

THE INDICATOR PARTICLE baa IN SOMALI

Michal Allon Livnat

Focus is a predominant phenomenon in Somali. One constituent in every main declarative clause must be marked for focus by an indicator particle. The most common indicator particle, baa, assumes various forms; it may occur in its unconjugated form baa or may be conjugated with a subject pronoun clitic. The same clitics occur in relative, adverbial and complement clauses. This paper demonstrates that the distribution of the various forms of the indicator particle, as well as the distribution of subject clitic in subordinate clauses can be accounted for in a unified fashion if every main clause in Somali is analyzed as a cleft construction, i.e. one NP is extracted out of its clause and marked by baa. I argue against an alternative analysis - Antinucci and Puglielli's proposal to analyze subordinate clauses as containing underlying indicator particles, and discuss the implications of the proposed analysis as well as apparent exceptions and problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is part of a larger work, the research for which is still in progress, which aims at describing and analyzing focus constructions and related phenomena in Somali.

In this paper I concentrate on the description and analysis of structures containing the indicator particle baa although reference is made occasionally to other indicator particles.

The importance of the particle baa has been recognized by everyone who has seriously attempted to describe the Somali language. In 1951, in his pioneering work, "The Principles of Somali" Abraham wrote: "The word ba' is the most important word in Somali and it is no exaggeration to say that if its usage is not understood, most Somali sentences cannot be explained." (p.72)

I fully agree with Abraham. The particle baa, with its special syntactic and semantic characteristics, plays a central role in Somali, and understanding it is essential to any adequate analysis of the language.

In this paper I mainly examine the syntactic role of baa although some discussion is devoted to its semantic function.

Previous works on indicator particles, including baa have, in my view, not been able to come up with an adequate analysis of its role in the syntax of Somali. Most of these works merely describe the distribution of the particle, the different positions in the sentence where it can occur, and the various phonological shapes it assumes, but do not analyze these forms, nor explain their distribution (see for example Abraham, Bell, Andzrejewski, Hetzron).

The only work done on this topic within the framework of generative grammar is, to the best of my knowledge, Antinucci and Puglielli (1980) and Antinucci (1980). Antinucci and Puglielli's work is a major breakthrough in the study of Somali syntax. This important and interesting study is a first attempt to provide a generative-transformational analysis of the indicator particle baa. The authors propose a highly abstract transformational analysis of different types of clauses in Somali, based on the role of the indicator particle baa in their derivation. Antinucci and Puglielli's work stimulated and directed much of the research which resulted in this paper, and although I disagree with their conclusions, I am greatly indebted to them. In section 3. I argue against Antinucci and Puglielli's analysis and show a) why it is incorrect as an analysis of Somali sentences and b) why it does not explain adequately the facts concerning the particle baa.

I will suggest an alternative analysis to account for the distribution of the particle baa and its central role in the syntax of Somali, and argue that the proposed analysis (though in need of refinement in certain areas) is more general and offers a better explanation for the perplexing phenomenon of the particle baa.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In Section 2. I describe the basic structure of Somali sentences, including the distribution of indicator particles. In Section 3. I point out basic deficiencies of previous treatments, particularly that of Antinucci and Puglielli. In Section 4. I propose an alternative analysis for the particle baa, and related phenomena. In Section 5. I discuss some problems with the proposed analysis. Section 6. is a summary and conclusion.

## 2. THE STRUCTURE OF SOMALI SENTENCES

In this section I present the basic facts of simple and complex sentences in Somali. Only those aspects of the language which are relevant to the main thesis of this paper are discussed.

Somali is a free word order language, though the preferred, unmarked order is probably SOV. Various syntactic and semantic factors constrain word order, and the order of constituents is often semantically and pragmatically significant.

The sentences in (1), which all mean roughly 'The man saw the woman.', exemplify<sub>2</sub> the grammaticality of each possible word order in a simple sentence.

- |     |    |         |                          |           |         |     |
|-----|----|---------|--------------------------|-----------|---------|-----|
| (1) | a. | ninkii  | baa                      | arkay     | naagtii | SVO |
|     | b. | ninkii  | baa                      | naagtii   | arkay   | SOV |
|     | c. | naagtii | buu                      | ninkii    | arkay   | OSV |
|     | d. | naagtii | buu                      | arkay     | ninkii  | OVS |
|     | e. | wuu     | arkay                    | ninkii    | naagtii | VSO |
|     | f. | wuu     | arkay                    | naagtii   | ninkii  | VOS |
|     |    | F       | saw                      | woman-the | man-the |     |
|     |    |         | 'The man saw the woman.' |           |         |     |

I now turn to a description of the basic structure of main clauses, relative clauses, and complement clauses. These three types of clauses share some important features; the most relevant to the present paper is subject pronoun clitics.

### 2.1. Main Clauses

Every indicative, affirmative sentence in Somali must contain one and only one indicator particle. Indicator particles occur only in main clauses. Sentences (2) through (10) are grammatical while (11) and (12) are not because they lack an indicator particle.

- (2) Axmed baa hilib cunay  
Axmed F meat ate  
'Axmed ate meat.'
- (3) Axmed hilib buu cunay  
Axmed meat F ate  
'Axmed ate meat.'
- (4) naagtii bay gooshii dishay  
woman-the F lioness-the killed  
'The lioness killed the woman.'
- (5) ninkii wuu cararay  
man-the F ran  
'The man ran.'
- (6) ninkii baa xaday sacii  
man-the F stole cow-the  
'The man stole the cow.'
- (7) ninkii ayaa koray geedka  
man-the F climbed tree-the  
'The man climbed the tree.'
- (8) naagta waan la xadlay  
woman-the F with talked  
'I talked to the woman.'
- (9) naagtii warqad bay u qoray ninkii  
woman-the letter F to wrote man-the  
'The woman wrote a letter to the man'
- (10) Cali mindi buu ku dilay libaaxii  
Ali knife F with killed lion-the  
'Ali killed the lion with a knife'
- (11) \*naagtii aragtay ninkii  
woman-the saw man-the

- (12) \*Cali arkay Caasha  
Ali saw Asha

In this paper I examine only indicative affirmative sentences although negative and interrogative sentences may also contain indicator particles.

### 2.1.1. The Semantic Function of Indicator Particles

The indicator particle marks one constituent in the sentence as the focus, the new information, the rheme. The particle baa may focus on any preverbal NP in the sentence, regardless of its grammatical function. baa immediately follows the NP which it marks as the focus. The indicator particle may occur in its unconjugated form baa or in one of several conjugated forms baan, baad, buu, etc. The choice of the right form of the particle are discussed below.

The following sentences (13) through (16) all have the same truth-conditional meaning: 'Yesterday Ali gave a present to Maryan.', but in each sentence the focus is on a different constituent. The use of the cleft construction in the English gloss brings to light the differences among the sentences.

- (13) Cali baa shalay Maryan hadyad siiyey  
Ali F yesterday Maryan present gave  
'It was Ali who gave Maryan a present yesterday.'
- (14) Maryan buu Cali shalay hadyad siiyey  
Maryan F Ali yesterday present gave  
'It was to Maryan that Ali gave a present yesterday.'
- (15) hadyad buu Cali Maryan siiyey shalay  
present F Ali Maryan gave yesterday  
'It was a present that Cali gave Maryan yesterday.'
- (16) shalay buu Cali hadyad siiyey Maryan  
yesterday F Ali present gave Maryan  
'It was yesterday that Ali gave Maryan a present.'

The particle baa may focus on a complex NP as well as on a simple one.

- (17) ninkii [ dameerka dilay ] baa u soo qoray  
man-the donkey-the hit F to towards wrote  
naagta warqada  
-woman-the letter-the  
'It was the man who hit the donkey who wrote a  
letter to the woman.'
- (18) inankii [ ay Caashi u sheekeysay ] baa qoslay  
boy-the 3.f.sg. Asha to story-told F laughed  
'It was the boy to whom Asha told the story who laughed.'

An indefinite NP can be focused as well as a definite one.

- (19) nin baa Caasha u sheekeyey  
 man F Asha to story-told  
 'A man told a story to Asha.'
- (20) nin baa guriga gudiihisa ku jira  
 man F house-the inside-of in is  
 'There is a man inside the house.'

Apart from baa there are several other indicator particles in Somali. Ayaa (and its conjugated variants ayaan, ayaad, ayuu, etc.) also focuses on the NP which it follows. The particle waa (and its conjugated forms waan, waad, wuu, etc.) focuses on the verb. The particle waa immediately precedes the verb which it marks as the focus of the sentence. The particle waxaa (and its conjugated forms waxaan, waxaad, waxuu, etc.) requires further analysis which is beyond the scope of this paper. In sentences where waxaa occurs the focused NP is not adjacent to it. In this paper I have little to say about indicator particles other than baa, the most common one.

The conversational function of the different indicator particles can be exemplified when we look at information questions (WH questions), and the sentences which can be appropriate answers to them. For example, although (22) and (23) have the same truth-conditional meaning, only the former can be an appropriate answer to the question in (21). Here and elsewhere below the element which is underlined in the English gloss is the focused element.

- (21) yaa qoslay  
 who laughed  
 'Who laughed?'
- (22) Cali baa qoslay  
 Ali F laughed  
 'Ali laughed.'
- (23) Cali wuu qoslay  
 Ali F laughed  
 'Ali laughed.'

In the same way (25) but not (26) nor (27) is an appropriate answer to (24).

- (24) yuu arkay Cali  
 whom saw Ali  
 'Who did Ali see?'
- (25) Maryan buu Cali arkay  
 Maryan F Ali saw  
 'Ali saw Maryan.'
- (26) Cali baa arkay Maryan  
 Ali F saw Maryan  
 'Ali saw Maryan.'

- (27) Cali wuu arkay Maryan  
 Ali F saw Maryan  
 'Ali saw Maryan.'

Similarly, (29) but not (30) is an appropriate answer to (28), and (32) but not (33) is an appropriate answer to (31). The answer to (34) can be (35) but not (36) nor (37).

- (28) muxuu Cali sameyey  
 What Ali did  
 'What did Ali do?'

- (29) Cali wuu qoslay  
 Ali F laughed  
 'Ali laughed.'

- (30) Cali baa qoslay  
 Ali F laughed  
 'Ali laughed.'

