

ALEXANDER ANDRASON

University of Stellenbosch

aleksand@hi.is

MICHAEL KARANI

University of Stellenbosch

University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

karanim@udsm.ac.tz

RADIAL CATEGORIES IN SYNTAX: NON-RESUMPTIVE LEFT DISLOCATION IN ARUSA

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, Left Dislocation, resumption, prototypes, radial categories

Abstract

This paper discusses the phenomenon of L(ef) D(islocation) in Arusa – a southern variety of Maasai – and, in particular, the presence of resumption in LD constructions. With respect to resumption, Arusa allows for two types of LD. In most cases, a non-resumptive type of LD is used. This variant is obligatory if a possible resumptive element refers to an argument of the verb of the matrix clause (i.e. subject, direct and indirect objects and applied objects). The resumptive type, which is significantly less frequent, appears only if the dislocate corresponds to an adjunct in the matrix clause. The pervasiveness of the non-resumptive LD stems from the ungrammaticality of overt independent pronominal arguments in most positions in Arusa. As a result, resumption cannot be viewed as a decisive feature for the classification of a construction as LD, and its lack as a sufficient reason to propose a different category. Rather, LD should be viewed as a radial category containing both constructions that match the LD prototype and structures that are more remote from the exemplar.

1. Introduction

Developed within the frame of cognitive linguistics, the present paper analyzes the phenomenon of L(ef) D(islocation) in Arusa (a southern dialect of Maasai;

Nilo-Saharan).¹ We will demonstrate that the Arusa evidence – and in particular the persistent absence of resumption – significantly contributes to a typological debate on the gradient nature of the LD construction and its radial conceptual structure.

The paper will be organized in the following manner: in section 2 the cognitive approach to LD will be presented. Section 3 will provide a brief overview of the Maasai morpho-syntax necessary for the study of LD in Arusa. The Arusa evidence will be introduced in Section 4. In Section 5, we will discuss the significance of the Arusa data for the typology of LD constructions. Lastly, in section 5, the main conclusion of this research will be drawn.

2. Left Dislocation – a cognitive perspective

Linguistic typology and cognitive linguistics define an LD construction in functional and formal terms simultaneously (Lambrecht 2001: 1050; Westbury 2014). This definition is usually articulated in the form of a prototype, that is, an idealized exemplar of the category. This prototype exhibits a set of functional and formal characteristics that are expected to appear in actual LD constructions.

Functionally, LD conveys complex information, being used to activate or re-activate a referent and to specify its role in the proposition. The referent typically entertains a low degree of accessibility even though it is identifiable, and its role can be specified pragmatically (e.g. as focus or topic) and/or syntactically (e.g. as subject, direct or indirect object or preposition complement, see Westbury 2014: 201–202, 214, 340).²

Formally, a prototypical LD construction appears in a mono-propositional context. The (re-)activated referent – which is known under the term “dislocate” – is located outside the matrix clause, more specifically in the left periphery, sentence-initially. The dislocate is separated from the matrix clause by a clause-boundary marker and by special intonation – a pause. This extra-clausal position can additionally be marked through the use of specific particles, interjections, conjunctions, and interrogatives. The dislocate tends to be a noun phrase and assumes an unmarked case form, so-called *casus pendens*, the nominative or the absolute. The role of the dislocate is specified in the matrix clause by means of an overt item – usually a resumptive pronoun – that is co-indexed with the dislocate and exhibits a total identity link with it (Westbury 2014, 2015; see also Lambrecht 2001).³

An example of LD that exhibits all the features mentioned in the previous paragraph is found in Polish (see example 1). In this LD construction, the dislocate – which

¹ Arusa is spoken by some 110,000 native speakers, inhabitants of the Arusha and Meru districts in northern Tanzania (Lewis 2009; LoT 2009). Arusa exhibits between 77% and 89% similarity with the Kenyan Maasai variety, which is also the most studied type of Maasai (Vossen 1988; Karani 2013).

² The activation role is associated with the dislocate while the specification role concerns the matrix clause (see next paragraph).

³ In generative approaches, LD is also viewed as base-generated (cf. Cinque 1983/1997).

is located in the left periphery and employed in the nominative – is separated from the matrix clause by the pause, the interjection *tak* ‘yes’ and the “demarcating” particle *to* (Duszak 1984). Its role as a direct object is specified in the matrix clause by means of the resumptive pronoun *go* ‘him’ employed in the accusative case.

