No [logo]*

Victor Manfredi Boston University

In diverse notations, the notion of logophoricity has been deployed in functionalist, generative and Tarskian-logical literature far beyond its origin in West African studies of indirect discourse. The primary data suffer from familiar failings of 'exotic' research with respect to phonetic transcription, semantic interpretation and morphosyntactic labels, cloaking empirical patterns in circular accounts and immunising pretheoretic concepts from disproof. In standard Yorubá however, three generations of scholarship have assembled ingredients of a generalization requiring the binding-theoretic diacritic [+logo] to finally "dissolve" à la Rooryck & Wyngaerd (2011) with nonparochial consequences for subjunctive obviation, long-distance anaphora and the typology of tenses and pronouns. The belated observation is that antilogophoricity depends on sequence of tense and fails otherwise. This contrast, unexpected in extant frameworks, fits longstanding intuitions about co-valuation of nominal and temporal features and rules out grammatical architectures that can't represent an extended domain of multiclausal syntax where tenses and pronouns jointly find their antecedents—in essence, Koster's "configurational matrix" (1987, 98). Minimalism may have precipitously foreclosed this option by "outsourcing'... pushing things into other modules" (D'Alessandro 2019, 17, 20).

KEYWORDS Yorùbá, anaphora, dependent tense, grammatical architecture

1. Outsourcing and globality

If the diacritic feature [+anaphor] is rightly to be dismissed from the *faculté de langage* and replaced by "mechanisms and principles that are independently needed in the grammar" (Rooryck & Wyngaerd 2011, 1) then it would be unjust to spare its tropical twin [+logo], a label for 'special pronouns' and correlated indirect discourse Comps, widely posited in languages of West Africa (Hagège 1974, Clements 1979, Hyman & Comrie 1981, Koopman & Sportiche 1989) and subsequently imported to the global North as a trump card of binding-theoretic amnesty for anomalous "anaphors... used logophorically with no antecedent in the sentence" (Reinhart & Reuland 1992, 191).

Anaphors and logophors are surely local "automorphisms" (Keenan & Stabler 2003, 11), but if they're unrelated then it's odd that languages supplied with 'logophoric pronouns' largely lack intrinsically reflexive and reciprocal vocabulary items. The typological coincidence reminds an Africanist of other continental tradeoffs, loosely expressable as: lexical 'tones' or syllable codas, 'serial verbs' or ECM, focus pseudoclefts or embedded wh. Tracking empirical asymmetries as a list of structural parameters only defers explanation one step back, into the tiny hands of improbably prescient homunculi waiting in Platonic limbo for predetermined acquisition cues (Newmeyer 2004, Koster 2009). Recoiling from infinite metaphysical regress, Minimalism sought "therapeutic value" (Chomsky 1995, 233) in "'outsourcing'... pushing things into other modules" (D'Alessandro 2019, 17, 20). Some perceivedly "imperfect" properties of LF and PF were chalked up to "third factor... efficiency" (Chomsky 2005, 9) and much else was redistributed to OT, DM, Tarskian ontology and other bolt-on modules, unintentionally but predictably heartening critics of "syntactico-centrism" (Jackendoff 2007) and opening the door to inductive Big Data mining. However, these post-SpellOut components are more calculation "procedures" (E. Keenan p.c.) than they are falsifiable theories, and a combinatorial engine alias "transformational grammar" (Chomsky 1956, 121) remains indispensable at the "epicenter of... normal human cognition" (Stabler 2013). Despite financial expenditure on the scale of global war machines, the machine translation industry has not overcome "the overestimation of statistics" (Bar-Hillel 1960) so much as set loose a flock of "stochastic parrots" (Bender & al. 2021). To calibrate the division of labor between syntax and syntax-external mental capacities is evidently beyond the reach of taxonomic methods on their own.

How to analyse nomino-temporal anaphora (Partee 1984, Enç 1986) depends on how tenses and pronouns are encoded. Reichenbach's E,R,S massively overgenerate compared to the empirical record (Vikner 1985, Verkuyl 2008). At the other extreme, a syntax parsimoniously reduced to Agr-checking (Zeijlstra 2012, 504) can't correlate tenses and pronouns without cloning the feature arrays of each category for the other, illustrating how "the derivational focus on features renders simple generalizations verbose by compiling them into the feature make-up of lexical items" (Graf 2017, 63). No less verbose is dynamic/flexible—i.e. noncartographic—Minimalism (Moro 1997b, Zwart 2007), because the hypothetical re-Merge of an embedded, dependent Tense would still require subsequent re-Merge of the embedded subject pro in its Spec, thus splitting a single phenomenon into two contingent operations. Finally, skipping syntax entirely and linking morphology direct to semantics makes no prediction at all, because each listed pronoun comes along with its own bespoke domain filter, entrenching the circularity of a global/transderivational—here, extra-derivational—framework (Kiparsky 2002a, 210).

The remaining possibility is to tie pronominal tense-dependence to abstract syntactic locality: "the configurational matrix [that] defines a structure without meaning or inherent purpose" (Koster 1987, 98, cf. Koster 1988), itself subsuming ECP "connectedness... understood only as a property of (referential) coindexing relations" (Kayne 1983, 239 fn. 18). With the descriptive background in §2, §3 shows that this structural representation is indispensable in Yorùbá reported speech, alongside cases previously discussed: subjunctive obviation (Ruwet 1984, 1990, Pica 1984, 272f., Rizzi 1990), long-distance anaphora (Koster 1987, 336, Pica 1991) and the referential opacity of phrasal reflexives (Déchaine & Manfredi 1994).

