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1. Introduction

Natural language distinguishes two kinds of copulas, I(nfl)-based and C(omp)-based. Diagnostically, a C-based copula manifests Ruwet’s “inverse” copular construction (with pre-copular Focus) but not the “canonical” one (with pre-copular Topic). An I-based copula takes both constructions, but has a restriction of its own: in the inverse type, the pre-copular element must be definite (*A hero is John) and the postcopular one can’t be (*There is the man in the garden). C-based copulas lack this pair of definiteness effects.

I-based copulas are familiar in Indo-European languages. A C-based copula (ni) is the sole option in Yorùbá (§2). Languages with both types include Akan and (probably) Thai. This limited crosslinguistic freedom is consistent with a theory of UG that keeps parametric diversity to the set of ‘functional’ (closed-class) categories (Fukui 1986). As a corollary, copulas are never members of the lexical category V, i.e. they assign no θ-roles, they have no semantics of their own. Two lexical verbs do occur expletively in Yorùbá in an equational sense: jë ’amount to’ and …e ’do, make’. Perhaps they spell out the head of the copular small clause à la Moro, but they are inflected. The same two expletives occur in Yorùbá yes-no questions and in factive pseudoclefts.

Turning to ‘have’ (§3), the relevant Yorùbá form (nó) is not obviously a lexical item, as it is made of closed-class materials: ni (the C of the C-based copula) plus a prosodically-determined strong H-tone (notatable as ₃H). The purely phonosyntactic origin of the H-tone of nó ‘have/own’ is shown by the fact that it is suppressed under several, prosodically appropriate circumstances (§4). No lexically specified H-tone in the language ever disappears in these contexts.

If all its overt components are closed-class (C, ₃H), why is Yorùbá ní ‘have/own’ a verb? Kayne 1993B decomposes French a-voir into a locative predicate à, but French à is itself ambiguous between this locative P and a functional element K which has no intrinsic semantics. In Yorùbá, too, it happens that locative P is homophonous with the phonetic spellout of null K. By hypothesis (Bittner and Hale 1994), K is the “nominal counterpart” of C, so [K ni ₃H] is expected: the ECP requires an un govered null K to be pronounced, and all un govered, null F-heads (whether C, T, K or D) in Yorùbá are prosodically strong. In this way, echoes of ní’s journey from the functional world to the lexical world—from C/K to P/V—are audible in Yorùbá as the homophony of overt ‘ACCusative’ with both ‘at/in’ and ‘have/own’.

2. **No copulas in l-syntax**

Across languages, copulas are irregular as compared to other predications. They display morphologically unique agreement as well as lexical suppletion in different tenses (in Indo-European languages); functional suppletion (in Akan and Thai, cf. Ellis and Boadi 1969, Kuno and Wongkhomthong 1981); and non-pronunciation (in Semitic ‘nominal sentences’, Fassi-Fehri 1982, Doron 1983, Mouchaweh 1986). Yorùbá provides another instance of this general phenomenon, which I will argue to be categorial in origin.

There are four relevant primary observations about copular sentences in Yorùbá. The Yorùbá item normally translated ‘be’ lacks the unique morphological property of a verb: H tone subject agreement (§2.1). A related property, also missing for the putative Yorùbá copula, is H-tone nominalization (§2.2). A third idiosyncrasy is semantic or pragmatic in nature: Yorùbá has no well-formed copular constructions with a post-copular Focus (§2.3). Fourth, the ‘copula’ negates suppletively (§2.4) – the only other Yorùbá item which does so being the locative predicate of existence (§3.2).

These four observations are consistent with a scenario in which there is no copular element present at some level of representation which is crucial for licensing all of these phenomena. I assume that this level is the “lexical structure” of Hale and Keyser 1993, otherwise known as “lexical syntax” or l-syntax. (L-syntax in this sense is that representation which accounts for the properties which LGB-type frameworks account for in terms of θ-grids.) Conversely, if copulas existed in l-syntax, all four of the anomalies under consideration would be truly surprising.

### 2.1 No subject agreement (& related properties)

Every finite verb in Yorùbá, and every AUX which displays 3S subject pro-drop except the NEG auxiliary, requires H-tone AGREement on a lexical subject, cf. (1). Also, every finite verb or AUX takes a clitic subject, cf. (2). The element *ni*, on the other hand, takes neither subject AGR nor any AUXes, and it disallows a clitic subject, cf. (3-4).