- (1) Tomek , tak to widziałem go wczoraj
 Tom-NOM [pause] yes PART see-PAST.1SG him-ACC yesterday
 ‘Tom, yes I saw him yesterday’

In addition to the formal LD prototype presented above, cross-linguistic studies reveal a variety of non-canonical LD constructions. Probably, one of the most common non-canonical varieties is a structure in which no resumption is found (Westbury 2015). There are two types of such constructions. One type fails to exhibit an overt anaphoric co-indexation between the dislocate and a resumptive element in the matrix clause, even though there is a possible slot in the matrix clause enabling such a co-indexation. In other words, even though the verb or the matrix clause licenses a slot for the use of a resumptive pronoun, such a resumptive element is not employed. In the other type, the entire argument or adjunct slot for the dislocate is absent in the matrix clause, which makes the use of resumptive elements impossible (Westbury 2015; see also Chafe 1976 and Lambrecht 2001). For the purpose of this study, only the former sub-type is relevant. Therefore, the term “non-resumptive” LD will uniquely make reference to that class of LD.

Although a non-resumptive LD differs from the prototype, it may exhibit all other formal characteristics typical of LD; most importantly the pausal intonation, the extra-clausal position of the dislocate, and its use in the *casus pendens*. Despite its less-canonical shape, such an LD variety is not typologically infrequent. A study of LD in Biblical Hebrew demonstrates that non-resumptive LD constitutes roughly 7% of all the cases of LD in that language (Westbury 2014). In a similar vein, the non-resumptive type of LD seems to be preferred to canonical forms in certain conditions in Polish. This stems from the fact that the use of a resumptive element is felt as redundant in Polish and that of the *casus pendens* is perceived as artificial (Duszak 1984; Andrason 2016). As a result, due to language-specific idiosyncrasies, LD constructions may omit resumptive elements more commonly than they employ them. The LD construction in Polish in example (2) illustrates this phenomenon. While the dislocate is separated from the matrix by a pause, an interjection (*tak* ‘yes’) and the particle (*to*), the resumptive pronoun is absent (Andrason 2016).⁴

- (2) Tomka , tak to widziałem wczoraj
 Tom-ACC [pause] yes PART see-PAST.1SG yesterday
 ‘Tom, I saw (him) yesterday’

⁴ This omission is possible because the role of the dislocate is, to a certain degree, specified by its case marking. That is, the dislocate is not used in the *casus pendens* (i.e. the nominative) but assumes the case licensed by the verb of the matrix clause, thus corresponding to the case of the resumptive, if this were expressed overtly.

For cognitive scholars, non-canonical LD constructions, such as the non-resumptive type discussed previously, do not constitute major problems. They are all related to the prototype by exhibiting a degree of family resemblance with it. That is, they approach the idealized prototype to a certain degree, failing however to comply with all the features. As is customary in cognitive linguistics, grammatical categories, LD included, are radial categories represented by core and peripheral members. The former are similar to the prototype, while the latter are more distant from it. In general, the fewer features are fulfilled, the more a given construction resembles other grammatical categories (cf. Janda 2015). However, the sole fact whereby a construction does not exhibit all the features associated with the prototype does not necessarily imply that it belongs to a new category or that it constitutes a distinct grammatical phenomenon. On the contrary, in all such cases, a construction can still be classified as an instantiation of a category (that is exemplified by the prototype), although a less canonical-one (Westbury 2014).

3. Arusa – general information related to LD

To our knowledge, the question of LD in Arusa has never been addressed. In fact, very little has been written on LD in Maasai in general. This issue is only briefly noted by Payne (1995: 455) who analyzes the instances where Maasai does not comply with the unmarked VSO word order, but rather locates certain constituents before the verb. Payne (1995: 455) observes that LD in Maasai exhibits pausal intonation that separates the dislocate from the matrix clause and that the dislocate may be co-indexed with a resumptive element present in the matrix clause, by which the construction complies with the cross-linguistic prototype. Payne correctly notes that in most cases in Maasai such a resumptive element is absent. Although Payne (1995) offers a highly valuable study of cases where the VSO word order is altered, she does not make a distinction between LD and Fronting used for topicalization or focus. This distinction is crucial as LD and Fronting constitute two distinct grammatical phenomena, both formally and functionally (for a detailed discussion, consult Westbury 2014).⁵ The present study exclusively deals with LD.