The result is welcome, because externalization trouble is old news. Kaye (1988) indignantly refused to play a "useless... game" of cross-theoretical phonology against unrestrictive, extrinsically ordered Halle-Markov rewrite rules—rejigged soon thereafter as the invincible, freely reorderable soft filters of OT. No less futile, to try to defend the N-to-D definiteness rule of phrasal topology (Delfitto & Schroten 1991, Longobardi 2005), a theorem of internal syntax, against a open stock of denotations styled "parameters" (Chierchia 1998) whose precompiled pragmatics display morbid symptoms of

- * N. Ruwet, paix à ton esprit. Thanks ever to S. Kuno and A. Zribi-Hertz, and now to Q. Ajîbóyè and O. Adéşolá. Homophony alert: logo colloquially denotes a commodity tag disguising sweatshop labor (Klein 1999). Science too would be debased by abusive marketing, if not for committed scholar-editors like the honorand. Abbracci di cuore, grande Johan! [under review; this version 5 oct 2025]
- 1. Equally incredible, but helpfully more vivid, is the creationist-catastrophist re-telling of the Platonist parameter tale (Baker 1995).
- 2. At the Optimality Syntax plenary (Chomsky 1998), Norbert Hornstein sought tongue-in-cheek confirmation that under Minimalism, X⁰-movement which in the preceding decade had grafted a forest of syntactic trees was henceforth relegated to PF: "Noam, do you really mean that if I hire Mark Baker now in my department, it has to be for a phonology position?" (paraphrased from 20 May 1995).

'reading-itis': the wish to assign as many readings as possible to a sentence without taking into account that a sentence might simply be used to underinform and that it is better to provide for means to describe underinformation precisely and formally.

(Verkuyl 1993, xiif., cf. 2008, 157)

The externalist direction of travel rejoins Russell's dim view of natural language as the clumsy servant of mathematics (Moro 1997a, Lechner 2015, 1201, 1245), restores the behaviorist doctrine that "anaphora is deixis in a semantical game" (Hintikka & Kulas 1985, 147) and *voilà*, "There is now no longer a need for a syntactic 'binding theory'" (Kratzer 2009, 232).

In sum, an uncanny Familienähnlichkeit unites the Africanist's [+logo] and the logician's "logophoric mood-time... a world variable with the feature log" (Stechow 2003, 400). Either one of these taxonomic entities can sit neatly in the répertoire of phrasal-appearing output templates of cartography and "silent syntax" (Cinque 2006, Kayne 2022), for example "Proind" hosted in a "universal spine" (Wiltschko 2014, 209). But if, across superficially different descriptive formats, an alleged phenomenon can at best be saved transderivationally, the time may be ripe for empirical as opposed to notational advance.

2. Yorùbá anaphora

Paradigm (1), due to Bámgbósé (1966, 107), got its first generative analysis from his erstwhile student Pulleyblank (1986).3

- (1)a. Ó_{**w**} ri pé ó_{**z**} l'ówó. pro.NOM see.proACC COMP pro.NOM have.money 'S/he (has) ensured that s/he had money' INTERPRETATION: **w** and **z** are preferentially distinct.
 - Ów ri pé òúnz l'ówó.
 prv.NOM see.prvACC COMP 3S.NOM have.money
 'S/he (has) ensured that s/he had money'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are preferentially identical.

In (1a), Bámgbósé's translation has the two δ clitics referentially distinct ("he other than himself") but coreference is also possible (Q. Ajíbóyè p.c.) and the latter option, albeit marginal, escapes Pulleyblank's analysis of embedded δ as a logical variable bound by an abstract, wide-scope speech-act operator that automatically excludes any local antecedent by virtue of binding condition C (Chomsky 1981a, 188).

Despite preferred coreference in (1b), δun is not intrinsically an anaphor, as Pulleyblank duly notes (1986, 60). It occurs independently as a condition B pronoun: nonlocally free, whether in a matrix A-position (2) - (6) or in a subordinate clause if lacking overt Case, e.g. by hosting a right-adjoined modifier (7a) or by occupying left-peripheral A-bar focus (7b). A Reflexive interpretation fails equally for the accusative 3s clitic (3) as for δun itself (4). In all these environments, the only interpretive difference between δ and δun is the latter's specificity, approximable as "some recoverable relation to a familiar object" but which is not total "identity of reference" (Enç 1991, 24). Assorted other instances of δun confirm this impression:

- (i) evoking a presupposed entity: Ó di òun 'It became a reality' (Abraham 1958, 494), Òun ni wí pé wón ti ghà lá.ti kúrò 'The fact of the matter was that they had agreed to leave' (Awóyalé 2008).
- (ii) conjoining paired entities: *grun* **oun** *ayé* 'heaven-and-earth', *qbệ ata* **oun** *eran* 'pepper-and-meat broth', *òòṣà* **oun** *aṣṇṇ rệ* 'the *òriṣà* together with its funeral shroud' (Abraham 1958, 150, 494).
- (iii) avoiding direct address: Sé ara òun kò dá? Is the relevant individual's body not strong?' i.e. 'Are you quite OK?'6

The closest thing Yorùbá has to an inherent anaphor is not ∂un but the periphrastic idiom [ara [X]] literally 'body of X' formed, just like its Haitian counterparts, with an inalienably possessed head N⁰ (Déchaine & Manfredi 1994). The reflexive parse of [ara [X]], obtained if X = pro, doesn't block the competing, literal construal 'body of pro' (Awóyalé 1986, 11), cf. (5).

3. For legibility, the traditional referential indices *i* and *j* are replaced here by *w* and *z*. Prosodic inflections illustrating "direct interface and one-channel translation" (Scheer 2012) of "prosodic events... under syntactic control" (Yu & Stabler 2017, 36) are explicitly glossed:

```
pro.NOM \rightarrow \delta comprising a cyclic pitch accent (nonlexical H-tone) plus a PF-epenthetic, LF-expletive vowel.
```

pro.ACC → unaccented (M-tone/toneless) timing unit translating a cyclic phrase-boundary as a last resort.

3s.NOM → òún, comprising pronominal òun '3s' plus a cyclic pitch accent (nonlexical H-tone).