(1a) *Ãgbẹ̀ (*é) lọ. ni
farmer AGR ni
‘A/the farmer went’

(2a) Mo lọ.
sCL ni
‘I went’

(3a) *Ãgbẹ̀ (*é) ni.
farmer AGR ni
‘S/he’s a farmer’

(4a) *Mo ni.
sCL ni
‘It’s me’/‘I’m the one’


2The exclusion of AGR before *ni is stated by Abraham (1958: 435).
2.2 **No H-tone nominalization**

Abraham (1958: xvi) describes a reduplication process which nominalizes a verb into a gerund. The reduplicating prefix comprises the verb’s initial consonant plus the default vowel (≡i) plus phonosyntactic i.\(^3\) This process of syntactic affixation (Fabb 1986) creates either the head of a relative clause (CP), cf. (5a), or else the head of an ordinary DP, cf. (5b). This type of nominalization is productive for all verbs in the language (Kujöre 1972, Awóyalé 1974); it is not, however, possible with the element ni, cf. (6).

\[(5)a. \text{li-lo} \text{ ni} \text{ [agbè ë lo]} \quad (6)a. *\text{ni-ni} \text{ ni} \text{ [agbè ni]}\]

Abraham (1958: xvii) describes a reduplication process which nominalizes a verb into a gerund. The reduplicating prefix comprises the verb’s initial consonant plus the default vowel (≡i) plus phonosyntactic i.\(^3\) This process of syntactic affixation (Fabb 1986) creates either the head of a relative clause (CP), cf. (5a), or else the head of an ordinary DP, cf. (5b). This type of nominalization is productive for all verbs in the language (Kujöre 1972, Awóyalé 1974); it is not, however, possible with the element ni, cf. (6).

\[(5)\text{a. ló-lò} \quad \text{tò } \text{[Ågbí ë lò]} \quad (6)\text{a.*nó-ni \quad tò } \text{[Ågbí ni]}\]

\[(5)b. \text{li-lo} \quad \text{ò \ agbè} \quad (6)b.*\text{ni-ni} \quad \text{i \ agbè}\]

\[(5)\text{b. ló-lò} \quad \text{®} \quad \text{Ågbí} \quad (6)\text{b.*nó-ni} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{Ågbí}\]

Abraham 1958 implies that the predicational and presentational readings of (7) can be distinguished with reference to the more explicit paraphrases in (8), both of which lack the presentational reading. Bángbóçé (1967: 40) calls (7) an “elliptical form” of (8a).

\[(7)\text{Aya à mi ni.} \quad (8)\text{a. [Aya à mi]} \quad \text{tì} \quad \text{ni ò \ [jè/šè]} \quad \text{tì}\]

\[(7)\text{partner.f GEN 1S ni} \quad (8)\text{a. partner.f GEN 1S ni 3S.CL equal/do} \quad \text{[italicized material in focus]}\]

\[(7)\text{‘She’s my partner’} \quad (8)\text{a. ‘What she is/functions as is my partner’} \quad \text{[italicized material in focus]}\]

\[(7)\text{‘It’s my partner’} \quad (8)\text{b. ‘She is/functions as my partner’} \quad \text{[= non-focused version of (8a)]}\]

(5a), a cleft, partially matches the word order of (7), which is a linear substring of (8a) but not of (8b). (8a) is distinguished from (8b) in containing an explicit focus, which also ought to be present in (7). Some evidence supporting this expectation is discussed by Davison (1986: 108f.). Consider (9a) and (10a), and their assumed sources.

\[(9)a. \text{Ołópá ni Jimò.} \quad (10)a. \text{Jimò ni ołópá.} \quad \text{[cf. Jimò est un flic.]}\]

\[(9)b. \text{Jimò o jè ołópá.} \quad (10)b. *\text{Ołópá jè Jimò.} \quad \text{[cf. Jimò est un flic.]}\]

\[(9)c. \text{Jimò o še ołópá.} \quad (10)c. \text{Ołópá še Jimò.} \quad \text{[cf. Jimò est un flic.]}\]

If (10b) underlies (10a), they should be equally as bad, but (10a) is saved by the fact that ołópá can be read non-predicatively, i.e. as part of the Topic, as D-linked. To save Abraham’s conjecture, this reading of (10a) must have some other source than (10b).

\(^3\text{On (5), cf. also Awòbúlúyì 1978b; Awóyalé 1985; Manfredi 1992b, 1993A.}\)
A plausible alternative source for (10a) is supplied by Bāngbọ̀sè (1967: 40). Consider (11), which has two readings, the second of which is the counterpart of (10a). Both readings are expected from the parallel existence of the two alternatives in (12).

(11) Olorun ni òba.
    sky:holder ni king
‘A king is effectively God’ (≈12a)
‘It’s only God that rules’ (≈12b)

(12a) Olorun, ni òba je [t].
    sky:holder ni king AGR equal
    ‘God is what a/the king amounts to’

b. Olorun, ni ójè òba.
    sky:holder ni AGR equal king
    ‘It’s God that rules/is king’

The bare noun òba is ambiguously [±definite] in (12a), but òba in (12b) can only be indefinite, since it is predicative. The silent object trace in (12a) is licit, but the subject trace in (12b) which fails the ECP is pronounced with default (3S) \( \phi \)-features (Koopman 1983: 37; Pulleyblank 1986; Manfredi 1987; Déchaine 1993).