The issue of LD in Arusa is closely related to the syntactic, morphological and morpho-syntactic properties of this language, namely to word order, verbal inflections, and case marking, respectively.

As is typical of Maasai, the unmarked declarative word order of Arusa is VSO. The verb appears in the initial position, that is, furthest to the left in the clause. There are, however, instances where a N(ominal) P(hrased) or other elements can occur before the verb (Tucker, Mpaayei 1955; Payne 1995; Caponigro 2003; Karani 2013; Carstens, Shoaff 2015). A set of instances where the verb does not occupy the first

⁵ This distinctiveness concerns the prototypes of the two constructions. LD and Fronting are otherwise related. For instance, certain non-canonical LD structures are similar or even syntactically identical to Fronting (Andrason 2016).

positon in its clause includes the following cases: a) pragmatically marked environments (e.g. focus, contrast and topic), b) *wh*-questions, c) answers to specific questions, d) certain temporal sequences, e) so-called delimiting phrases, and f) structures similar to nominal or cleft constructions where the non-initial verb is headed by a relative clause marker (Payne 1995: 454–461; Caponigro 2003; Carstens, Shoaff 2015). As will be evident from the subsequent discussion, one of such instances where VSO word order is, to a degree, altered concerns LD.⁶

The other issue related to LD in Arusa is verbal inflection and/or subject and object agreement. Arusa verbal morphology is highly agglutinative with the verb being inflected for subject and, in certain instances, for object (Tucker, Mpaayei 1955; Hamaya 1997; Karani 2013).⁷ Such subject and object markers, which appear as fused prefixes, are present in all verbal forms except for infinitives (Tucker, Mpaayei 1955: 71; Hamaya 1997: 13).⁸

As far as the subject inflection is concerned, verbs in Arusa are inflected for person and number. For intransitive verbs, the inflection consists of adding the following prefixes: 1SG *á-* (e.g. *á-kwét* ‘I run’), 1PL *kí-*, 2SG/PL *í-*⁹ and 3SG/PL *é-*. Since the subject is marked on the verb by means of inflection, overt pronominal subjects are not necessary – the language allows for the pro-drop rule. Indeed, such independent pronouns are most commonly unexpressed. If they are used, they regularly introduce nuances of emphasis, e.g. topic, focus or contrast (Karani 2013; Scarborough 2014: 4).

The verb is also inflected for object. In contrast to the subject inflection, the explicit object inflection is not consistent, being rather limited to certain instances involving 1SG and 2SG objects. To be exact, the explicit object marking is found when: a) the subject is 1SG and the object is 2SG (cf. the prefix *aa-* as in *áádólíta* ‘I see you’); b) the subject is 2SG/PL and the object is 1SG (cf. the prefix *ki* as in *kídólíta/kídólítáta* ‘you see me’); c) the subject is 3SG/PL and the object is 1SG (cf. the prefix *aa-* as in *áádólíta* ‘he sees me’); and d) the subject is 3SG/PL and the object is 2SG (cf. the prefix *ki-* as in *kídólíta* ‘he sees you’). In all the remaining cases, the inflectional prefix is indistinguishable from the prefix used with intransitive verbs introduced in the previous paragraph (Karani 2013; Scarborough 2014). Such forms can therefore be viewed as uninflected for object.¹⁰

The pro-drop rule operates for objects as well, since independent object pronouns can be dropped in the same manner as subject pronouns. This includes the

⁶ In LD, the overall word order of the sentence is not VSO as the dislocate occupies the position most to the left and, thus, before the verb. However, the matrix clause usually exhibits the regular, unmarked word order with the verb in the first position.

⁷ Such inflections represent actual syntactic arguments of the verb rather than agreement *sensu stricto* (Hamaya 1997). The inflectional pattern is a morpho-phonemic phenomenon as tone plays a distinctive role in verbal inflections.

⁸ As will be evident from the subsequent discussion, for the sentence to be clearly interpreted, context is also crucial.

⁹ The form of 2PL is also marked by the suffix *-te*.