Other direct SpellOuts of abstract Case include:

```
non-nominative finite subject → pro-drop (Oyèlá.ràn 1970, 157, Déchaine 1993, 486, Manfredi 2010, 2018) nonfinite null subject → cyclic pitch accent plus timing unit (Bámgbóṣé 1966, 76f., Awóyalé 1983, 2018)
```

With respect to tense, a finite eventive predicate of Yorùbá is "vague" (in the precise sense of Verkuyl quoted above) covering simple past and completive/extended-now (Awóyalé 1991, 195), like the old Neapolitan passato remoto with present relevance (Ledgeway 2009, 439-41) as also reported in Spanish and Sicilian. At least for Yorùbá, the semantic mismatch with respect to Germanic is neither coded as polysemic denotation (Kiparsky 2002b) nor coerced by context (Mittwoch 2008) but instead is generated by regular syntax that spells out Tense and VP in separate phases—as also for fellow members of the innovative BK2 clade of Niger-Congo, to the exclusion of the dispersed, remnant population BK1 (Manfredi 2009). There remains an unsolved contradiction between phased derivational SpellOut and extended (multi-phase, multiclausal) representational domains, so long as both concepts are empirically necessary.

With respect to lexical glosses, the deaccented (M-tone/toneless) syllable \vec{n} in examples (1) and (7) is not itself a predicate root but a PF contraction (Abraham 1958, 566 §2a, Bámgbósé 1966, 161) of the accented (H-tone) root $-\vec{n}$ 'see' with pn.ACC, the aforementioned, unaccented (M-tone/toneless) inflectional mora of default inflection. Before the embedded clause [pe S], Bámgbósé gives the *allegro* contracted form \vec{n} pe MH, thus underlining the derived sense 'noticed, understood, verified', reminiscent of French *remarquer* and therefore less intensionally inclined to take a clausal complement infused with "soi-à-soi" selfconsciousness (Ruwet 1984, 83) than what obtains with the canonical speech-act predicates sampled in (8), (9) and (12) below.

- 4. The site of *inn* in (7b), conventionally labeled Spec, CP/FocP, has alternatively been analysed as an inverse specificational pseudocleft (Obílàdé 1977, Awóbùlúyì 1978b, Adéṣolá 2006).
- 5. Here òòṣà (òrṣà) denotes eégún (egúngún), a masked dancer simulating a departed ancestor (Verger 1957, 507-10, plates 153-58).
- 6. This is not honorification, which—particularly in old Qyó territories—is expressed with plurali di maestà: e/yin/èyin 2P and (à) won 3P.

- (2)a. Ó sùn.

 prø.NOM sleep

 'S/he fell asleep/was asleep'
 - Öún sùn.
 3S.NOM sleep
 "The relevant individual fell asleep/was asleep"
- (3)a. Ó $_{\mathbf{W}}$ rí $_{\mathbf{i}}$ rí. $_{\mathbf{z}}$. $_{pro.NOM}$ see $_{pro.ACC}$ 'S/he saw/has seen 3S' INTERPRETATION: $_{\mathbf{w}}$ and $_{\mathbf{z}}$ are distinct.
 - b. Òún_w rí i_z. allegro → [Òún ri]
 3S.NOM see pro.ACC
 "The relevant individual saw/has seen 3S'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are distinct.
- (4)a. Ó_w rí òun_z.

 pro.NOM see 3S

 'S/he saw/has seen the relevant individual'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are distinct.
 - Öún_w rí òun_z.
 3s.NOM see 3s
 The relevant individual saw/has seen a second relevant individual' INTERPRETATION: w and z are distinct.
- (5)a. Ó_w rí ara arè_z. allegro → [...ara è]
 pro.NOM see body pro.GEN
 'S/he saw/has seen himself/herself'
 OR 'S/he saw/has seen the body of 3s'
 INTERPRETATION: if ara 'body' is referential, w and z are unrestricted, else identical.
 - b. Òúnw rí ara arèz. allegro → [...ara è]
 3S.NOM see body prø.GEN
 'The relevant individual saw/has seen himself/herself'
 OR 'The relevant individual saw/has seen the body of 3s'
 INTERPRETATION: if ara 'body' is referential, w and z are unrestricted, else identical.
- (6)a. Ó_{**w**} rí ara òun_{**z**}.

 pm.NOM see body 3s

 'S/he saw/has seen the body of the relevant individual'
 INTERPRETATION: **w** and **z** are unrestricted.
 - Öúnw rí ara òunz.
 3s.NOM see body 3s
 'The relevant individual saw/has seen the body of a relevant individual' INTERPRETATION: w and z are unrestricted.
- (7)a. Ów ri pé [òunz náà]-á l'ówó.

 pro.NOM see.proACC COMP 38 even-NOM have.money

 'S/he ensured that even the relevant individual had money'

 INTERPRETATION: w and z are unrestricted.
 - b. Ó_w ri pé òun_z ni ó_z l'ówó.

 pro.NOM see.proACC COMP 3s be pro.NOM have.money

 'S/he ensured that the relevant individual was the one with money'

 INTERPRETATION: w and z are unrestricted.

In past tense $\bar{o}r\bar{a}ti\bar{o}$ obliqua, a sharper division of referential labor appears between \acute{o} and $\grave{o}un$ than observed in the propositional complement in (1), above where no predicate of speaking is involved:

- (8)a. Ó_w sọ pé ó_z ti jí tệ 'lệ. pro.NOM say COMP pro.NOM from awaken previously 'S/he said that s/he was awake already by the time of speaking' INTERPRETATION: w and z are necessarily distinct.
 - b. Ów sọ pé òúnz ti jí tệ 'lệ.

 pra.NOM say COMP 3S.NOM from awaken previously

 'S/he said that s/he was awake already by the time of speaking'

 INTERPRETATION: w and z are preferentially identical.
- (9)a. Ó w ké.de pé ó z ti jí té'lè.

 pro.NOM shout.out COMP pro.NOM from awaken previously
 'S/he proclaimed that s/he was awake already by the time of speaking'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are necessarily distinct.
 - b. Ó_W ké.de pé òún_Z (ti) jí tệ 'lè.

 pro.NOM shout.out COMP 3S.NOM from awaken previously

 'S/he proclaimed that s/he was awake already by the time of speaking'

 INTERPRETATION: w and z are preferentially identical.

