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ABSTRACT

Our aim in undertaking the present study is to discover and present the semantic and syntactic rules or conventions that determine the meanings of nominalizations in Yoruba. There has been a relatively accurate outline of grammatical structure of the Yoruba language in about half a dozen or so more or less traditional individual descriptions of the language. Some scholars have also worked on specific aspects of its grammatical structures; what has never been attempted is the study of nominalizations on a full scale.

The present study evaluates the contributions of earlier writers in very general terms in the first chapter, the rest of the chapter is devoted to the verb system and the definition of nominalization as it appears in this study. Chapter II gives the theoretical orientation of the thesis. It overviews the present position in transformational grammar, and we have to choose either the 'Extended Standard Theory' of Chomsky, Katz, Doughert, Jackendoff etc.; or the Basic Theory of Lakoff, Ross, McCawley, Bach, Postal etc. as our syntactic model.

Considering the nature of Yoruba structures, we choose the Basic Theory. The problem of choice rests mainly on one basic question; whether the relationships between pairs of Yoruba Structural types could be correctly stated if only the purely syntactic deep structure of the 'Established Standard Theory' were available. In work in the tradition of the 'Basic Theory' the usual argument is that there is no autonomous level $P_1$ of syntactic deep structure
where all lexical insertion must take place in a block. The 'EST' on the other hand, maintains that all the lexical insertion takes place in the deep structure and furthermore, it is syntactically based in that it asserts that 'the sound-meaning relation P.S. is determined by $\sum$' (i.e. syntax). The rest of Chapter II asserts that greater generality in description is achieved and the duplication of rule representation is forstalled if we break the main condition on P, that is, the level where all transformations have applied and from which all true syntactic transformations start to operate.

Chapter III describes the infinitives and related nominalizations i.e. Purposive and Non-Purposive. It goes on to describe the Gerundive Structures. Chapter IV examines the relative clause constructions and the bearing they have on nominalization and other related structures in Yoruba. It proves that it is a conjunction hypothesis that is appropriate for the formation of the relative clause.

Chapter V deals with factive/non-factive, emotive/non-emotive nominalizations and some nominal pieces identified as ideophones by some Yoruba grammarians. The point on the achievement of economy of description is made for derived nominals and most proper noun derivations in chapters VI and VII where the classifiers in relation to Yoruba proper nouns and nominal compounds are treated respectively.

We have applied some transformational rules which are not numbered, because the rules in chapter II are formulated to justify the choice of our grammatical model. We
number the rules which are applicable to the underlying representation of nominalization in Yoruba and which, we hope, can apply to any natural language with or without modifications.
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CHAPTER I

1.0.0 INTRODUCTION.

The Yorùbá language has been described as a dialect continuum.¹ It is the major language of Ṣọyọ, Ṣógun, Oòdó, Kwára, Lagos (and part of Bendel) States of Nigeria. It is also spoken in the neighbouring country, Dahomey. Variants of Yorùbá are also used as religious languages in Sierra Leone, Brazil and Cuba. It is a member of the Kwa family of languages and its speakers number several millions.

It has as many dialects as there are districts in all the states mentioned above, principal among the dialects are Ṣọyọ, Ògbá, Æjú, Òkití, Oòdó and Akókó-Èdó; each of which has distinct characteristic features of its own. Delang (1958: XII-XIV) makes a brief comparison of the major dialects of Yorùbá. The type of Yorùbá studied here is known as Standard Yorùbá, it does not belong to any particular place, but it can be correctly labelled as the Ṣọyọ dialect if the provincialisms of Ṣọyọ have been removed from it. It is the type studied in schools, used by newscasters and by an educated Yoruba to address other people whose dialects are different from his. Since it is in most cases not the first learned by a speaker, it is invariably tinged with localisms from the speaker's district of birth; for this reason the standard Yoruba has many idiolectal variants. Disagreements among Yoruba scholars,

¹ Bamgbose, A. (1966: 2 Fn.)
particularly concerning syntax and semantics, have often resulted from such differences.

1.0.1 The Yoruba People and the Language

It is simply impossible for a Yoruba to discuss the most ordinary subject to any depth without recourse to the use of illustrative metaphors, proverbs, aphorisms, and almost poetic expressions. Dennett (1910) who knew this aspect of the Yoruba people was wonderstruck that man, governed more or less by his senses and environment, should have instinctively built up trains of thought and ways of expressing them that have led native philosophers to divide their mythology into certain well-defined categories.

Writing three years later, Frobenius confirms the same point when he describes 'the Yoruba' as a people so vivacious and alert, so skilful in the management of life that they may very well be called the nation of practical philosophers of dusky Africa, people who are ready with apt illustration of whatever may be under discussion. As a result of these characteristics of Yoruba, being an agglutinative language, compound words are numerous. Substantives are formed by a regular system of prefixes. This is a prominent feature in the language and it renders it susceptible of increase to an indefinite extent. For example, notice the different derivations from the verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derivation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. m$n</td>
<td>(to know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. m$m$n</td>
<td>(knowing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. l$m$n</td>
<td>(knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. l$l$m$n</td>
<td>(without knowing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Alálmọ (the state of having no knowledge)
6. Alálmọkan (one who knows nothing)
7. Atimọ (the problem of knowing).

1.0.2 Early Grammatical Studies.

In 1817, Bowdich, who was the English Diplomatic agent in Ashanti, collected some Yoruba words and got them printed in 1819. From then on the missionaries stationed at Sierra Leone took up the challenge. Their activities got crowned by Crowther's publication in 1852 of his Yorùbá Grammar. Before Bamgbose's A Yorùbá Grammar, the offspring of his Doctoral Thesis submitted to Edinburgh University, there were quite a few grammatical descriptions of Yoruba. Many of them are short grammars mainly intended as companion pieces to major works in other fields or adjuncts to dictionaries. Examples are, Johnson's Grammar attached prefactorily to his History of the Yorùbá; Abraham's and Delano's grammars are prefaces to their dictionaries. Others which are mainly for teaching Yoruba are Rowlands: Teach Yourself Yorùbá, Ward: Introduction to the Yorùbá Language and Beecroft and de Gaye's Grammar and composition. Though traditional in approach, all these grammars together provide us with a valuable outline of the grammatical structure of the Yoruba language.

However, the general traits of these traditional grammars are that Latin grammar and terminology are transported via English grammar to the Yorùbá language. This wholesale transportation proves inadequate for the structures of both English and Yorùbá. Besides, traditional
grammars only make an essential appeal to the intelligence of the reader, they do not actually formulate the rules of the grammar, but rather give examples and hints that enable the intelligent reader to determine the grammar, in some way that is not at all understood. However, inadequate as their system may be, the studies of early Yorùbá grammarians have provided an insight into certain features to be written within the coherent framework of a general linguistic theory. The theoretical framework is the one outlined in 'Categories of the theory of Grammar.' The main body of the grammar presents an excellent and very helpful sketch of Halliday's theory and of the description of the form and structural classes of the Yoruba grammar. That it excels earlier grammar in being systematic is obvious. Next to it in being a complete grammar is the work of Afolayan: The Linguistic problems of Yorùbá. 

1.0.3 Recent Studies in Yoruba

Professor Ayò Bamgbose's A Grammar of Yorùbá is the first and the only complete grammar of modern Yoruba to be written within the coherent framework of a general linguistic theory. The theoretical framework is the one outlined in 'Categories of the theory of Grammar.' The main body of the grammar presents an excellent and very helpful sketch of Halliday's theory and of the description of the form and structural classes of the Yoruba grammar. That it excels earlier grammar in being systematic is obvious. Next to it in being a complete grammar is the work of Afolayan: The Linguistic problems of Yorùbá.

1 For the inadequacies of the grammars, see Bamgbose (1966: pp. 2-3).
2 Complete in the sense that it covers major Yorùbá Syntactic structures.
3 Halliday (1961).
of area of study now becomes clear after considering the foregoing review of the existing works. To the best of our knowledge, no attempt has been made to present a syntactic and semantic study of Yorùbá nominalization. All the works we have are on the Yorùbá verb or verb system by Awobuluyi and Okè.

1.0.4 Bangbose’s Grammar

For a new approach to replace an older model, there appear to be two things necessary. First, the new model must account for roughly the same amount of data as the old one. Second, there must be some reason other than simple novelty for preferring the new one to the old. The model must be able to provide a formal demonstration that the old model is unable to account for certain classes of data considered to be an essential part of the subject-matter of the discipline.

Starting from Bangbose, it must be noted that due to the inadequacy of the theory applied to Yorùbá as the framework within which the authors worked, they have certain faults in common. Bangbose based his work on Halliday’s Scale and Category Grammar. It is however, fair to say of him that the application of the theory has been adhered to to the letter. As for the theory itself, it is what Haas (1960) called a reductive approach wherein one begins with the smallest atomic unit of the system. At the time the theory was formulated it was referred to as the scale-and-category theory of grammar (Bangbose 1966: 14). Later, Halliday and others¹ developed it to a

systemic theory of grammar. Within the scale-and-category theory 'system and structure' deal with one plane; that is, surface, but system in the systemic theory is a property of the deep grammar. The attendant fault of the work based on the first theory is pretty obvious. Bamgbose in his introduction wrote 'the criteria used in establishing or distinguishing grammatical categories are structural and the categories set up for the grammar are based on the internal structures of the language'. This simply means that the application of the formulation is restricted to linear structure only, to the exclusion of 'logical structure' or the underlying representation. Afolayan's work which is based on the revised form of the 'Scale and Category' comes nearer the mark in the underlying representation.

Ọkẹ and Awobuluysi worked on specific area(s) in the language which as we have mentioned earlier, are, on Yorùbά verbs. Also Awobuluysi based his work on Transformational Grammar which is near the model chosen for the present study. But all the same, they are not without their own faults, which we discuss in the present study in places where they are relevant.

1 The inadequacy of TG. will be discussed in Chapter II of this work. However, Chomsky still maintains his basic stand, though he had modified the model and had also changed the label 'deep structure' and 'Surface structure' because according to him the terms are too technical, so much so that people misunderstood and misapplied them (London: ‘Sunday Times’, May 16, 1976).
With the above explanation, it is clear that we shall have more recourse to the works of Bamgbose and Afolayan than others' as needs call for them in the course of the present work.

Yorùbá is basically a subject, verb, object (SVO) language. Besides the imperatives and some embedded relative constructions, the sentence always has a subject in the surface structure. With the exception of sentence fragments like short replies to questions where a single noun phrase will do for an answer, the verb is always present in a sentence.

Our definition of the sentence will generally follow the theoretical framework we adopt unless otherwise stated. The sentence is dominated in the tree structure of a phrase structure grammar by the S node. So is a S which contains no internal occurrence of another S node. The internal structure of S is usually NP VP where VP may be rewritten as V NP, or V alone, or V NP PP.

1.1.1 Orthographic Representation.

The following letters, and symbols which are phonemic will be used.

(a) Consonants: b, t, d, k, g, gb, m, n, f, s, h, l, r, w, j, =/ʃ/, p=/kp/=/ʃ/, and y=/j/.

Broadly speaking the symbols have I.P.A. value, /kp/ is voiceless and /gb/ is voiced labiovelar stops respectively.
(b) **The Oral vowels:** i, e, a, o, u, e, /ɛ/ and ə /ɔ/.

(c) The nasal vowels are represented by the corresponding oral vowels followed by n', e.g. in = /iː/, ŋn = /ɛ̆/ un = /uː/ which has the allophones /ŋ/ after the velar stops as in Ọkun (okù) the sea' and /uː/ elsewhere. It should be noted, however, that we shall not follow the traditional orthographic convention of representing the third person pronoun object of a verb that ends in a nasal vowel by using an oral vowel symbol. So, instead of the traditional mo dìn i we shall have mo ɗn in = /mo diˈi/ (I fried it)

mo tàn ḗn
mo tâ á
I deceived him/her/it

mo pən ŋn
I sharpened / flattered him / her / it.

(d) **Tones:** Basically the tone will be marked lexically in the present study. However, we shall indicate pitch occasionally to clarify certain difficult to determine elements.

The following tones are present in the language. High tone (') low tone ('); mid tone is indicated by leaving the vowel unmarked. The compound tones are: low high (¥) mid high (']), high low (ċ'), high mid (׳), low mid (٪) and mid low (').

---

We do not intend either to double our vowels unless of course condition warrants it such as in case we have significant minimal contrasts e.g. mà don't Vs. MÁa 'going to' 'continue to'.

(c) **Word Division**: We write each word separately contrary to traditional orthography in such cases as:

nìgbàfì = nì ìgbàfì 'when' ènítífì - èní tìfì person who, and some predicates and adverbials are written together occasionally, e.g. dékunk for dé dékun 'to stop' lèla for ní nèle 'tomorrow'.

1.1.2 **Terms Used in the Present Study**

(1) **Analyzability**

This is the basic predicate in terms of which the theory of transformational generative grammar is formulated. X is analyzable as Y if and only if Y is a proper analysis of X (i.e. all the members of Y can be mapped onto X and all the members of X can be mapped onto Y). For instance, let P be a phrase - marker with Terminals $t_1$ ... $t_n$, and X a string $X_1$ ... $X_n$ of category symbols and terminals, P is analyzable as X if and only if:

$X_1$ dominates $t_1$ ... $t_p$

$X_2$ dominates $t_p + 1$ ... $t_q$

.............(where $1 \leq p \leq q \leq n$)

(2) **Category Symbol**

A category symbol is an element which can appear to the left of the rewriting arrow in an Aspects grammar.
Category Symbols are distinguished from terminals which are not rewritten in rules of grammar.

(3) **Logical Structure**

The syntactic level that provides the input to the semantic component of grammar or the syntactic level postulated for determining semantic interpretation of sentences.

(4) **Dominate**

\[ X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \]

X immediately dominates Y means Y is an immediate constituent of X. So in the Tree diagram, here the Y node will come directly under the dominating category (See under T rules below for examples.)

(5) **Phrase Marker**

A representation of the constituent structure assigned to a sentence (See Lyons, J. 1970:56).

(6) **Rules for forming Complex Symbol on Major Lexical Categories**

Rules forming complex symbols on major lexical categories N and Det (though Det is not a major lexical category) are not ordinary PS-rules but elementary T-rules of some sort, or local transformations (Chomsky 1965: 98-99). There are two types of rules forming CS on major lexical categories. First we have context free rules which introduce inherent features such as

(+ animate), (+ count).

The second kind of rules are context sensitive; and they
are of two types:

(1) Strict sub-categorisation rules, and
(2) Selectional restriction rules.

Strict sub-categorisation rules are of the form:

\[ A \rightarrow CS / Z - W \]

where 'A stands for any symbol ready for re-writing through sub-categorisation rules, such as N or V. CS stands for any partial matrix in the CS of lexical entry of the form +A, +X-Z' (Seuren: 1969:41) Z and W are complex, perhaps null strings acting as context restriction, and ZAW is some X category symbol that appears on the left of the rule X ZAW that introduces A. In concrete terms, then, if A is a verb, then only the VP which in this case substitutes for X determines the strict sub-categorisation of A. If, however, A is an N, then the strict sub-categorisation of A is determined by frames dominated by NP.

(7) Selectional Restriction Rules

Selectional Restriction rules "sub-categorise" a lexical category in terms of syntactic features that appear in specified positions in the sentence; they are of the form

\[ +A \rightarrow CS / \alpha - \beta \]

where \( \alpha \) & \( \beta \) are variables ranging over a set of specified features. Thus if +A is +V and \( \alpha \) is N, and \( \beta \) is also N, then the rules abbreviated by the above schemata states simply that each feature of the preceding and following noun is assigned to the verb and determines an appropriate selectional sub-classification of it (Chomsky: 1965:97).

Selectional Restrictions have come under severe criticism by generative semanticists. For example
McCawley (1970) argues that:

(I) Selectional Restrictions have no independent status in linguistics, whereas Chomsky (1965) employs them as a form of constraint on deep structure which, for generative semanticists, is not a clearly defined level as it is in Aspects (See Chapter II below).

(II) Selectional Restrictions are predictable from the meaning of the lexical items in question;

(III) Many of the so called selectional violations do, in fact correspond to "possible messages" in possible words.