¹⁰ It is this fact that differentiates them from the other variants in which the object is inflected overtly.

forms that are indistinguishable from inflectional patterns used with intransitive verbs discussed previously (Scarborough 2014: 9). As a result, clauses controlled by a transitive verb always contain an object even though this object is not overt (Karani 2013). In general, object pronouns referring to 3SG and PL, which are probably the most common objects employed in LD structures, are implied by the meaning and valency pattern of a given verb, rather than being expressed overtly.

Besides word order and verbal inflections, the grammatical case is the third feature relevant for LD constructions in Arusa. Arusa distinguishes two cases: the nominative and the accusative. The nominative is principally the case of subject, while the accusative is the case of objects (be they direct, indirect or applied) and prepositional complements.¹¹ The nominative case is marked by means of the high tone placed on the first syllable of a noun (see example 3.a below). In contrast, in the accusative case, the high tone is located on the penultimate or the ultimate syllable (see example 3.b below; Karani 2013).

- (3) a. é-íβót-o βάβα εη-kérai
 3SG-call-PFV father.NOM child.ACC
 ‘The father called the child’
- b. é-íβót-o βαβά έη-kerai
 3SG-call-PFV father.ACC child.NOM
 ‘The child called the father’

4. Left Dislocation in Arusa – evidence

As is common cross-linguistically, Arusa allows for more than one type of LD construction. All such constructions can be used to convey a function that is typically associated with LD. In a mono-sentential structure, they activate or reactivate a referent that, even though identifiable, entertains a low degree of accessibility, and specify its syntactic or discourse-pragmatic role. This may be illustrated by example (4). This case of LD is extracted from a larger fragment where the noun *inkera* ‘children’ has previously been mentioned and is accessible.¹² However, the extent of this accessibility is relatively low and therefore the reactivation is necessary. While the left periphery reactivates the referent, its role is specified in the matrix clause that follows. In example (4), the role of the dislocate corresponds to the direct object and can only be identified given the properties of the matrix clause, not from the dislocated referent itself.

¹¹ An exception is the preposition *te* ‘for’ which governs the nominative (Tucker, Mpaayei 1955).

¹² A: *Késoi, Kái doi ηλε ifómo? Ájomo enkán ηo lakuyani lainei. Nalo nainepu inkéra kumok. Eeta ηλε ilo akwi lai emafo e murata oo nkéra. teina aay?*

B: *Kuna kéra, éé, átadua. Áiriamunóre doi iηe nona kera kiwuonuto aay teipa. Oo olupáyian iriamunore?*

A: ‘Keso, where did you go yesterday? I went to my uncle’s place. When I got there I found a lot of **children**. My uncle had a (children) circumcision ceremony yesterday.

B: These **children**, Yes! I saw them. I even came back with them in the evening. (The referent *inkéra* ‘children’ and the co-indexed pronominal are marked in bold.)

- (4) *kuna kéra* , *á-ta-dua*
 These children-NOM [pause] 1SG-PFV-see
 ‘These children, I saw them’

As is frequent in other languages, LD constructions in Arusa can be either of a “bare” or “as-for” type. In the former, the dislocate fails to be headed by any specific expression, while in the latter it is introduced by an element (or a group of elements) that signals the dislocation and (re)activation. As far as the “bare” type of LD is concerned, three classes of constructions can be distinguished depending on the syntactic function of the dislocate specified in the matrix clause. That is, the dislocate may correspond to the subject of the matrix clause, to its argument (a direct object, an indirect object, or an applied object) and to an adjunct.

The LD constructions in (5.a–c) exemplify cases in which the dislocate (*βάβα* ‘father’, *kuna kéra* ‘these children’ and *έη-kerai* ‘the child’) refers to the subject of the matrix clause. In these examples, the dislocated noun exhibits a nominative case marking (i.e. it is marked by the high tone placed on the first syllable) and is separated from the matrix clause by a pause. The extra-clausal position of the dislocate may be rendered more evident by the use of interjections (such as *έέ!* ‘yes!’ in 5.b) or interrogatives (such as *kánu* ‘when’ in 5.c). It should be noted that in all these cases, the matrix clause fails to exhibit any overt resumptive pronoun. Rather, the role of the dislocate is specified by the inflected verb, in these examples marked by the third person prefix *e-*.