- (31) xagee buu saaray ninkii buugga  
 place-which F put man-the book-the  
 'Where did the man put the book?'

- (32) miis buu saaray ninkii buugga  
 table F put man-the book-the  
 'The man put the book on a table.'

- (33) ninkii baa buugga miis saaray  
 man-the F book-the table put  
 'The man put the book on a table.'

- (34) goormuu Cali cararay  
 when Ali ran-away  
 'When did Ali run away?'

- (35) shalay buu cararay Cali  
 yesterday F ran-away Ali  
 'Ali ran away yesterday.'

- (36) Cali baa cararay shalay  
 Ali F ran-away yesterday  
 'Ali ran away yesterday.'

- (37) 'shalay Cali baa cararay  
 yesterday Ali F ran-away  
 'Ali ran away yesterday.'

Contrastive sentences exemplify the same point in a different way. In (38) through (43) the contrasted element is marked as the focus by the indicator particle.

- (38) Mustafa ma dilin Casha e Cali baa dilay  
 Mustafa not hit-not Asha but Ali F hit  
 'Mustafa didn't hit Asha, Ali did.'
- (39) Cali buugga Casha muu siinin e Maryan buu siiyey  
 Ali book-the Asha not gave-not but Maryan F gave  
 'Ali didn't give the book to Asha, he gave it to Maryan.'
- (40) Cali manta ma iman e shalay buu yimi  
 Ali today not came-not but yesterday F came  
 'Ali didn't come today, he came yesterday.'
- (41) Cali buug ma akhriyin e warqad buu akhriyey  
 Ali book not read-not but letter F read  
 'Ali didn't read a book, he read a letter.'
- (42) Cali ma dhisan guri e wuu iibsaday  
 Ali not build-not house but F bought  
 'Ali didn't build a house, he bought one.'
- (43) Cali ma qoslin e wuu heesay  
 Ali not laughe-not but F sang  
 Ali didn't laugh he sang.'

Another function of indicator particles is to signify the completeness of a sentence. For example in (44) the baa tells us that it is a sentence, while the absence of the indicator particle in (45) means that it is an NP and not a complete sentence.

- (44) ninkii baa arkay naagta  
 man-the F saw woman-the  
 'The man saw the woman.'
- (45) ninkii arkay naagta  
 man-the saw woman-the  
 'the man who saw the woman'

### 2.1.2. The Distribution of the Various Forms of baa

The indicator particle baa may mark any preverbal noun in a main clause. The focused NP is usually (but need not be) preposed to sentence initial position. Cases where the focused NP does not occur sentence initially are discussed in Section 5. The particle may either occur in its unconjugated form baa, or in one of its conjugated forms, baan, baad, etc. It has been recognized by several linguists in the past that these forms result from the conjugation of baa with the short form of subject pronouns (henceforth subject clitics). Besides a set of full subject pronouns there is a corresponding set of short forms of these pronouns. These forms play an important role in the analysis proposed in this paper.

The following is a list of the full subject pronouns, the corresponding clitics, and the forms of baa conjugated with these clitics.

(46)	Full form	Clitics	baa + Clitic
1 sg.	aniga	aan	baan
2 sg.	adiga	aad	baad
3 sg.m.	isaga	uu	buu
3 sg.f.	iyada	ay	bay
1 pl.inc.	innaga	aynu	baynu
1 pl.exc.	annaga	aanu	baanu
2 pl.	idinka	aydu (aad)	baydu (baad)
3 pl.	iyaga	ay	bay

The distribution of the indicator particle in its conjugated vs. unconjugated form is quite complex. These distributional patterns constitute the main problem that this paper addresses, and thus need to be kept in mind throughout the exposition.

Several factors determine whether the indicator particle appears in its unconjugated form baa or in one of its conjugated forms. One factor is whether the indicator particle marks the subject of the sentence or a noun other than the subject. If the latter, it is irrelevant whether this non-subject is a direct object, a locative, an instrumental, etc. Another factor is whether the subject of the sentence precedes or follows the verb, regardless of the relative order of other constituents in the sentence. A third factor has to do with whether the subject of the sentence is itself a pronoun. A fourth factor is whether the focused NP occurs before or after the subject. These factors will be taken up one by one to show how they effect the choice of the right form of the indicator particle. When the indicator particle occurs in its conjugated form, it (or rather the clitic in it) always agrees with the subject of the sentence. In my exposition of the facts below I divide the discussion into five parts (a, b, c, d, and e), corresponding to the different conditions under which the various shapes of the indicator particle occur.

a. When the indicator particle baa marks a subject in a sentence, it always occurs in its unconjugated form baa.

(47) ninkii/Cali { baa } arkay naagtii  
 { \*buu }  
 man-the/Ali F saw (3 m.sg.) woman-the  
 'The man/Ali saw the woman.'

(48) naagtii { baa } aragtay ninkii  
 { \*bay }  
 woman-the F saw (3 f.sg.) man-the  
 'The woman saw the man.'

The subject in such sentences may be a pronoun.<sup>3</sup>

(49) adigaa muuska cunay  
 you-F banana-the ate (3 m.sg.)  
 'You ate the banana.'

b. When baa marks a non-subject, and the subject of the sentence is itself a (full) pronoun, the indicator particle occurs in its conjugated



form, agreeing with the subject.<sup>4</sup> This is true even if the full form of the subject pronoun does not occur on the surface (see (51), (53), (55)).

(50) ninkii        { baan }        anigu        arkay  
                   { \*baa }  
 man-the        F            I            saw  
 'I saw the man.'

(51) ninkii        { baan }        arkay  
                   { \*baa }  
 man-the        F            saw  
 'I saw the man.'

(52) muuskii      { bay }        iyagu        cuneen  
                   { \*baa }  
 banana-the    F            they        ate  
 'They ate the banana.'

(53) muuskii      { bay }        cuneen  
                   { \*baa }  
 banana-the    F            ate  
 'They ate the banana.'

(54) ninkii        { buu }        isagu        arkay  
                   { \*baa }  
 man-the        F            he            saw  
 'He saw the man.'

(55) ninkii        { buu }        arkay  
                   { \*baa }  
 man-the        F            saw  
 'He saw the man.'

c. When the indicator particle marks a NP in sentence initial position, other than the subject, and the (nominal) subject of the sentence precedes the verb, the indicator particle may occur either in its conjugated or in its unconjugated form.

(56) fuudkii      { baa }        nimankii    cabbeen  
                   { bay }  
 soup-the        F            men-the     drank  
 'The men drank the soup.'

(57) .naagtii      { baa }        nimankii    arkeen  
                   { bay }  
 woman-the      F            men-the     saw  
 'The men saw the woman.'

(58) muuskii      { baa }        Cali        cunay  
                   { bay }  
 banana-the    F            Ali          ate  
 'Ali ate the banana.'

d. When the indicator particle marks a non-subject, and the subject follows the verb, the conjugated form of baa is obligatory.

(59) fuudkii            { buu }            cabeen            nimankii  
                               {\*baa}  
 soup-the                F                drank            man-the  
 'The men drank the soup.'

(60) naagtii            { bay }            arkeen            nimankii  
                               {\*baa}  
 woman-the                F                saw                man-the  
 'The men saw the woman.'

(61) muuskii            { buu }            cunay            Cali  
                               {\*baa}  
 banana                    F                ate                Ali  
 'Ali ate the banana.'

e. When the indicator particle marks a non-subject, and the subject precedes this NP, the conjugated form of baa is obligatory.

(62) Cali            warqad            { buu }            naagtii            u            qoray  
                               {\*baa}  
 Ali            letter                F            woman-the            to            wrote  
 'Ali wrote a letter to the woman.'

(63) Axmed            hilibkii            { buu }            cunay  
                               {\*baa}  
 Axmed            meat-the                F            ate  
 'Axmed ate the meat.'

Notice that the conjugated form of baa is obligatory only when the subject precedes the focused NP. If the focused NP is preceded by a NP other than the subject, the unconjugated form of baa can occur. This is shown in (64).

(64) naagta            warqad            { buu }            Cali            u            qoray  
   baa  
 woman-the            letter                F            Ali            to            wrote  
 'Ali wrote a letter to the woman.'

In (65) below the distribution of the conjugated vs. unconjugated form of the indicator particle baa is shown schematically. S stands for the subject, where S[-pron] is a nominal subject and S[+pron] is a pronominal subject. N stands for any non-subject noun phrase. buu stands for any one of the conjugated forms of baa.

(65) The Distribution of baa vs. Its Conjugated Forms

- a. S { baa } N V The subject is marked as the focus--the unconjugated form baa is obligatory.  
 { \*buu }
- b. N { \*baa } S V A non-subject is marked as the focus and the subject is a pronoun--the conjugated form of baa is obligatory.  
 { buu } [+pron]
- c. N { baa } S V A non-subject is marked as focus and the subject precedes the verb--both conjugated and unconjugated form are possible.  
 { buu } [-pron]
- d. N { \*baa } V S A non-subject is marked as the focus, and the subject follows the verb--the conjugated form is obligatory.  
 { buu }
- e. S N { \*baa } V A non-subject is marked as focus, and the subject precedes the focused NP--the conjugated form is obligatory.  
 { buu }

2.2. Relative Clauses

Relative clauses, like all other subordinate clauses in Somali do not contain indicator particles. Relative clauses are not marked by complementizers and there are no relative pronouns. Word order inside the RC is free and does not distinguish RCs from main clauses. Relative clauses immediately follow their head NP. A complex NP which consists of a head and a RC may be marked for focus like any other NP (see (66), (67)).

- (66) ninkii [aan arkay] baa cararay  
 man-the 1 sg. saw F run-away  
 'The man I saw ran away.'
- (67) naagtii [qososhay] baa cuntada karisay  
 woman-the laughed F food-the cooked  
 'The woman who laughed cooked the food.'
- (68) naagtii [ninku arkay] way qososhay  
 woman-the man-the saw(3 m.sg.) F laughed  
 'The woman whom the man saw, laughed.'
- (69) magaalada [uu ku nolyahay Cali] way weyntahay  
 city-the 3 m.sg. in lives Ali F big  
 'The city where Ali lives is big.'