Example (13), cited by Williams (1993: 43f.) from Higgins 1972, is comparable in information structure to (10a), but presumably it doesn’t have a source like (12b). Rather, it is licit because Olivier is both a Focus and inherently definite if not D-linked.

(13) Hamlet will be Olivier.
    (e.g. in announcing a list of *dramatis personae*)

The lack of a parallel ni-sentence in Yorùbá suggests that ni is not a predicator at any level of representation, whereas English *be* is a V at least at the superficial level accessed by pragmatics. Call this level s-structure or f(unctional)-syntax (where the latter label is an intentional pun between closed-class phrasal categories and pragmatic structure).

### 2.4 Suppletive negation (& related properties)

Negation of a ni-sentence is fully suppletive if the topic is null, cf. (14) vs. (15).

(14a) Òótó ni.  
truth ni
‘It’s true’

b. Òótó ni.
    1S ni
‘It’s me’

(15a) Òótó kó (*ni).
truth NOT
‘It isn’t true’

b. Òótó kó (*ni).
    1S NOT
‘It’s not me’

Even if the topic is non-null, the negator of a ni clause (= kó) is distinct from the negator of a verb phrase (= k, phonetically reducible to \( o \) unless the subject is null):

(16a) Òótó ni iyen.
truth ni that
OR: Òótó ni iyén jè.
    AGR equal
‘That’s a fact’
(Bāngbọ̀sè 1967: 40)

b. Òótó ni iyén.
    1S ni jè
‘That’s not a fact’

(17a) Òótó kó ni iyen.
    truth NOT ni that
    OR: Òótó kó ni iyén jè.
    AGR equal
‘That’s a fact’

b. Òótó kó ni pro yóò ìrò.
    PROS go
‘I’m not the one who’s about to go’

(18) Jimó ó lo.
    AGR go
‘Jimó went’

(19) Jimó (k)ó lo.
    NEG go
‘Jimó didn’t go’
Why is "ni" obligatory in (17) but ungrammatical in (15)? If "ni" is non-lexical, its presence in a string should depend only on well-formedness in f-syntax, and this expectation is borne out. (15) differs minimally from (17) in that the latter contains an overt Topic (the embedded subject), which requires Case. This is schematised in (17'), where ∅₁ is the head of S and ∅₂ indicates lexical content which is recoverable as either jë or e. In (15'), by contrast, the null Topic (pro) doesn’t need Case; there being no other content in S, the wh-chain headed by "pro" is vacuous.

(17') Ōōtoj kō ni [ŋ iyen ∅₁ ∅₂ t₁]  (15') Ōōtoj kō (*ni) [ŋ pro ∅₁ ∅₂ t₁].

Notice that the expletive verb—∅₉—is itself a possible negation target, in which case it spells out as e, the negator is not kō but kën, and "ni" becomes optional, cf. (20a).

(20a) a. Kō i se ōōtoj (ni).  b. Ŭdūkē kō i se aya âni.
    NEG 3S PROG do truth ni  NEG PROG do partner GEN 1S
    'It’s not the truth'  'Ďūkē is not my partner'
    (Bāmgbọsẹ 1967: 40)  (Abraham 1958: 370)

Abraham calls kō i jë (or kō i se, from kō n'jë) “the negative of jë” (1958: 370), and this suppletion comes as no surprise if jë and se are both expletive. One may ask, why not the reverse, i.e. why isn’t kō i jë the negative of se? If jë and se differ, it is plausibly in the fact that se—which as a nonexpletive verb means ‘make’ or ‘do’—is compatible with eventive (nonstative) aspect. But this is not straightforwardly so: the progressive auxiliary in (20) is not some kind of aspectual ‘patch’ between the stativity of jë and the eventiveness of se, since there are noneventive uses of expletive se like (21a)—cf. also se in (8a) and (9c) above. Moreover, the progressive is only optional in (21b).

(21a) a. Ť se pelebe.
    3S do flatness
    'It is flat'
    (Awōbuláyí 1978A: 8)
    b. Ŭ (n) se ągbẹsẹ.
    3S PROG do launderer
    'He is a washerman'
    (Abraham 1958: 433)

If se is expletive, then the aspectual type of the predicate is determined by se’s(nominal) complement, unless that complement is itself ambiguously individual-level or stage-level, as in the near-minimal pair in (22) where the progressive selects the latter (22b):

(22a) a. Ť se okunrin
    3S do man
    'He is manly'
    (Abraham 1958: 608)
    b. Ť n se ńmòderé.
    3S PROG do child
    'He is behaving childishly'
    (Abraham 1958: 608)

Then, to explain the obligatory progressive aux in (20a), it is enough to assume that a ni-cleft construction, with its inherent focus, is necessarily stage-level. A residual problem for this view is the optionality of ‘sentence-final’ ni in (20a).

Now, optional "ni" is also found without negation, in contexts where the upstairs verb is non-expletive, cf. (23). There being no evidence that the material to the left of "ni" is a nominalization, I adopt the ECM/control structure in (23').