- (5) a. *βάβα* , *έe-wu-o* *ηολε*
 father-NOM [pause] 3SG-come-PFV yesterday
 ‘The father, he came yesterday’
- b. *kuna kéra* , *έέ* *έe-tu-o* *ηολε*
 these children-NOM [pause] yes 3SG-come-PFV yesterday
 ‘These children, yes they came yesterday’
- c. *έη-kerai* , *kánu* *έe-wu-o*
 child-NOM [pause] when 3SG-come-PFV
 ‘The child, when did he come?’

The use of overt subject pronouns is only possible for focal purposes, either emphasis (6.a) or contrast (6.b):

- (6) a. *βάβα* , *nije o-e-wu-o* *ηολε*
 father-NOM [pause] he REL.3SG-come-PFV yesterday
 ‘Father, *he* is the one who came yesterday’
- b. *βάβα* , *έe-wu-o* *nije* *ηολε*
 father-NOM [pause] 3SG-come-PFV he yesterday
 ‘Father, he (and no one else) came yesterday’

The role of the dislocate can also be specified as an argument other than subject. One of such cases involves direct objects. This type of an LD construction exhibits

all the properties explained above: pausal intonation (7.a–b), extra-clausal position of the dislocate (see the use of the interjection (8.a) and interrogative (8.b)) and its nominative case marking (7.a–b and 8.a–b). It should be noted that the nominative case marking of the dislocate (instead of the accusative if the noun were used in the matrix clause) indicates that the dislocated noun is employed in the Maasai equivalent of *casus pendens*. In all such instances, resumptive elements are absent (7.a–b and 8.a–b). For native speakers, the use of an overt resumptive pronoun is perceived as ungrammatical (9.a–b).

- (7) a. βάβα , á-ta-dua
father-NOM [pause] 1SG-PFV-see
'Father, I saw him'
- b. kuna kéra , kí-yelo
These children-NOM [pause] 2PL-know
'These children, we know them'
- (8) a. βάβα , éé á-ta-dua
father-NOM [pause] yes 1SG-PFV-see
'Father, yes I saw him'
- b. έη-kerai , ke tiai í-ta-dua
child-NOM [pause] where 2SG-PFV-see
'The child, where did you see him'
- (9) a. *βάβα , á-ta-dua nije
father-NOM [pause] 1SG-PFV-see him
Intended meaning: 'Father, I saw him'
- b. *kuna kéra , kí-yelo nince
these children-NOM [pause] 2PL-know them
Intended meaning: 'These children, we know them'

The dislocate may also refer to an indirect object of the matrix clause. Once again, this type of LD exhibits all the properties mentioned above (10.a–c), including the ungrammaticality of resumption (10.d).

- (10) a. βάβα , á-ífo-o enkitábu
father-NOM [pause] 1SG-give-PFV book.ACC
'Father, I gave him the book'
- b. έη-kerai , éé kí-nco-o enkitábu
3SG.F-child-NOM [pause] yes 1SG-give-PFV book.ACC
'The child, yes we gave him the book'
- c. kuna kéra , kanu í-nco-o enkitábu
these children-NOM [pause] when 2SG-give-PFV book.ACC
'These children, when did you give them the book'
- d. *βάβα , á-ífo-o enkitábu nije
father-NOM [pause] 1SG-give-PFV book.ACC him
Intended meaning: 'Father, I gave him the book'

Additionally, the dislocate may refer to an applied object, that is an argument necessitated by an applicative verb. To begin with, the dislocate may correspond to the object of so-called dative applicatives, which are usually associated with the role of beneficiary (see example 11.a) or goal (11.b; Lamoureaux 2004). This type of LD exhibits analogous properties to those offered by the aforementioned types: pause, extra-clausal position of the dislocate, and its nominative case marking (*casus pendens*). Furthermore, as is typical of other LD constructions, this type fails to use resumptive pronouns – the presence of resumption being perceived by native speakers as ungrammatical (12.a–b).

- (11) a. ólpayian , á-yier-áki endáa
 man-NOM [pause] 1SG-cook-DAT food
 ‘The man, I cook food for him’
 b. Árusha , á-idur-áki
 Arusha-NOM [pause] 1SG-move-DAT
 ‘Arusha, I will move there’
- (12) a. *ólpayian , á-yier-áki endáa nije
 man-NOM [pause] 1SG-cook-DAT food him
 ‘The man, I cook food for him’
 b. *Árusha , á-idur-áki ine
 Arusha-NOM [pause] 1SG-move-DAT there
 ‘Arusha, I will move there’

The LD construction in which the dislocate refers to an argument of the instrumental applicative offers equivalent properties (see examples 13.a–b).¹³ Once more, the use of overt resumptive pronouns is ungrammatical (14.a–b).