(8) and (9) are devised here as tense controls for (12) below. The adverb $t\not\in t$ ' $t\not\in t$ 'previously' (lit. 'put.down') compensates for the lack of morphological past (Awóyalé 1991, 195). Low construal of $t\not\in t$ depends on the embedded particle t, a signal of completive viewpoint aspect (Awóyalé 1991, 200). Without low t, $t\not\in t$ takes root scope and lends the speech act an air of "prophecy" (Abraham 1958, 594) as if it mystically preceded the reported event—a true Schlenkerian indexical "monster"!

In Pulleyblank's analysis applied to (1), and *ergō* to (8) and (9), *òun* is "allowed and required" just if "the relevant NP position is to be interpreted as coreferential to an appropriate antecedent" (1986, 62). He derives this contrast from the Avoid Pronoun rule of LGB but loosely so, because Chomsky's version (1981a, 65, 222 fn. 1) regulates morphological not semantic economy, preferring *pro* to an overt pronoun just in case both options allow *the same* antecedent, as in (10).

(10) John prefers {pro/his} going to the movies.

Pulleyblank's Avoid Pronoun is more like Bouchard's Elsewhere Principle: an anaphor (±null) ousts a pronoun (±null) if the respective interpretations overlap (1982, 320), a sub-case of a more general preference of grammatical dependencies for more specialized exponents (Koster 1997, 244). This functional asymmetry can be mechanically recast as a DM procedure in the PF branch: competitive vocabulary insertion is won by "the item matching the greatest number of features specified in the terminal morpheme" (Halle 2000, 128, cf. Rooryck & Wyngaerd 2011, 15-28) but only accepting the counterintuitive, global prōvīsō that "in the phonology, both phonetic and grammatical features are of interest" (Halle 2000, 127).

Secondly, unlike in (10), morphological competition never arises in the first place in (1), (8) or (9) for Pulleyblank, who defines embedded δ not as pro but as a bound variable—in effect, a logical antilogophor alla Chierchia (1989). To make this plausible, he points to instances of expletive δ realising nominative wh-trace: of a focused nominal (7b), of a relative head (Bámgbóṣé 1966, 117f), of an ex- $sit\bar{u}$ content question (Stahlke 1973, 198; Carstens 1986, 25; Pulleyblank 1986, 54). In all such contexts, δ is notably neutral to the person/number of its antecedent, which indifference presumptively diagnoses PF epenthesis to pass the ECP filter (Chomsky 1981, 250), as if phonology really does not bother itself with grammatical number ($p\bar{a}ce$ DM). Assuming this much, now notice that in indirect discourse, number-neutrality in fact fails: in neither (1a), (8a) nor (9a) is the embedded δ construable as plural. Therefore, conjuring condition C for those examples is classic salvatio in extremis serving as a global/transderivational "constraint in terms of 'features' or other ad box markings" (Postal 1972, 50).8

- (11), the plural of (1), poses a similar problem for the logo-operator hypothesis.
- (11)a. Wón**w** ri pé wón**z** l'ówó.

 **prv.NOM.PL see.*prvACC COMP prv.NOM.PL have.money

 "They (have) ensured that they had money'

 INTERPRETATION: **w** and **z** are unrestricted.
 - b. Wọnw ri pé àwọnz l'ówó.

 pro.NOM see.proACC COMP 3S.NOM have.money
 'They (have) ensured that they themselves had money'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are preferentially, but not necessarily, identical.

In (11a), the embedded clitic *wón* has two equally accessible parses, "they themselves or they other than themselves" (Bámgbóṣé 1966, 107), whereas in (11b) nonclitic àwon prefers coreferent interpretation. This asymmetry conforms to Pulleyblank's Avoid Pronoun because clitic *wón* is classified as "purely pronominal" (1986, 51) thanks to its interpretable plural feature, but then the hypothetical logo-operator is fully vacuous in (11a), again redolent of *adhoccery*: use when needed.

To my knowledge, Pulleyblank's is the only attempt (other than my working paper of 1987) to obtain the referential contrasts of (1) and (11) from narrow syntax plus particular category representations. To accomplish this, he treats *δ* as an underspecified clitic and *δun* as an ordinary tonic pronoun obliged to pay the LGB Avoid Pronoun 'tax' when in competition with *δ*, a tax-free variable. But there's nothing ordinary about *δun*, whose descriptions unanimously recognize its discourse *extra*-ordinariness: "emphatic when used as subject or object of a verb" (Abraham 1958, 494), a "pronoun substitute" (Bámgbóṣé 1966, 107), a "human noun" (Awóbùlúyì 1978a, 23), a "*strong* pronoun" (Pulleyblank 1986, 44, original italics). These intuitive qualms are amplified by the construction-independent specificity of *δun*, sampled in (i) - (iii) above.

Perhaps a suitably "enriched" (Sundaresan 2020) featural distinction between δ and δnn can be found that doesn't simply restate the [+logo] function more abstractly, but even that stretch is unlikely to suffice if, as a general matter, anaphora does not directly express the semantic content of a particular morpheme but instead appears "on the basis of a specific type of structural relation with the antecedent in addition to the morphological basis" (Bouchard 1982, 71). Pulleyblank himself floats—before rapidly scuttling—such a relational boat, venturing that the referential contrast of embedded subject δnn versus δ in (1), (8) and (9) would follow immediately if these items respectively checked LGB binding conditions A and B, but on condition that in these particular examples the binding domain "is modified in such a way as the matrix clause... would count as the governing category" (1986, 61). Admittedly this conjecture too would be *ad hoc*, unless somehow the requisite domain modification turned out to have an independent empirical basis. Which, surprisingly or not, seems to be true.

