from SpecT to SpecC
 - **PIC** (Chomsky 2000; 2001)
 ⇒ long SU-extraction is blocked because the SU cannot reach the escape hatch SpecC at the edge of the embedded clause
- whether this can be upheld and how exactly anti-locality is defined – especially in light of a split CP (see Richards 2022 for an overview of proposals) depends on the structure of the two other TTE-repair strategies
 - \emptyset -C: compatible with an anti-locality-based account if it involves truncation → no clear evidence for or against truncation so far
 - **sí**: might involve more structure (VP-shell) because this element is homophonous with the verb ‘to say’ → potentially a case of ‘say-complementation’ (Major 2023; also a TTE-repair in Nupe, Kandybowicz 2006)

Thank you!

Bibliography I

- Amaechi, Mary (2020): *A'-movement dependencies and their reflexes in Igbo*. PhD thesis, University of Potsdam, Potsdam.
- Amaechi, Mary and Doreen Georgi (2019): 'Quirks of subject (non-)extraction in Igbo', *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4(1), 1–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.607>.
- Aremu, Daniel, Katharina Hartmann, Anke Himmelreich and Johannes Mursell (2022): When long distance dependencies are actually short: The case of Mabia languages. Handout of a talk at Leipzig University, available at <https://mabia-vp.com/tiki-index.php?page=Output>.
- Bošković, Željko (2016): 'On the timing of labeling: Deducing Comp-trace effects, the Subject Condition, the Adjunct Condition, and tucking in from labeling', *The Linguistic Review* 33(1), 17–66.
- Bošković, Željko (1997): *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Bresnan, Joan (1972): *Theory of Complementation in English Syntax*. PhD thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Bresnan, Joan (1977): Variables in the Theory of Transformations. In: P. W. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian, eds, *Formal Syntax*. Academic, New York, pp. 157–196.
- Brillman, Ruth and Aron Hirsch (2016): An anti-locality account of English subject/non-subject asymmetries. In: *Proceedings of CLS 50*. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000): Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In: M. Roger, M. David and J. Uriagereka, eds, *Step by Step*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 89–155.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001): Derivation by Phase. In: M. Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 1–52.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik (1977): 'Filters and Control', *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 425–504.
- Culicover, Peter W. (1993): 'Evidence against ECP accounts of the that-t effect', *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 557–561.
- Davies, William D. (2005): 'Madurese Prolepsis and Its Implications for a Typology of Raising', *Language* 81(3), 645–665.
- Deal, Amy Rose (2018): Compositional paths to de re. In: S. Maspong, B. Stefánsdóttir, K. Blake and F. Davis, eds, *Proceedings of the 28th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*. LSA, Washington, DC, pp. 622–648.
- Douglas, Jamie (2017): 'Unifying the that-trace and anti-that-trace effects', *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2(1), 1–28. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.312>.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka (2016): 'Anti-locality and optimality in Kaqchikel Agent Focus', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34, 429–479.

Bibliography II

- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka (2020): 'Anti-locality and subject extraction', *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* **5**(1)(84).
- Georgi, Doreen and Mary Amaechi (2020): Resumption and islandhood in Igbo. In: M. Asatryan, Y. Song and A. Whitmal, eds, *Proceedings of NELS 50*. GLSA, Amherst, MA, pp. 261–274.
- Georgi, Doreen and Mary Amaechi (2022): 'Resumption in Igbo: two types of resumptives, complex phi-mismatches, and dynamic deletion domains', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **41**(3), 961–1028.
- Georgi, Doreen and Mary Amaechi (2023): 'Resumption in Igbo: Two types of resumptives, complex phi-mismatches, and dynamic deletion domains', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **41**, 961–1028.
- Goldsmith, John A. (1976): Autosegmental Phonology. Phd dissertation, MIT.
- Goldsmith, John A. (1981): 'The structure of wh-questions in Igbo', *Linguistic analysis* **7**, 367–393.
- Green, Margaret Mackeson and Georgewill Egemba Igwe (1963): *A descriptive grammar of Igbo*. Akademik-Verlag, Berlin.
- Ishii, Toru (1999): Cyclic spellout and the *that-t* effects. In: S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. Haugen and P. Norquest, eds, *Proceedings of WCCFL 18*. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA, pp. 220–231.
- Ishii, Toru (2004): 'The Phase Impenetrability Condition, the Vacuous Movement Hypothesis, and *that-t* effects', *Lingua* **114**, 183–215.
- Kandybowicz, Jason (2006): 'Comp-Trace Effects Explained Away', *Proceedings of WCCFL* **25**, 220–228.
- Kenstowicz, Michael (1989): The Null Subject Parameter in Modern Arabic dialects. In: O. Jaeggli and K. Safir, eds, *The Null Subject Parameter*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 263–275.
- Koopman, Hilda and Dominique Sportiche (1982): 'Variables and the Bijection Principle', *The Linguistic Review* **2**(2), 139–160.
- Lohndal, Terje (2009): 'COMP-T effects: variation in the position and features of C', *Studia Linguistica* **63**(2), 204–232.
- Lohninger, Magdalena, Iva Kovač and Susanne Wurmbrand (2022): 'From Prolepsis to Hyperraising', *Philosophies* **7**(32), 176–215. Special Issue: New Perspectives of Generative Grammar and Minimalism, ed. by Peter Kosta.
- Major, Travis (2023): 'Re-analyzing 'say'-complementation: implications for case theory and beyond', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. to appear.
- Manfredi, Victor (2018): Phono-semantic subordination. To appear in Contemporary Studies in African Linguistics: Essays in Memory of Rev. Sr. M.A. Uwalaaka. <http://people.bu.edu/manfredi/PhonosemSubord.pdf>.

Bibliography III

- Martinović, Martina (2017): 'Wolof wh-movement at the syntax-morphology interface', *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* **35**, 205–256.
- Nwachukwu, Philip Akujooobi (1976): Noun phrase sentential complementation in Igbo. PhD thesis, SOAS, London.
- Perlmutter, David (1971): *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.
- Perlmutter, David M. (1968): *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. Phd dissertation, MIT.
- Pesetsky, David (2017): Complementizer-trace effects. In: M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, eds, *Blackwell Companion to Syntax, 2nd edition*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pesetsky, David (2021): Exfoliation: Towards a Derivational Theory of Clause Size. Ms., MIT, lingbuzz/004440.
- Richards, Norvin (2022): Anti-locality. Ms., MIT, to appear in *The Cambridge Handbook of the Minimalist Program*, K. Grohmann and E. Leivada (eds.).
- Robinson, J. (1974): Focus-presupposition and wh-questions in Igbo. In: E. Voeltz, ed., *Proceedings of the 3rd annual conference on African linguistics*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, p. 243–249.
- Salzmann, Martin (2006): *Resumptive prolepsis: a study in indirect A'-dependencies*. LOT, Utrecht.
- Salzmann, Martin (2017): Prolepsis. In: M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, eds, *Blackwell Companion to Syntax, 2nd edition*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tada, Hiroaki (1995): 'Floating tones and \bar{A} -movement in Igbo', *Fukuoka University review of literature & humanities* **26**(4), 1619–1642.
- Takano, Yuji (2003): 'Nominative Objects in Japanese Complex Predicate Constructions: A Prolepsis Analysis', *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* **21**(4), 779–834.
- Uwalaka, Mary Angela (1991): 'Wh-movement in Igbo', *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* **3**, 185–208.
- van Urk, Coppe (2015): A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: a case study of Dinka Bor. PhD thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.