- (13) a. βáβa , á-ta-ηamá-yie
 father-NOM [pause] 1SG-PFV-talk-INST
 ‘Father, I talked with him’
 b. ele kálamu , á-isir-ijó-re
 this pen-NOM [pause] 1SG-write-APAS-INST
 ‘This pen, I write with it’
- (14) a. *βáβa , á-ta-ηamá-yie nije¹⁴
 father-NOM [pause] 1SG-PFV-talk-INST him
 Intended meaning: ‘Father, I talked to him’
 b. *ele kálamu , á-isir-ijó-re ije
 this pen [pause] 1SG-write-APAS-INST it
 Intended meaning: ‘This pen, I write with it’

¹³ The instrumental applicative licences a variety of semantic roles, for instance instrument and comitative. For this type of applicatives consult Lamoureaux (2004).

¹⁴ Constructions with a comitative marker *oo* (e.g. *oo nije* ‘with him/it’) are also ungrammatical.

The role of the dislocate may likewise correspond to an argument of the directional applicate (Lamoureaux 2004). In Arusa, this applicative extension licenses two roles: motion towards or motion away. In both cases, an LD construction exhibits typical characteristics such as a pause, the extra-clausal position of the dislocate, and its nominative case marking (*casus pendens*; see examples 15.a–b). Resumption is regularly absent (15.a–b) and perceived as ungrammatical (16.a–b).

- (15) a. áan̩ , éé é-lɔt-u
 home [pause] yes 3SG-come-DIR
 ‘Home, yes, he will come here’
- b. óserɔ , éé é-rew-aa Tom inkífu
 bush [pause] yes 3SG-take-DIR Tom cows
 ‘The bush, yes, Tom will take the cows there’
- (16) a. *áan̩ , éé é-lɔt-u ene
 home [pause] yes 3SG-come-DIR here
 Intended meaning: ‘Home, yes, he will come here’
- b. *óserɔ , éé é-rew-aa Tom inkífu ine
 bush [pause] yes 3SG-take-DIR Tom cows there
 Intended meaning: ‘The bush, yes, Tom will take the cows there’

The dislocate in LD constructions in Arusa can also be headed by an expression similar to *as for*, *as far as ... is concerned* or *regarding* in English, thus allowing for the so-called ‘as-for’ type of LD. Among the most common heading locutions are *tenaa* ‘as for’ (lit. ‘if’), *ore* ‘as for’ (lit. ‘when’), and its composites *ore taa tenaa* ‘as far as *x* [is concerned]’ (lit. ‘when so for’) and *ore tenaa* ‘as for’. The ‘as-for’ type of LD in Arusa exhibits properties that are fully analogous to those offered by the simple LD structure analyzed previously. This includes a pausal intonation, an extra-clause position of the dislocate and its separation from the matrix clause by means of interjections and interrogatives (17.a–c), and the absence and ungrammaticality of resumption (18.a–c). As was the case of the “bare” type, the dislocate of the “as-for” variety is marked for the nominative case. This, however, does not constitute an example of *casus pendens*, but is conditioned by language-specific idiosyncrasies. To be exact, the dislocated NP is either introduced by the conjunctions *tenaa* ‘if’ or *ore* ‘when’, which typically govern the nominative case, or it is headed by the preposition *te* ‘for’ that also requires the nominative case on the noun, contrary to all the other prepositions (Tucker, Mpaayei 1955: 103, 175).¹⁵

- (17) a. tenaa βáβa , éé á-porr
 if father-NOM [pause] yes 1SG-like
 ‘As for father, yes I like him’
- b. ore taa te éŋ-kerai , é-yielo yieyo
 when and.so for 3SG-child-NOM [pause] 3SG-know my.mother
 ‘As for the child, my mother knows him’

¹⁵ As mentioned previously, prepositions govern the accusative case.