The facts about RCs which are most relevant to the main topic of this paper have to do with subject clitics. A subject clitic may occur inside the RC in any preverbal position, although the most common position is clause initially. When a subject clitic occurs, it agrees with the subject of the RC. The conditions which determine the distribution of subject clitics in RCs are very similar to those which determine the distribution of clitics in the conjugated forms of baa in main clauses.

### 2.2.1. The Distribution of Subject Clitics in RCs

a. A subject clitic may never occur in a subject relative clause (i.e., a RC which lacks a surface subject). The ungrammaticality of (71) and (72) exemplifies this.

(70) ninkii [dameerka dilay] wuu heesay  
man-the donkey-the hit F sang

(71) \*ninkii [dameerka uu dilay] wuu heesay

(72) \*ninkii [uu dameerka dilay] wuu heesay

'The man who hit the donkey, sang.'

b. In non-subject RCs<sup>5</sup> if the subject of the RC is itself a (full) pronoun, a subject clitic, which agrees with the subject, is obligatory.<sup>6</sup>

(73) naagta [{aad} adigu aragtay] Maryan bay ahayd  
\*  
Woman-the 2 sg. you saw Maryan F is  
'The woman you saw is Maryan'

(74) ninka [{uu} isagu arkol] waa Cali  
\*  
man-the 3 m.sg. he sees is Ali  
'The man he sees is Ali.'

The clitic is obligatory whether the full form of the pronominal subject occurs on the surface or not. (75) and (76) are examples where the (full) subject pronoun does not show up but a subject clitic is still obligatory.

(75) naagta [{aad} aragtay] Maryan bay ahayd  
\*  
woman-the 2 sg. saw Maryan F is  
'The woman you saw is Maryan.'

(76) ninka [{uu} arkol] waa Cali  
\*  
man-the 3 m.sg. sees is Ali  
'The man he sees is Ali.'

c. In a non-subject RC if the (nominal) subject precedes the verb a subject clitic is optional.

- (77) miiska [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>∅</sub> Cali saray buugga] wuu weynyahay  
 table-the 3 m.sg. Ali put book-the F big  
 'The table on which Ali put the book is big.'
- (78) dameerkii [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>∅</sub> ninku xaday] wuu cararay  
 donkey-the 3 m.sg. man-the stole F ran-away  
 'The donkey which the man stole, ran away.'
- (79) buuggii [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>∅</sub> ninkii siiyey inanka] wuu lumay  
 book-the 3 m.sg. man-the gave boy-the F lost  
 'The book which the man gave to the boy was lost.'
- (80) buuggii [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>∅</sub> inanka ninku siiyey] wuu lumay  
 book-the 3 m.sg. boy-the man-the gave F lost  
 same meaning

d. In a non-subject RC if the subject follows the verb a subject clitic is obligatory

- (81) buuggii [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>\*∅</sub> siiyey inanka ninkii] wuu lumay  
 book-the 3 m.sg. gave boy-the man-the F lost  
 same meaning
- (82) buuggii [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>\*∅</sub> siiyey ninku inanka] wuu lumay  
 book-the 3 m.sg. gave man-the boy-the F lost  
 same meaning
- (83) dameerkii [<sub>{uu}</sub><sub>\*∅</sub> xaday ninku] wuu cararay  
 donkey-the 3 m.sg. stole man-the F ran-away  
 'The donkey which the man stole, ran away.'

It should be emphasized that it is the relative order of the subject and the verb which determines the distribution of subject clitics, regardless of the order of other constituents in the clause (see (79), (80) and (81), (82)).

The distribution of subject clitics in RCs in Somali is summarized schematically in (84). Here NP stands for the head of the RCs. S stands for the subject where S[+pron] is a pronominal subject and S[-pron] a nominal subject. N stands for a non-subject NP, and # represents the deletion site.

(84) The Distribution of Subject Clitics in RCs

- a. NP [ {  $\emptyset$  } # N V] Subject RC--no subject clitic.  
           [ { \*uu } ]
- b. NP [ { \* $\emptyset$  } S # V] Non-subject RC, the subject of the clause is a pronoun--subject clitic is obligatory.  
           [ { uu } [+pron] ]
- c. NP [ {  $\emptyset$  } S # V] Non-subject RC, the nominal subject precedes the verb--the clitic is optional.  
           [ { uu } [-pron] ]
- d. NP [ { \* $\emptyset$  } # V S] Non-subject RC, the subject follows the verb--the clitic is obligatory.  
           [ { uu } ]

2.3. Complement Clauses

In this paper I discuss one type of non-relative subordinate clauses. These clauses are introduced in Somali by the complementizer in meaning 'that'. Like all other subordinate clauses, in clauses can never contain indicator particles. Word order inside in clauses is free. The complementizer in is obligatory and cannot be deleted.

- (85) Cali baa rumaysaan [ { in } nimankii tageen]  
   [ { \* $\emptyset$  } ]  
       Ali F believed that men-the left  
       'Ali believed (that) the men left.'

In clauses may contain subject clitics. These clitics can occur at any preverbal position, but usually they occur clause initially and contract with the complementizer in. When a subject clitic occurs in an in clause it agrees with the subject of the clause.

- (86) Cali wuxuu rumaysaanyahay [ inuu ninku  
       Ali F believed that-3 m.sg. man-the  
       ku nolyahay Berbera ]  
       in live Berbera  
       'Ali believed that the man lived in Berbera.'
- (87) Cali wuxuu rumaysaanyahay [ inay Caashi  
       Ali F believed that-3 f.sg. Asha  
       waanka mindi ku qashay ]  
       lamb-the knife with slaughtered  
       'Ali believed that Asha slaughtered the lamb with a knife.'

- (88) Cali baa qaba [ inay naagta qoray warqada  
 Ali F thinks that-3 f.sg. woman-the wrote letter-the  
 'Ali thinks that the woman wrote the letter.'
- (89) Cali wuu ogyahay [in nimanku ay qateen lacagta]  
 Ali F knows that men-the 3 pl. took money-the  
 'Ali knows that the men took the money.'

The conditions which determine the distribution of subject clitics in in clauses are very similar to those which determine their distribution in RCs and in the conjugated form of the indicator particle in main clauses, but there is a major difference which is discussed below.

### 2.3.1. The Distribution of Subject Clitics in in Clauses

a. When an in clause lacks a surface subject (this situation may arise when the subject of the clause has been relativized or preposed) a subject clitic is obligatory. The clitic agrees with the original subject of the clause. This is the case where in clauses differ from relative clauses, since in the latter there is no clitic when there is no surface subject. This difference and its implications are the main topic of Section 5. and I will not discuss it further at this point.

- (90) naagta [ uu Cali qabo [ {inay} ninka  
 woman-the 3 m.sg. Ali thinks that-3 f.sg. man-the  
 buugga siiyey ] ] waa Amina  
 book-the gave F Amina  
 'The woman that Ali thinks gave the book to the man,  
 is Amina.'

- (91) ninkii buu rumaystay [ {inuu} tagay ]  
 man-the F believe (1 sg.) that-3 m.sg. left  
 'I believe that the man left.'

b. When the subject of an in clause is itself a pronoun, a subject clitic is obligatory. This clitic agrees with the subject of the clause, whether the full pronoun actually occurs or not.

- (92) Cali wuu ogyahay [ {inaan} libaaxa dilay ]  
 Ali F knows that-1 sg. lion-the killed  
 'Ali knows that I killed the lion.'

- (93) Cali wuu ogyahay [ {inaan} anigu libaaxa dilay ]  
 Ali F knows that-1 sg. I lion-the killed  
 same meaning

(94) Cali wuu ogyahay [ {inay} libaaxa dishay ]  
   \*in  
 Ali F knows that-3 f.sg. lion-the killed  
 'Ali knows that she killed the lion.'

(95) Cali wuu ogyahay [ {inay} iyadu libaaxa dishay ]  
   \*in  
 Ali F knows that-3 f.sg. she lion-the killed  
 same meaning

c. When the subject of an in clause is nominal and it precedes the verb, a subject clitic is optional.

(96) Cali baa qaba {inay} naagtu warqada qortay  
   in  
 Ali F thinks that-3 f.sg. woman-the letter-the wrote  
 'Ali thinks that the woman wrote the letter.'

(97) Cali baa qaba {inay} naagtu qortay warqada  
   in  
 Ali F thinks that-3 f.sg. woman-the wrote letter-the  
 same meaning

d. When the subject of the clause follows the verb, a subject clitic is obligatory.

(98) Cali baa qaba [ {inay} warqada qortay naagtu ]  
   \*in  
 Ali F thinks that-3 f.sg. letter-the wrote woman-the  
 same meaning

(99) Cali baa qaba [ {inay} qortay naagtu warqada ]  
   \*in  
 Ali F thinks that-3 f.sg. wrote woman-the letter-the  
 same meaning

(100) Cali baa qaba [ {inay} qortay warqada naagtu ]  
   \*in  
 Ali F thiks that-3 f.sg. wrote letter-the woman-the  
 same meaning

The only difference then between the behavior of in clauses and RCs as far as the distribution of the subject clitics, is in cases where the clause does not contain a surface subject (case 'a' above). Otherwise the distribution of subject clitics in RC and in clauses is completely parallel.

In this section I have described the basic structure of main clauses, relative clauses and complement clauses. The main emphasis was on the distribution of subject clitics. I have shown that the three types of clauses demonstrate significant similarities in this respect. The question which this paper addresses has to do primarily with the distribution of the different forms of the indicator particle baa in main clauses, i.e., why is it that subjects are focus-marked with baa while non-subjects are usually



marked with the conjugated form of the particle, agreeing with their subject. The facts concerning subordinate and relative clauses are brought to help solve this problem and provide evidence for the analysis proposed below.

In the next section I discuss previous attempts to explain these facts and show why they are inadequate as an analysis of Somali sentences and particularly focus constructions.

### 3. PREVIOUS TREATMENTS OF THE INDICATOR PARTICLE baa

#### 3.1. Traditional Work

Ignoring details, the main phenomenon, and the most interesting one concerning the indicator particle baa described in the previous section (particularly in Subsection 2.1.) is the fact that when the particle marks a subject it occurs in its unconjugated form baa, while when it marks a non-subject, it usually occurs in its conjugated form. This is a peculiar state of affairs since it may look as if an object (or another non-subject NP) may exhibit agreement with the subject of the sentence by means of a particle which is attached to it. This is an unusual situation in the world's languages, and one which deserves to be accounted for.