(23) Wōn n so ńró (ni).
    3P.AGR PROG talk word ni
    'The fact is they are talking'
    (Bāmgbọsẹ 1967: 38)

(23') Wōn n so ńró [ŋ iyen ∅₁ ∅₂ ∅₃ t₁] ni [ŋ ∅₁ ∅₂ ∅₃ t₁]

4For Moro (1993), “S” in (17’) would be a small clause, i.e. an uninflected predication. However, ∅₁ is present in this “S”: it is phonetically realized iff ∅₂ is, cf. (16a) and (17a) above.
In (23), control of the clefted internal argument (ıí) suffices to reconstruct all material in the scope of that argument, namely the entire event in S, so that all such material can appear overtly above the CP. This makes (20a) and (23) homologous, the main difference being that in the former the verb is expletive, so reconstruction is trivial. In both examples, the linear integrity of the material above CP is responsible for the apparent optionality of ni; in reality, ni is obligatory and the clefting of the internal argument is the optional part. Optional ni is usually described as an ‘emphatic’ discourse-particle, but the assumption in (23) is that it always has the syntax of C0.5

If we can go this far, two further steps are possible. (24) can be assimilated to the structure in (23), with one difference: all the lexical content is downstairs while the (pronounced) ∅V is upstairs. And, both of the ordinary yes/no questions in (25) can be treated as isomorphic to (24), with the sole difference that C0 is null, spelled out ıH, in (25a), while C0 contains overt irrealis features in (25b). This parallelism entails that the sentence-initial ‘question marker’ Şe in (23a) is composed syntactically of two pieces: ıe, the toneless (M-tone bearing) expletive verb, plus ıH spelling out null C0.

(24) Şe ni [ış wón ı nı sörı].  
   do ni  3P.AGR PROG talk  
   ‘The fact is that they are talking’  
   (Báŋbọ̀se 1967: 38)

(25)a. Şe [ış wón ı nı sörı]?  
     do.C  3P.AGR PROG talk  
     ‘Are they talking?’  
     ‘Is it the case that they are talking?’

b. Şe bi [ış wón ı nı sörı]?  
     do if  3P.AGR PROG talk  
     ‘Is it the case that they are talking?’

The other expletive verb, jë, forms a yes/no question with the same structure, (26b). The corresponding factive (26a) is not exactly parallel to (24): it lacks the null expletive subject and its complementizer is not ni but pê, the conflation of V0 pê ‘say’ with null C0 (Déchaine 1993C). Nevertheless, the association of both of the expletive verbs (jë and ıe) with C0 ni in copular sentences and also in factive pseudoclefts makes it plausible to derive Ni in the yes/no question (23b) from C0 ni plus jë.

(26a). Ô jë pê [ış wón ı nı sörı].  
     3S equal say  3P.AGR PROG talk  
     ‘It is the case that they are talking’  
     (cf. Abraham 1958: 341)

b. N-jë [ış wón ı nı sörı]?  
     ni-equal  3P.AGR PROG talk  
     ‘Is it the case that they are talking?’  
     (cf. Awóyále 1987)

There is supporting evidence from tonal prosody. Báŋbọ̀se 1967 says that an alternate pronunciation of Şebí (MH) in (23b) is Şebí (LH). It is tempting to compare this LH variant of underlying MH to the LH outcome Një in (26b) which I would derive from a sequence of ni (M) plus jë (H). This tone change is expected if any cliticized, weak element which begins this sentence type has to occupy a strong position, since on purely phonetic grounds I have claimed (1993B) that only L can be the initial member of branching (i.e. tonally complex) ı position in Yorùbá. Even apart 5As already alluded to, an alternative approach along the lines of Collins 1994 would treat the material in (23) to the left of ni as a factive nominalization of the embedded S. That view would be more compelling but for two difficulties: (i) the nominalization at issue would be completely abstract, and otherwise unattested in Yorùbá; and (ii) in other contexts e.g. clefts, the supposedly ‘factive’ meaning of the abstract nominalizer never occurs independent of an eventive or a manner reading or from ordinary object scope, so it may be entirely parasitic on one or more of these independently motivated effects, cf. Báŋbọ̀se 1992, Manfredi 1993A, Wold 1994.
from the Comp domain, there are cases of sentence initial MH becoming LH. The examples in (27) are from Báñgboşé (1965: 18):

(27)a. Mo ñlọ. OR: [mïnlọ]
   1S PROG go
   ‘I’m going’

     b. E ñ ñorin. OR: [cïkorin]
   2P PROG sing song
   ‘You’re singing’

(This effect fails for the third person clitics, since third person has the $H$ default AGR.)

2.5 Copular typology

The above four properties suggest that the Yorùbá copula is C-based, and is neither I-based nor is it a verb. Crosslinguistically, copular CP and IP seem to be independent, since they can contrast in a single language. Ellis and Boadi 1969 give evidence that Ákán has both a C-based copula ($nç$—cognate to Yorùbá $nì$) which heads a cleft, and also an I-based copula ($yé$) which excludes a post-copular Topic (much like an Indo-European canonical copular construction).