Independently, toneless ti heads adjunct PPs of possession or spatiotemporal source (Abraham 1958, 640) recalling French de. Toneless
ti is arguably a component of the relative Comp ti which bears a compositional cyclic accent, alias H tone (Ajibóyè 2005, 101f.).

^{8.} Unlike Yorùbá, Vatà (Kru) does not show total homophony between cased, clitic pro and the bound variable resumptive that can accidentally contain the same segmental content. Instead, the Vatà clitic ɔ '3s ANIM' (as well as inanimate i) differs prosodically depending on interpretation: it bears MH (upper-mid 'tone') when pronominal but L (low) when it "behaves as a variable" (Koopman & Sportiche 1982, 142f; 1986, 360, 371; Koopman 1983, 367; 1984, 37, 145, 170). One exception is that pronominal ɔ has L when coreferent to a preceding variable (Koopman 1984, 77f, ex. 92 vs. 90a) in a 'parasitically' connected graph à la Kayne (1983). Otherwise, whenever ɔ has L, its segmental content is "optional" just in that circumstance, so it is more plausibly analysed as being epenthetic in lento speech than as being "deleted" in faster tempi (Koopman 1983, 388 fn. 4). On both phonetic and semantic grounds therefore, argumental ɔ with L is Vatà's nominative signe zéro (Benveniste 1946) and the fact that a subject clitic in indirect discourse is pronounced not L but MH (except in the parasitic gap configuration) vēlerīs pāribus undermines Pulleyblank's morphological argument that Yorùbá ó in (1a), (8a), (9a) is necessarily a variable bound by an abstract operator—in these instances, one of indirect discourse.

^{9.} Relational/configurational explanations of inflection along these lines include Bittner & Hale (1996) and Déchaine (1999).

3. Domain extension alias CFC

The foregoing suggests that the referential contrast between δ and δun in (1) combines two autonomous factors, each one ideally more tractable by itself than when the two are confounded together in an inductive functional taxonomy:

- (i) *dun*, a nonreflexive form, acts in a subordinate clause like a long-distance anaphor.
- (ii) ó shows unexpected disjoint reference in a subordinate clause of "contenu de conscience" (Ruwet 1990, 55).

As to (i), a solution appears in monoclausal (2) - (6), where *dun*'s specificity as compared to *description* matches its audible "heaviness" (Ross 1967, 56), just as prosodic weight distributes nonrandomly across a wide range of topicalization, scrambling and D-linking constructions (Williams 1997, Delfitto & Corver 1998). This appeal is less arbitrary than a [+anaphor] diacritic, to the extent that the reverse markedness—with a 'lighter' item interpreted as more specific than its weightier counterpart—is unattested. A second *prīmā faciē* reason to invoke *dun*'s heaviness rather than a diacritic of anaphora is that *dun* is totally excluded from the only reflexive expression in the language, namely the phrase headed by the inalienably possessed noun *ara* 'body' whenever this item is construed nonreferentially, as in the topline parses in (5). In case *dun* does combine in such a phrase, only a nonreflexive interpretation is available, cf. (6).

The remaining question is (ii), namely how and why clausal subordination could or would extend the referential domain of pronominal antilocality to the upstairs clause. An answer supplies itself, as soon as we contrast examples (1), (8) and (9) where this apparently happens, to others where it doesn't, such as (12) reported by Adésolá (2005, 190f.).

- (12)a. Olú**w** ti gbà kí ó**z** má je ìresì mó. O.NOM from receive COMP *pro*.NOM NEG.IMV eat rice clean 'Olú agreed that s/he should not eat rice again/further/at all thereafter' INTERPRETATION: **w** and **z** are unrestricted.
 - b. Olúw ti ké.de pé óz ń bò l'ó.la.
 O.NOM from shout.out COMP pro.NOM DUR return LOC.tomorrow 'Olú said that s/he is coming tomorrow'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are unrestricted.

The unrestricted reference of embedded δ in (12) has been eagerly claimed to prove that "Yorùbá does not show antilogophoricity effects" and instead to vindicate the intensional-functional idea that the reference of δun in indirect discourse is "true de se anaphora, bound by an OP-LOG" (Anand 2006, 52). But the Tarskian story is circular to the extent that, without a syntactic account of antilogophoricity, the disjoint reference of embedded δ in standard examples like (1a) requires an extra and incurably global rule, preciously Capitalised as "the De Re Blocking Effect" (Anand 2006, 52). QED!

On anybody's analysis, (12) differs from (1a), (8a) and (9a) in the content of the downstairs tense: in (12) the subordinate clause is nonpast and δ has unrestricted reference, whereas in (1a), (8a) and (9a) δ is disjoint, correlated to past-under-past. If tense is the head of S alias TP, sequence of tense (SOT) is the least surprising context in which "the matrix clause... would count as the governing category" (Pulleyblank 1986, 61) of an embedded pronoun. This explanation is vulnerable to disproof by any example of antilogophoricity in a *nonpast* (non-SOT) subordinate clause, or conversely by the failure of same in any past-under-past configuration. If the correlation stands, it may also banish the indexical "monsters" of Amharic (Schlenker 2003) to the paratactic realm of free indirect discourse alias "disquotational incontinence" (Sperber 1997, 72).