It has been recognized (see Bell (1953), Abraham (1951), Hetzron (1965), Andrzejewski (1975)) that the conjugated form of the indicator particle is the result of the combination of baa and a subject clitic. None of the previous researchers has been able, to the best of my knowledge, to explain why the conjugated form is used in some cases while the unconjugated form in others. The distribution of the conjugated versus the unconjugated form of indicator particles in Somali, although a central and predominant phenomenon in the syntax of Somali, has been left unaccounted for. This problem is the one which this work is primarily concerned with.

#### 3.2. Antinucci and Puglielli's Analysis

Recently there has been an attempt (Antinucci and Puglielli (1980)), the first within the framework of Generative-Transformational Grammar, to account for various constructions in Somali by referring to the central role of indicators in the syntax of Somali.

Below I briefly summarize Antinucci and Puglielli's analysis (henceforth A&P) and show why it does not provide an adequate account of the phenomenon.

##### 3.2.1. A&P's Analysis of RCs

Antinucci and Puglielli claim that most types of sentences in Somali are derived from a basic kernel containing only main declarative sentences. In particular, all Somali RCs are derived from main declarative clauses in which (a) one of the NPs is identical to the head-noun; (b) this NP is

always marked with the indicator particle baa; (c) this NP is deleted together with baa.

Antinucci and Puglielli observe that a RC can never contain an indicator particle and that a subject clitic can never occur by itself in a main clause; in those clauses the subject clitic always combines with the indicator particle. They account for the presence and distribution of subject clitics inside RCs by deriving RCs from main clauses with indicator particles. The subject clitic (if it occurs) is what is left after the NP which is correferential to the head NP has been deleted together with baa. For example (101) (A&P's (11)) is derived from (102) (A&P's (18)) by deletion of the NP which is marked with baa inside the RC, together with baa (but without the subject clitic which is attached to it).

(101) warqadda [Cali uu qoray] maanta bay tegi doontaa  
 letter-the Ali 3 m. wrote now P-3 f. go will  
 'The letter which Ali wrote will leave now.'

(102) [warqadda<sub>i</sub> [Cali warqadda<sub>i</sub> buu qoray ]<sub>S</sub>]<sub>NP</sub>  
 maanta bay tegi doontaa

I repeat here the relevant part of the derivation as sketched in A&P. The slashes mark the portion which is deleted.

(103) [Cali ~~warqadda baa~~ + uu qoray] ==> [Cali uu qoray]

When the main clause underlying the RC contains the unconjugated form baa the derivation would result in a RC without a subject clitic. Thus (104) (A&P's I, p.3) is derived from (105).

(104) wiilka [kuu soo qoray] waa walaalkay  
 boy-the you-to hither wrote F brother-my  
 'The boy who wrote to you is my brother.'

(105) [[wiilka<sub>i</sub> [wiilka<sub>i</sub> baa kuu soo qoray] ]<sub>S</sub>]<sub>NP</sub> waa walaalkay]<sub>S</sub>

### 3.2.2. Problems with A&P's Analysis

The analysis presented by Antinucci and Puglielli shares the same drawbacks with previous descriptions which I have mentioned above: It offers no explanation as to why some NPs are marked with the unconjugated form baa while others with the conjugated forms buu, bay, etc.

The sole motivation for postulating the indicator particle in RCs is to account for the distribution of subject clitics in RCs. If the distribution of subject clitics in RCs can be explained independently (and I hope to show later it can) the motivation disappears for postulating baa in clauses where it never occurs on the surface.

A&P give two arguments for their proposed derivation of RCs. One has to do with the presence and distribution of subject clitics in RCs, the

other with subject-verb agreement. In Section 4. I show that both are consistent with, and can be accounted for, by an alternative analysis which does not share the problems of A&P's analysis.

If A&P's analysis is adopted, a deep structure constraint would be needed in the grammar to ensure that the indicator particle marks the correct NP, i.e., the one which is identical to the head.

A&P's analysis is based on purely syntactic arguments. They do not provide any semantic justification for postulating a focus marker (i.e., an indicator particle) in the underlying structure of RCs. In the concluding paragraph of their paper A&P acknowledge the problematicity of their analysis which seems to suggest that Somali is an exception to a universal tendency. In particular, Kuno (1976) observes that operations like pronominalization and deletion are strongly dependent on the thematic relation of the NP involved, and that they tend to affect a thematic or topical NP and not a rhematic or focused NP. A&P admit that the Somali case runs completely opposite to this apparently universal trend. The NP deleted in the derivaton of RCs accoring to A&P's analysis has to be the focus of the clause. A&P offer no solution to this problem.

So far I have outlined some general and theoretical inadequacies of the analysis proposed by A&P. Their analysis runs into more serious problems, however, when one tries to apply it to more complicated cases than those the authors examined. A case in point is relativization out of subordinate clauses.

### 3.2.2.1. Relativization out of Complement Clauses

It is possible in Somali to relativize an NP which is in an in subordinate clause. Sentences (106) through (110) are examples of sush relative clauses.

(106) mindida [uu Cali rumaysaanyahay {inay  
knife-the 3 m.sg. Ali believed that-3 f.sg.  
Caashi wanka ku qashay }] way xiiraysa  
Asha lamb-the with slaughtered F sharp  
'The knife that Ali believed that Asha slaughtered  
the lamb with is sharp.'

(107) magaalada [ay Caashi rumaysaantahay  
city-the 3.f.sg. Asha believed  
{inuu ninku ku noolyahay }] waa Berbera  
that-3 m.sg. man-the in live F Berbera  
'The city that Asha believed that the man lived  
in is Berbera.'

- (108) warqaddii [uu Cali rumaysnaa [inay  
 letter-the 3 m.sg. Ali believes that-3 f.sg.  
 naagtu qortay ]] way luntay  
 woman-the wrote F lost  
 'The letter that Ali believes that the woman wrote to  
 the man was lost.'
- (109) naagta [uu Cali qabo [inay  
 woman-the 3 m.sg. Ali thinks that-s f.sg.  
 ninka buugga siisay ]] waa Amina  
 man-the book-the gave F Amina  
 'The woman that Ali thinks gave the book to the  
 man is Amina.'
- (110) naagaha [uu Cali qabay [inay  
 women-the 3 m.sg. Ali thought that-3 pl.  
 inanka dileen ]] waa walalahay  
 child-the hit F sisters-my  
 'The women that Ali thought hit the child are my  
 sisters.'

Examples such as those present a problem for A&P's analysis. Let us examine how these examples can be accounted for within A&P's analysis.

Notice that in each of these examples a subject clitic agreeing with the subject of the higher clause of the RC occurs in the higher clause. For example, in (106) a subject clitic uu (3p m.sg.) agreeing with Cali occurs in the upper clause. According to the analysis of A&P, the only source for this subject clitic is the conjugated form buu of the indicator particle. The problem is that the subject pronoun clitic shows up in the upper clause, while the relative NP (and its alleged indicator particle buu) originates in the lower clause. Furthermore, the relativized NP in some sentences (e.g., (109), (110)) is originally a subject, and subjects can only be marked by baa and not by any of its conjugated forms.

The analysis of A&P, as it is, makes the wrong prediction with regards to the presence and distribution of subject clitics in cases of relativization out of subordinate clauses.

Although A&P have not examined in their paper cases of relativization out of subordinate clauses, one might try to change slightly some of their assumptions as an attempt to save the basic idea in their analysis. Let us assume then that in (109) the relativized NP (i.e., naagta) had been raised or fronted to the higher clause together with baa prior to relativization. Let us assume further that after this NP had assumed its new grammatical relation (direct object) the indicator particle acquired the subject clitic and was changed to buu. In a later stage, the NP, which is identical to the head NP, is deleted together with baa, leaving behind the subject clitic uu.

The modified version of A&P's analysis which I have sketched above (and which, it should be emphasized is not proposed by A&P) does seem to account for cases like (106) through (110) as far as the distribution of the subject clitic is concerned. It is, however, very different from the original

analysis proposed in A&P's paper. The presence and distribution of the subject clitic in RCs is no longer determined by the form of the indicator particle in the underlying structure but rather in some intermediate structure, subsequent to Raising to Object or a similar transformation. The modified version suffers from the same problems as the original one; the form of the indicator particle is left unexplained

Another problem with this proposal is that since every main clause has an indicator particle, and since according to the modified version of the proposed analysis, the relativized NP is raised with baa prior to relativization, the upper clause should contain two indicator particles. Some grammatical device would have to be postulated to insure that both indicator particles are deleted, since neither shows up on the surface.

Even a stronger argument against the modified version of A&P's analysis would be offered by cases where extraction of an NP out of a subordinate clause (I leave open the question whether this is Raising or not) is not possible, but relativization of the same NP is. Such examples would serve as evidence that the subject clitic in the upper clause could not have originated from the conjugated form of baa. Such evidence is not available to me at the moment.

### 3.2.2.2. Relativization out of Impersonal Clauses

A similar argument can be raised against A&P's analysis with regards to Impersonal clauses. Somali does not have passive in the sense English does. Sentences such as (111) are traditionally called impersonal and the pronoun la is the impersonal pronoun.

- (111) Cali baa la dilay  
 Ali F Imp killed  
 'Ali was killed.' or 'Someone killed Ali.'

Subject clitics never occur in impersonal sentences. Hence, only the unconjugated form of indicator particles may occur in this type of sentence.

- (112) a. dameerkii baa la xaday  
 b. \*dameerkii buu la xaday  
 c. dameerkii waa la xaday  
 d. \*dameerkii wuu la xaday  
 donkey-the F Imp stole  
 'The donkey was stolen.'

The problem for A&P's analysis is that when an NP is relativized out of an embedded impersonal clause, a subject clitic shows up in the upper clause as in (113).

- (113) nimanka [uu Cali ogyahay [in la tumay]] waa tuug  
 men-the Ali knows that Imp beat F thieves  
 'The men that Ali knows that were beaten are thieves.'

The subject clitic uu in (113) could not have originated in the conjugated form buu in the lower clause, since only baa and not the

conjugated form is possible in impersonal clauses. The only possible source of the subject clitic (within the modified version of A&P's analysis) is an intermediate stage where the NP to be relativized is raised and marked with buu. (114) might be such a source.