The minimal pair in (28) suggests that $nç$ takes a Focus to its left, but $yé$ doesn’t.6

   man  ne chief
   ‘It is Kwási tha t’s a chief’

     b. Kwási $yé$-hãne.
   yé chief
   ‘Kwási is a chief’

Another difference: the arguments to either side of $nç$ can be definite, or not, cf. (29), but $yé$ prefers a definite subject (30) and rejects a definite predicate (31). The sensitivity of agreement to animacy allows us to see that the argument to the right of the copula may be definite just in a presentational context (31d), i.e. where it is not a predicate.

(29) Òbarímá (no) $nç$-shéne (no)
   man the ne chief the
   ‘It is {the/a} man that’s {the/a} chief’

(30)a. Òbarímá $yé$-hãne.
   man  yé chief
   ‘A man is a chief’

     b. Òbarímá no $yé$-hãne.
   man the yé chief
   ‘The man is a chief’

(31)a. Òhãne (no) $yé$-òbarímá.
   chief  the yé man
   ‘{The/a} chief is a man’

     b. Òhãne (no) $yé$-òbarímá no.
   chief  the yé man the
   [‘{The/a} chief is the man’]

     c. Ò $yé$-òbarímá no.
   3S.INANIM yé man the
   [‘He is the man’]

     d. Ò $yé$-òbarímá no.
   3S.ANIM yé man the
   [‘He is the man’]

The existence of a language like Ákán, with both I-based and C-based copulas, indirectly supports the above analysis of Yorùbá. Two partly distinct copular structures also co-occur in Thai (Kuno and Wongkhomthong 1981), where the items pen and khi are presumably I-based and C-based, respectively. A further question, not addressed here, is whether all inverse copular constructions are really C-based instead of I-based, thus bringing f-syntax and semantic interpretation into closer correspondence.

6Ákán (or Twi, the particular variety described by the authors) is, like Yorùbá, a Kwa language. Tone is not indicated in the source. I have added orthographic tonemarks to the examples in (28) – (31), on both political and scientific grounds, but also at the risk of error.
3. Syntactic composition of ní

So far, the discussion has done little more than restate diverse insights of the West African linguistic literature in more formal terms. Henceforth, things get controversial. The claim throughout this section is that certain instances of (H-tone) ní contain the C₀ (toneless or M-tone) ní as an ultimate—if not an immediate—constituent. The items in question are: (i) ní the accusative marker; (ii) ní the Preposition ‘in/at’; and (iii) ní the verb meaning ‘have’ or ‘own’. First, a brief digression.

3.1 Ní → ní without category change

Abraham (1958: 436) cites an example where an undisputed instance of C₀ ní acquires H-tone from local phonetic context, namely from the resumptive third person AGR ó which we saw spelling out a subject wh-trace in (12b) above. If the H-tone is realized on ní, the default φ-features of the resumptive trace (= φ) fail to surface.

(32) Ta ní ó lọ? [phonetically: talólo OR tanílo]
who C AGR go ‘Who went?’

The default character of the third person AGR in (32) is also shown by the fact that its antecedent can be either singular or plural. This alternation is a trivial example of ní being pronounced ní without changing category. The remaining cases are different.

3.2 Ní → ní with category change

Oyèláràn 1981 lists five semantically distinct tokens of ní (with H-tone). All but the first one in (33e) undergo the n~l alternation (which occurs before vowels other than i).

(33)a. Mo ní owó. [phonetically: molówó]
1S V money ‘I have (some) money’

b. Mo ní Olú dè ilé. [phonetically: molóludélè]
1S V arrive house ‘I said that Olú got home’

c. Mo fún Olú ní owó. [phonetically: mofúnolúwó]
1S give K money ‘I gave Olú (some) money’

d. Mo bá Olú ní oko. [phonetically: mobólólóko]
1S meet P farm ‘I encountered Olú at the farm’

e. Mo ní Olú ní owó. [phonetically: monolówó]
1S V K hand ‘I assist(ed) Olú’

Schematically, in a string [...X₀ YP (Z₀ WP)…], either X or Z can be ní, or both (33e). Semantically, all the various tokens in (33) are not so different. The ní in (33a) is translatable as ‘have’; ní in (33d) heads a locative PP; two more nís—in (33c) and the first token in (33e)—have something to do with possession. I claim that all these tokens of ní are related syntactically. Specifically, starting from the result of §2 that toneless (i.e. phonetically M-tone) ní is categorially C₀, all the instances of ní in (33) are arguably derived through a sequence of syntactic compositions:

(34)a. [C₀ ní +₁ H] → [ Ko ní ] 
by spellout and prosodic government cf. (33b, c, e)

b. [p₀ O + K₀] → [p₀ ní ] 
by conflation cf. (33d)

c. [v₀ O + P₀] → [v₀ ní ] 
by conflation cf. (33a, e)
The required concepts of spellout and conflation are adopted from configurational Case theory (Bittner and Hale 1994) and from the theory of lexical syntax (Hale and Keyser 1993). Prosodic government (cf. Rizzi and Savoia 1992) is a type of metrical licensing which holds in phonosyntax—arguably the same representation where spellout phenomena occur: s-structure or f-syntax. Conflation, by contrast, is a type of head-movement which occurs at or before the “d-structure” representation, i.e. in l-syntax. All three operations instantiate subtypes of government, which is presumably the only core grammatical principle involved. Details of these operations follow.