- c. *tenaa eɛ kálamu* , *á-isir-ijó-re*
 as.for this pen-NOM [pause] 1SG-write-APAS-INST
 ‘As for this pen, I write with it’
- (18) a. **tenaa báβa* , *éé á-ɲorr niɲe*
 as.for father-NOM [pause] yes 1SG-like him
 Intended meaning: ‘As for father, yes I like him’
- b. **ore taa te éŋ-kerai* , *é-yielo yieyo niɲe*
 as is for 3SG-child-NOM [pause] 3SG-know my.mother him
 Intended meaning: ‘As for the child, my mother knows him’
- c. **tenaa eɛ kálamu* , *á-isir-ijó-re iɲe*¹⁶
 as.for this pen-NOM [pause] 1SG-write-APAS-INST it
 Intended meaning: ‘As for this pen, I write with it’

The review of the Arusa evidence can be concluded by introducing the only case where the resumption is necessary. This takes place in instances when the referent does not correspond to a slot licensed by the verb (subject, direct or indirect object, applied object), but rather refers to an adjunct (19.a–b). In such instances, it is the absence of resumptive elements that is ungrammatical (20.a–b).

- (19) a. *ore tenaa báβa* , *á-ɲomo oo niɲe*
 when if father-NOM [pause] 1SG-go.PFV with him
 ‘As for father, I travelled with him’
- b. *kúlo áyiok* , *á-igúra-na oo niɲe*
 these boys-NOM [pause] 1SG-play-REC.PFV with them
 ‘These boys, I played with them’
- (20) a. **ore tenaa báβa* , *á-ɲomo*
 when if father-NOM [pause] 1SG-go.PFV
 Intended meaning: ‘As for father, I travelled with him’
- b. **kúlo áyiok* , *a-igúr-ana*
 these boys-NOM [pause] 1SG-play-REC.PFV
 Intended meaning: ‘These boys, I played with them’

5. Discussion

The evidence shows that, in Arusa, LD fails to use any overt resumptive element in most instances. Resumption is typically absent in cases where the dislocate corresponds to an argument licensed by the verb of the matrix clause. This argument may be the subject of the verb, its direct and indirect object, or an object of a predicate extended by dative, instrumental and direction applicative morphemes. In all such instances, overt resumptive pronouns are not only missing but also ungrammatical. The resumptive pronouns can only be used if the discourse-pragmatic function of

¹⁶ A construction with the comitative marker *oo* (i.e. *oo niɲe*) is also ungrammatical.

the referent is specified in the matrix clause as focus and if such a pronominal element is fronted.¹⁷ The only obligatory use of resumption, which fails to convey any focal nuance, is found in cases where the dislocate refers to an adjunct of the matrix clause, i.e. an element that is not syntactically required by the verb.

The common absence of resumption in LD in Arusa – and its ungrammaticality in most cases – is related to the morpho-syntax of this language and its idiosyncrasy. As has been explained in section 3, in Arusa, the arguments of a verb (i.e. the subject and all the types of objects) do not need to be overtly conveyed in the form of pronouns. In fact, pronominal arguments are most commonly left unexpressed. This is possible because the information related to such arguments is either encoded by verbal inflection or is implicitly assumed by the semantics of the verb. To be exact, the information concerning the subject – its person and number – is regularly indicated by means of verbal inflections. In certain cases, the object is also encoded explicitly through inflectional prefixes and tone. This occurs if the object corresponds to 1SG and 2PL. In all the other cases, even though the object is not overtly expressed, it is implied by the argument structure of the verb. Consequently, since the expression of overt pronominal objects is not required by the syntax of Arusa, LD of this language does not necessitate the use of resumptive pronouns either. To put it simply, the grammar of Arusa makes it impossible to use resumption in LD because the pronouns that could refer to arguments are almost never employed. As a result, the non-resumptive type of LD is not only optional in Arusa – in most cases, it is *de facto* the only LD construction the language allows for.

Whereas the non-resumptive type of LD in Arusa fails to comply with the LD prototype by lacking resumptive elements in the matrix clause, it exhibits all the remaining formal characteristics cross-linguistically associated with LD. This includes a pausal intonation, an extra-clausal position of the dislocate and its nominative or *casus pendens* marking. Likewise, from a functional perspective, the non-resumptive type complies with the LD prototype. The locution first (re)activates a referent characterized by a low degree of accessibility and subsequently specifies its syntactic and discourse-pragmatic role in the matrix clause. As a result, since the non-resumptive LD complies with all the other formal and functional traits characteristic of the LD prototype, and since in most cases the idiosyncrasy of Arusa makes resumption impossible to appear, this type of LD in Arusa should be regarded as an instantiation of an LD category.