- (114) niman buu Cali ogyahay [in la tumay ]  
 men F Ali knows that Imp beat  
 'Ali knows that some men were beaten.'

It is clear then, that cases of relativization out of subordinate clauses present problems for A&P's analysis. The modification which I have suggested above overcomes some of these difficulties. It does however share some major problems with the original analysis of A&P.

### 3.2.3. Antinuucci and Puglielli's Analysis of Non-Relative Subordinate Clauses

Antinuucci and Puglielli claim that in Somali all subordinate clauses are syntactically constructed relative clauses. I repeat below A&P's examples (119), (124), and (127) of complement and adverbial subordinate clauses:

- (115) in Cali yimmado baan doonayaa  
 that Ali comes P-I want  
 'I want Ali to come.'
- (116) goorta ay qorraxdu dhacdo imow  
 when sun-the sets come  
 'Come when the sun sets.'
- (117) sida Axmed uu doonaya u qor ereyga  
 as Axmed wants at write word-the  
 'Write the word as Axmed wants it!'

A&P give three arguments for their claim that complement and adverbial clauses are syntactically relative clauses in Somali. First they point out that these clauses are introduced by an element which is a real noun (in means 'part', goor means 'time', and si means 'manner'). Their claim is that this noun acts as the head-noun of a RC. Secondly, they show that these clauses may contain a subject clitic (the short form of subject pronoun) and that its distribution is the same as in RCs. Finally, they examine subject-verb agreement inside subordinate clauses and point out that it is parallel to the situation in RCs.

In view of these arguments, A&P claim that sentences such as (115) through (117) (A&P's (119), (124), and (127) respectively) are to be derived in a completely parallel fashion to RCs, from underlying structures like the following (A&P's (132) through (134)).

- (118) [in<sub>i</sub> [in<sub>i</sub> baan Cali yimaado]<sub>S</sub> ]<sub>NP</sub> baan doonayaa

(119) [goorta<sub>i</sub> [goorta<sub>i</sub> bay gorraxdu dhacdo]<sub>S</sub> ]<sub>NP</sub> imow

(120) [sida<sub>i</sub> [Axmed sida<sub>i</sub> buu doonaya ]<sub>S</sub> ]<sub>NP</sub> u qor ereyga

In these structures the NPs in, goorta, and sida are the head nouns of a RC construction. NPs identical to them are contained in the RC and are always marked by baa. In the process of relativization, these NPs are deleted together with baa by the same deletion rule operating in the derivation of RCs.

### 3.2.4. Arguments Against A&P's Analysis<sup>7</sup>

I argue below that A&P's analysis of subordinate clauses as RCs is unjustified and unnecessary. Furthermore, it makes the wrong predictions.

According to A&P's analysis the element in is the head-noun of a RC. An NP which is identical to it and which is marked by baa is deleted in the derivation. Since only one NP in a clause can be marked by baa and since, according to A&P only an NP which is marked by baa can be relativized, their analysis predicts that no other NP can be relativized out of a complement clause. Examples such as (106) through (110) above show that this prediction is wrong. Contrary to the prediction made by A&P's analysis of subordinate clauses, relativization out of complement clauses is possible in Somali.

Furthermore, A&P's claim that subordinate clauses are in fact relative clauses makes the prediction that the two types of clauses would behave in a completely parallel fashion. However, complement in clauses behave differently from RCs in some cases. These cases are discussed at length in Section 5.

A&P's first argument is based on the fact that in (and certain adverbs which introduce adverbial clauses) is a noun since it means 'part' and can be modified by the definite article, giving inta. But the fact that the particle in may be historically or morphologically related to a noun is irrelevant to a synchronic analysis of Somali syntax. Furthermore, if in were indeed the head-noun of RCs as A&P claim, it would be definite more often than not when followed by (what A&P analyze as) a restrictive RC. But in fact the definite noun inta never occurs in these cases. Therefore, synchronically, in should be viewed as a complementizer of a certain type of subordinate clauses.

The other two arguments that A&P bring for the parallelism between RCs and subordinate clauses are inconclusive. As I show in the next section, this parallelism between the two types of clauses automatically follows from a unified principle, relevant to all types of clauses in Somali, including main clauses.

All this shows that the claim that all subordinate clauses in Somali are syntactically RCs is incorrect.

#### 4. AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INDICATOR PARTICLE baa

in this section I propose an alternative analysis to that of Antinucci and Puglielli. This analysis accounts for the structure of main clauses, relative clauses and subordinate clauses in Somali. I will try to show that my analysis overcomes the difficulties encountered by previous accounts including that of A&P, that it is more general, offers a better explanation for crucial phenomena in Somali syntax and accounts for a wider range of data.

The distribution of the indicator particle in its basic form (i.e., baa) versus its conjugated form (i.e., baan, buu, bay, etc.), and the distribution of subject clitics in RCs and subordinate clauses, can be accounted for in a unified fashion if Somali main clauses are analyzed as cleft constructions.<sup>8</sup> I will argue that:

1. The indicator particle baa is an exclusively main clause phenomenon;
2. At a certain relevant stage in the derivation the NP which is the focus of assertion is always marked with the invariable (unconjugated) form baa;
3. The NP which is the focus of assertion is extracted out of its clause and moved to sentence initial position where it is marked by baa;
4. A general principle, which I call the Subject Clitic Rule determines the distribution of subject clitics inside all types of clauses;
5. The indicator particle baa contracts with the subject clitic (if there is one) inside the clause to its right, to yield the conjugated form baan, buu, etc.

##### 4.1. The Subject Clitic Rule

The Subject Clitic Rule determines the presence and distribution of subject clitics inside all Somali clauses. The domain of this rule is the clause (S in an  $\bar{X}$  theory framework). The Subject Clitic Rule applies after such processes as Relativization and Cleft (or Focus Extraction). The Subject Clitic Rule states that:

1. In a clause without a subject, no subject clitic may occur. (This is true only of RCs and main clauses. I discuss the special case of subordinate in clauses in Section 5.);
2. When the subject of a clause is itself a pronoun a subject clitic which agrees with it is obligatory. There is a rule of subject (full) pronoun deletion which optionally applies after the Subject Clitic Rule;



3. When the subject of the clause is nominal and it precedes the verb, a subject clitic agreeing with the subject is optional;
4. When the subject of the clause follows the verb, a subject clitic agreeing with the subject is obligatory.

(121) illustrates the presence and distribution of subject clitics. uu stands for any subject clitic, and  $\emptyset$  its absence.

(121) The Subject Clitic Rule

a.	$S[ \emptyset$	$V]^9$	Subjectless clauses-- no subject clitic
b.	$S[ uu$	$S [+pron]$	$V]$ Pronominal subject-- subject clitic obligatory
c.	$S[ \{uu\}$	$S$	$V]$ Nominal subject, precedes the verb-- subject clitic optional
d.	$S[ uu$	$V$	$S]$ Subject follows the verb--subject clitic obligatory.

#### 4.2. The Derivation of Main Clauses

In every indicative sentence one NP must be marked as the focus of assertion. Hence, in the derivation of main clauses, one NP is extracted out of its clause and moved to sentence initial position where it is marked with baa. This is true regardless of the grammatical relation of the focused NP. Thus the derivation of every main clause results in a structure in which an NP is followed by baa and a clause which (in simple cases) is the clause from which this NP has been extracted. This clause is the domain of the Subject Clitic Rule. If this clause contains a subject clitic, the subject clitic phonologically contracts with baa to form the conjugated form. This contraction operates over a clause boundary. If the focused NP is the subject, the derivation results in a structure which contains a subjectless clause. In the latter case there would be no subject clitic in the clause (according to the Subject Clitic Rule) and the indicator particle remains in its unconjugated form baa.

The following diagram illustrates the derivation of the sentence ninkii baa naagta arkay, 'The man saw the woman.' (or rather: 'It was the man who saw the woman.').

(122) The Derivation of Sentences with baa

1. Underlying Str	[	S	O	V]	S	
2. Focus	S-baa	[		O	V]	S
3. Subject Clitic Rule	S-baa	[∅		O	V]	S
4. Contraction						
5. Surface Str	S-baa		O	V		
	ninkii	baa	naagta	arkay		
	man-the	F	woman-the	saw		
	'The <u>man</u> saw the woman.'					

Since after the subject has been extracted out of its clause, the remaining clause does not contain a subject, the Subject Clitic Rule (part 1) predicts that no subject clitic may occur. And, indeed only baa and not its conjugated form is possible.

The diagram in (123) illustrates the derivation of the sentence 'The man ate the food' (or rather: 'It was the food which the man ate') where an object NP is focused.

(123) The Derivation of Sentences with baa+Clitic

1. Underlying Str	[	S	O	V]	S	
2. Focus	O-baa	[	S		V]	S
3. Subject Clitic Rule	O-baa	[ <u>uu</u>	S		V]	S
4. Contraction	O-baa+ <u>uu</u>	S		V		
5. Surface Str	O-buu	S		V		
	cuntadii	buu	ninku	cunay		
	food-the	F	man-the	ate		
	'The man ate <u>the food</u> .'					

In this example, since after Focus Extraction, the remaining clause contains a nominal subject which precedes the verb, the subject clitic is optional (part 3 of the Subject Clitic Rule) and thus both baa and buu are possible.

I leave open the question of the exact formulation of the focus extraction rule and will only sketch three possible analyses:

1. The indicator particle baa may be inserted transformationally after the extraction of the NP out of its clause.

2. A second possibility is to have a place-holder, a "hole" in the upmost node of every indicative sentence, followed by an indicator particle. This place holder must be filled by an NP for the sentence to be grammatical. It is possible to assume that this place-holder may be filled by a complex NP as well as by a simple one. E.g.:

(124) inankii [ ay Caashi u sheekeysay ] baa qoslay  
 boy-the 3 f.sg. Asha to story-told F laughed  
 'The boy to whom Asha told a story, laughed.'

(125) ninkii [ dammerka dilay ] buu arkay Cali  
 man-the donkey-the hit F saw Ali  
 'Ali saw the man who hit the donkey.'