3.2.1 ni as K₀

(34a) claims that C₀ ni becomes K₀ ní, Oyèláráñ’s (1993) “antifocus” particle, a marker of inherent Case or abstract incorporation à la Baker. This is not a category change so much as an appeal to an equivalence asserted by Bittner and Hale 1994, who describe K as the “nominal counterpart” of C. This equivalence may be expressible in a theory of functional elements such as Fukui 1986; see also Déchaine (1993: 71–75).

According to Bittner and Hale, UG makes KP available for marked structural Cases. Yorùbá not having overt agreement on arguments⁷, KP is called only for the direct structural cases ERG and ACC (the marked cases).⁸ NOM, a direct structural Case, is universally unmarked, hence it does not involve KP. A K₀ spelled out as either ERG or ACC is underlyingly null, and is therefore licensed by the ECP.⁹ By hypothesis, the antecedent government requirement of the ECP is satisfied by a “Case-binder” head (either P₀ or V₀). The realization of ACC additionally depends on a “Case-competitor”, which is a K-less argument (a bare DP or NP) also in the local domain of the Case-binder. The spellout of null K₀ is ACC if the Case-binder is V₀ and the Case-competitor is D₀. Spellout is relevant to the Case Filter which, as stated by Bittner and Hale, requires a DP or its trace to be governed by either C₀ or K₀. The idea is that C₀ and K₀ are each other’s “counterparts” in the verbal and nominal domains respectively: as far as the Case Filter cares, one is as good as the other. The attraction of this idea for Yorùbá is that C₀ ni and K₀ ní are near homophones, the only difference being the privative presence in the latter of a H-tone—there being no substantive M-tone present in the former.¹⁰ Therefore, consider the H-tone.

For a list of languages traditionally called ‘tonal’ (including Yorùbá), Bamba 1992 has argued for the activity of metrical structure à la Liberman and Prince. His idea is that tones are not randomly distributed in autosegmental tiers, but group into feet with all the properties of metrical structure (headedness, binarity, recursiveness). In a series of papers¹¹, I apply Bamba’s theory to a ubiquitous phenomenon in Niger-Congo: the occurrence of a lexically unexpected H-tone in grammatical contexts which implicate a null f-head (C, K, T, D). To generalize across all these cases, assume that a null f-head

---

⁷Yorùbá H-tone AGR, realized phonetically on subjects, is generated not in a KP, but rather in some functional head in the extended projection of V, i.e. in a member of the post-Pollock “exploded Infl family” such as T₀ (Déchaine 1992, 1993A). The H-tone spellout of T₀ is thus regulated, not by Case theory, but by prosodic government as defined below.

⁸Bittner and Hale’s NOM covers both traditional labels “nominative” and “absolutive”.

⁹In the theory, the availability of ERG and ACC in a given language depends on phrase structure (in f-syntax). I assume that ERG is not relevant to the examples in (33).

¹⁰That Yorùbá M-tone is just the pronunciation of tonelessness is argued by Akinlabí (1985).

not licensed by the ECP (i.e. which is not itself governed) is not a good syntactic governor, but it can become one if it has some phonetic content. The question is why, across the Niger-Congo languages, the necessary phonetic content is just a H tone.

Suppose that H-tone has a property which uniquely qualifies it to rehabilitate an unfit syntactic governor. Recall that, in all the examples, the type of syntax is f-syntax. Bamba proposes that H-tone is the head of a metrical foot; in the KLV framework (Kaye et al. 1990), it is a metrical governor. Apparently, grammar is willing to accept a metrical governor as an f-syntactic governor. In other words, the government relation in at least some part of syntax (f-syntax, or s-structure) is equivalent to the government relation in at least a sub-part of phonology (metrical structure, or prosody).

These claims of the preceding paragraph are summarized in (35).

\[(35)a.\] Prosodic government
Null X∅, X closed-class, is strong if X is both ungoverned and governing.

b. Principles
A metrical governor is stronger than its governee (H>L>M).
[s] immediately dominates a metrical governor.
[w] is strictly adjacent to a metrical governor.
Tonal government iff [s].

c. Parameters
The set of tonal governors is: \{H\}, \{L\}, \{H, L\}.

d. Yorùbá
The set of tonal governors is: \{H, L\}. (This implies the existence of a M tone.)