The above conclusion – and the ungrammaticality of resumption in LD in Arusa – demonstrate that resumption cannot be viewed as a necessary condition to categorize a construction as LD. Conversely, the absence of resumption cannot be regarded as a sufficient reason to classify a construction as a category distinct from LD. This provides further support for the cognitive view of LD. According to this view, LD constructions that are found cross-linguistically establish a family-resemblance relationship with the prototype, exhibiting certain properties associated

¹⁷ This is related to the fact that independent pronouns are usually employed to communicate focal or contrastive nuances.

with it, but not necessarily all of them. As this prototype is idealized, realistic forms may fail to perfectly comply with it, while still being instantiations of the category (Janda 2015).

6. Conclusion

The present study demonstrated that Arusa frequently employs a non-resumptive type of LD. This less canonical type of LD is *de facto* the most common type of LD in Arusa, obligatorily found in cases where the possible resumptive element refers to an argument of the verb of the matrix clause. This, in turn, shows that resumption cannot be viewed as a decisive feature for the classification of a construction as LD. Rather, LD should be viewed as a radial category whose members approximate the prototype to a greater or lesser degree. Given this gradient nature of LD, even non-canonical instantiations should still be analyzed as cases of LD, albeit more remote from the idealized exemplar.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative, **APAS** – antipassive, **DAT** – dative applicative, **DIR** – directional applicative, **INST** – instrumental applicative, **LD** – left dislocation, **NOM** – nominative, **O** – objet, **PART** – particle, **PAST** – past, **PL** – plural, **PFV** – perfective, **REC** – reciprocal, **REL** – relative, **S** – subject, **SG** – singular, **V** – verb.

References

- Andrason A. 2016. To resume or not to resume: A note on resumption in left dislocation constructions in Polish and its relevance for Biblical Hebrew. – Andrason A., Westbury J. (eds.). *Left Dislocation. Special Issue of SPIL 50*. Stellenbosch: 185–199.
- Caponigro I. 2003. Unbalanced coordination in Maasai. – *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 1–16.
- Chafe W. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. – CH. Li (ed.). *Subject and Topic*. New York: 22–25.
- Carstens V., Shoaff C. 2015. *D-to-C and VSO/SVO alternation in Kisongo Maasai: Evidence from relative clauses*. [coral.missouri.edu/docs/maasai/GlowAbsNonAnon.pdf].
- Cinque G. 1983/1997. ‘Topic’ constructions in some European languages and ‘connectedness’. – Anagnostopoulou E., van Riemsdijk H., Zwarts F. (eds.). *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 93–118.
- Duszak A. 1984. Topical sentence positions in English and Polish. – *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 18: 55–70.
- Hamaya M. 1997. Vowel harmony in Maasai. – *Linguistics* 607: 1–30.
- Janda L. 2015. Cognitive linguistics in the year 2015. – *Cognitive Semantics* 1: 131–154.
- Karani M. 2013. *The Arusa verb system*. [MA Diss., University of Dar es Salaam].

- Lambrecht K. 2001. Dislocations. – Haspelmath M. (ed.). *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Berlin: 1050–1078.
- Lamoureux S. 2004. Applicative construction in Maasai. [MA Diss., University of Oregon].
- Lewis M.P. (ed.). 2009. *Ethnologue. Languages of the world*. [16th edition]. Dallas.
- LoT. 2009. *Atlas ya Lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam.
- Payne D. 1995. Verb initial languages and information order. – Downing P., Noonan M. (eds.). *Word order in discourse*. Amsterdam: 449–485.
- Scarborough S. 2014. Accounting for null arguments: Pronoun dropping in Maa. [Talk at the 45th Annual Conference on African Linguistics. April 19, 2014, the University of Kansas].
- Tucker A.N., Mpaayei J. 1955. *A grammar of Maasai with vocabulary*. New York.
- Vossen R. 1988. *Towards a comparative study of the Maasai dialects of Kenya and Tanzania*. [Translated by Marion Frank]. Hamburg.
- Westbury J. 2014. *Left Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew: A cognitive linguistic account*. [PhD Diss., Stellenbosch University].
- Westbury J. 2015. Left Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew: Towards a comprehensive syntactico-semantic and discourse-pragmatic profile. [Talk presented at the SBL Conference 2015].