3. Within a framework of  $\bar{X}$  theory, baa may be an obligatory node (Comp in  $\bar{S}$  or alternatively Focus in  $\bar{S}$ ). An obligatory movement rule moves one NP from S to either Comp in  $\bar{S}$  or Focus in  $\bar{S}$  (depending on whether the two categories may be collapsed). The Subject Clitic Rule then applies to S. For a more detailed discussion of this proposal see Livnat (1980b).

The choice of the right formulation of the rule of Focus Extraction should depend inter alia on considerations which have to do with the nature of the focus phenomenon. Is the indicator particle the trigger or the reflector of focus? What is the relation between the process of fronting the NP and marking it with baa? Such questions may prove useful in further research of focus constructions.

The analysis proposed here accounts in a simple way for the distribution of indicator particles with and without subject clitics. Rules generating the general pattern of the distribution of subject clitics (i.e., the Subject Clitic Rule) are needed anyway for RC and subordinate clauses.

#### 4.3. The Derivation of Relative Clauses

The diagrams in (126) and (127) illustrate the derivation of subject RC and non-subject RCs respectively. For the sake of the clarity of exposition these diagrams represent underlying headless RCs and a movement analysis of relativization. This however is not essential for the proposed analysis. Regardless of whether a movement or a deletion analysis is adopted for RCs, the Subject Clitic Rule applies after relativization, i.e., after the relative NP is no longer within the RC. ay stands for a subject clitic and  $\emptyset$  stands for its absence.





#### 4.5. Somali Main Clauses as Cleft Constructions

The new analysis of the indicator particle baa receives ample support from the structure of RCs and complement clauses. The Subject Clitic Rule which states the distribution of subject clitics in RCs and complement clauses, automatically accounts for the distribution of baa versus its conjugated forms, if every main clause is analyzed as a case of extraction of one NP out of its clause. I have referred to the structure of main clauses as 'Cleft Constructions'. This may not be the best term for the Somali phenomenon under consideration, but it is suggestive of its structure, as well as semantically appropriate. There are, however, important differences between Somali main clauses and, for example, English cleft constructions. The former is a predominant phenomenon in Somali while cleft constructions in English are highly marked and infrequent. Unlike English where cleft constructions contain a higher verb (be) there is no such higher verb in Somali to serve as the predicate of the focus NP.

I now turn to discuss some additional evidence for my analysis.

#### 4.6. Evidence from Subject-Verb Agreement

An examination of the facts of subject-verb agreement in different types of sentences shows that they are consistent with my analysis.<sup>10</sup> Verbs in Somali may be conjugated in two paradigms which are traditionally termed 'extensive' and 'restrictive'.<sup>11</sup>

In main clauses, when the subject is marked with baa, the verb follows the restrictive paradigm. Otherwise the extensive paradigm is used. This is exemplified in (134) through (137).

- (134) a. dumarkii baa cuntadii kariyey (restrictive)  
 women-the F food-the cooked
- b. cuntadii bay dumarku kariyeen (extensive)  
 food-the F women-the cooked  
 'The women cooked the food.'
- (135) a. dumarkii baa kariyey cuntadii (restrictive)  
 woman-the F cooked food-the
- b. dumarkii way kariyeen cuntadii (extensive)  
 woman-the F cooked food-the  
 'The women cooked the food.'
- (136) a. nagihii baa dilay inankii (restrictive)  
 woman-the F hit boy-the
- b. naagihii way dileen inankii (extensive)  
 woman-the F hit boy-the  
 'The women hit the boy.'

- (137) a. naagihii baa arkay Cali (restrictive)  
 women-the F saw Ali
- b. naagihii way arkeen Cali (extensive)  
 women-the F saw Ali  
 'The women saw Ali.'

The restrictive paradigm is also used in subject relative clauses, whereas in non-subject RCs the extensive paradigm is used. Notice the difference in the lower verb between (138) and (140) on the one hand versus (139) and (141) on the other.

- (138) naagihii [cuntada kariyey] way qosleen (restrictive)  
 women-the food-the cooked F laughed  
 'The women who cooked the food laughed.'
- (139) cuntadii [ay naaguhu kariyeen] (extensive)  
 food-the 3 f.pl. women-the cookd  
 way wanaagsanayd  
 F good  
 'The food which the women cooked was good.'
- (140) naagihii [Cali jacala] waa walalahay (restrictive)  
 women-the Ali loved F sisters-my  
 'The women who loved Ali are my sisters.'
- (141) ninka [ay naaguhu jacalayeen] (extensive)  
 man-the 3 f.pl. women-the loved  
 waa Cali  
 F Ali  
 'The man whom the women loved is Ali.'

These differences in verb agreement are accounted for by the generalization that the restrictive paradigm is used only in subjectless clauses. Since according to the analysis proposed here a sentence in which the subject is marked with baa is in fact a construction consisting of an NP followed by a subjectless clause (which has the same structure as a subject RC) the verb in this clause follows the restrictive paradigm. The restrictive paradigm is also used in subject RCs since they are subjectless. The extensive paradigm on the other hand is used in all clauses which contain a subject, whether nominal or pronominal, including subject clitics. Hence it is used in main clauses where a non-subject RCs is marked with baa. The extensive paradigm is also used in non-subject RCs and in subordinate in clauses. The latter always follow the extensive paradigm since they must contain a subject (see Section 5.).

Subject-verb agreement in Somli provides additional support for my analysis. The distribution of extensive versus restrictive forms of verbs is explained by a simple and general principle.

Although subject-verb agreement facts are consistent with both A&P's analysis and the analysis proposed here (see Note 10), the two analyses have different consequences with regards to subject-verb agreement. According to

A&P's analysis the paradigm of subject-verb agreement is determined in an underlying structure, prior to the application of transformational rules of movement and deletion. This is so because what determines which verb paradigm is used is whether the subject or another NP is marked by baa in the underlying structure. According to the analysis proposed here, on the other hand, subject-verb agreement is sensitive to surface structure, subsequent to the application of rules such as Focus (Cleft) and Relativization.

The analysis proposed here offers a simple explanation for the distribution of the extensive versus the restrictive verb paradigms. The restrictive paradigm exhibits limited agreement with the subject and hence verbs of this paradigm occur in clauses which lack a subject. The extensive paradigm, on the other hand, which exhibits full agreement with the subject is used in clauses which contain a subject.

#### 4.7. Evidence from Impersonal Sentences

Another case which is automatically accounted for by the analysis proposed here is that of impersonal ('passive') sentences.

Remember that only the unconjugated form baa may occur in impersonal sentences. The impersonal pronoun la does not count as a subject for the Subject Clitic Rule. Thus after an NP is extracted from the clause and focused, the remaining clause is subjectless and the subject clitic may not occur in it. This explains why only baa and not any of its conjugated forms is possible.

(142) Cali { baa } la dilay  
           { \*buu }  
       Ali       F       Imp hit  
       'Ali was hit.'

For the same reason, when an NP is relativized out of an impersonal clause, the remaining clause does not contain a subject and thus the subject clitic may not occur. Compare (143) with the ungrammatical (144).

(143) ninkii [ la tumay ] wuu orday  
       man-the       Imp beat       F ran  
       'The man who was beaten, ran.'

(144) \*ninkii [ uu la tumay ] wuu orday

As expected, only the restrictive form of verbs can occur in impersonal clauses.

#### 4.8. Evidence from Case Marking<sup>12</sup>

The suffixes which serve as markers of definiteness in Somali seem to have several other functions: They mark a noun as close or remote in time and space and they also function as demonstratives. The same suffixes are



also relevant to the grammatical function of the noun they mark. The three suffixes which will be discussed here are -kii, -ka, and -ku. (These have corresponding feminine variants -tii, -ta, and -tu.) Generally, -ku is associated with the subject, -ka is associated with a non-subject, and -kii may be associated with either.

- (145) naagtu way aragtay ninka  
 { naagtii } { ninkii }  
 \*naagta \*ninku  
 woman-the F saw (f) man-the  
 'The woman saw the man.'

This generalization does not hold in the following cases: When the subject of the sentence is marked with baa or when it is modified by an adjective or a RC, the subject can be suffixed with -ka or -kii but not with the subject Case marker -ku.

- (146) naagta baa qortay warqada<sup>13</sup>  
 { naagtii }  
 \*naagtu  
 woman-the F wrote letter-the  
 'The woman wrote the letter.'

- (147) naagta [ aan arkay ] waa Caasha  
 { naagtii }  
 \*naagtu  
 woman-the 1 sg. saw F Asha  
 'The woman I saw was Asha.'

- (148) a. naagta wanaagsaan way qortay warqada  
 b. naagtii wanaagsanayd  
 c. \*naagtu { wanaagsaan }  
           { wanaagsanayd }  
 woman-the good F wrote letter-the  
 'The good woman wrote the letter.'<sup>14</sup>

These facts can be accounted for within the analysis proposed here. If the suffix -ku (or -tu) is associated with subjecthood, my analysis explains why NPs which are marked with baa cannot be suffixed with -ku. According to this analysis the NP which is marked with baa is extracted out of its clause and thereby ceases to be the subject of the clause.

The case of nouns which are modified by a RC or an adjective is a little more complicated than that. A possible explanation for why such nouns cannot be marked with the subject Case -ku is that only subjects of clauses can receive the subject Case. A noun which is modified by a RC or an adjective is not by itself the subject of the clause but rather only part of the subject, the subject being the whole NP (either NP [RC] or NP + Adj).<sup>15</sup>

However, the point to be emphasized here is that the proposed analysis provides a reasonable explanation for the exceptional behavior of subjects

which are marked with baa. This explanation provides additional support for the analysis proposed here.

## 5. SUBJECTLESS COMPLEMENT CLAUSES AND RELATED PROBLEMS

In this section I discuss some problems with the analysis proposed in this paper, and outline a general approach towards a solution to these problems.

### 5.1. The Nature of the Subject Clitic Rule

We saw that the Subject Clitic Rule determines the presence and distribution of subject clitics in Somali clauses. An examination of this rule raises several questions: First, it is not clear what kind of rule the Subject Clitic Rule is nor where in the grammar it applies. There are at least three possibilities: a) It might be a surface filter. In this case subject clitics would be freely generated and the filter would rule out ungrammatical sentences. However, it is impossible to formalize all four parts of the rule as either a negative or a positive filter (see Livnat (1980b) for a discussion of this problem). b) It might be a rule which inserts subject clitics in the appropriate places. In this case, subject clitics would not be base generated at all. c) Subject clitics might be base generated in every clause, and the Subject Clitic Rule might be a deletion rule which deletes the clitics in the appropriate places. Further research is needed before this question can be answered.