To account for the phenomena described in (34a), it remains to point out that two of the instances (34c), (34e) involve double object constructions where the notional Theme, marked with \(nì\), is non-adjacent to the verb, hence it is both ungoverned and governing, so both spellout and prosodic government are invoked. The third instance, (34b) has an indirect discourse complement but no verb of speaking. If there is an overt verb, C0 can stay null, but since there is no overt verb in (34b), C0 is spelled out \(ni\), and \(ni\) gets its H-tone because it is both ungoverned and governing. It is traditional, in Yorùbá grammar, to refer to this \(ni\) as a verb meaning ‘say’ (Oyelâràn 1982).

3.2.2 \(nì\) as \([p o ∅ + \text{K}]\)
Another token of \(nì\) translates English \(at/to\), cf. (33d) repeated here as (36a). Oyelâràn 1993 shows that this is a true lexical P: it can pied-pipe when its object is clefted (36b), unlike a K in a double object construction like (37).

\[(36)a.\] Mo bá Olù nì oko.  \(\text{1S meet P farm}\)  \(\text{I met Olù at the farm’}\)
Olù rán ni \(nì\) \{išé/obi\}.  \(\text{send 1S K job/kola}\)  \(\text{Olù sent me on an errand/for kola’}\)

\[(37)a.\] Olù rán \(nì\) \{išé/obi\}.  \(\text{An errand is what Olù sent me on’}\)
\(\text{Some kola is what Olù sent me for’}\)

b. (Ní) \(nì\) \(nì\) Olù bá \(mí\).  \(\text{At the farm is where Olù met me’}\)
\(\text{At the farm is where Olù met me’}\)

A third possibility is intermediate between lexical P and pure (null) K. \(S’\) in (38) is a Case marker, since like \(nì\) it cannot pied-pipe (38b), but unlike \(nì\) it can strand (38c). In Bittner and Hale’s framework, \(s’\) has the behavior of non-accusative K, i.e. an inherent or underlying (non-null) Case, just like the English item \(to\) which appears with send.

---246---
a. Olo ni Oló rán mi *(nìsì)
    send 1S K farm
    ‘Olo sent me to the farm’

b. *(Ni/sì) oko ni Oló rán mi.
    K farm C send 1S
    ‘The farm is where Olo sent me to’

Other evidence that *sì is inherent Case comes from existential constructions. In the negative and positive versions of (39), *sì is in a suppletive relationship with the verb *uá ‘exist’. Only in child Yorùbá and in some dialects (such as Èkíù), does *sì have the status of a verb, cf. (40a) where subject AGR is audible before *sì.

    vehicle AGR exist K ground
    ‘There is a car/cars (somewhere)’
    ‘A car or cars is/are available’

b. Okoró kò sí (nì ile).
    vehicle NEG K K ground
    ‘There is/are no car(s)’

3.2.3 nì as [V o Ø+P]
Finally, there is the ‘have/own’ token of nì, exemplified in (33a) above and in (41).

(41) Jimò ó ni ajá.
    [ phonetically: jimòólajá]
    AGR V dog
    ‘Jimò has/owns a/the dog’

The subject AGR in (41) shows that nì is categorially V. But other evidence, reviewed in §4, shows that it is not an unanalyzable item, from a phonosyntactic standpoint.

4. Suppression of phonosyntactic tone
Nì may be a verb, but it is an unstable molecule, not a lexicalist’s ‘syntactic atom’ (§4.1). Phonosyntactic tone effects also occur in other, independent empirical domains (§4.2).

4.1 Nì ‘have’ → nì
Nì ‘have’ undergoes obligatory loss of its H in an appropriate prosodic context.

4.1.1 Phrasal context
The minimal pair in (42)\(^{12}\) shows suppression of H in between the default, 35 subject resumptive element ó—seen in (12b) and (32) above—and a definite, bare object.

(42)a. Ta nì ó ni [KP Ø [DP Ø ajá]]?  b. Ta nì ó ni [KP Ø [DP [ajá] ti ]]?
    who C 35 V dog
    ‘Who has/owns a dog?’
    ‘Who has/owns the dog in question?’

Null D being an option in Yorùbá, this effect is attributable to prosodic government. In (42a), null K assigns accusative to ajá ‘dog’. K is not spelled out because it is antecedent governed by V, and, if existential quantification of the object comes from a null D (Longobardi 1994), then null K governs a null D. In (42b), the object is referential, which Longobardi ascribes to its substitution in null D, so null K minimally governs lexical material in D, and there is one less null f-head. Thus, the V in (42b) resides between two f-heads, each of which minimally governs lexical content. But this context removes the original need for nì to be a prosodic governor, so the H drops.