McCawley, therefore, concludes, rightly it seems, that the deviance of sentences arising from the violation of the so-called selectional restrictions is in fact a consequence of extra-linguistic factors in the context of situation. (McCawley (1970, pp.166-168). If selectional restrictions are seen as the semantic property of lexical items, then the need to analyse them as a syntactic constraint will cease to exist. It happens that certain properties or features of lexical items may have certain syntactic reflexes, for example, the application of Equi-NP deletion happens to be sensitive to the specific property of certain verbs being forward-looking. This is a semantic property which has a corresponding syntactic reflex. Kempson (1975: 4-7) in a published University of London Ph.D. thesis, argues along similar lines.

(8) The Lexicon

The lexicon in a transformational grammar is a set of lexical entries, each lexical entry being a pair (DC), where D is a phonological distinctive feature matrix 'spelling' a certain lexical feature, and C is a collection of specified syntactic features, a complex symbol (Chomsky 1965: p.84). The lexicon will also contain the following information:

(a) features peculiar to a formative which can trigger a transformation or block it;
(b) relevant features for semantic interpretation. In the lexicon, we are primarily concerned with syntactic and semantic features.

(9) Lexical Insertion Rules

The PS rules generate strings consisting of grammatical formatives for example, past C. To derive a terminal string from preterminal strings, a lexical insertion rule of the following kind is required: "H& is a complex symbol of preterminal string, and (DC) is a lexical entry, where C is not distinct from Q then Q can be replaced by D" (Chomsky, op. cit., p.84). This rule permits lexical items from the lexicon to be inserted into the preterminal string generated by the PS- and sub-categorisation rules if the markers in the lexicon for that item and the markers in the complex symbol under the particular node do not conflict (Grinder and Elgin 1973, p.129). As Seuren (1969, p.38) observes "one notices that this lexical rule is not so much a rule as a rule schemata: it is a cover formula for a large number of individual rules, each of which would apply to a particular complex symbol and a particular lexical item. The formal abstract structure generated by the base rules plus lexical insertion constitute the deep structure of a sentence and may be represented in the form of a tree."


(10) (a) Structural Description;

The structure form of a phrase marker before the
operation of a transformational rule.

(b) Structural change: The form of a phrase marker after the operation of a transformational rule.

(11) **Surface Structure**

The syntactic level that contains the last phrase marker Pn - in the syntactic structure (P1 ... Pn) of a transformational grammar. It provides the input to the phonological component of a transformational generative grammar.

(12) **Transformational or T rules**

T rules map phrase markers, onto phrase-markers meeting the Boolean\(^1\) conditions of analyzability. Certain elementary transformations that are commonly used in the present work are:

- **Deletion**, **Replacement** and **Adjunction** e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD:</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adjunction deletion)

(where '###' = boundary symbol)

Condition: 2 = 5.

In the SC, we have sister adjunction of 6 to the left of 4 since both 6 and 4 are sisters under the common dominance of the same VP node.

(13) Two other forms of adjunction are possible in transformational grammar. We shall illustrate them with tree diagrams:

(a) Daughter adjunction and (b) Chomsky-adjunction as shown below:

\(^1\)Boole, F. (1951).
Thus, adjoining a daughter of C (i.e. \( F \)) in \( P_x \) above to the right of B we have the derivation above, (where G is removed as a result of Ross' tree pruning and the successive terminals will be \( P_x - D E H J K L \), \( P_{x+1} - D E K L H J \).

With successive terminals \( P_x = D E H J K L \), and \( P_{x+1} - D E M H J K L \). Only syntactic transformations are illustrated so far.

Variables: The late capitals like U, W, X, Y and Z are used to represent variables in structural description (SD). They stand for all possible category symbols and terminals in the relevant structural description. Early capitals like A B C D E F are used to represent category symbols as in the example (b) above for the elimination of the distinction between category symbols and features. (See Chomsky 1970: 208).

1.1.3 The Verb Phrase

As remarked earlier in 1.0.3, much penetrating work has been done on the Verb Phrase in Xoruba, so we would just present an elementary discussion of it here. Moreover, our interest in the Verb Phrase is in the use we can make of it in the description of nominalization. In this respect, our discussion will be rather utilitarian in nature and it will be
determined by the relevance of the items discussed to the Yorùbá Nominalization.

A verb phrase rule might look like Rule (1) as an expansion of the base rule on VP.

Rule 1. \[ \text{VP} \to (\text{NEG}) \text{ AUX } V \text{ (NP) (PP)} \]

(where the obligatory elements are V and AUX), the auxiliary is regarded as obligatory because in many cases, the absence in the surface structure of the tense indication in Yorùbá verb phrases is a result of an auxiliary transformation. This is made obvious if the case of a class of verb described variously as 'qualitative/statative' verbs and predicative adjectives is considered. In surface structure representations it is not always possible to indicate tense for this class of verbs. However, it is not always the case that if an element is not present in the surface structure it is not there in the Logical Structure. The class of the stative verbs includes \( \text{gà} \) 'to be tall' \( \text{gbọ} \) 'to be dry/lean'. Adverbs with double underscore are often regarded by traditional grammarians as the only time indicators. This assumption is not always true as we shall soon see; consider:

(15) \( \text{Adé ti burú rí àgbón kò burú mọ} \)

(Ade have been wicked before but not wicked again)

'Ade has been wicked in the past but he is no longer wicked'.

It should be noted that the aspect marker \( \text{ti} \) also participates in tense indication and not the adverbs with double underscore alone. The stative verbs also take on

\(^1\text{Bangbose, Awobuluyi, Delano, Ward, Abraham, Oke and Afolayan.} \)
certain auxiliaries like the future indefinite tense marker as observable in such sentences as:

(16) Ójó yio ga tó Adé ní ọdún yí
(Ójo shall tall equal Ade in year this)
'Ojo will be as tall as Ade this year'.

(17) Òlá máa tó ọgbón
(Ólá going-to right-- time-to-be-wise)
'Ólá will soon be wise'

The following are what we consider as VP structures in the language. We underline the VP in the examples.

(18) Adé kó ọ́g sí ìjà  VP=NEG. V PP
(Ade not go to market)
'Ade did not go to the market'.

(19) Adé kó ti ọg sí ilé  VP=NEG. AUX V PP
(Ade not have go to house)
'Ade has not yet gone home'.

(20) Adé ki yio ọg só ilé lọsọa  VP=NEG AUX. V PP PP
(Ade not shall go to house tomorrow)
'Ade shall not go home tomorrow'.

We have discontinuous verbs in some structure as witnessed by:

(21) Adé kó mì ówó rà sì ilé lána  VP=NEG. V NP V PP PP
(Ade not take money come to house yesterday)
'Ade did not bring any money home yesterday'.

(22) Adé kò mì ówó lọ só ilé lána  VP=NEG V NP V PP PP
(Ade not take money go to house yesterday).
'Adé did not take any money home yesterday'.

The difference in meaning, brought about by the polarity created by 'go' and 'come', of the two sentences suggests that
there may be two separate verbs rather than a discontinuous verb in the structures. One can argue that all discontinuous verbs are a series of the verb structures in the verb phrase. To engage in such an argument is beyond the scope of the present work which is mainly on nominalization.

In the expansion of the base rule we have above i.e. (1), we choose only one NP but in the rule we have two. It is possible to have two NP's which need not be conjoined. If they are conjoined they would be derived by the rule (1) above, but if no conjoining were possible, in such cases, the trf n1 is inserted between the two NP's as witnessed by:

(23) Dada kọ Ọjọ ọf ilé VP=V NP trf1 NP.
      'Dada burgled Ojo's home.'

(24) Adé gbá Alínà ọf etí VP as in (23). (Adé slap Alínà trf ear)
      'Adé slapped Alínà (or Aina's ear).'

(25) Olá tè Adé ọf ọṣè VP as in (23) (Olá step Adé trf foot)
      'Olá stepped on Adé's foot'.

From (23)-(25) it should be noticed that it is not necessary that there should be a connection between the two NP's in the VP. They may be direct and indirect objects, or they may even have genitival relationship (e.g. in the inalienable possessive relationship existing between the two NP's of (24)-(25).

The last feature of the verb phrase we discuss here is its relationship with the adjective. Two items are invariably used for comparison in Yoruba i.e. ju and lọ. For the comparative degree, in its conventional and traditional sense,

1 For fuller information on ọf as a transformational formative see Awobuluyi (1969b, pp.67-77).
ju and ṣọ are discontinuous, but for the superlative degree they occur together as one lexical item. Consider:

(26) Ọlọ tóbi ju Adé ṣọ.  
(Ọlọ big exceed Adé beyond)  
'Ọlọ is bigger than Adé'.

(27) Ọjọ gbọn ju Aíná ṣọ.  
(Ọjọ wise exceed Aíná beyond)  
'Ọjọ is wiser than Aíná'.

(28) Ọlọ lá purọ ju Bọsẹ ṣọ.  
(Ọlọ can lie exceed Bọsẹ beyond)  
'Ọlọ can lie more than Bọsẹ'.

(29) Ọlọ lá ṣiṣẹ ju Aíná ṣọ.  
(Ọlọ can work exceed Aíná beyond)  
'Ọlọ can work more than Aíná'.

(30) Ọlọ ni ọ tóbi jùọ.  
(Ọlọ is he big exceed—beyond)  
'Ọlọ is the biggest'.

(31) Adé ni ọ gbọn jùọ.  
(Adé is he wise exceed—beyond).  
'Adé is the wisest'.

(32) Bísì ni ọ lè ṣẹ ẹmèlẹ jùọ ninu gbogbo wọn.  
(Bísì is he can do laziness exceed—beyond them all).  
'Bísì is the laziest of them all'.

As could be noticed examples (26–32) cover verbs, predicative adjectives, and also both the comparative and superlative degrees. Notice that no modal auxiliaries (e.g. lè 'can') occurs with the predicative adjectives examples. This however does not mean that they cannot co—occur with predicatives as witnessed by:

(33) Ọlọ máa ga ju Bùnmí ọ látẹ̀ ọjọ.  
(Ọlọ going to tall exceed Bùnmí beyond soon this).  
'Ọlọ will soon be taller than Bùnmí'.

Oldi le ga ju Bannmi lọ.
'Olu could be taller than Bunmi.'

Two other forms of comparison exist but the only one we have already discussed above is relevant to this work. However, in passing we may mention the other two briefly. The two forms are described as the 'comparative of equality' and the 'comparative of inferiority'.

(34) Adé tóbi tó Oldi.
(Adé big equal Oldi)
'Adé is as big as Oldi'.

An example of the second type will be the negation of the first as in

(35) Adé kọ tóbi tó Oldi
(Adé not big equal Oldi)
'Adé is not as big as Oldi'.

It should be noted however, that the earlier examples (26–32) will not constitute a comparison of inferiority in this sentence. Consider:

(36) Oldi kọ tóbi ju Adé lọ.
(Oldi not big exceed Adé beyond)
'Oldi is not bigger than Adé'.

In (36) it is possible for Adé to be as big as Oldi but the possibility of equality is ruled out in case of (35). Since, the comparisons of 'equality' and 'inferiority' is of marginal significance for us in the present study we may end our discussion of it here.

1.1.4 Yorùbá Modal System

The modal system of the Yorùbá verbs coincide with the following three terms; Probability, Obligation and Condi-

1 Beecroft and de Gaye (1923: 16).
tion as indicated by the following preverbs - là, gbódó, và and ibà. They can co-occur with the aspectual markers but never with tense markers. Their occurrence may be illustrated by the following examples.

1. **Probability**

   (i) ó là lò.  
   'He may go'.

   (ii) ó là ti lò.  
   'He may have gone'.

   (iii) ó là màa lò.  
   'He may be going'.

   (iv) ó là ti màa lò.  
   'He may be going already'.

   Or

   'He may have been going'.

2. **Obligation**

   (i) ó gbódó lò.  
   'He must/should go'.

   (ii) ó gbódó ti lò.  
   'He must/should have gone'.

   (iii) ó gbódó màa lò.  
   'He must/should be going'.

   (iv) ó gbódó ti màa lò.  
   'He must/should be going'.

3. **Condition**

   (i) (a) ibà lò.  
   'He would have gone'.

   (b) ibà lò.  
   'Even if he is gone'.

   (ii) (a) ibà ti lò.  
   'He would have gone'.

   (b) ibà ti lò.  
   'Even if he has gone'.
(iii) (a) ìbá màà lò. 'He would have been going'.
(b) ìba màà lò. 'Even if he is/should be going'.
(iv) (a) ìbá ti màà lò. 'He would have been going'.
(b) ìba ti màà lò. 'Even if he is already going'.

1.2.0 **AUXILIARY IN YORÙBÀ**

The category symbol Aux. stands for a number of elements which occur between the subject and the verbs of a sentence. They are otherwise referred to as pre-verbs cf. Bamgboye (1966: 69-70). The list comprises:

1. Yìkó 'will' (future tense marker).
2. à 'already' (erstwhile aspect marker).
3. ì 'indefinite aspect marker'.
4. màà 'already' (conditional mode marker).
5. tètè 'without delay'.
6. mọmọ 'on purpose'.
7. sì 'still'.
8. pàpà 'still'.
9. gbodò 'must' 'should' (obligation mode marker).
10. àkùkù 'for all I know'.
11. sì 'just'.
12. àkùkù 'for all I know'.
13. sì 'still'.
14. sì 'just merely'.
15. wulù 'in vain'.
16. jọ 'together'.
17. jàjà 'finally'.
18. kò 'not'.
19. bá 'happen to'.
20. mà (ṣe) (do) not.
What is notable about ́ibá 'would have' is that it could occur both protastically and apodistically with non-factive predicates of unfulfilled conditions. Consider the following:

4. ́ibá še pé Adé dúdo si ilé ni kò ́ibá tì jà.
   'Had it been the case that Adé had stayed at home, he would not have fought'.

It should be noted that the sentence

5. pé Adé dúdo si ilé ni
   'pe Adé stayed at home ni'

is derived from the logical structure string:

6. ́ibá še pé ́ibá dúdo si ilé ni.
   It would-have been ́ibá dúdo si ilé ni.
   Pé Adé kò ́ibá tì jà.
   'Adé not would-have fought'.

The second occurrence of Adé in (6) is first pronominalized into ́ó, after which both this pronominal and the subject, ́ó 'it', of the protasis matrix sentence are deleted by a regular rule of morphophonemic because this pronoun is represented by a null argument¹ before the modal ́ibá and ́ibá.

Other sentences contain the modal ba 'happen to be' in the protasis only, for example:

7. (i) tì Adé bá wà ni ilé ki yìó jà.
   (if Adé happen-to stay at home not will fight).
   'Adé won't fight if he stays at home'.

   (ii) tì ́ó bá dúdo ki yìó jà.
   (if he happen to stay not will fight).
   'He won't fight if he stays'.

The modal *ibáà* is used in concessive clauses as witnessed by:

8. *Adé ibáà dúró si ṣi ilé o á jà.*
   (Adé even-if stay at home he will fight).
   'Adé will fight whether or not he stays at home'.

1.2.1 The Temporal System

The temporal system comprised two tenses. Borrowing from Rowlands we can designate the tenses as definite and indefinite\(^1\) tenses. The definite tense indicates action that either has already happened or is happening, while the indefinite tense signals action that is yet to occur. The definite tense can be said to correspond to the English past and present tenses, and the indefinite tense to the so-called future tense.

The Definite Tense

Any verb that is not accompanied by one of the indefinite tense markers is in the definite tense. Depending on the context the definite tense is either interpreted as past or present. In the absence of any aspctual markers the majority of verbs in Yorùbá are for the past time interpretation except those listed below.

- *gbôn* 'to be wise'
- *wà* 'to be (in a place)'.
- *gbà* 'to agree'
- *mọ* 'to know'
- *jọ́* 'to be'
- *gọ́* 'to be foolish'
- *rọ́* 'to think'

For example

9. *mo mọ́* 'I know' or 'I knew'.

---

10. mo gbà 'I agree' or 'I agreed'

but

11. mo tà 'I sold'

i.e. trading was brisk, and I sold all I had to sell.

On the other hand, in the presence of aspectual markers even those verbs that are marked for past time interpretations are apt to have present and future time interpretations imposed on them.

The Indefinite Tense

The Indefinite Tense markers are the auxiliary verbs m̀̀à, yio, Ọ and á as exemplified by:

12. (i) Adé m̀̀à wá.
    'Adé will come'.

(ii) Adé yio wá.
    'Adé will come'.

(iii) Adé Ọ wá.
    'Adé will come'.

(iv) Adé á wá.
    'Adé will come'.