A second question is: is it really one rule or several different rules which were (mistakenly) grouped together? The rule covers four different environments. In some cases a subject clitic is obligatory, in some cases it is optional, and yet in other cases it is obligatorily absent.

If subject clitics are viewed as agreement phenomenon, it is reasonable that they would not occur in subjectless clauses because they have nothing to agree with. But why should the relative order of the subject and the verb, or the fact that the subject is a pronoun, affect the obligatoriness of subject clitics?

An examination of apparent exceptions to the rule raises more questions about it.

### 5.2. The Problem with Subjectless Complement Clauses

There is one class of cases where subordinate clauses which are introduced by the complementizer in differ from other clauses. When such clauses contain no subject as a result of either movement or deletion, a subject clitic is obligatory. Remember that a subject clitic may not occur in a main or relative clause which contains no subject. The following sentences are examples of subordinate in clauses which have no subject as a result of Relativization (149)-(150), Focus Extraction (151)-(152), and Equi (or Pronominalization) (153)-(154). The subject of the complement clause in

(155) has been moved across the complementizer. I leave open the question whether it is still within the lower clause (as is suggested by the suffix -ku) or has been raised to the upper clause.

(149) naagta [{}uu] Cali qabo [{}inay] ninka  
 woman-the 3 m.sg. Ali thinks that-3 f.sg. man-the  
 buugga siisay ]] waa Amina  
 book-the gave F Amina  
 'The woman that Ali thinks that gave the book to the man is Amina.'

(150) nimankii [{}uu] Cali rumaysnaa [{}inay] tageen]]  
 men-the 3 m.sg. Ali believes that-3 pl. left  
 wali way joogaan  
 here F are  
 'The men that Ali believes left are still here.'

(151) ninkii baan rumaystay [{}inuu] tegey ]  
 man-the F believe that-3 m.sg. left  
 'I believe that the man left.'

(152) nimankii buu Cali rumaysaanyahay [{}inay] tageen]  
 men-the F Ali believed that-3 pl. left  
 'Ali believed that the men left.'

(153) Cali baa rabay [{}inuu] cuno]  
 Ali F wanted that-3 m.sg. eat  
 'Ali wanted to eat.'

(154) nimankii baa raba [{}inay] tageen ]  
 men-the F want that-3 pl. go  
 'The men want to go.'

(155) Cali wuu rumaysaanyahay nimanku [{}inay] tageen  
 Ali F thought men-the that-3 pl. left  
 'Ali thought that the men left.'

But, example (156) shows that the subject clitic may not occur in subordinate in clause which is inherently subjectless such as an impersonal clause.

(156) Amina qirtay [{}in] la dilay nimanka ]  
 Amina verified that (3 pl) Imp kill men-the  
 'Amina verified that the men were killed.'

This difference between the behavior of subordinat in clauses and other clauses with regards to the presence of subject clitics has to be somehow accounted for. It should be noted that this is also evidence against A&P's claim that all subordinate clauses in Somali are in fact RCs. This claim makes the incorrect prediction that the two types of clauses would behave in a completely parallel fashion.

If the Subject Clitic Rule is indeed a rule, it has to apply after such rules as Relativization and Focus Extraction because it is the output of these rules which is the domain of the Subject Clitic Rule. However, in cases of subjectless in clauses if this is the order of application, the original subject of the complement clause is no longer available when the Subject Clitic Rule applies and thus this rule cannot account for the obligatory clitic which agrees with the original subject. Hence we are faced with a rule ordering clash.

One way to account for the lack of parallelism in Somali between complement clauses on the one hand and RC and main clauses on the other is to postulate a constraint which states that no subject may be deleted or moved out of a subordinat in clause unless a subject clitic agreeing with the subject, occurs in the clause. This is a constraint on the Subject Clitic Rule.

Similar phenomena can be found in other languages. For example, in English, a subject cannot be relativized out of a complement clause which is introduced by the complementizer that.

(157) \*This is the man that John said that saw Mary.

Notice that the sentence becomes grammatical if that is not present.

(158) This is the man that John said  $\emptyset$  saw Mary.

The option of deleting the complementizer is not available in Somali, thus (159) is ungrammatical.

(159) \*Cali wuxuu rumaysaanyahay [ {ay} nimankii tageen ]  
 $\emptyset$   
 Ali F thought (3 pl) men-the left  
 'Ali thought the men left.'

Just like in Somali, an object can be freely relativized out of a clause with the complementizer that.

(160) This is the man that John said that Mary saw.

(161) buugga [uu Cali qabo [ {inay} Caashi  
 $\emptyset$  in  
 book-the 3 m.sg. Ali thinks that(3 f.sg.) Asha  
 siisay ninka ]] wuu lumay  
 gave man-the F lost  
 'The book that Ali thinks Asha gave the man was lost.'

This phenomenon has been referred to in English as "that trace" (Chomsky and Lasnik (1977)). A filter rules out the sequence that and trace: \*[that [NP e]]. This filter rules out ungrammatical sentences like (157).

Since subjectless in clauses are only one of several cases where a subject clitic is obligatory, one might look for a more general solution than an ad hoc constraint for this particular case. In the next subsection I discuss one additional case where a subject clitic is obligatory.

### 5.3. Non-Initial Focus

It is possible in Somali to focus on an NP by marking it with baa even if this NP is not in sentence initial position.

(162) muuskii Cali baa cunaya  
 banana Ali F eating  
 'Ali is eating the banana.'

(163) Cali muus buu cunay  
 Ali banana F ate  
 'Ali ate a banana.'

The fact that sentences such as (162), (163) are possible presents a problem for the analysis proposed here. Since the focused NP is not linearly out of its clause, the question arises as to what the domain of the Subject Clitic Rule is in these cases. Furthermore, if a non-subject NP is focused and occurs after the subject, the conjugated form of the indicator particle is obligatory as in (164) and (165), while it is optional if the focused NP occurs sentence initially (as in (166)).

(164) nimankii naagtii { bay } arkeen  
   \*baa  
 men-the woman-the F saw  
 'The men saw the woman.'

(165) naagtii nimankii { bay } aragtay  
   \*baa  
 woman-the men-the F saw  
 'The woman saw the men.'

(166) fuudkii { baa } nimankii cabeen  
   bay  
 soup-the F men-the drank  
 'The men drank the soup.'

The difference is schematically illustrated in (167) below.

(167) The Difference between Initial and Non-Initial Focus

O	{baa}	S	V
	buu		
S	O	{ buu }	V
		*baa	

One possibility to account for sentences like (164), (165) is to claim that Focus Extraction always involves fronting the NP to sentence initial position (in addition to marking it with baa). At a later stage a scrambling rule changes the order of constituents in the sentence, resulting in the situation in (164) and (165). The problem is that this scrambling rule has the effect of changing the distribution of subject clitics. Hence, an additional condition has to be added to the Subject Clitic Rule, stating that if the subject is moved over an NP marked with baa, a subject clitic is obligatory.

5.4. VS Order and the Subject Clitic Rule

I mentioned in the beginning of this section that the part of the Subject Clitic Rule which refers to the relative order of the subject and the verb is somewhat suspicious. It is not obvious why a subject clitic is optional in a SV order but obligatory in a VS order. Since the basic unmarked word order in Somali is probably SOV, it is conceivable that in cases where the object is focused, VS order is the result of a late movement rule which moves the subject rightward across the verb. It might be possible that the fact that a subject clitic is obligatory in a VS order should not be accounted for by the Subject Clitic Rule but rather be a part of a general condition on moving the subject across certain elements in the sentence.

If we look at the two "exceptions" to the Subject Clitic Rule we see that they both involve movement of the subject. In one case a subject clitic must be left behind if the subject moves over a complementizer, in the other a subject clitic must be left if the subject moves over a focused NP. If the basic word order in Somali is indeed SOV, it seems that movement of the subject over the verb has the same effect. It seems then that movement of the subject in Somali is subject to a special constraint. If the subject is moved over certain elements in the sentence, a subject clitic which agrees with it must be left behind. These elements are: the verb, the complementizer in and the indicator baa. These elements do not seem to form a natural group. At the moment I have no explanation as to why they group together in the way they do.

If this approach is adopted, the Subject Clitic Rule would only have three parts. It would state that: a) the subject clitic may not occur in a subjectless clause; b) it must occur if the subject is a pronoun; c) it is optional otherwise. Subsequent movement of the subject over a complementizer, baa, or a verb, results in leaving behind an obligatory subject clitic. One consequence of such an approach is that the subject

clitic is both an agreement feature and a resumptive pronoun or a subject "trace".

In this section I have only outlined some of the problems which arise in connection with the Subject Clitic Rule, and some possible directions towards a solution.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper I have proposed an analysis of sentences containing the indicator particle baa. Such sentences are an instance of the central and predominant phenomenon of Focus in the syntax of Somali. Although I have claimed that focus in Somali is a main clause phenomenon, my proposal is crucially dependent on a unified analysis of other types of sentences, specifically relative and complement clauses.

I have proposed that every main clause should be analysed as a case of extraction of one NP out of its clause and marking it with the indicator particle baa which is a focus marker. I have shown that if such an analysis is adopted, the presence and distribution of subject clitics in main clauses is parallel to their distribution in RCs and complement clauses. I have proposed that this distribution is determined by a general rule--the Subject Clitic Rule.

I have brought evidence for the proposed analysis based on the examination of RCs, complement clauses, impersonal clauses, subject-verb agreement, and Case marking, and argued against the analysis proposed by Antinucci and Puglielli.

The major advantages of this analysis over previously suggested proposals are the following:

- a. The indicator particle has (prior to phonological rules) one invariable form regardless of the grammatical function of the NP which it focuses.
- b. The different forms of the indicator particle are analyzed and their distribution accounted for.
- c. The presence and distribution of subject clitics in relative and complement clauses are accounted for.
- d. The distribution of suffixes which function as Case markers is accounted for.
- e. The use of the two verb paradigms, extensive vs. restrictive, is explained.

