

## Focus, move and resumption

Lahcen Alami  
University of Essex  
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK  
lalami@essex.ac.uk

This is a discussion of pronouns that appear in Focus constructions when accusative or/and dative arguments are not lexically realised. Various linguists such as Ouhalla (1988) and Boukhris (1998) treat these elements as clitics since they move and cliticise to a higher functional category in a non-defective simple clause. When these elements appear in Focus constructions which involve the operation Move (Chomsky 1995-2006), they become resumptive pronouns (RPs) as they resume their respective matrix A-bar antecedents. Resumptive pronouns are often construed to be a property of Merge as they appear in syntactic constructions where movement is preempted via various principles of grammar (Shlonsky 1992, McCloskey 1990, 2001, Aoun & Chouieri 1997). Newly examined data from Berber suggest that resumptive pronouns should not necessarily be treated as pre-emptive elements as they appear sensitive to islands (Ross 1965). The aim here is to identify the behaviour of these pronominal clitics as well as the nature of the relation with their ex-situ focused antecedents in complex clauses. It will be shown that resumptive pronouns are always obligatory when the corresponding arguments are not present in their canonical positions. Further being sensitive to islands, RPs should be construed as the spellout of lower copies of their respective antecedents (not stranded determiner heads as in (Boeckx 2001). It is also shown based on evidence of anti-agreement (Ouhalla 1993) and A-bar disjointness requirement (Aoun and Li 1990) that strict locality considerations imposed by phase system (Chomsky 2001) cannot be observed, as apparently it would preclude the spellout of RPs. Once the vP phase is complete, its complement undergoes Transfer, and the relevant copy is spelt out as null, as otherwise the spelling out of RP would violate Impenetrability Condition, thus yielding a non-convergent/ill-formed derivation. Ostensibly, the spelling out of RP only appears possible if the convergent copy is contained outside the lower CP phase or within the matrix specifier phase head, thus favouring procrastinated spellout imperative for the full convergence of the derivation. Consequently it appears that movement in a language like Berber is not cyclic. Noting that convergence-based spellout provides a better account than a phase-based cyclic spellout.

## References

- Aoun, Joseph and Audrey, Li. 1990. Minimal disjointness. *Linguistics*. 28, 189-203.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2001. Mechanisms of Chain Formation. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Ken Hale: A life in language. Kenstowicz, ed. 1-52. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA
- Chomsky, Noam. 2005. On Phases. Ms MIT.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. 1993. Subject extraction, negation and the anti-agreement effect. *Natural Language and Linguistics*. 11, 477-518.