As could be noticed there appears to be no meaning difference among all the markers in (12 i - iv); Ọ m̀̀à and á are more frequently used. The forms yio and Ọ co-occur with the negative form ki an allomorph of the negative form kò 'not' as exemplified by:

13. Adé ki yio lọ
    'Adé will not go'.

The indefinite tense is more explicitly expressed in the environment of kò by means of an alternative construction involving the verb nì 'to have' as in:
1.2.2 The Aspectual System

The Aspectual System comprises two terms: whilst and duration.

Whilst is indicated by means of the pre-verb *ti* 'already'. If there are two actions within a construction involving *ti* it indicates that one action occurred before the other. When there are no two actions involved *ti* merely indicates that the action took place before the speaker started to speak, or will take place before the time specified or implied by the speaker as exemplified by the following.

15. Ade *ti* pari rë.
   (Ade already finished it)
   'Ade has (already) finished it'.

16. Ade á *ti* pari rë.
   (Ade will already finish it).
   'Ade will have finished it'.

17. Ade á *ti* pari rë ni iwoyi ọla.
   (Ade will already finish it in this-time tomorrow)
   'Ade will have finished it by this time tomorrow'.

Duration

The durative aspect indicates action occurring through time. It may be interpreted as either continuous or habitual. It is indicated by means of *ǎ* or *màa*, in some contexts, or by both in others. With one or probably two exceptions, *ǎ* co-occurs only with the definite tense, while *màa* co-occurs with both definite and indefinite tenses, as well as in imperative clauses. Whenever *màa* occurs with definite tenses, it must be accompanied by *ǎ* as in:
18. (i) Adé ni ta iṣu.
Present: 'Adé is selling yams'.
or 'Adé sells yams'.

(ii) Past: 'Adé was selling yams (at that moment)'
or 'Adé used to sell yams'.

Máa 19. (i) Máa ta iṣu.
'Keep selling yams'.

(ii) Adé á máa ta iṣu.
'Adé will keep selling yams'.

Ni and máa together:

When the two occur within a construction the aspectual meaning is habitual as witnessed by:

20. Adé máa ni ta iṣu.
'Adé sells yams'.
or
'Adé used to sell yams'.

It should be noted that (20) has the same meaning as (18) consequently máa seems redundant in (20). Thus for practical purposes, máa and ni are in complementary distribution with the latter occurring with the definite tense, and the former elsewhere. (See 3.1.1 below).

**Tense and Aspect Co-occurrence**

These tenses and aspects occur in the following arrangements:

(1) Definite. (2) Indefinite. (3) Erstwhile Definite.
(4) Durative Definite. (5) Erstwhile Indefinite.

1. O gbẹ. 'It is/was dry'.
2. Yio gbẹ 'It will become dry'.
3. Ọ ti gbẹ 'It is already dry'.
4. Ọ Ṇ gbẹ 'It is/was becoming dry'.
5. Ọ màa Ṇ gbẹ 'It usually becomes/became dry'.
6. Yīo màa gbẹ (It will be becoming dry) 'It will be getting dried'.
7. Ọ ti Ṇ gbẹ 'It is/was becoming dry already'.
   Ọ ti màa Ṇ gbẹ 'It used to become dry'.
8. Yīo ti màa gbẹ (It will already be becoming dry) 'It will have been getting dried'.

(The morpheme 'O' she/he/it has a null argument before yīo and Ọ). (Cf. Awobuluyi 1967).

One wonders why we should spend so much time on the verb system in Yorùbá. The fact becomes clear if we realize that the whole range of the verb system is involved in nominalization in Yorùbá. Consider:

A - tẹtẹ - dé. 'The fact of coming early'
àl - pẹ - dé. 'The fact of not coming late'
à - ọ - gbẹ. 'The fact of using till being worn out'.

And of course the second source of nouns in Yorùbá is the so-called ideophones. (See Chapter V below).

1.2.3 The Noun Phrase

This work is primary concerned with nominalization, and it will be helpful to look at the surface structure of Yorùbá NPs at this stage. The surface word order is the mirror image of the English word order as witnessed by (44).

(44) Awọn Plur  màlu noun  |  sisanra |  rębọtọ |  mẹfà  |  yên |  nà
      |  cow |  fat |  stout |  six |  those |  the
      |  noun |  ger, adj. | 'Ideophone' | num | Dem. | Topic-marker

'Those six fat stout cows.'

1 The nature of this phenomenon is described in full in Chapter V.
(44) is an example of the possibility of having a noun phrase where all the following elements occur; viz. plural marker, now, Gerundive Adjective, Ideophone, Numerals, Demonstrative Determiner and Topic Marker. Topic marker nà conveys the idea of the previously mentioned: note that it is quite different from the two other nà i.e. (a) nà Determiner as in:

(45) Qmpkùnùn nà ni ko orin. 'The boy is singing'. (b) nà glossable as 'also'.

(46) O lu Adé nà. 'You beat Adé also'. It is glossable as 'even' in English as well. Adé nà lọ. 'Adé even went'.

It is possible for the order of words in (44) to be rearranged but such rearrangements invariably result in doubtfully acceptable Yorùbá utterances. It is not the case that all these elements should be present in all NP's; we present here what we consider to be the maximum length of a NP. IC's

A simple Yorùbá NP may consist of a single lexical item e.g. (47) Qkùnùn 'man'.

NP like (47) can be found in generic structures, e.g. (48)

Qkùnùn kòlè burú ju Obùnùn lọ. (man not can bad exceed woman beyond). 'man cannot be worse than woman'.

It is quite difficult for unqualified NP's to occur in Yorùbá sentences, and so single element NP's are rare. They are mostly found in generic environments like (48).¹

¹ Cf. Ward, I. (1952: 46) "... it is not usual to have a noun along as subject of a verb, the sentences in which such a usage is natural are few: these are mainly general statements."
As our main concern is with nominalization we do not want to go beyond the above definition of what a NP is in Yorùbá. In the present work nominalization means the derivation of nominal groups from Verbs, verb phrases and simple sentences, as witnessed by the following examples.

(a) \textit{V\: lọ 'to go' \: lọ (kan) ('certain) going'.}

(b) \textit{VP \: wa ọkọ drive a vehicle, in the sentence.}

\underline{Adé wa ọkọ} where the VP is underlined.

\underline{Wiwa ọkọ} Adé dá ìrù bá mí.

'Ade's driving frightens me'.

(c) 

\textit{Nominalization: Pé ó lọ ilé ni ohun tí a gbọ.}

That he went home was what we heard.

\underline{S \: ó lọ ilé} 'He went home'.

As the process is actually involved we present an oversimplified form of what is done in the work here. As a sort of generalization which is copiously itemized in the rest of this study, we make the claim that whatever structure is of the nature: \textit{NP-S}, exclusive of the relative clause which according to traditional analysis,\(^1\) bears a striking similarity to it, is a form of nominalization. In other words, any form, sentential or non-sentential, which is directly dominated by a NP node is a form of nominalization.

This study excludes the primitive or basic nouns because the history of their derivation is not known to us.

\(^1\) See Chapters IV and V for our analysis of the relative clause constructions.
 CHAPTER II.

2.0.0 SYNTACTIC METHODOLOGY.

In the preceding Chapter we mentioned briefly the model we use for our analysis, namely, the Transformational Generative Grammar. Here, it is our intention to present a survey of the model in just the sense of the relevance it bears to the present study.

The syntactic framework is that which was originally proposed by Chomsky in *Syntactic Structures* (1957) and which has been subject to far reaching modifications ever since. A fundamental claim of Transformational Grammar in its present form is that a grammar of a language is a system of rules that expresses the correspondence between sound and meaning in this language in a language independent way. ¹ This Grammar is also assumed to specify an infinite class of surface structure, ² each of which is mapped onto a phonetic representation by a system of phonological rules (in a phonological Component of the Grammar). Furthermore, this grammar contains a system of grammatical transformations mapping phrase markers onto phrase markers such that each transformation defines a set of well-formed pairs of successive phrase markers \( P_i - 1 \) and \( P_i \). The system of Grammatical Transformations defines an infinite class \( K \) of finite sequences of phrase markers, each sequence \( P_i - P_n \) meeting the following conditions:

1. \( P_n \) is a surface structure.
2. Each \( P_i \) is formed by applying a certain transformation to \( P_{i-1} \), in a way permitted by the conditions of grammatical rules (a) ³.

² For the definition of such terms like 'surface structure' see Bach, e.(1974 : 74–75).
(iii) There is no Po such as Po, Pi ... Pn meets conditions (i) and (ii).

The acceptability of conditions (i)-(iii) by transformationalists is not in dispute since both Chomsky 1971 (Setting up the views of the interpretive semanticists) and Lakoff 1971 (explaining the generative semanticists position) accept and assume the validity of conditions (i) to (iii), thence, (i) to (iii) will be our fundamental assumption here.

Another major assumption of present day transformational grammar is that the grammar contains lexicon which is a class of lexical entries each of which specifies the grammatical (i.e. Phonological, Semantic and Syntactic) properties of some lexical item.2

A Lexical item may be considered as "incorporating a set of transformations that insert the item in question (i.e. the complex of features that constitutes it) in phrase markers"3 along the line suggested by Chomsky in Aspects:

(2) (1) A lexical transformation associated with the lexical item 1 (i.e. man) maps a phrase marker P containing a sub-structure Q (represented in Aspects by △) onto a phrase-marker Pi formed from P replacing Q by 1 (i.e. man).

---

1 The interpretive semanticists are the Linguists who believe that semantics merely interprets what has already been fully specified at another level of representation known as the 'Deep Structure'. Their system is known as the 'Standard Theory' which is in opposition to the Generative Semanticists 'Basic Theory' on the existence of a level of representation called the 'Deep Structure', on the relationship between Syntax and Semantics and on some other matters which need not concern us here.

2 Chomsky(1971 184), Note that 'Grammar' is used here as defined in Aspects 1965.

3 Chomsky(1971 184).
A lexical transformation can therefore be considered as a 'well-formedness' constraint on classes of successive phrase markers $P_i$ and $P_{i-1}$ for any $i$ where the only difference between $P_i$ and $P_{i+1}$ is that $P_i$ contains the lexical items associated with $Q$.

Various versions of present day transformational grammar accept the possibility of lexical transformations defined by (2), although they differ in the conditions on $Q$ e.g. where in the Grammar lexical transformations apply, whether they apply in a block and all lexical items are inserted into phrase markers before any non-lexical transformations (i.e. - 'true syntactic transformations') apply as in Chomsky's condition 3\(^1\) or whether non-lexical transformations occur both before and after lexical insertion so that the existence of an autonomous (and deterministic) level of Syntactic 'Deep Structure', the level after which all lexical insertions have already taken place but before which any non-lexical transformation ever applies is denied. One version of Transformational Grammar that accepts the possibility of all lexical insertion in a block before any non-lexical transformation is called the 'Standard Theory', while the other version that denies this possibility is called the 'Basic Theory' (although the labelling is not intended by the proponents of the theories to confer some unique conceptual or empirical status to the former, or to suggest that there is anything ontologically, psychologically or conceptually 'basic' about the latter). Consequently; (3) below:

\(^{1}\text{Chomsky (1971, 183-184). We are leaving out Chomsky's fn (a)}\) on (11) since it is just an elaboration on the conditions on grammatical rules, some specific and some general like the principle of Transformational Cycle as in Aspects (1965)
(3) The Standard Theory specifies, for each sentence, a Syntactic Structure $\Sigma = (P_1 \ldots P_l \ldots P_n)$ (where $P_i$ is the deep, and $P_n$ the surface structure) a Semantic representation $S$, and a phonetic representation $P$. It asserts furthermore, that $S$ is determined by $P_i$ and $P$ by $P_n$ under the rules of semantic and phonological interpretation respectively. More generally, the theory is 'Syntactically Based' in the sense that it assumes the sound meaning relation $(P, S)$ to be determined by $\Sigma$; on the other hand, the level $P_i$ of $\Sigma$ does not exist in a 'Basic Theory' and the Basic Theory abrogates syntactic 'determinism' my expression for the most important characteristics of the theory which assumes "that the sound - meaning relation" is determined by $\Sigma$.

It must be noted that the differences between the 'Standard Theory' and the "Basic Theory" as represented here appears to be only differences caused by disagreement on a single suggestion namely, that lexical insertion should occur in a block before non-lexical transformation applies. Simply put, this is the main difference. However, the difference itself is not one that can easily be resolved since the position of the Standard Theory cannot be easily changed because it is dictated by a major attitude to linguistic description which has always characterized all works in the Standard Theory tradition, and which was originally proposed in Syntactic Structure as:

(4) "Only a purely formal basis can provide a firm and productive foundation for the construction of Grammatical Theory".

1 Chomsky (1957: 100).
Since the version of Transformational Grammar to be used here will tend more towards the Basic Theory, it will be necessary to discuss the objections of the 'Standard Theory' that could justify any adoption of the basic theory in a work like this one. It should be noted, however, that those working within the Basic Theory do not actually constitute a unified school since various systems of analysis e.g. McCawley's indices and Bach's contentives are found in recent works. However, they all agree on the non-existence of a level of Deep Structure which is defined as condition (3) of Chomsky 1971.

In 4, above not only does Chomsky contrast form with meaning (i.e. Syntax with Semantics) but he also states as an instrument of policy, the direction which future research in transformational grammar should take (i.e. the one observed in 3 earlier where everything linguistic is determined by 'form' (i.e. \( \Sigma = \) Syntax). Thus it had been stated already in Syntactic Structures that whatever is included in future extensions of Transformational Grammar should have only a purely formal basis. Hence in Aspects, when Semantics was first officially recognized\(^1\) as a subject for linguistics to describe, its only function was to interpret what had previously been fully specified in the 'purely formal' omnipotent syntactic component, since the syntactic component specifies an infinite set of abstract formal objects, each of which incorporates all information relevant to a single inter-

\(^1\) Semantics was first recognised as a proper area of T.G. Studies by Fodor and Katz (1964: 479-518). But one might say that its official recognition came only with its incorporation into the general framework of TG in Katz and Postal (1956) and Chomsky (1965).
However, recent attacks on the standard theory are directly referable to the requirement 4 above, that 'only a purely formal basis' is needed for the construction of a grammatical theory and the deterministic definition of the Syntactic component in Aspects. For instance, since the syntactic component specified 'an infinite set' of abstract formal objects, and since each of these objects contains all information needed for the interpretation of any 'sentence', there is bound to be a duplication of information in the semantic component if the semantic component itself were developed as a system of projection rules. One such duplication of effort is that noted by Weinreich whereby there is a dictionary in the semantic component and a separate lexicon in the syntactic component. Thus, in an integrated theory, the existence of a lexicon separate from the dictionary is a vestigial absurdity, but one which can be removed without difficulty. It is a vestigial absurdity because the duplication was originally caused by the reliance of linguists on 'a conception of linguistic theory as a whole which did not anticipate a semantic component' (i.e. the conception of a purely formal linguistic theory).

1 Chomsky (1965: 16). This definition of the Syntactic Component is the original Aspects statement of 'Syntactic determinism' and Chomsky's definition of standard theory represented as 3 is a restatement of deterministic theory. In 3 Chomsky was unequivocal in asserting that "the sound-meaning relation (P.S)" is determined by \( \sum \) = (i.e. Syntax) existential Quantifier).

2 Weinreich (1966) reprinted in Steinberg and Sokolowsky (1971: 312) in Katz and Postal (1955: 151) postulate a 'lexicon' (distinct from the dictionary) which presumably specifies the phonological form of morphemes. Chomsky (1965) has the underlying phonological shape of morphemes specified by the same component - the lexicon - as the syntactic features.

3 Weinreich (1966).
So, objections to the Standard theory arise as a result of the lack of simplicity and generality entailed by a duplication of efforts in both the interpretive semantic component and the 'deterministic' syntactic component beside many other objections that have been noted by transformationalists. One such is the fact that the base of an Aspects Standard Theory generates many deep structures which are blocked by restrictions on the application of transformational rules and consequently have no surface structure realizations. This same filtering effect of transformations must be duplicated in some ways at least in the semantic component. Another duplication occurs in the existence of semantic selectional restrictions in the semantic component postulated by Fodor, Katz and Postal vis-à-vis the syntactic selectional restrictions of Chomsky (1965) which have the syntactic features like Human and Animate which are not completely distinct from the semantic features having the same names.

Apart from duplication, the standard theory as formulated by Chomsky (1971) makes the status of semantic representation more indeterminate than previously. In pre-(1971) standard theory (i.e. Aspects), the deep structure was set up only to determine semantic interpretations whilst the surface structure (a less significant level of representation at that time) determines only phonological interpretation. In the revised standard theory of (1971), there are three significant shifts of positions although the first two are related.