There are, however, some yet unsolved problems. These have mainly to do with apparent exceptions to the Subject Clitic Rule discussed in Section 5., and with the exact formulation of the Subject Clitic Rule.

In this paper I have restricted the discussion to sentences with the indicator particle baa which focuses the NP it follows. However, other focus markers such as waa and ayaa, and structures with waxaa are also very common in Somali. Future research will hopefully be able to determine whether these can be incorporated in the analysis proposed here. The discussion was also restricted to affirmative indicative sentences. Much insight into the phenomenon of Focus can be gained from the examination of other types of sentences such as negative, conditional, and interrogative. The investigation of these and other phenomena is left for future research.

## NOTES

\*The main source of data for this paper which were collected during 1979-80 is Mahamud A. Gulaid. Further data were collected during 1981 from Ali H. Abdulla and Abdikarim M. Hussein--all speakers of the Northern dialect of Somali. Their help is gratefully acknowledged. A large part of this research has been done in collaboration with Susan M. Burt. I wish to thank Peter Cole, Georgia Green, Michael Kenstowicz, Charles Kisseberth and Jerry Morgan for their helpful comments and discussions.

<sup>1</sup>I adopt here the term "indicator particle" which is traditionally used in the literature on Somali. As was pointed out by Antinucci (1980), note 1) other terms, such as "focus markers" might be more appropriate.

<sup>2</sup>In the English gloss F stands for the indicator particle. At this point, the reader may ignore the various phonological shapes of the particle. The transcription basically follows the official orthography of Somalia. A long vowel is represented by two consecutive vowels. Notice that c stands for the voiced pharyngeal fricative [ʁ], x stands for the voiceless pharyngeal fricative [ħ], sh stands for the palatal fricative [ʃ], j stands for the voiceless palatal affricate [tʃ], kh stands for the voiceless velar fricative [x], and dh stands for the emphatic alveolar stop [d̥].

<sup>3</sup>When the indicator particle baa (or one of its conjugated forms) follows a word ending in a short non-high vowel, a contracted form is used in which the b disappears as well as the short vowel, e.g.:

ninka baa ==> ninkaa  
biyo buu ==> biyuu

but:

Peru buu  
ninkii baa

Thus in (49) adigaa is a combination of adiga ('you') and the indicator particle baa. This phonological rule equally affects proper names, i.e.:

Caasha baa ==> Caashaa



For the sake of clarity, I avoid the use of such cases in this paper as much as possible.

<sup>4</sup>In their paper Antinucci and Puglielle incorrectly make a distinction between third person subjects on the one hand and first and second person subjects on the other. They claim that when the subject is first or second person, the clitic (in their terminology: the short form of the subject pronoun) must accompany baa, but not when the subject is third person. Sentence (i) shows that this is incorrect.

- (i) muuskii            { buu }        isagu    cunay  
                          {\*baa}  
      banana-the        F            he        ate  
      'He ate the banana.'

The correct distinction is between nominal subjects on the one hand and pronominal subjects (regardless of the person) on the other. The conjugated form of baa is obligatory if the subject is a pronoun and where it is not the focus. The source of Antinucci and Puglielli's mistake is probably their failure to examine sentences with pronominal third person subjects. Antinucci makes the same mistake in his subsequent paper (Antinucci, 1980).

<sup>5</sup>It is possible in Somali to relativize NPs of all the categories in the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy:

- (i) ninkii [naagta arkay ] wuu qoslay  
      man-the woman-the saw F laughed  
      'The man who saw the woman laughed.'
- (ii) cuntadii [ay naagtu u karisay ninka ] way kulalayd  
      food-the 3 f.sg. woman-the for cooked man-thei F hot  
      'The food which the woman cooked for the man was hot.'
- (iii) inankii [uu ninku buugga siiyey ] wuu qoslay  
      boy-the 3 m.sg. man-the book-the gave F laughed  
      'The boy to whom the man gave the book, laughed.'
- (iv) ninkii [ay naagtu u karisay cuntada ] wuu qoslay  
      man-the 3 f.sg. woman-the for cooked food F laughed  
      'The man for whom the woman cooked the food.'
- (v) magaalada [uu ku nolyahay Cali ] way weyntahay  
      town-the 3 m.sg. in live Ali F big  
      'The town where Ali lives is big.'
- (vi) miiska [uu Cali saaray buugga] wuu weynyahay  
      table-the 3 m.sg. Ali put book-the F big  
      'The table on which Ali put the book is big.'
- (vii) mindida [uu Cali libaaxa ku dilay] way xiraysa  
      knife-the 3 m.sg. Ali lion-the with killed P sharp  
      'The knife with which Ali killed the lion was sharp.'

- (viii) waxaan aqaan ninka [ay inantiisu qososhay]  
 P-I know man-the 3 f.sg. girl-his laughed  
 'I know the man whose daughter laughed.'
- (ix) ninkii [dameerkiisa la xaday] waa Cali  
 man-the donkey-his Imp stole F Ali  
 'The man whose donkey was stolen, was Ali.'
- (x) inanka [ay Caashi ka dertahay] wuu qosleya  
 boy-the 3 f.sg. Asha from taller F laughed  
 'The boy that Asha is taller than (him) is laughing.'

<sup>6</sup>Here again Antinucci and Puglielli make the same mistake as the one mentioned in note 4. They claim that the subject clitic (pronoun) is obligatory if the subject of the RC is first or second person but not if it is third person. Apparently they did not examine cases of RCs with a pronominal third person subject. The correct distinction is between nominal vs. pronominal subjects, when in the former case the subject clitic is optional (in an SV order) while in the latter it is obligatory, i.g.:

- (i) buugga [<sub>∅</sub>uu] [<sub>∅</sub>Cali] naagta siiyey] wuu weynyahay  
 book-the Ali/man-the woman-the gave F big  
 'The book which Ali/the man gave the woman is big.'
- (ii) buugga [<sub>\*∅</sub>uu] [<sub>∅</sub>isagu] naagta siiyey] wuu weynyahay  
 book-the he/∅ woman-the gave F big  
 'The book which he gave the woman is big.'

<sup>7</sup>In this paper I only argue against the analysis of complement clauses which are introduced by the complementizer *in*, as relative clauses. A&P's analysis of adverbial clauses as relative clauses may be correct, and indeed in sentences such as (116) and (117) *goor* and *si* occur in their definite form *goorta* and *sida* respectively.

<sup>8</sup>Hetzron (1965) makes virtually the same suggestion with regards to sentences where the subject is marked by *baa*. He suggests that *baa*-phrases should be analysed as cleft sentences. However Hetzron claims that this analysis cannot be applied to *buu*-phrases, i.e. sentences where an NP other than the subject is marked for focus. Therefore Hetzron's analysis cannot account in a unified way for both Somali sentences with the indicator particle *baa* and its various conjugated forms.

<sup>9</sup>The first part of the Subject Clitic Rule is true only of main clauses and RCs. The special case of complement clauses will be discussed in Section 5.

<sup>10</sup>Antinucci and Puglielli bring evidence to their analysis from subject-verb agreement. As I show below, these facts are also consistent with the analysis proposed here. Subject-verb agreement facts are then consistent with both analyses and cannot be said to confirm either one of them. However, I believe that the analysis proposed here offers a better,

less arbitrary explanation for the distribution of the different forms of verbs in Somali.

<sup>11</sup>The extensive paradigm shows a full pattern of agreement with the subject, while the restrictive paradigm shows a limited pattern of agreement. For a discussion of the two verb paradigms see Andrzejewski (1956) and Hetzron (1965).

<sup>12</sup>The role and function of the suffixes discussed here are not well understood and more research has to be done before any definite conclusions can be drawn. Therefore, the following discussion should be regarded as tentative. I am indebted to Elizabeth Pearce for many observations and much of the data in this subsection.

<sup>13</sup>Since in (146) naagta ends with a short non-high vowel, it contracts with baa (see note 3.) and the sentence in the first option of (146) will be:

(i) naagtaa qortay warqada

<sup>14</sup>The adjective assumes a different inflection according to the suffix on the noun. This difference is beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>15</sup>A similar proposal was made by Elizabeth Pearce.

#### REFERENCES

- ABRAHAM, R.C. 1951. *The principles of Somali*. Oxford: Published by the author.
- ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. W. 1956. "Accentual patterns in verbal forms in the Isaaq dialect of Somali", BSOAS XVIII/1, pp. 103-129.
- ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. W. 1964. *Declension of Somali nouns*. London: School of oriental and African studies.
- ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. W. 1975. "The Role of indicator particle in Somali." *African Linguistics* 1/6, pp. 123-191.
- ANTINUCCI, F. and A. Puglielli. 1980. "The syntax of indicator particles in Somali. Part one: Relative clause construction." *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7/3, pp. 85-102.
- ANTINUCCI, F. 1980. "The syntax of indicator particles in Somali. Part two: The construction of interrogative, negative and negative-interrogative clauses." *Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics* 11/1, pp. 1-37.
- BELL, C.R.V. 1953. *The Somali language*. London: Longmans. [Reprinted in 1968 by Gregg International Publishers, Farnborough]
- BURT, S.M. 1980. "On a rule that isn't raising in Somali." Ms. University of Illinois.
- CHOMSKY, N. and H. Lasnik. 1977. "Filters and control." *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8/3, pp. 425-504.
- HETZRON, R. 1965. "The particle baa in Northern Somali." *Journal of African Languages* 4/2, pp. 118-130.
- KUNO, S. 1976. "Subject, theme and The speaker's empathy: A reexamination of relativization phenomena." In C.N. Li (ed) *Subject and Topic*. New York:

- Academic Press, pp. 417-444.
- LIVNAT, M. A. 1980a. "The role of the short form of subject pronouns and their interaction with indicator particles--A unified analysis of main, relative and complement clauses in Somali." Ms. University of Illinois.
- LIVNAT, M. A. 1980b. "Sentence structure in Somali--An EST analysis for a free word order language." Ms. University of Illinois.
- PEARCE, E. 1980. "The form of definiteness markers in Northern Somali." Ms. University of Illinois.
- PERLMUTTER, D. M. 1971. Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- SCHACHTER, P. 1973. "Focus and relativization." Language 119 pp. 19-46.