For Fòn-Gbè, Kinyalolo (1993, 233) anticipates domain extension with the concept of "complete functional complex" (CFC) wherein "all grammatical functions compatible with its head are realised" (Chomsky 1986, 169). ¹¹ If tense is part of the CFC, then all dependent tenses should be likewise—including those in (1), (8) and (9) but not the subordinate tense in (12) which either is not referentially "anchored" (Enç 1987) at all (quā irrealis) or else is anchored separately. Kinyalolo also has the Fòn-Gbè logophor émì "strongly bound" (Chomsky 1986, 85) by an intensional operator of indirect discourse, giving émì the hybrid status of a subject-oriented anaphor plus LF variable, but domain extension makes this unnecessary so far as these *indicia* of LF anaphor movement are already expected in an extended government domain (Pica 1987). ¹²

Domain extension has legs outside the logo-ghetto. In Italian, subjunctive obviation of an overt or null subject (13a), which in West Africa would be called antilogophoricity, is attributed by Rizzi (1990, 35) following Ruwet (1984) and Pica (1984, 272f.) to the "anaphoric" status of the embedded tense i.e. to an extended tense domain, in contrast to the unrestricted reference of the subject (null or non) of a subordinate clause whose tense is independently "referential" (13b).¹³

- (13)a. Gianniw vuole che {pro/lui}z scriv-a un libro.
 say.3s COMP 3s write-IMV.3s a book
 lit 'G. wants that 3s write a book'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are necessarily distinct.
 - Gianniw dice che {pro/lui}z scriv-erà un libro say.3s COMP 3s write-FUT.3s a book
 'G. says that 3s will write a book'
 INTERPRETATION: w and z are unrestricted.

^{10.} Referential heaviness may also correlate with richness of lexical 'tone' contrasts, representationally identifying null D (Manfredi in press).

^{11.} In strict derivational syntax, appealing either to extended government or to the CFC is heterodox, because the former span necessarily, and the latter potentially, contains multiple "phases" of cyclic SpellOut à la Chomsky (2001). Rather than abjure the data, better to accept that this technical contradiction between GB and Minimalist architecture is not ipsō factō an argument pro or con.

^{12.} Kinyalolo (1993, 233) remarks that Fòn-Gbè is isomorphic in relevant respects to Ètè-Gbè, a language where the "claim that there are obligatorily *de se* expressions in natural language" can be salvaged only with strenuous Tarskian epicycles (Pearson 2015, 116).

^{13.} The generalization also casts a logical shadow: "there cannot be any tense information in embedded constructions... the subjunctive is somehow responsible for the tense deletion... No direct reference in strong intensional contexts" (Stechow 1995, 367, 381).

Still further North, upwards extension of the governing category shared by pronouns and tenses has been invoked in Dutch and Icelandic, where "dynasties for anaphors are formed if the chain of governors is somehow dependent on the first element. …long distance anaphors are possible… to the extent that a dynasty of dependent heads can be formed" (Koster 1987, 151, 340, cf. Pica 1991).

Domain extension is also indispensable to phrasal reflexives formed with an inalienably possessed noun denoting 'body' or 'head' (Déchaine & Manfredi 1994, cf. Carden & Stewart 1988). Such an expression would crash on Full Interpretation (Chomsky 1986, 98) if not rescued by the cyclic merger of the possessor as structural subject. This extended binding domain is no less transparently syntactic in Yorùbá than in Haitian, cf. (5) above. 14

References

| Abraham, R. [1958]. Dictionary of Modern Yorùbá. University of London Press. |
|--|
| Adéș olá, O. [2005]. Pronouns & null operators; A-bar dependencies & relations in Yorùbá. Dissertation, Rutgers University of New Jersey, New Brunswick. |
| . [2006]. On the absence of superiority and weak crossover effects in Yorùbá. Linguistic Inquiry 37, 309-17. |
| Ajíbóyè, O. [2004]. The syntax of Yorùbá reflexive epithets. Journal of West African Languages 31, 89-123. |
| |
| Anand, P. [2006]. De de se. Dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge Mass. |
| Awóbùlúyì, O. [1978a]. Essentials of Yorùbá Grammar. University Press Limited, Ìbàdàn. |
| ——. [1978b]. Focus constructions as noun phrases. Linguistic Analysis 4, 93-114. |
| Awóyalé, 'Y. [1983]. On the development of the verb-infinitive phrase in Yorùbá. Studies in African Linguistics 14, 71-102. |
| . [1986]. Reflexivization in Kwa languages. Current Approaches to African Linguistics 3, edited by G. Dimmendaal, 1-14. Foris, Dordrecht. |
| |
| ——. [2008]. Global Yorùbá lexical database. Ms., Linguistic Data Consortium, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. |
| ——. [2018]. Vowel assimilation and elision in Yorùbá; the interface of phonology and syntax. Data-rich Linguistics; papers in honor of Yúnolá Anóyalé, edited by O. Adéṣolá & al., 368-96. Cambridge Scholars, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England. |
| Baker, M. [1995]. Conclusion; on the nature of parameterization, 11.3.3. A theological explanation. <i>The Polysinthesis Parameter</i> , 512-15. Oxford University Press. |
| Bámgbósé, A. [1966]. A Grammar of Yorùbá. Cambridge University Press. |
| Bar-Hillel, Y. [1960]. The present status of automatic translation of languages. Advances in Computers 1, 91-163. |
| Bender, E. & al. [2021]. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: can language models be too big? FAvT '21, Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability & Transparency, edited by L. Irani & al., 610-23. Association for Computing Machinery, New York. |
| Benveniste, É. [1946/1966]. La structure des relations de personne dans le verbe. Problèmes de linguistique générale, 225-36. Gallimard, Paris. |
| Bittner, M. & K. Hale. [1996]. The structural determination of Case and agreement. Linguistic Inquiry 27, 1-68. |
| Bouchard, D. [1982/1984]. On the content of empty categories. Dissertation, M.I.T., Cambridge Mass./Foris, Dordrecht. |
| Carden, G. & W. Stewart. [1988]. Binding theory, bioprogram and creolization; evidence from Haitian Creole. <i>Journal of Pidgin & Creole Languages</i> 3, 1-67. |
| Carstens, V. [1986]. Proper government in Yorùbá. M.A. thesis, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles. |
| Chierchia, G. [1989]. Anaphora and attitudes de se. Semantics & Contextual Expression, edited by R. Bartsch & al., 1-31. Foris, Dordrecht. |
| ——. [1998]. Reference to kinds across languages. Natural-Language Semantics 6, 339-405. |
| Chomsky, N. [1956]. Three models for the description of language. Institute of Radio Engineers Transactions on Information Theory 2, 113-24. |
| ———. [1981]. Lectures on Government & Binding. Foris, Dordrecht. |
| ———. [1986]. Knowledge of Language; its nature, origin & use. Praeger, New York. |
| [1995]. The Minimalist Program. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. |
| ——. [1998]. Some observations on economy in generative grammar. Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality & competition in syntax, edited by P. Barbosa & al., 115-27. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. |
| |