First, the reconstructed theory gives fn - surface structure or rather "the structure determined by the phonolo-
gical interpretation of \( P_n \) with intonation assigned, more powerful than the deep structure since it is capable of determining both phonetic representation and parts of semantic representation, whereas \( P_I \), the deep structure, determines only the remaining part of semantic representation; thus, the significant level of representation now is the surface structure which is necessary for both semantics and phonetics.

Secondly, it was only the projection rules of Fodor and Katz (1963) and Katz and Postal (1964) that functions in the semantic component, but we have a different situation in the reconstructed standard theory of 1971 \(^2\) i.e. (5):(113) base: 

\[(P_I, \ldots, P_i) (P_I \text{ the } K\text{-initial, } P_i \text{ the post-lexical (deep)} \]

structure of the syntactic structure which is a member of \( K \) transformations: 

\[(P_i, \ldots, P_n) (P_n \text{ the surface structure;} \]

\[(P_I, \ldots, P_n) \in K \]

phonology: \( P_n \rightarrow \text{phonetic representation} \]

semantics: 

\[(P_i, P_n) \rightarrow \text{semantic representation (the grammatical relations involved being those of } P_i \text{, that is, those represented in } P_I). \]

In (5), Chomsky's final formulation of the standard theory, the (Syntactic) phrase markers at \( P_I \) and \( P_n \) including the grammatical relations represented in \( P_i \), also participate

---


2 Chomsky (1971) and (1965), theories will henceforth be referred to as the 'Standard' and Aspects respectively in this Section.

3 Note the parenthesized information following 'semantic representation' in (5) or Chomsky's (113). This does not suggest that \( P_I \) determines semantic representation, but that the grammatical relations represented in \( P_I \), the first phrase markers for lexical transformations, are the relations involved in \( P_I \) the DS.
in the determination of semantic interpretation, although it is not clear whether they are syntactic converses of, or actual replacements for semantic projection rules. Lakoff (1971b:269) actually assumes that the phrase markers (Pl, ..., Pi) in the standard theory are replacements for the projection rules Am, ..., Ao in the Aspects theory. It is likely that Lakoff has misinterpreted the standard theory notation since both Chomsky and Lakoff used the same formula, the 'Syntactic Structure' (Pl, ..., Pn) for entirely different purposes. Lakoff stated: 'Given a Syntactic Structure (Pi ... Pn) we define the semantic representation SR of a sentence as SR=(Pi, Pr, Top, F, ...) where PR is a conjunction of presuppositions, Top is an indication of the 'topic' of the sentence, and F is the indication of the focus of the sentence a'.

As far as Chomsky was concerned, all P's with subscripts are in syntax, and there is no Pl in semantic representation SR e.g. in

(6) = "(32) = (Pi, ..., Pi, ..., Pn)"

Where the S and P on the lower line respectively represent semantic representation and phonetic representation. In the final version of the standard theory (i.e. 5 above), the only necessary change from the Aspects theory is that there is another arrow from Pn leading to S giving:

---

1 Lakoff (1971b: 234) fn (a) suggests the possibility of eliminating topic and focus and representing them in the presuppositional part of the sentence. Perhaps this can make for simplicity in description when it is done.
Thus, the only clear difference between the Aspects theory represented as (6) and the latest standard theory (7), is that there is another arrow leading from Pn to S. If the vertical arrow from Pi to S in both (6) and (7) is interpreted as 'projection rules' and the vertical arrow from Pn to P as phonological rules the diagonal arrow (representing 'surface structure interpretation rules') cannot be interpreted as 'projection rules' - which are vertical, and which do not rely on phonological information like intonation from Pn or as 'phonological rules' (which are also vertical, but which do not lead to semantic representation). Perhaps a comprehensive and comprehensible formulation of 'surface structure interpretation rules' may later clarify the position of the diagonal arrow and the way it operates. Nevertheless, the schemata (6) and (7) still show that the standard theory has not yet abolished projection rules although it has abandoned the strong position in Katz and Postal (1964) and Chomsky (1965) that only the deep structure determines semantic 'interpretation'.

Hence, until the proponents of the standard theory give a full specification of the diagonal arrow in (7), it will be rash to suggest that the Standard theory has abolished the Katzian semantics, thus, Lakoff's account of the Standard

Note that (7) is the statement of the standard theory presented in Chomsky (1971). There are however corollaries of (7) e.g. the suggestion in Chomsky that "it is quite possible that other terms in syntactic structure (Pl,...,Pn) are also relevant for semantic representation". Since this suggestion will only increase the number of diagonal arrows, its discussion will be postponed till we have finished dealing with the problem of one diagonal arrow.
theory (1971: 234), and his reformulation of the standard theory in a full deviation (1971:264-5) may be incorrect. All that can be said is that the semantic component of the standard theory is non-descript since it is no longer the vertical projection rule arrow of (7) alone, which directly determines semantic representation, but this vertical projection arrow plus a diagonal arrow which could even interpret items like presuppositions which are not represented directly in any part of Pn. It should be noted that one of the implications of the surface structure interpretation rules is that the surface structure could determine the semantic representation of structurally available formal objects like 'focus' (in normal intonation) and structurally unavailable formal objects like 'presuppositions', whereas the deep structure could determine only the semantic 'interpretation' of available formal objects like 'complex symbols'; it should also be noted that presuppositions cannot be assumed to be structurally available the way the main verbs of sentences are, hence, the surface structure is even more stronger and significant than the deep structure in the latter's only field of operation - that of the semantic representation. By this, it only means that the only important reason for postulating a level of deep structure (for determining semantic interpretation) is not really cogent since the surface structure which can use

---

1 It is very unlikely that Chomsky could have formulated the integrated standard theory the way Lakoff did it since the part from P. to Pn in Lakoff's reformulation (p.265) violates condition 1 (iii) of Lakoff (1971b) and Chomsky (1971) that "(iii) that there is no Po, Pl .... Pn meets conditions (i) and (ii)".

Assuming that Chomsky has abandoned Katzian Semantics, he is unlikely to incorporate a Po which violates one of the conditions he set up into the revised standard theory.
both structurally avoidable and structurally unavoidable information for determining semantic interpretation is now more powerful than the deep in its only task.

The third Shift in the standard theory is that it is assumed that it is possible for other terms in the syntactic structure \((P_1 \ldots P_n)\) "to be relevant for semantic interpretation". Apart from dwarfing the deep structure further, if it has not technically eliminated it, this assumption allows semantic interpretation to be multiply determined by an unspecified number of possible 'terms' in \(P_1, \ldots P_n\), and some of these possible terms could be identical with some of the derivational constraints in the basic theory like subject raising, predicate lifting, quantifier lowering etc. In other words, both syntactic and lexical transformations affect meaning so that there can be many diagonal arrows now leading to \(S\) from \(P_1\) to \(P_n\) in (7) above. If every part of Syntax can now affect meaning (as the reconstruction of the corollary of (7) indicates in (8) below), then one is justified to doubt the necessity of a Syntax/Semantic distinction since semantics can now be relevant at every state in the syntactic component as suggested by:

\[
(8) = P_1, P_i, \ldots, P_n
\]

So, the third shift of position in the standard theory looks like a subtle move towards the basic theory position although the statement of principle from Syntactic Structures that "only" a purely formal basis" (where purely formal, is "only" a purely formal basis" (where purely formal, is
interpreted now as 'Syntactic') "can provide a firm and productive foundation for the construction of a Grammatical theory", will always make the standard theory proponents resist the basic theory position (in theory but not in actual practice).

One can note at this stage, that Chomsky actually criticized and rejected what was variously referred to as 'a semantically based' theory of generative grammar, and a semantically based grammar, because "what one believes, realizes, etc., depends not only on the proposition expressed, but also on some aspects of the form in which it is expressed". However, his general interpretation of 'based' e.g. when syntactically based, means that the 'sound-meaning relation (p.s.) is 'determined by (where \( \geq \) = 'Syntax') will make it difficult for his criticism to be justly applicable to the basic theory. For instance, the basic theory did not state that the deep structure-phonetic representation relation \( (\Pi, P) \) is determined by semantics. Hence, the basic theory is not 'semantically based' in the sense in which the standard theory is 'syntactically based', and so the standard theory's proponents' real criticism of the basic theory is yet to come on this crucial point.

---

1 Chomsky (1957: 100).
3 Chomsky (1971: 197).
4 Chomsky's fn. 9 (1971: 197) is omitted here.
2.0.1 Linearity in the Surface Structure.

In 1.0.4 above we discussed briefly Bamgbose's model. Here, we are going to show how inadequate the model is to handle the linear structure for the surface nominal.

If we have, in Bamgbose's Nominal Group, m, n, Q, on the top line, in the expansion of Q we have n, j, l, k, d, t. If these two factors are brought together we shall have m, h, n, j, l, k, d, t, as a single line representation. From this, it is clear that l obligatorily comes between j and k. Now, let us consider the analysis of a nominal using the model.

(9) Egbérin ajá dúdú ó lé kan (800 dog black it increases-by one) '801 black dogs' (where the underlined part constitutes a sentence).

Using Bamgbose's analysis we shall come up with Egbérin as h, ajá as n, dúdú as j and ó lé kan as k (the ranshifted qualifier). So for (9), Bamgbose's grammar will give us the structural description hjq where q is realized as njk i.e. (9) is hnjk. But we know that what we actually have is a numeral, a noun and an adjective. In the structural description there is no mention of the 'numeral' at all. It should be noted that the type of inadequacy now being pointed out actually occurs in Bamgbose's structural analysis (1966: 114). This inadequacy is not peculiar to Bamgbose's grammar alone as we shall shortly see.

1 Bamgbose (1966: xii & 99).
If we use Afolayan's analysis what we shall come up with is $mha$ where $Egharin$ (800) will be $m$, ajá will be the head, $ddj$ will be the adjective, and $6la kan$ will be rankshifted qualifier. This will now give us $mhaik$. However, we get better information by the designation $mhai$ than is provided by the earlier $hnijk$ since it, at least, gives us the information that the head of the NP is ajá 'dog' and not $Egharin$ '800'. However like Bamgbose's analysis, it fails to tell us that there is any numeral in the NP. So, it is quite obvious now that this constituent cannot be adequately handled by the systemic grammar. However, we can reasonably assume that no serious efforts have been made to provide an adequate and generative structural description which indicates the right place that the numeral occupies in the Yoruba nominal group, moreover from our discussions in the preceding paragraph we can come to the conclusion that the linear NP structure of the Systemic Grammarians is difficult to justify if established as the only structural model for the Yorùbá Nominalization. There are more structural types to be examined, but in this section, we shall not go into further details since our main aim here is just to show that we are not using a new method to rework other people's grammars, and that no work, to the best of our knowledge, has actually been done so far on Yorùbá Nominalization in full scale.

2.0.2 Phonology and Syntax.

In terms of the version of transformational generative phonology presented by Chomsky and Halle (1968: pp.6-7), a grammar consists of three main components, namely, the Syntactic, Semantic and Phonological components.
The syntactic component comprises two major sub-components: the base component and the transformational component. The base component, in turn, includes a categorial component, the lexicon, and the lexical insertion rule. The Categorial Component specifies in terms of Grammatical Categories and relations and lexical categories the basic sentence patterns of a language. The lexicon consists of a finite number of lexical items or morphemes. Each lexical item is constituted by three sets of features: Syntactic, Semantic and Phonological features. These features represent the idiosyncratic syntactic, semantic and phonological properties of a language. A set of lexical redundancy rules, specifies the predictable syntactic, semantic and phonological characteristics of the morphemes. The function of the lexical insertion rule is to place the lexical items in the appropriate positions in the basic sentence patterns generated by the Categorial Subcomponent.

The level of structure of sentence that is specified by the base component constitutes its logical structure. A syntactically unambiguous sentence is assigned only one logical structure. A syntactically ambiguous or homonymous sentence is assigned as many distinct logical structures as there are ways in which it is syntactically ambiguous. The logical structure generated by the base component constitutes the input to the semantic component of a grammar. The semantic component assigns to each sentence, via its one or more logical structures, a semantic interpretation.

The major task of the transformational components is to derive the surface structure of each sentence from its logical structure and other underlying structures. The other
structures are the input of the phonological component. This component assigns to each surface structure a phonetic representation. Both the semantic and phonological components operate solely on impulses which they receive from the syntactic component.

In Yoruba it can be said that phonology is often dependent on syntax as argued in the preceding paragraphs, but it will not be right to suggest that syntax completely determines phonology contrary to Chomsky's (1965) suggestions that 'the knowledge of syntactic structure representation helps in phonological descriptions so that phonology is not completely independent of Syntax', one of the distinguishing characteristics of Yoruba sentences is the presence of (phonological) high tone between the subject NP and the following VP. In other words, the knowledge that there are NP's and VP's is relevant to tone assignment in most cases. In many published works this phonomenon is described and used in arguments to prove that Yoruba 'Predicative Adjectives' are verbs (see Delang, 1965). Here, we may prove that what follows the junction could be a VP and not necessarily a verb. However, there are certain exceptions that are difficult to explain. For instance, this phonological high tone does not occur if the first element in the VP is the Neg. formative 'Kọ' 'not' or if it is the future tense formative yîo 'will/shall' although it appears before the perfective aspective formative ti 'have'. The environment of the exception is difficult to state since both yîo and ti could be called auxiliaries and while the exception holds for one it does not hold for the other.
It should be noted that to a very large extent, the distinctions that are normally made in Syntax are also reflected in Yorùbá phonology. We shall use example of the distinction which Bamgbose made between his 'pronominals' and his 'pronouns' for this discussion. Bamgbose called the 'pronominals' - a closed system sub-class of nouns which are pronoun substitutes. In one particular respect, it is quite clear that 'pronominals' and nouns are similar in that monosyllabic verbs ending in low tones change their tones into mid whenever they preceed 'pronominals' and nouns but retain their low tones if they preceed 'pronoun'.

In the examples below, we use object pronouns in (10) object pronominals in (11), and object nouns in (12). We shall mark the mid tone on the verbs since it is what we want to call attention to. The item ná at the end of every sentence means 'also'. It is not to be confused with the homophonous determiner ná 'the'.

(10) (a) Ọ tì mì ná (he push me also) 'He pushes me also'
    (b) Ọ tì ṣ a ná (he push you also)
       'He pushes you also'
    (c) Ọ tì i ná (he push him/her/it also)
       'He pushes him/her/it also'
    (d) Ọ tì wá ná (he push us also)
       'He pushes us also'

(11) (a) Ọ tì ì mì ná (he push I-myself also)
       'He pushes me also'
    (b) Ọ tì i wọ ná (he pushes you also)
    (c) Ọ tì ò un ná 'he pushes him/her/it also'
    (d) Ọ tì àwà ná 'he pushes us also'

(12) (a) Ọ tì Pàdè ná 'he pushes Pàdè also'
    (b) Ọ tì Òlá ná 'he pushes Òlá also'
(c) ū ti Jōkō na 'he pushes Jōkō also'
(d) ū ti Okunrin yen na 'he pushes that man also'.

(12) (a-d) could be either surprise or additional information.

We may note that the low tone on the verb ū is retained when it precedes pronouns in (10), but this low tone is changed to mid elsewhere i.e. before nouns and 'pronominals'. In (12), the first three examples shows that the tone on the following noun can be high, mid or low. The example (12)(d) is intended to show that the following noun need not be a personal name. A determiner yen is inserted between Okunrin and na in (12)(d) in order that na might not be interpreted as the determiner 'The'. This is done to complete the symmetry stated from (10)(a) when all nā's are interpreted as 'also'.

A second observation about the phonological evidence for grouping pronominals with nouns is found in the behaviour of 'conjunctive pronouns' i.e. Bamgboye's 'pronouns' that occur before VP's. Earlier, we stated that there is a high tone junction between subject NP's and the following VP's, but there is an exception in the case of pronominals. Any pronoun that precedes a VP retains its tone. Consider (13) (a-c) which are mid, mid and high respectively.

(13) (a) mo rī qa 'I see you'
     (b) 0 rī mi 'You see me'
     (c) ū rī wa 'he sees us'.

It is likely that the retention of the tone is necessary in the case of pronouns as a disambiguation phenomenon between the second and third person singular pronouns.

1 For further information on tones, see Rowlands, E.C.(1969 : 9-12).
Note that the third person singular pronoun has a high tone in (13) (c) whereas the second person singular pronoun has a mid tone. If the NP tone junction rule is applied to pronouns, then there would be some ambiguity between the second and third person singular pronouns when they function as subjects in syntactic structures.