\(^{12}\)Adapted from Abraham (1958: 438) and kindly confirmed for me by three Yorùbá-speakers.
4.1.2 In a synthetic compound
Abraham (1958: 438) describes H-tone loss in synthetic compounds of ní ‘have’ where
the logical object has all L-tone (43a), vs. elsewhere (44) where the H-tone stays.

\[(43)a. \quad \text{alÅgbÅ}<\text{nó} - \text{ÅgbÅ} \quad \text{‘respected person’ er-have-seniority} \]
\[\quad \text{b. alÅåyå}<\text{nó} - \text{Åyå} \quad \text{‘living creature’ er-have-space} \]
\[\quad \text{c. ol§…ò}<\text{nó} - \text{§…ò} \quad \text{‘poor person’ er-have-destitution} \]

\[(44)a. \quad \text{alÄ…®}<\text{nó} - \text{a…®} \quad \text{‘cloth owner/seller’ er-have-cloth} \]
\[\quad \text{b. êlëíró}<\text{nó} - \text{író} \quad \text{‘witness’ er-have-evidence} \]
\[\quad \text{c. alÄd∞n}<\text{nó} - \text{ad∞n} \quad \text{‘candy’ er-have-sweetness} \]

Assuming that an MHL sequence is insufficient to project two prosodic feet, nevertheless
by hypothesis both L and H are tonal governors in Yor∞bÄ (cf. 35d), so the L in
(43) can ‘take over’ the prosodic government requirement which motivated s H on ní
to begin with. This is only possible, however, if the domain of this L goes to the end of
the word, since the metrical governor (H) must be adjacent to the governee (35b).

4.2 Related (de)composition effects of H
Two other phenomena (briefly) show that the manipulation of phonosyntactic tone in
Yor∞bÄ is not limited to the verb ní ‘have’.  

4.2.1 K + s H = C
There is probably a relationship between relative Comp ś in (43) and the inherent
Casemaker ś in (46).

\[(45) \quad \text{iwé} \quad \text{ti mo ra.} \quad \text{book C 1S buy} \quad \text{‘the book I bought’} \]
\[\text{b. Leiden ni mo ti ra} \quad \text{iwé.} \quad \text{C 1S K buy book} \quad \text{‘Leiden is where I bought a/the book(s)’} \]

4.2.2 Contraction of V + K
Ward 1952, Báningbọ̀ 1965, Oyèlarān 1970 and others have observed a regular
contraction involving the 3 S object clitic after an underlying high tone verb (47a); the
converse effect occurs with a toneless (lexical ‘mid’ tone) verb (47b):13

\[(47)a. \quad \text{Mo rí i.} \quad \text{[contracted to: Mo rí]} \quad \text{b. Mo jë ṣ.} \quad \text{[contracted to: Mo jë]} \]
\[\text{1S see 3S} \quad \text{1S eat 3S} \quad \text{‘I saw her/him/it’} \quad \text{‘I ate it’} \]

Note that this apparent ‘tone change’ is restricted to contexts where the underlying
tones involved are not independent of each other. Thus, Stahlke (1974: 140) draws
attention to the complementarity of the object clitic tone: H after M and L verbs, vs.
M after H verbs. Pulleyblank 1983 and Akinlabi 1985 restate this observation in a non-
metrical framework with a phonological rule which deletes a H-tone just if it is linked

13Ward (1952: 38) identifies this contraction as specific to “Lagos speakers”, but this may not be
dialectal, if the speech of that city simply presents the freest use of contraction.
to an object clitic and follows another H-tone. In a metrical framework, all three stipulations can be dropped. There is no tone ‘deletion’ if what occurs is simply the failure to spell out a null f-head as strong in a predictable context, namely where it is locally governed, cf. (35a) and (48). There is no need to mention object clitics, since the f-syntax gives the context, nor to mention a preceding H-tone, since by hypothesis a preceding L or M-tone would not count as the head of a strong position. Thus the uncontracted forms in (47) are given directly by phonosyntax, as in (48).

(48)a.  

Whatever phonetic process is responsible for the contracted forms, the relevant point is that the items in (47) which contract are distinguished from those in (49) which don’t directly by their phonosyntactic properties. Only with an L-tone verb are both V and K inherently strong and can both of them occupy a single branching $s$ (cf. §4.2.1).

(49) Mo rā ā.  

‘I bought it’

n.b. *Mo rā/*Mo rā (not contractable)

5. Conclusion.
Yorùbá ‘be’ and ‘have’ suggest that the (de)compositional properties of lexical as well as functional items—the objects of l-syntax and f-syntax—are both richer and more constrained than one currently imagines. The initial idea about Yorùbá ‘be’ as C° was inspired by Ruwet’s classic work on French. The method of study was to demonstrate “proliferating consequences” of this idea across many constructions of Yorùbá and several modules of grammar. This exercise was feasible only with the help of Abraham’s Yorùbá dictionary—a philological monument as yet unequalled in the Niger-Congo family—and with the acute insights of the formally oriented, Yorùbá speaker-linguist tradition which Bāngbọjẹ led throughout the 1960’s and ’70’s. Finally, if my claims about Yorùbá ‘have’ are not entirely mistaken, then the crucial role of tonal prosody in the f-syntactic composition of Yorùbá words points to a much closer relationship between phonology and syntax than has been standardly assumed.
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