Cinque, G. [2006]. Restructuring & Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 4. Oxford University Press.

Clements, G. [1979]. The logophoric pronoun in Èvè, its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* **10.2**, 141-77. [Nominal date misprinted on publication is "1975"].

-. [2005]. Three factors in language design. Linguistic Inquiry 36, 1-22.

^{14.} The phrasal reflexive further combines productively with an appositional epithet (Ajíbóyè 2004).

D'Alessandro, R. [2019]. The achievements of generative syntax; a time chart and some reflections. Catalan Journal of Linguistics Special Issue, Déchaine, R.-M. [1993]. Predicates across categories; towards a category-neutral syntax. Dissertation, UMass Amherst. -. [1999]. What Algonquian morphology is really like; Hockett revisited. MITOPL 17, 25-72. Déchaine, R.-M. & V. Manfredi. [1994]. Binding domains in Haitian. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 12, 203-57. Delfitto, D. & N. Corver. [1998]. Feature primitives and the syntax of specificity. Rivista di Linguistica 10, 281-334. Delfitto, D. & J. Schroten. [1991]. Bare plurals and the number affix in DP. Probus 3, 155-85. Enç, M. [1986]. Towards a referential analysis of temporal expressions. Linguistics & Philosophy 9, 405-26. -. [1987]. Anchoring conditions for tense. Linguistic Inquiry 18, 633-57. [1991]. The semantics of specificity. Linguistic Inquiry 22, 1-25. Graf, T. [2017]. Derivations as representations; news from the computational frontier. Wiener Linguistische Gazette 82, 61-69. Hagège C. [1974]. Les pronoms logophoriques. Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 69, 287-310. Halle, M. [2000]. Distributed morphology, impoverishment and fission. Research in Afroasiatic Grammar; papers from the 3rd Conference on Afroasiatic Languages, Sophia Antipolis 1996, edited by J. Lecarme & al., 125-49. Benjamins, Amsterdam. Hintikka, J. & J. Kulas. [1985]. Anaphora & Definite Descriptions; two applications of game-theoretical semantics. Reidel, Dordrecht Hyman, L. & B. Comrie. [1981]. Logophoric reference in Gokana. Journal of African Languages & Linguistics 3, 19-37. Jackendoff. R. [2007]. A scientific mistake: syntactico-centrism. Language, Consciousness, Culture; essays on mental structure. 35-38. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. Kaye, J. [1988]. The phonologist's dilemma; a game-theoretic approach to phonological debate. GLOW Newsletter 21, 16-19. Kayne, R. [1983]. Connectedness. Linguistic Inquiry 14, 223-49. -. [2022]. A note on ought and OUGHT in English. lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/006735. Keenan, E. & E. Stabler. [2003]. Bare Grammar; a study of language invariants. CSLI, Palo Alto California. Kinyalolo, K. [1993]. The logophoric pronoun émì as an LF operator/anaphor. NELS 23, 223-37. Kiparsky, P. [2002a]. Disjoint reference and the typology of pronouns. *More than Words; a festschrift for Dieter Wunderlich*, edited by I. Kaufmann & B. Stiebels, 179-226. Akademie, Berlin [2002b]. Event structure and the perfect. The Construction of Meaning, edited by D. Beaver & al., 113-36. CSLI Publications, Palo Alto California. Klein, N. [1999]. No Logo; no space, no choice, no jobs; taking aim at the brand bullies. Flamingo, London. Koopman, H. [1983]. Control from COMP and comparative syntax. Linguistic Review 2, 365-91. -. [1984]. The Syntax of Verbs; from verb movement rules in the Kru languages to Universal Grammar. Foris, Dordrecht. Koopman, H. & D. Sportiche. [1982]. Variables and the bijection principle. Linguistic Review 2, 139-60. [1986]. A note on long extraction in Vatà and the ECP. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 4, 357-74. [1989]. Pronouns, logical variables and logophoricity in Abs. Linguistic Inquiry 20, 555-88. Koster, J. [1987]. Domains & Dynasties; the radical autonomy of syntax. Foris, Dordecht. [1997]. Anaphora and the unity of grammar. Atomism & Binding, edited by H. Bennis & al., 235-50. Foris, Dordrecht. [2009] Word meaning and the preformationist fallacy. nnw.let.rug.nl/~koster/papers/Word meaning and the preformationist fallacy 1.pdf. Kratzer, A. [2009]. Making a pronoun; fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. Linguistic Inquiry 40, 187-237. Lechner, W. [2015]. The syntax-semantics interface. Syntax; theory & analysis, edited by T. Kiss & A. Alexiadou, 1198-1255. De Gruyter, Ledgeway, A. [2009]. Grammatica diacronica del napoletano. Niemeyer, Tübingen. Longobardi, G. [2005]. Toward a unified grammar of reference. Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 24, 5-44. Manfredi, V. [1987]. Anti-logophoricity as domain extension in Ìgbo and Yorùbá. Niger-Congo Syntax & Semantics 1, 97-113. Boston University African Studies Center. people.bu.edu/manfredi/NoLogo.pdf. ——. [2009]. Morphosyntactic parameters and the internal classification of Benue-Kwa (Niger-Congo). *Historical Syntax & Linguistic Theory*, edited by P. Crisma & G. Longobardi, 329-43 plus omnibus references for the volume, 375-412. Oxford University Press. *people.bu.edu/manfredi/DIGS9.pdf*.