The third piece of phonological evidence we intend to give here is that all nouns in Yorùbá are polysyllabic. This fact proves that they are not self dominant. All abbreviated forms of nouns are also polysyllabic. Even when personal names are abbreviated, the abbreviated forms are polysyllabic. Thus, there is no abbreviated form of any Yorùbá personal name that is monosyllabic. Here, we find that Bamgboṣe's pronominals too behave like nouns since all of them are polysyllabic. But all pronouns and verbs like some articles are monosyllabic.

There is, in fact, syntactic evidence for grouping pronominals with nouns, and in determining what the ideophone is in the language, this will be discussed at length in Chapter V, below. Here, our main interest is in the significance of syntax for phonology, and it seems that with the pronoun – pronominal examples, the points that are necessary have been made. However, phonology plays a very important role in Yorùbá grammar.

2.0.3 The Framework.

The framework that is used in this work is in the tradition of the basic theory. Apart from the observations on the standard theory in (2.0.0) above, there are reasons to suggest that the basic theory will help us in obtaining a
more satisfactory solution to the problems attacked than
the standard theory. For instance, we wish to propose a
sentential derivation not only for Yorùbá nominals but also
for elements within the nominal rules, like nouns, verbs and
adjectives. One of the advantages of sentential derivation
for forms like the Yorùbá numeral system is that we are able
to provide a common underlying form for different classes of
numerals (e.g. cardinals, ordinals, distributives etc.)
although in most Yorùbá descriptions of the numeral system,
only the cardinal can be produced beyond a certain low limit.
If the rules postulated by those Yorùbá grammarians who cared
to discuss the numeral adequately for generating ordinals
were applied beyond the one hundred and eighty fourth position
(184th), only ungrammatical, unacceptable and uninterpretable
forms would be obtainable e.g. *Ekogósanlémarun for the 185th
position. It is through the type of sentential representation
suggested here that the productive capacity of the Yorùbá
numeral system can be adequately accounted for.

It is certainly the case, that one implication of
sentential derivation for parts of nominals is that syntactic
rules like syntactic transformations would have applied to
the suggested underlying representations of these parts of
nominals in order to derive the single lexical item that is
ultimately inserted in the appropriate parts of the nominal.
For instance, Ẹkerinlépogósan (the 184 position) could be
derived from:

(14) ipò tì ọ jẹ ogósan ọ le ẹrin

(Position which it is 180 it plus 4)
'the 184th position' through some syntactic transformations
like deletion, and it is the derived structure Ẹkerinlépogósan
that is inserted as a lexical item in Pi or logical structure of the standard theory.

The underlying similarity of '184th' and '185th' could be shown in a representation of '185th' that follows the pattern of (9) above e.g.

\[(15) \quad \text{ipò ti ó je ogόsan ó lé arín} \]
(position which it is 180 it plus 5) the 185th position.

The difference between '184th' and 185th will then be a derivational rather than an underlying one since (15), can later develop into Ṣkerinléléogọsan through a series of syntactic transformations like the deletion of ipò ti ó je (position which it is). The sister adjunction of 14 'plus/increase' to the right of Ṣrín 'four' giving Ṣrínlé, the adjunction of ni - (the Trf = Transformational formative) to the left of ogόsan '180' giving ni ogόsan lógọsan and the sister adjunction of the derived Ṣrínlé to the left of lógọsan giving the numeral form Ṣkerinléléogọsan. From this numeral form, the Cardinal forms: Ṣkerinléléogọsan 'the 184th' or Kerinlélọgọsan '184th' could be derived. If instead of ipò 'position' of (14) & (15) we had iye 'amount' we would have now derived Kerinlélọgọsan '184th' which is the Ordinal form. The main point here, is that all Yorùbá Ordinals are similarly represented at a certain stage and are converted into the forms normally inserted at Pi. Thus, without violating the Boolean condition of analyzability, true syntactic transformations like adjunction, sister adjunction and deletion could even apply before Pi, the stage which must precede all Syntactic transformations (or 'Upward-toward-the surface cyclical transformations') in the standard theory.
Since true syntactic transformations like deletion and adjunction would have already applied before we reach Pi, the main condition on Pi, that it precedes all post-lexical i.e. Syntactic transformations, is violated. But if we do not violate this condition (and thereby reject the deep structure as defined in the standard theory), we will be unable to state the similarity between the 184th position and higher positions, i.e. (from 185th to infinity) which are similarly represented in underlying representation as demonstrated in the preceding paragraph. Moreover unless we violate the condition on Pi, and provide sentential transformation for nominalization such as in numerals, we will be unable to prove that Yorùbá can actually generate and conceptualize the 185th position and positions with higher figures, since there is no single formative representing '185th' (the way ἀκρινλόγοςαν represents 184th), which can be inserted at Pi. Consequently the abandonment of the standard theory for the basic theory is absolutely correct while the standard theory is incorrect. In fact, the basic theory itself may be wrong in some of its assumptions. It is still in the formative stages. Nevertheless, since the publication of Lakoff's article on 'Instrumental adverbs', one common and significant style of argument in linguistic research by transformationalists, had been to show that the relationships between some pairs of sentence types could not be correctly stated if only the purely syntactic deep structure of the standard theory were available. The suggestions about the Yorùbá numerals in the preceding paragraphs also follow this general trend. However, whether the basic theory were basically correct or not is irrelevant,

1 Lakoff, G. (1968).
provided it can make for greater generality and simplicity in describing the areas where the standard theory will make the statement of generalization impossible.

2.0.4 Syntactic Transformation Before P₁

It is assumed that the phrase marker P₁ of the Syntactic Structure \( \sum \) = (P₁ ... Pᵢ ... Pₙ) of the standard theory in present-day transformational grammar refers to the 'autonomous' level of syntactic deep structure, and is described as:

(16) Given (P₁ ... Pₙ) in \( K \), there is an \( i \) such that for \( i < i \), the transformation used to form Pₗ + 1 from Pₗ is lexical, and for \( \frac{J}{i} \) the transformation used to form Pₗ + 1 is nonlexical \( b \).

The main implication of (16) is that there is a certain level Pᵢ between P₁ and Pₙ which is the level from which all Syntactic Transformations start to operate. In 2.0.3 above, it was suggested that certain similarities in underlying representations are very easily stable only if we have sentential derivations for some Yorùbá noun phrases, and that true syntactic transformations would have applied in such derivations even before we derive the lexical items that are later inserted at P₁. A sketch of this proposal is given below. It is worked backwards from P₁, the level of syntactic deep structure, in the sense that the phrase markers are numbered Pᵢ-1, Pᵢ-2 etc. The numbering is done this way, because we make no assumption about what the representation at P₁ (the K-initial phrase marker) is, Pᵢ-6 in the representations below would have occurred between P₁ and Pᵢ.

---

Let us assume that in the Yorùbá sentence:

(17) \[\text{Adé wà ni ipò kẹrínléọgojo} \]

'Adé is in the 164th position'.

the item kẹrínléọgojo '164th' occurs as a single lexical item which is an ordinal at the level of syntactic deep structure. Let us further assume that this single lexical item was derived only through lexical and morphological rules, and that it has not yet been operated upon by any syntactic transformational rule. If our assumptions were correct, then the derivational history of kẹrínléọgojo from smaller elements would not violate condition (16) above, and so, it would guarantee the existence of the autonomous level of syntactic deep structure.

However, only one of our assumptions is correct, and the correct one is the first assumption that kẹrínléọgojo occurs as a single lexical item at the level of Pi of the syntactic deep structure. The incorrectness of the second assumption is demonstrated through the following derivations for numerals in underlying representations.

At the level of syntactic deep structure, we can have a simplified representation like (18) for (17).

\[(18)\]
(18) represents a typical tree representation for (17) at Pi after lexical insertion, that is, after all lexical transformations have applied so that there is no complex symbol representation or any Aspects representation on the tree. We shall leave the deep structure representation as it is in (18) and now operate at another stage before Pi.

Suppose at Pi-6, we concentrate only on the NP that was dominated by PP (prepositional phrase) at Pi, i.e. in (18), then at this level we can disregard other parts of (18) except NP = ipo Kerínélégójó under the assumption that there is no change in the syntactic structure of the disregarded part of (18) throughout the derivation from Pi-6 to Pi. Thus, although we apply transformational rules on NP representations from (19) below, the complete structure index on which such transformational rules operate is a sentence like (18).

Hence, at Pi-6, we can expect the lowest NP of (18) (the NP dominated by PP) to be represented as (19).

\[(19) \quad \text{Pi - 6.}\]

literally \((\text{position a (position a is twenties eight it increased by four)})\).
'the 164 position'

We assume for convenience that the final forms of the lexical items used could be represented on the trees as in (19). Note the similarity of (19) to the underlying structure we propose for NP's in general. From (19), through a relativization transformation, we could derive (20), the phrase marker Pi-4 (assuming that the two similarly indexed items in 'position' in (19) are coreferential.

(20) \[ \text{Pi-4} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{ipō, (Det) RM NP VP} \\
\text{f} \quad \text{Pronoun Cop} \\
\text{Numeral} \\
\text{ogún mẹjọ} \quad ọ lé ẹrin}
\end{array}
\]

literally (position which it is 160 it increased by 4) 'the position which is 164'.

Notice that the formulation chosen in (20) for the derivation of the relative clause construction is quite the traditional one, for an alternative formulation see 4.1.6 - 4.1.1 below.

The derivation of Pi-4 from Pi-6 (i.e. (20) from (19)) involves two processes. First, we have the relativization process which involves the adjunction of the Relative Marker (RM) to the left of the second occurrence of in 'position' in (19). Then we have the pronominalization of the second in 'position'.

Both the relativization and pronominalization processes involved in the derivation of Pi-4 from Pi-6 are respectively represented as (21) (a) and (b) below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SD:} & N \text{ DET} & N \text{ DET} & \text{COP} & \text{NP} \\
\text{(a)} & \text{Pi-6} & 1 & 2 & \text{NP} & \text{NP} & \text{NP} & \text{NUM} & \text{VP} & \text{S} & \text{NP} \\
\text{SC:} & \text{Pi-5} & 1 & 2 & \text{RM} & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & \text{NUM} & \text{VP} & \text{S} & \text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

Conditions: \(1 = 3\) and \(2 = 4\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SD:} & N \text{ DET} & \text{RM} \text{ N DET} & \text{COP} & \text{NP} \\
\text{(b)} & \text{Pi-5} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{NUM} & \text{VP} & \text{S} & \text{NP} \\
\text{SC:} & \text{Pi-4} & 1 & 2 & 3 & \text{PRON} & 0 & 6 & 7 & \text{NUM} & \text{VP} & \text{S} & \text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

Conditions (i) \(1 = 4\) and \(2 = 5\)

(ii) (21) (a) has applied.

The output of 21(b) is the tree diagram (20) above which represents the P-Marker Pi-4.

Note that both the relativization rule (21) (a) and the pronominalization rule (21) (b) are true syntactic transformations which should normally occur after Pi, the level of syntactic deep structure, but now we find them operating from Pi-6 to Pi-4 (i.e. before Pi, the level from which true syntactic transformations should start to operate). Note that the boundary symbol ' \(\neq\)' is not used in the derivation from 4 downwards since the NP being considered is no longer the whole of the sentence in (17).

Next, we wish to consider Pi-3 and at this stage we intend to expand the Numeral NP i.e. 6 of the sentence description of (21) (a) above. Since other parts of (21) will remain unchanged in the derivations that follow, we shall now concentrate only on the numeral NP. So, we have reduced
the Sentence Description twice. First, we limited our description to the NP that is dominated by a PP in (18), and now, we intend to limit the description to the Numeral NP that is dominated by VP in the Sentence Description of (21) or in both Pi-4 and Pi-6.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{NP} & \text{PRON} & \text{V} & \text{NP} \\
\text{SD} / \text{NP} & / & / & / \\
\text{Pi-3} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{SC} & \text{Pi-3} & 1 & \emptyset & \emptyset & 4 + 3
\end{array}
\]

Where 2, 3 and 4 of the SD constitute the expansion of (21) (i.e. 6 lé erin) in examples (19) to (21) (a) and where the numeral NP at Pi-3 is the 6 of the SD of rule (21)(a) or the 7 of rule (21) (b). We have omitted one stage in the derivation, that from Pi-4 to Pi-3. That stage is reserved for the derivation of (20 x 3) '160' from Ogun 6 jé ómà méjo (20 it is times 8) '160'. It is the derived Ogun at Pi-3 that will be dominated ultimately by the NP represented by 1 in the Sentence Description of (22).

The transformational operation in (22) is the conversion of Pi-3 to Pi-2 through the sister adjunction of the verb lé 'exceed/increase by' to the right of erin the the 4 of the Sentence Description. After the operation of (22), we now have a tree like:

\[
(23)
\]

and this becomes the SD at the next stage in derivation where Pi-2 is transformed to Pi-1. The next major operation is the
permutation of the remaining element in (23), by a prepositional element ni that occurs between ṭrinlé and ogọjo after their permutation. Suppose the adjunction of ni to the left of ogọjo takes place during the mapping of Pi-2 onto Pi-1, and the permutation of ni ogọjo and ṭrinlé takes place during the transition in derivation from Pi-1 to Pi. Then at Pi, we can take ṭrinléogọjo which later becomes ṭrinléogọjo after the operation of the necessary phonological adjustment rules outside the Syntactic component (i.e. after Pn). We shall however, use the final form ṭrinléogọjo in our discussions here. But this does not imply that phonological rules can apply within the syntactic component. The form, ṭrinléogọjo '164', will be the general numeral form, and from it, the ordinal forms kerinléogọjo '164th' and ikerinléogọjo 'the 164th and the cardinal form mɛrín l6 l6 g6 j6o '164' could be derived morphologically as suggested in 2.1.2 below. What one finds is that true syntactic transformations have to apply between Pi-6 and Pi, and unless some syntactic transformations could also be called lexical transformations, this derivation will have grave consequences for condition (1) p.32 above which draws a strict line between lexical transformations needed before Pi, and non-lexical transformations from Pi to Pn.

---

1 Abraham 1958: ṭi0 treated this prepositional element ni as the ni which occurs after some verbs like kuru "leave". With verbs like l6 in ṭrin léogọjo (160 + l) '164' or din, 'less' in ṭrin din l6 g6 jo (160-4) '156'. It appears the formative ni is a construction from ni, ñor, l6ri 'on top of', l6 and ni, ni, ni (in stomach of) inside of for din. Hence, an alternative way of expressing ṭrinléogọjo '164', and ṭrinléogọjo '156' is to use ṭrin 6 l6 and i ori ogọjo 'four extra on top of 160' for former and ṭrin 6 din ogọjo 'four less from within 160' for the latter.
However, in an effort to save the concept of syntactic deep structure and guarantee the autonomy of Pi, one can propose an alternative derivation. For instance, assuming that a prepositional element had to be introduced between ḫrinlé and ṣugājo after their permutation, one may propose underlying structures for ḫrinléḥagājo which will put ḫrin before ṣugājo and give underlying representation to the prepositional element. In fact, this is a possible way out of the problem.

Thus, we can have the following representation as a replacement for the numeral NP at Pi-3 i.e. (22) above.

(24) ḫrin ṣ le 16rj ṣugājo
    (four it increases on-top of 160) = 14 + 160 = '164'

A counterpart of (24) for the representation of numerals subtracted from groups of tens between 20 and 180 will be:

(25) ḫrin ṣ din ṭinā ṣugājo
    (four it decreases from within (160) = four from 160 = '156'

A tree for (24) will look like this:

```
  S
   /\  \\
  NP NP
   |   |
 ḫrin | NP
      |
   (four) (from)
   /\  \\
 (it) 16
      |
   (increase)
      |
    0
      /
    Prep
     /\
    NP NP
    |   |
   nf orj
    (on) (top or head) ṣugājo
      (160)
```

i.e. (four, it increases on top of 160) = '14 + 160' or '164'.
from (25), we may allow the deletion of ə 'it' and oni 'head' to take place before Pi, and after the operation of all necessary phonological adjustment rules in the phonological component, we have 'Erinlêjjo'. We shall modify the labelling Pi-3 of (22) above to Pi-1 since a smaller number of P-marker mapping is required for the derivation. This means that corresponding adjustments of earlier P's will be necessary so that the Pi-6 of the earlier derivation is the Pi-4 of the present one. Different stages of this derivation may then have the lexical representations in (26).

(26) (a) Ərin ə lé ni oni ogôjo at Pi-2
(b) Ərin lê ni oni ogôjo at Pi-1 and
(c) Ərin lê ni ogôjo at Pi which becomes
(d) Ərin lê logôjo after Pn in the phonological component

Note now that deletion is the only syntactic rule employed. In order to guarantee the autonomy of Pi, all we have to do now is to suggest that deletion is also a lexical rule. This suggestion is necessary since we actually have deletion operations in (26) (b) and (c) rather than the phonological rule of assimilation which is excluded from syntax. For instance, assuming that the pronoun ə were assimilated into Ərin in (26) (a) it will change the tone on Ərin to Ərin as indicated in the representation (26) (b). This is the only possible surface form of (26) (b) since Ərin with the mid tone on the second syllable will sound odd there. But if what we have in (26) (b) had been real assimilation, then, this modified tone pattern on Ərin will be retained on the final form Ərinlêjjo. On the other hand, there are two low tones on the Ərin of Ərinlêjjo, and this shows that the pronoun ə
was not really assimilated and that the operation in (26) is syntactic and not phonological.

The deletion of Orl 'head' at Pi-1 however, can hardly be disputed since it has had no phonological effect on the surrounding items at Pi the next stage, which is the level of syntactic deep structure. Thus, it appears that some radical changes about the concept of lexical and syntactic transformational rules (e.g. the labelling of 'deletion' as both a syntactic and a lexical transformational rule) may have to be done in order to guarantee the autonomy of Pi, the level of syntactic deep structure.

Note, however, that the above discussion is based on what happens to the Numeral NP from Pi-2 to Pi, and nothing was said about the levels Pi-4 and Pi-2 to corresponding respectively to the former Pi-6 and Pi-4) where a relativization transformation was used to map Pi-4 onto Pi-2. It is now certain that relativization is recognized as a lexical transformation so that whatever happens at this level is a further support to the maintenance of the level of syntactic logical structure.

The only way out of the dilemma posed by the Pi-6 of the first proposal (or Pi-4 for the second) for the proponents of an autonomous Pi level is to repudiate it and suggest that there is no such phrase-marker as Pi-6 and no such transformational derivation as example (21) above. But the purpose of Pi-6 and Pi-4 is to show the similarities in the underlying representations of subclasses of the numeral like ordinals, cardinals and distributives. These subclasses of numerals are different to the extent that they use different
to the extent that they use different 'Classifiers' in the place of the ordinal classifier - *inb* 'position' in Pi-6 and that they are similar in that all other parts of their underlying representations are identical for instance, the only difference between the ordinal *ëkëri\'ìgëgëgë* 'the 164th' and the cardinal *ëkëri\'ìgëgë* '164' is that the former uses the classifier *inb* in the tree representations (19) and (20) above whereas the latter will use the classifier *ive* 'amount' in the same place in (19) and (20). A disregard for Pi-6 and Pi-4 of the first proposal in order to guarantee the autonomy of Pi implies that generalities and similarities concerning subclasses of elements in the Yorùbá nominalization will be unstatable.

So, one finds that the alternative derivation suggested in order to guarantee the autonomy of Pi and safeguard condition (1) above still fails to exclude the operation of true syntactic transformation before Pi. There are reasons to reject the alternative derivations e.g. the dissimilarity in underlying representations between low numerals (i.e., those below two hundred) and the higher numerals (those above 200) which (25) and (26) above imply, or even the treatment of deletion as a lexical transformation, but it seems there is no need to discuss the inadequacies of this alternative solution since it does not solve the problems of an autonomous Pi level.

2.1.0 **THE STRUCTURAL SKETCH OF YORÙBÁ.**

As the transformational generative framework is used, the terms we use e.g. S for sentence, N for noun, NP for Noun Phrase; Conj, for Conjunction etc. should be understood within the theory of the grammar we use. Some brief
comments on the grammatical model used here and a glossary of the syntactic terminology employed appear later in the work.

Bambose (1966) suggested two requirements for any good grammar. First, 'a proper description must be based on a linguistic theory', and secondly, categories cannot be assumed. They must be defined by reference to structures. The present work satisfies the first requirement since it is based on the transformational generative theory of linguistic description. Before it can satisfy the second requirement, we should examine how Bambose's grammar met the requirement and then follow his example.

Bambose described the sentence as 'the highest grammatical unit in Yoruba' and added that 'it can only be structurally defined in terms of structure'. Since Bambose used Halliday's Scale and Category Theory of Grammar, in which unit is a technical term, it seems any direct reference to the theory underlying a descriptive grammar could help in the task of Category definition. We shall take note of this technique when we define the categories used. Another technique of category definition from Bambose suggests that certain categories are determined only by surface structure sequence, for instance he suggests the structure, 'n, j, l, k, d, t', for 'qualifiers' of the 'head' noun where the six symbols represent nominal, adjective, numeral, rank shifted, deictic, and post deictic qualifiers respectively. Thus

1 Bambose (1966: 5).
2 It appears he found the definition of categories used so significant that he had to emphasize the principle 'that a bad definition is better than no definition', (p.5).
Bamgbose had six 'sequence determined secondary elements of structure',\(^1\) in the 'nominal group'.\(^2\) Having listed the surface structure sequence of the six secondary elements of structure, he was able to give definitions like this: 'the class of words operation at \(\textit{a}\) is deictic' and 'the class of words operation at \(\textit{i}\) is adjective'.\(^3\) This second technic of definition fails to satisfy what Chomsky described as the condition of 'descriptive adequacy'\(^4\) since no reason or explanation is given to show why the numerals are not adjectives or vice versa. It appears that Bamgbose's 'numerals' are indistinguishable from his 'adjectives'. He has several examples where he analyses what he calls 'numerals' as 'adjectives' although the two classes (i.e. numeral and adjective) are 'Sequence determined'. In effect, this second technique of definition is inadequate, and it seems the only justification for it is the statement quoted earlier: 'A bad definition is better than no definition'. Our definition here will generally refer to the theoretical framework we are using unless we use terms in peculiar ways, then we shall give our own definitions of the terms we use.

The sentence is what is ultimately dominated by a \(S\) node in the tree structure of a phrase structure grammar (where \(\textit{node, } S, \textit{tree, dominated, and phrase structure have their conventional interpretations in transformational grammar}). Bamgbose divided the Sentence into (i) 'the single sentence structure',\(^5\) (ii) the complete sentence structure,\(^6\) and (iii)  

---

the compound sentence structure; Bamgbose's grammar will be, in transformational grammar, one in which no other sentence is embedded.

Examples:-

(27) Ṫọmọkùnrin yeń yòọ ọ̀ṣi ọ̀lẹ̀ wa
(boy that will go to our house) 'That boy will go to our house'.

This proves, beyond reasonably doubt, that 'single sentence structure' is an 'S' which contains no internal occurrence of another 'S' node. The internal structure of an 'S' is usually NP, VP, where VP (i.e. Verb Phrase) may be rewritten as V, NP or V alone, or V, NP, PP etc. This contrasts with Bamgbose's analysis where the NP object of the NP dominated by the VP is absent. Afolayan (1968) has correctly pointed out that Bamgbose's SFA analysis is not adequate for the Yorùbá Language since Yorùbá actually has surface structure objects.

A complex sentence is one in which some sentences are dominated by non-sentential elements like ADV (adverb), NP (noun phrase) etc.

Example:-

(28) 

( at time which we happen go finish, boy that will go to our house). 'When we are gone, that boy will go to our house'.
A compound sentence structure is one in which one S node dominates directly more than one S node (and the dominated S nodes are linked by linking elements known as conjunctions). The parentheses is unnecessary since the direct dominance of more than one S by an S often involves the occurrence of at least one linking element in underlying representation, e.g. S → and S. Moreover, as one can see later, in this work, not all these linking elements will be represented in surface structure representations: e.g.

(29) Òkùnrin yẹn yio lọ sì ọjà ṣun yio sì ra ọbẹ kan nifẹ

(man that will go to market he will conj. buy knife one there)

'That man will go to the market and he will buy a knife there'.

(30) Òkùnrin yẹn yio lọ sì ojú ogun ọgbọn kò nì padà

(man that will go to the face war, but not have to return)

'That man will go to the battlefield but he will never come back alive'.

(31) S → S  Conj  S

But a complex sentence is derived through rules like in (21) and (22) above.

(32) S → ADV  S

(33) ADV → S

Note that when S is directly dominated by ADV as in (33), it is often preceded by an adverbial formative like ní ọgbà tí (at time which, when) ní ibi tí (at place which) where, tí or bi 'if' bi ó titi jẹ pé (If it even is that 'although' etc. .... If S is dominated directly by NP, it could be preceded by elements like pé 'that' etc. (See Chapter V below).
There are more involved structures where compound sentences occur within complex sentences or vice versa. Since examples of such involved structures will be used later when we examine the relative and other structures, we shall just give two examples now.

(34) Ọkùnrin yen lọ ọfoko wa lana, ọgbọn kọ ọgbìn āgbádo tì a fun un.
(Man that go to farm our yesterday, but not plant maize which we give him).
'That man went to our farm yesterday, but he did not plant the maize which we gave him'.

We can represent (34) by the tree diagram (35).

(35)

Where items with the same index are coreferential e.g. the three instances of Ọkùnrin yen l and the two āgbádo j in (35).
In (35) the conjoined sentences occur immediately below the topmost $S$ while the embedded sentence occurs towards the end of the tree diagram.

However, it is possible for conjoined sentences to occur within a complex sentence i.e. not immediately dominated by the $S$ node which is the topmost element in FS trees.

Example:

(Equation)  ilé yín ni mo ti rf ṣkhrin tf ọ ọ sọ oko wa, tf kó gbín âgbádo wa, tf kó bá wa ká kókó wa, ṣugbón ti ô fi ilá wa fun âgbórin jẹ,¹ (house your is I have see man which he go to farm our, which not plant maize our, which not for us pluck cocoa our, but which he give okro our give deer eat)².

'It is in your house that I saw the man who went to our farm, who did not plant our maize, and did not help us to pluck our cocoa, but who used our okro to feed some deer.'

In (36) there are four conjoined sentences, each 'modifying' or saying something about ṣkhrin 'man' an element of a higher sentence in tree structure.

Structure like (36) cannot be described by Bamgbose's grammar since he defined a 'complex sentence' as one which consists of an $\mathcal{C}$ preceded by one or more $\mathcal{S}$ 'S' where $\mathcal{C}$ is defined as 'the free clause element' i.e. (one $S$ not dominated by categories like ADV, NP etc.) While a $\mathcal{S}$ is

¹ In (36) we indicated the $\mathcal{C}$ Clause of Bamgbose (1966: 28), by a single under score and we use a double underscore to mark the first part of the $\mathcal{C}$ Clause. Actually, the rest of the sentence is a part of the $\mathcal{C}$ Clause, since the four relativized sentences that follow the underlined parts of (36) modify ṣkhrin 'man' (and could be treated as 'rank-shifted clauses' in Bamgbose's framework).

² This item 'tọ ... fun' is discontinuous. It is Synonymous with fun 'to give' hence we literally gloss it as (give ... give).
defined as 'the dependent clause element (i.e. one S structure that is dominated by non-sentential elements like ADV etc.). Since his dependent clause element must precede his free clause element, his grammar can only account for $\mathcal{G}$ $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{G}$ $\mathcal{H}$ $\mathcal{E}$ structures and not $\mathcal{E}$ $\mathcal{G}$. Hence, his grammar can produce:

(37) nken $\mathcal{e}$ so yen $\mathcal{e}$t$\mathcal{e}$ ni.¹

truth is thing that you say

'What you say is true or what you say is the truth'.

Note that the 'dependent clause element' (i.e. nken $\mathcal{e}$ so yen) in (37) contains a noun nken 'thing' a relative clause marker $\mathcal{t}$ which' which becomes $\mathcal{e}$ through a vowel assimilation and a sentence, the underlying form of which will look like $\mathcal{e}$ so nken yen (you say thing that) 'you said that thing'. It is a perfect example of a S dominated by NP in tree structure, and at some stage during its derivational history, it is likely to have a rule like:

(38) NP $\rightarrow$ N RM S (where RM is a relative marker).

2.1.1 Some General Sentence Types.

The Yoruba sentence types are worth mentioning at this stage. They are the 'declarative', 'the interrogative' and 'the imperative'. These three types which are recognized in transformational grammar are correct for Yoruba. Since we do not use any of those terms (e.g. 'declarative') in any sense that is different from its conventional usage and interpretation, it will be superfluous to hunt for language specific

¹ Bamgbose (1966: 28). His transcription is retained.
definitions of such terms. They actually belong to the theory within which we work.

All the sentences we have provided so far are examples of declarative sentences. For the interrogative sentence, some question words are used in the surface sentences e.g. ńjọ and ọgẹ initially in sentence structure with bì and ndan finally. The question word will be represented as QW (Question word) in the literal translation of examples here e.g.

(39) ńjọ ọkùnrin yen ọ̀ sì oko wa lána?
(40) ọgẹ ọkùnrin yen ọ̀ sì oko wa lána?
Both (39) and (40) are (QW man that go to farm our yesterday)
'Did that man go to our farm yesterday?'

(41) ọkùnrin yen ọ̀ sì oko wa lána bì?
(42) ọkùnrin yen ọ̀ sì oko wa lána ndan?
Both (41) and (42) are (man that go to farm our yesterday QW)
'Did that man go to our farm yesterday?'

The interrogative can also be realized through a tag¹ e.g.

(43) ọkùnrin yen ọ̀ sì oko wa lána, t'àbí kàbọ lọ?
(Man that go to farm our yesterday, or not go)
'that man went to our farm yesterday, didn't he?'

A sentence of declarative structure generally functions in utterance as a statement. But when declarative sentences occur on high registers, they usually function as questions. However, both statements and questions are found on high or low registers in Yorùbá so that the surface structure realiza-

¹ In English, a question tag does not necessarily require an answer, invariably it requires a sort of reaction from the listener, but in Yorùbá it requires an answer.
tion of underlying sentences having the declarative structure could ambiguously represent statements and questions when taken out of contexts, Bamgbose observed:

'It is observed in the text, however, that both statements and questions occur on normal as well as high registers. It is difficult to say accurately whether an affirmative clause is a statement of a question if it is heard in isolation.'

It seems that ambiguity between statement and questions is a surface structure phenomenon since surface structure questions and surface structure statements would normally have different underlying representations. If we adopt Ross's suggestion 'that every deep structure contains one and only one performative sentence as its highest clause', we can use the differences between the underlying performatives for statements and questions to handle such surface ambiguities.

The Imperative Structures like:

(44) Dide 'Stand up'
(45) Fún mì nì owó yên (give me (Trf) money that)
give me that money.
The imperative is a prohibition when it occurs in the negative e.g. in:
(46) Lá fún mì nì owó yên (don't give me Trf money that)
'do not give me that money'.

2.1.2 Derivational Morphology in Syntax

Chomsky concluded the Aspects with an ironical verb phrase 'remains an open question'. This sums up many of the

1 Bamgbose (1966: 54).
2 Ross (1970: 261).
crucial syntactic discussions in the book. Where Chomsky has not explicitly kept some questions open, it is easy to find certain locutions that can be interpreted as ways of keeping the questions open: and where such locutions cannot be found, post Aspects generative literature has reopened several topics from Aspects. Without reopening any of the open questions already mentioned in the preceding chapter e.g. autonomous level of the syntactic deep structure, and while ignoring other equally significant problems e.g. the centrality of syntax, the problem of selectional restrictions and the syntactic relevance of case categories, and finally the filtering power of transformations, we shall reopen the question of derivational morphology with special reference to Yorùbá nominalization, and suggest that more than one duplication is inevitable in Yorùbá syntactic structure if the controversial requirement that lexical insertion takes place in block makes us list certain classes of derived nominals in the lexicon.

The listing of derived nominals in the lexicon is symptomatic of restrictive conditions on rules which were stated in Aspects as:

(47) (a) "Once a subcategorization rule has applied to a certain category symbol \( \rightarrow \) no branching rule can apply to any of the symbols that are derived from \( \rightarrow \)."  \(^1\)

The restrictive condition represented as (47) (a) also occurs as:

(b) "Once a subcategorization rule has applied

\(^1\) Chomsky (1965: 112).
to form a complex symbol \[\sum_\cdot\] , no branching
rule can later apply to \[\sum^-\] ¹.