——. [2018]. Cyclic accentuation in Yorùbá. *Data-rich Linguistics; papers in honor of 'Yíwolá Awóyalé*, edited by O. Adéșolá & al., 211-36. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England. *people.bu.edu/manfredi/YorubaCyclicAccent.pdf*.

people.bu.edu/manfredi/reviewKoenig08.pdf.

[2010]. A case against African case? Review of Case in Africa by C. Koenig (Oxford University Press, 2008). Lingua 120, 1327-32.

- -----. [in press]. The referential prosody of bare arguments. www.sino-platonic.org. Manuscript: people.bu.edu/manfredi/ReferentialProsody.pdf.
- Mittwoch, A. [2008]. The English resultative perfect and its relationship to the experiential perfect and the simple past tense. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 31, 323-51.
- Moro, A. [1997a]. A brief history of the copula. The Raising of Predicates; predicative noun phrases & the theory of clause structure, 248-61. Cambridge University Press.
- ——. [1997b]. Dynamic antisymmetry; movement as a symmetry-breaking phenomenon. Studia Linguistica 51, 50-76.
- Newmeyer, F. [2004]. Against a parameter-setting approach to language variation. Linguistic Variation Yearbook 4, 181-234.
- Òbílàdé, A. [1977]. Some syntactic signals for presupposition and factuality in Yorùbá. Languages & Linguistic Problems in Africa, edited by P. Kotey & H. der Housikkian, 239-48. Hornbeam Press, Columbia South Carolina.
- Oyèlá.ràn, Q. [1970]. Yorùbá phonology. Dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto California.
- Partee, B. [1984]. Nominal and temporal anaphora. Linguistics & Philosophy 7, 243-86.
- Pearson, H. [2015]. The interpretation of the logophoric pronoun in Èvè. Natural Language Semantics 23, 77-118.
- Pica, P. [1984]. Subject, tense and truth; towards a modular approach to binding. *Grammatical Representation*, edited by J. Gueron & al., 259-91.
- ——. [1987]. On the nature of the reflexivisation cycle. NELS 17, 483-99.
- Postal, P. [1972]. A global constraint on pronominalization. Linguistic Inquiry 3, 35-59.
- Pulleyblank, D. [1986]. Clitics in Yorubá. The syntax of pronominal clitics [= Syntax & Semantics 19], edited by H. Borer, 43-64.
- Radford, A. [1990]. Syntactic Theory & the Acquisition of English Syntax; the nature of early child grammars of English. Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart, T. & E. Reuland. [1992]. Anaphoric territories. Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik 34, 155-99.
- Rizzi, L. [1990]. On the anaphor-agreement effect. Rivista di Linguistica 2, 27-42.
- Rooryck, J. & G. vd. Wyngaerd. [2011]. Dissolving Binding Theory. Oxford University Press.
- Ruwet, N. [1984]. *Je veux partir/* Je veux que je parte.* De la distribution des complétives à temps fini et des compléments à l'infinitif en français. *Cahiers de Grammaire* 7, 74-138
- . [1990]. En et y: deux clitiques pronominaux antilogophoriques. Langages 97, 51-81.
- Scheer, T. [2012]. A Lateral Theory of Phonology 2. Direct interface & one-channel translation; a non-diacritic theory of the morphosyntax-phonology interface. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Schlenker, P. [2003]. A plea for monsters. Linguistics & Philosophy 26, 29-120.
- Sperber, D. [1997]. Intuitive and reflective beliefs. Mind & Language 12, 67-83.
- Stabler, E. [2013]. The epicenter of linguistic behavior. Language Down the Garden Path; the cognitive & biological basis of linguistic structures, edited by M. Sanz & al., 316-23. Oxford University Press.
- Stahlke, H. [1973]. Ross' constraints and related problems in Yorùbá. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 3, 193-230.
- von Stechow, A. [1995]. On the proper treatment of tense. SALT 5, 362-86.
- ------. [2003]. Feature deletion under semantic binding; tense, person and mood under verbal quantifiers. NELS 33, 379-403.
- Sundaresan, S. [2020]. Distinct featural classes of anaphor in an enriched person system. Agree to Agree; agreement in the Minimalist Program, edited by P. Smith & al., 425-61. Language Science Press, Berlin.
- Verger, P. [1957]. Notes sur le culte des òrìsà & vodun à Bahia, la Baie des tous les Saints, au Brésil, & à l'ancienne Côte des Esclaves en Afrique. Mémoire 51. I.F.A.N., Dakar.
- Verkuyl, H. [1993]. A Theory of Aspectuality; the interaction between temporal & atemporal structure. Cambridge University Press.
- -----. [2008]. Binary Tense. CSLI, Palo Alto California.
- Vikner, S. [1985]. Reichenbach revisited; one, two or three temporal relations? Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 19, 81-98.
- Williams, E. [1997]. Blocking and anaphora. Linguistic Inquiry 28, 577-628.
- Wiltschko, M. [2014]. The Universal Structure of Categories; towards a formal typology. Cambridge University Press.
- Yu, K. & E. Stabler [2017]. (In)variability in the Samoan syntax/prosody interface and consequences for syntactic parsing. *Laboratory Phonology* **8**.25.
- Zeijlstra, H. [2012]. There is only one way to agree. Linguistic Review 29, 491-539.
- Zwart, J.-W. [2007]. Uncharted territory? Towards a non-cartographic account of Germanic syntax. Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik 45, 55-75.