The implication of condition (47) (a), is that
derivational morphology is prohibited in syntax. Since
branching rules² will be needed for deriving 'horrid' and
'horrify' from horror etc. such derivations must not take
place because complex symbols like (+ N), (+ Common), and
(- Count) must have been derived from the category symbol N
through subcategorization rules before getting the root
'horror', and once the first subcategorization rules have
applied, no branching rule can apply. Hence all derived
lexical items must be listed in the lexicon. The main
reason for listing them is that they are quasi-productive and
besides, they will complicate the transformational subcomponent
of the grammar. At this stage, we may say that a branching
rule with a categorial symbol like NP, V, N, VP, etc. occurs
on the right hand side of the rewriting arrow \[\rightarrow\] e.g.
S \[\rightarrow\] NP, VP. Note that one type of branching rule excluded
by condition(1) is; Personal Name \[\rightarrow\] S or Personal Name
NP. Since the personal name will be specified as the feature
complex (or complex symbol \[\sum^-\] N - Common - Count + Human).

¹ Chomsky(1965: 113). The earlier form of this condition will
be the preferred one here for notational reasons. Since we
have already used the symbol \[\sum^-\] for the syntactic structures
(Pi ... Pn) of transformational grammar we should refrain
from using the same symbol for 'Complex' 'Symbols'. Since
(47) (a) and (b) are different ways of stating the same
condition, this notational preference creates no differences
in empirical consequences.

² See Chomsky (1965: 112) for branch rules which are
rewritten rules of the categorial subcomponent in grammar.
No branching rule can develop S or NP from such features by condition (1). A subcategorization rule on the other hand has complex symbols or sets of specified syntactic features on the right of the rewriting symbol (which is still an arrow in Aspects). Hence a subcategorization rule "forms or extends a complex symbol".¹

The position represented by condition (1) was however recognised as being too severe: "This restriction may be a bit too severe, and we must apparently weaken it slightly" (Chomsky 1965: 112). This weakening took place later when the restriction was stated to 'hold only above the level of the word' (p. 189). However, this weakening of Condition (47), was reserved by the establishment of the lexicalist hypothesis. The lexicalist hypothesis which was stated earlier will be repeated here for convenience as Condition (48). It implies that 'derived nominals' as opposed to 'gerundive nominals' must be entered in the lexicon.

¹ See Chomsky (1965: 112) for the definition of branching and subcategorization rules. The problems of the use of the rules to derive related items like horror horrid horrific terror (*terrified) terrify: Condon candid (*Candify): or telegram phonography gramophone, etc" are discussed in Chomsky 1965: 186–9. It seems the syntactic and semantic idiosyncracies of the English derived nominals which were discussed by Chomsky and by Stockwell et al could make the lexicalists proposal admissible for English. The problems of semantic idiosyncracies actually exist for a few Yoruba derived nominal groups, e.g. fáiyáwọ = fi-áiyá-ọ (take chest crawl) 'smuggling' where the semantic content of the derived fáiyáwọ is not a summation of the derivation, but on the question of productivity. The derived nominal groups discussed are unlike those in English.

In this work we are not actually disproving the lexicalist hypothesis generally but suggesting that there is no reason to draw sharp distinction which Chomsky and the lexicalists did for gerundive and derived nominals, (see Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1970: 187).
(48) We might extend the base rule to accommodate the derived nominal directly (I will refer to this as the "lexicalist position"), thus simplifying the transformational component: or, alternatively, we might simplify the base structures, excluding these forms, and derive them by some extension or the transformational apparatus' (the "Transformationalist position").

The main suggestion in Chomsky's lexicalist paper was that a lexicalist framework (involving a list in the lexicon) could be proposed for 'derived' nominal groups while the transformationalist position could be adopted for gerundive nominals, since there exist three principal differences between gerundive nominals and derived nominals which justify the solution. The first basic difference concerns the matter of productivity where "the transformation that gives gerundive nominals applies quite freely ... but there are ... many restrictions on the formation of derived nominals." On the productivity questions, the Yoruba examples to be examined here fail to justify Chomsky's separate treatment for gerundive nominals and non gerundive nominals. The second main difference deals with the 'idiosyncratic character of the relation between gerundive and derived nominals and the associated Verb', and the third principal difference between gerundive and derived nominals is that "Only the latter have the internal structure of noun phrases, through their occurrence

1 In the last paragraphs of the lexicalist paper (Chomsky 1970: 214-5), the discussion was extended to nominals of a third group with some peculiar properties e.g. 'The growing of tomatoes' which Chomsky labelled 'The "Mixed" form', p.215. The lexicalist solution was half heartedly proposed for the mixed forms. Later in this work, the term derived nominal group will be used to include gerundive nominals also.

with the full range of determiners, their ability to pluralize, their inability to contain aspect" etc. However, in Yorùbá language, as we shall soon see, there is no special class of gerundive nominal derivational processes, they are not always clearly distinguishable from the derivations of other forms of derived nominals e.g. the ìì + VP or (ìì + V) nominalization which derives both negative factive nominals and negative abstract nouns as in:

\[(49) \quad (a) \quad \text{AìIsn} \quad \text{fact of 'not sleeping' or 'wake keeping'} \quad \text{from sun to sleep}.\]

\[(b) \quad \text{AìbhSn} \quad \text{fact of 'not being able to sleep'} \quad \text{or sleeplessness} \quad \text{from le sun 'can sleep'} \quad \text{and}\]

\[(c) \quad \text{AìgbOrSn} \quad \text{fact of not obeying 'disobedience'} \quad \text{from gbOrSn 'to obey.}\]

Thus, the anti-lexicalist suggestions we make for Yorùbá derived nominals (where derived nominals include gerundive nominals) are based on very productive syntactic derivational processes. And besides, it has even been observed by linguists that similar productive derivational processes could be found in several West African languages and in a number of American Indian languages, that the majority of nouns appear to be derived from verbs by means of productive syntactic processes.

In all, we examine seven sources of nominalization viz: infinitival, Gerundive, Factive, Non-Factive, Personal and Place names, Ideophones, and Nominal compounding. Note that each of these has its own subgroups, that is, Infinitival, for example, has Purpose Nominalization, Non-Purpose Nominalization etc. (See Table of Contents above).
In this study the following assumptions are made
(a) That the English examples used by Chomsky for the
discussion of derivational morphology at word level in the
Aspects and for the 'derived nominals' of the lexicalist
paper are quasi-productive and so could have justified the
imposition of condition(1) (p.34 above). But then the Yorùbá
examples that will be discussed here, like Chomsky's gerundive
nominals in the lexicalist paper are very productive, and are
covered by generalizations used elsewhere in Yorùbá grammar
for the nominalization of sentences. (b) That although it
is sometimes possible to choose between complicating the
base or complicating the transformational subcomponent while
working with Chomsky's English examples in the lexicalists
paper; in the Yorùbá examples here it is only possible to
choose between complicating the base or not complicating it,
and neither choice reduces the burden on the transformational
sub-component.

Note that the pure syntactic rules like deletion
and adjunction will be needed even for the derivation of
derived nominals though this is not mentioned as one of our
assumptions now since the fact provided independent evidence
against the use of lexicalist framework for Yorùbá nominaliza-
tion derivational morphology. It seems we shall ultimately
arrive at the conclusion that there is no possibility of a
solution within the standard theory framework (lexicalist)
that could be used to prevent the duplication of purely
syntactic transformations in the lexicon (i.e. between PI and
Fl) and in the transformational subcomponent of the syntactic
component (i.e. between PI and Pn for Yorùbá nominalization
derivational morphology). The arguments that will lead to this
conclusion will be advanced in Chapter VII.
CHAPTER III

3.0.0 INFINITIVAL NOMINALIZATION.

The infinitives are taken to be the secondary consequence of several distinct processes, which have the effect of leaving the subject of the embedded sentence dangling. Infinitives occur regularly when the subject of an embedded sentence is removed by a transformation or when it is raised into the superordinate clause, and the VP is simultaneously daughter-adjointed to the right of the VP of the higher sentence.

The subject of the contained sentence can be deleted under identity with a noun phrase in the containing sentence, that is, Equi-NP Deletion rule.

Rule 2. Equi-NP Deletion.

SD: \( X - NP - V - NP - V - Y \)

\[ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \]

SC: \( X - 1 - 2 + \emptyset^R_1 - 4 - Y \)

Conditions 1. \( X - Y \) variables

2. \( 3 \) is erased and the relic is sister-adjointed to \( 2 \).

Consider (1). Mo

\( f_9 \quad g \quad l_9 \)

(I want \( g \) - go

'I want to go'

the logical structure of which is represented as (2).

\[ ^1 \text{Where R represents the relic of the deleted NP.} \]
Notice that the subject of S1, that is, the embedded sentence, is deleted under identity with the subject of So, the matrix sentence. Then the S1 gets pruned, and the VP becomes an infinitive which is sister-adjointed to the right of the VP of the higher S as witnessed by (3) below:

(3)

The second way, as mentioned above, is by raising the subject of the embedded sentence, and at the same time the VP is daughter-adjointed to the right of the VP of the higher sentence.

Rule 3. Subject Raising

Raise the subject of the contained sentence to make it the object of the containing sentence. Then change the subjective
to objective pronominal.

Consider:

(4)  
    Add fà mi lọ
     (Add pull me go)
'Add made me go'

in which the subject of lọ is raised to become the object of
the verb of the containing sentence. Sentence (4) is represen-
ted in the logical structure as (5).

(5)  

The verbs which trigger the infinitive formation
as in (3) in the language are listed, among others, in Ward
(1952: 116) as 'verbal combinations where a long vowel occurs
when certain verbs are immediately followed by another verb ...
in every case the lengthening is on the high tone, and would
therefore correspond to the reduplicated form which is the
noun'. Bamgboye (1966: 76-7) attributes the occurrence of
the phenomenon to 'the high tone nature of assimilation of
the original verbal prefix i. Rowlands (1969: 67) takes more
or less the view already expressed by Ward, that is, 'the
extra length given to the vowel in these cases is best
regarded as really a prefix of an infinitive form'.
Bamgbose (1971: 77) apparently takes the syllable to be a prefix, he concludes 'the non-occurrence of high tone junction after the verbs can simply be explained by the fact that such verbs cannot occur before the infinitive, the assimilation of the prefix admits no exception'. Awobuluyi (1967: 139) proposes the following frame for the A-verbs (we shall present the classification later in this section).

"marked \( \text{NML (ti) NC} \) in the lexicon".

There are a number of reasons to doubt, at a very high level of abstraction the appropriateness of the conclusions of the aforementioned scholars - at varying degrees.

Notice that all (the scholars) but one, base their conclusions on phonological evidence alone, and this of course is a surface level property. As far as that goes they are correct.

Professor Awobuluyi, who presents his argument on a syntactic basis has to formulate five rules for reducing conjoined sentences into complement structures, our conclusion is that only one rule is required as we shall soon demonstrate. Professor Bamgbose on the other hand makes us believe that 'verbs take prefixes to become verbs', which is contrary to the normal theory of Yorùbá word formation, because prefixation leads naturally to nominalization in the majority of, if not in all, cases.

There are two types of infinitives in the Yorùbá language, first, there are those with overt marker \( \text{låti} \) (\( \text{nl/li + åti} \)) or åti? (\( \text{å + ti} \)) and the second, those
with high tone lengthened vowel preceding them. It is quite obvious that ḷtì is a compound whether ṭtì is a compound consisting of (à + ti) is not clear. However, it is observed that the extra vowel and ḷtì 'to' are mutually exclusive as they occur in the same position in the surface structure configuration in the language.

We present the table of the verbs which trigger the infinitives according to the authors mentioned above (for Abraham's extra see below the table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bọ̀rẹ̀ (sil) to start \begin{align*} \text{begin to} \ \text{begin to} \end{align*}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tò 'to be enough'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣe 'to be possible'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fẹ́ 'to want'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ní 'to have'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mọ́ 'to know'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṁọn 'to be sweet'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yé 'to stop'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọ̀ró 'to be difficult'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wà 'to please'</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọ̀iwọ́ 'to stop'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kọ́ 'to learn'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ká 'a verb in greeting'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sù 'to tire'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pọ́ 'to be late'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yá 'to be quick'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gọ́ 'to tire'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wà 'to come'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lọ́ 'to go'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dárá 'to be good'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See Chapter IV on conjunction / cf. Awobuluyi (Forthcoming) and Rowlands (1969). //
Abraham has on his list the following: ɓɓ and ɗɗ:

ɓɓ 'of emerging',
as in:

(a) ɓɓ 'to predicate of emergence'

He's beginning to make his way in the world'.

(b) ɗɗ 'to strive'

We struggled to buy oil'.

The following are the list of verbs with which lāti cooccurs, alternating with the high tone syllable:

(7) **Group A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ɓɓ 'to be late'</td>
<td>to want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yá 'to be quick'</td>
<td>bɛɛ (si) 'to begin (to)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tó 'to be ready/after'</td>
<td>ɗɛɛnt 'to refrain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʋɛ 'to be possible'</td>
<td>nf 'to have'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dɔm 'to be easy/sweet'</td>
<td>ʃìwɔ 'to stop'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɡɔro 'to be difficult'</td>
<td>ɡɔ 'to sneak out'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sù NP 'to bug NP'</td>
<td>kɔ 'to learn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wù NP 'to appeal to NP'</td>
<td>wà 'to come'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɡè NP 'to be clear to NP'</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rɔrùn 'to be easy'</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɡɔ 'to be stupid'</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the verbs that are claimed to induce a high tone syllable between them and the following infinitives. Notice that some of them are compounds and also that A-verbs correspond to the intransitive subject – embedding verbs in the language. Many, though not all of them take inanimate deep subjects and always cooccur with the inanimate pronoun á 'it'. Most of the verbs are factive and emotive (see Chapter V below).

The group B verbs invariably have animate deep structure subjects, as opposed to the group A verbs, they are
transitive object embedding verbs. They do not cooccur with
the inanimate pronoun 0 'it'. They are mostly non-factive
and non-emotive verbs (see Chapter V).

Notice that they are all Equi-NP-Deletion verbs
which almost at all times allow object-to-object raising or
embedded object deletion under identity. In the diagrams
that follow we leave out details about the matrix sentence
and concentrate on the embedded sentence because it is the
source of the infinitive. Consider:

(8) Fünkɛ ɛkɔ ɔbɛ ɛ se
(Fünkɛ learn stew cook)
'Fünkɛ learns how to cook stew'.

It should be noted that 0bɛ 'stew' originates from the object
position of the contained sentence as witnessed by the logical
structure represented as (9).

(9)

Then Equi-NP-Deletion will delete the second occur-
rence of Fünkɛ while object-raising will move the object of
the contained sentence, that is, ɔbɛ 'stew' to the right of
the containing sentence. Consider:

(10) *Fünkɛ ɛkɔ ɔbɛ ɛ se
Fünkɛ learn stew -ing cook.
To convert (10) into (11)

\[(11) \; *\; \text{F\u0142nk\u00e9 k\u00f4 òb\u0160 s\u00e2} \; \text{(F\u0142nk\u00e9 learn stew cook)}\]

the progressive marker would have to be deleted by the progressive marker deletion rule, that is:

**Rule 4: Progressive Marker Deletion**

- **SD:** \( X - 1 - 2 - 3 - \emptyset - Y \)
- **SC:** \( X - 1 - 2 - 3 - \emptyset - Y \)

Condition = \( X - Y \) variables

It should be noted that the vacuum created by the deletion of the progressive marker cannot be left unoccupied without making the sentence ungrammatical, hence (11) above. It is the relic of this marker that induces the presence in the surface structure of the high tone syllable, which the earlier analyses could not account for.

As observed earlier in this section, 'låtì/åti' 'to' is conceived of as inserted element in the surface structure, which is obligatorily introduced to replace the progressive marker in the deep structures of complement sentences, just as the case of the high tone syllable discussed in the preceding paragraphs. It is introduced either after Equi-NP-Deletion rule or Raising has applied. It should be noted that in cases where 'låtì/åti' does not replace the progressive element, the progressive marker occurs in the surface structure configuration of the infinitives. Notice that the high tone is the assimilated relic of the progressive marker, which is always present in the deep structure of the contained sentence according to this analysis. Consider:

\[(12) \; \text{Adé p\u0103 \emptyset 1\u00f9 oko} \]

\[(12) \; \text{Adé want \emptyset 1\u00f9 oko} \]

\[(12) \; \text{Ade want/-s-ed to go the farm.} \]

which is represented as (13).
Notice that Yorùbá does not have an overt present tense marker instead Yorùbá has a marker for the progressive (or continuous) tense. Notice that the contained sentence in (13) cannot be interpreted to convey the meaning that the action of going is accomplished.

After the Equi-NP-Deletion rule has applied to (13) the S1-node is pruned (Ross 196?) and the remaining VP is daughter-adjointed to the right of the higher VP. The auxiliary node is replaced by either a relic of a progressive element with no tensing property, or láti replaces it altogether thereby rendering the verb nonfinite.

The A-verbs present a not altogether different situation as we shall soon demonstrate. Consider:

(14) Ìwé dún ùn kà
    "Book sweet to read"
    'Book is easy to read'
    i.e. 'It is easy to read a book'

which is represented in the deep structure as (15).
Omitting many details, the process of derivation is as follows: the agent of reading is not specified, hence, it is represented as a NP. Note that dún as a factive predicate induced extraposition optionally. The embedded verb is postposed to the higher verb, the auxiliary node is erased and láti or the high tone replaces it.

First we get sentence (16).

Either of two things could happen to this structure, first, the subject takes a pronoun with the feature specification [Animate] and láti/áti is inserted to derive (17).

(17) ò dún láti kà iwé
It is easy to read a book.
or the subject is specified by proposing the object to the subject position.

Rule 5: Object Preposing.

\[
\text{SD: } X - \text{ NP - V - láti - V - NP - Y}
\]

\[
1 \quad 2 \quad \text{láti} \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad \Rightarrow
\]

\[
\text{SC: } X - 4 \quad 2 \quad (\text{úm}) \quad 3 \quad - \quad Y
\]

(láti)

Conditions: 1 is an unspecified agent which is deleted for the infinitive to take place.

Consider:

(18) Ìwé dún (láti) kà

'Book is easy to read'

Notice that out of the group B verb bérèṣì can be morphologically broken down to bérè + sì because the meaning of bérè is included in bérèṣì. Consider the following:

(19) Òjó bérè iṣẹ lána

(Òjó start work in yesterday)

'Òjó started work yesterday'

(20) Òjó bérè sì ì sê iṣẹ

(Òjó start to do work)

'Ojo started working'.

In (20) bérè and sì are broken down morphologically meaning 'to start' 'begin' and 'to' 'into' 'towards' respectively. Both have a deep structure realization as (21).

---

1 The Yorùbá sentences (19) and (20) function in the same discourse as having the same meaning.
3.0.1 **Purpose Nominalization.**

The 'pre-in infinitive' verbs behave in a curious manner. They occur in many constructions that make it easy for one to mistake them for instances of other constructions in the language in a variety of ways. The purpose construction is such a case, because in Yorùbá, just as in English it may or may not take the complementizer lāti 'to'. In English the full complementizer for the purpose clauses is 'in order to'. Yorùbá on the other hand uses only lāti 'to' for both the infinitives and the purpose clauses. Consider the following:

(22) Òlú rínlọṣa ra igù ní ìjá
'Òlú walked to the market in order to buy yams'

(23) Àdé gẹ̀ iṣé (lāti) t̀á
'Àdé cut wood to sell'

(24) Àdé wá ni wá
(Àdé visit me come)
'Àdé came in order to visit me'

It is possible to claim that there are two purpose clauses in (22), that is;
The possibility of regarding (a) as a purpose clause depends on whether or not both walking and going are considered as a unit of action or two entities, one leading to another.

The following deep structure is proposed for (23).

(a) Ọlụ rịn ịwụ ọ ọụọ ịọ Ọjà
'Olu walked in order to go to the market'

(b) Ọlụ ọụọ ịọ Ọjà ịwụ, ra ịghụ
'Olu went to the market in order to buy yams'.

---

1 One can argue that the future marker ọụọ ịọ 'will/shall' can take the place of the progressive element in the tree diagram to give the sentence:

(a) Ọdị ọụọ Ọjà/ọụọ ịọ Ọjà ọụọ
Adé cut wood Adé will/shall sell wood.
This is quite possible if and only if the actions of cutting and selling are for one specific occasion. This analysis also permits the occurrence of the past tense marker ọụọ 'already', consider:

(b) Olu ọụọ Ọjà ọụọ ọụọ
(Ọlụ cut wood Olu already sell wood)
'Olů cut wood Olů has already sold the wood'.
However, (25) takes Olů as a habitual wood cutter/seller that is, a - ọụọ Ọjà - ọụọ 'agent-cut-wood-sell' professionally' (See 7.02 (1) below), hence our choice of the progressive marker. Notice that the habitual and the progressive markers can cooccur in sentences. Consider:

(c) Ọlụ ọụọ Ọjà ndị ọụọ ọụọ
(Ọlụ cut wood Olu habitually -ing sell wood)
'Olů cuts and sells wood'.

Contd. on following page...
Notice that two rules apply to (25) to derive (23). Since the embedded subject is coreferential to the high subject it is deleted by Equi-NP-Deletion rule and the subject is thus reduced to an infinitive. A similar deletion rule deletes the contained object since it is coreferential to the object of the matrix sentence. It should be noted however, that both Equi-NP-Deletion and Object deletion rules apply quite extensively in the language. Note also that both are governed by the matrix verb. It is observed that immediately the Equi-NP-Deletion rule applies, the contained sentence which is thus infinitivalized takes on the infinitive complementizer láti 'to' to derive (26).

(26) Adé gé igi (láti) ta igi
    (Ade cut wood to sell wood)

after object deletion it becomes

(27) Adé gé igi (láti) tà.

The basic claim made by (25) is that essentially, it is not any different from a complement structure as the logical structure is concerned. However, it is the matrix verb that determines whether an embedded sentence is purposive, factive

Footnote (1) continued from previous page...
Notice also that the occurrence of either makes no difference in the Yorùbá sentences (d) and (e).

(d) Olú gé igi Olú máa tà igi
    (Olú cut wood Olú habitually sell wood)
    'Olu cuts and sells wood'.

(e) Olú gé igi Olú ní ta igi
    (Olú cuts wood Olú -ing sell wood)
    'Olu cuts and sells wood'.

See the next section for details on the cooccurrence of the habitual and progressive markers.
or emotive. In any case, there are some verbs which behave ambiguously as to whether their complements are purposive or not. Consider:

(28) Mo wá á kí ọ
    I come to greet you.

This can be purposive or non-purposive, where it is purposive an adverbial or an object can follow the matrix verb as witnessed by (29).

(29) Mo wá ilé láti kí ọ
    'I come home to greet you'.

It is quite obvious then that it is the matrix verb that determines the type of embedding a sentence has.

3.0.2 Non-Purposive Constructions.

The main difference between these constructions and those discussed in the preceding section is that these are not purposive but they are infinitives as the earlier ones referred to above. However, it is important to note that in non-purposive constructions there is no cause and effect relation. Perhaps this accounts for the reason why the infinitive complementizer láti does not show up in the surface structure configuration as much as it does in the case of purpose clauses. Even then, in cases where láti occurs in the surface structure configuration of the non-purposive constructions, there is always the strong tendency to give them purposive readings. More often than not, the matrix verb clarifies the situation, but in some instances sentences may be ambiguous between purposive and non-purposive readings. Consider the following:

(30) Mo mára á wá (non-purposive)
    (I prepare to come)
    'I came fully ready'.
As could be deduced from these examples, it will not be out of place to conclude that the occurrence or non-occurrence of *látî 'to' alone does not determine when a sentence is purposive or non-purposive.

3.0.3 The Gerundive Structures

Complementizers.

In the preceding section, we discussed *látî/áti as complementizer. Here in this section we discuss other complementizers that occur in the language. These are four in all, namely; péki, pé, ti, kî. Although the last three translate as 'that' in English there are semantic differences among them. The pé - constructions are indicative and are comparable to English *that + indicative constructions. Kî - constructions are generally indirect requests. It behaves as the English *that + subjunctive* construction.

In terms of functions however, consider the following examples:

\^ See Quirk et al (1972: 823) for subjunctive *that - clauses in English.
As far as we know these are all the complementizers we have in the language.

3.0.4 The Target Structure in Gerundive Structures.

This structure is a phenomenon which is of much interest to us in what follows in the rest of this section. Although there are a great many underlying structures, there are relatively few surface structures. It appears as if there is a conspiracy of transformations over a whole derivation in which transformations literally cooperate to transform...
a whole variety of structures into certain surface configurations. So strong is this 'syntactic conspiracy' that it affords a rich stylistic device for two major syntactic categories in Yorùbá. These are a certain restricted serialized verbal structures and the gerundive formation.

Such structural regularities can be recognized in a grammatical description by characterising the set of transformations needed to produce these compounds as in (39-40).

(39) eja aṣìṣẹ
good fish that is cooking - Verbal Noun
cooked fish - Adjectival Noun.

(40) asọ fọ́fọ́
washing clothes - Verbal Noun
washed clothes - Adjectival Noun.

this and other related phenomena will be the focus of this section.

3.1.0 The Gerunds

As we have seen in Chapter II the relative marker ti (for details on ti see the next Chapter) is translatable into English, 'that' 'who' 'when' and 'which'.

Strictly speaking it has no semantic load, it behaves like 'WH' in all WH words such as relative pronouns and question words in English.

With this background we can proceed in our analysis of gerundive structures in Yorùbá. The rule for deriving the gerundive structure can be formulated thus:

Rule 6: Gerundive Formation Rule

\[ C_1 ti = (C_1 VW \ (CVW ...)) V \]

See Awobuluyi, O. (1973) for this type of structures.
which we eventually condensed to \( \text{Ci} - V \), that is, repeat
the initial consonant of the verb and insert a high tone (\( \text{I} \))
between the consonants, e.g.

\[19\quad \text{1\text{p}} \quad \text{l\text{1p}}
\]
\[\quad \text{'go'} \quad \text{'going'}.
\]

Notice that in (1.0.1 (2)), we have lexical gerundive structure,
here we deal with clausal gerundive structures. Consider the
following:

\[20\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a) Adé féràn láti mâa se ṣaja} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like to aspect-marker cook fish}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes to cook fish'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(b) Adé féràn péki ọ mâa se ṣaja} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like that he aspect-marker-cook fish}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes to cook fish'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(c) Adé féràn pé ki a mâa se ṣaja} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like that we aspect-marker cook fish}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes us to cook fish'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(d) Adé féràn péki èniyàn mâa se ṣaja} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like that people aspect-marker cook fish}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé like it that people cook fish'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(e) Adé féràn ṣaja pé ki èniyàn mâa sè ẹ.} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like fish that people aspect-marker cook it}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes people to be cooking fish'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(f) Adé féràn ṣaja pé ki a mâa sè ẹ.} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like fish that we aspect-marker cook it}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes us to be cooking fish'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(g) Adé féràn pé ki ṣaja mâa sè} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like that fish - aspect-marker cook}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes fish to boil'.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(h) Adé féràn ṣaja tì ó sè} \\
&\quad (\text{Adé like fish which it cook}) \\
&\quad \text{'Adé likes fish which is cooked'.}
\end{align*}
\]
(i)  Adé fèràn eja ti a sè
(Adé like fish which a cooks)
'Adé likes fish which has been cooked'.

(j)  Adé fèràn eja ti èniyàì sè
(Adé like fish which people cook)
'Adé likes fish which has been cooked'.

(k)  Adé fèràn eja ti wò̩n sè
(Adé like fish which they cook)
'Adé likes fish which has been cooked'.

In the sentences above, èniyàì 'people' and wò̩n,
'they' do not refer to any specific persons, they function
like the impersonal pronoun a which is very close to the
English indefinite pronoun one. In these contexts, a wò̩n and
èniyàì are interchangeable, but in some other contexts they
are not. Consider the following:

(43) A kò̩ iwé yì láti London
could either mean:

(i) 'We wrote this letter from London'
or (ii) 'This letter was written from/in London'.

(44) *èniyàì kò̩ iwé yì láti Londòn
*(people write book this from London).

(45) Wò̩n kò̩ iwé yì láti Londòn
(they write book this from London)
'They wrote this letter from London'.

Notice that in (44) èniyàì has specific reference and requires
that we mention the doer. a the impersonal pronoun and
èniyàì behave differently under reflexives, but wò̩n pairs
with èniyàì rather than with a the impersonal pronoun, as
shown in the following examples:

(46) Olú férràn pé kí a máa fọ aṣọ fún ara wá
(Olu like that a aspect-marker wash cloth for
ourselves).
'Olú likes us to wash our clothes ourselves'
'Olú likes our clothes washed by us'.


(47) * Old féràn péki a màa fọ aṣọ fún ara wọn.
(Old like that a aspect-marker wash clothes for themselves)
* 'Old likes that our clothes are washed by themselves'

(48) Old féràn péki ènìyànm màa fọ aṣọ fún ara wọn.
(Old likes people to wash their clothes themselves)

(49) * Old féràn péki ènìyànm màa fọ aṣọ fún arawá
* Olu likes people to wash clothes for ourselves.

We have about nine different readings for the sentence (42), (e) and (f) are derived from (d) and (c) respectively by copying òjìa 'fish' from its embedded object position of the matrix sentence, but a pronoun copy is left behind. (a) and (b) are paraphrases of each other; the only difference is in the type of complementizer each takes.

The nine readings fall into two major groups. In one pair of sets (a)-(g) we have the complement readings, while (h)-(k) give relative clause readings.

The following sentences could be analysed to give multiple readings like (42).

(50) Òjó kórìra Oko rìfọ
(Òjó hates farm hoeing/hoed)
'Òjó hates hoeing/hoed farm'.

(51) Fùnké féràn ìjìa jìjọ
(Fùnké likes fish burning/burnt)
'Fùnké likes burning/burnt fish'.

(52) Bísi kórìra ìlìfọ
(Bísi hates corn grinding/ground)
'Bísi hates grinding/ground corn'.

(53) Fùnké gbádùn ọràn dìndìn
(Fùnké loves meat frying/fried)
'Fùnké loves frying/fried meat'.

(50) Òjó kórìra Oko rìfọ
(Òjó hates farm hoeing/hoed)
'Òjó hates hoeing/hoed farm'.

(51) Fùnké féràn ìjìa jìjọ
(Fùnké likes fish burning/burnt)
'Fùnké likes burning/burnt fish'.

(52) Bísi kórìra ìlìfọ
(Bísi hates corn grinding/ground)
'Bísi hates grinding/ground corn'.

(53) Fùnké gbádùn ọràn dìndìn
(Fùnké loves meat frying/fried)
'Fùnké loves frying/fried meat'.

(50) Òjó kórìra Oko rìfọ
(Òjó hates farm hoeing/hoed)
'Òjó hates hoeing/hoed farm'.

(51) Fùnké féràn ìjìa jìjọ
(Fùnké likes fish burning/burnt)
'Fùnké likes burning/burnt fish'.

(52) Bísi kórìra ìlìfọ
(Bísi hates corn grinding/ground)
'Bísi hates grinding/ground corn'.

(53) Fùnké gbádùn ọràn dìndìn
(Fùnké loves meat frying/fried)
'Fùnké loves frying/fried meat'.
The following set of sentences allow multiple readings of a different type. They consistently maintain two possible structures, that is, the gerund occurs freely in pre- and post nominal positions with corresponding change of meaning. Consider the following:

(54) Ádè gbàdùn ilè gbìgbá — gbìgbá ilè
    'Adé likes floor swept clean — sweeping the floor'.

(55) Bísi fèràn asò ifìfì — ifìfì asò
    'Bisi likes washed clothes — washing clothes'

(56) Fúnkè fèràn ìrò pípa — pípa ìrò
    'Fúnkè approves of telling lies — telling lies'.

Why these sets of sentences end up looking alike in the surface structure is what we are going to examine now. There are sets of rules to be applied before we can account for the similarity of both the gerundive and the complement structures above. There must be something in the nature of those rules, or in their operation, which triggers gerundive reduplication and thus seals from the surface structures any trace of the underlying sentences. Furthermore it could be assumed that there must be something which is responsible for the complement structures, to encroach upon the position of the gerundive adjective.

It should be noted that these are two semantically distinct structures, that is, gerund before noun, and gerundive adjective after the noun, which occur in the same position in the surface structure configuration. They occur at the post head nominal position. Consider:

(57) as the deep structure of (42)(a).
First, equi-NP deletion applies obligatorily to the second occurrence of Adé and introduces lāti obligatorily (i.e. infinitival substitution) thereby rendering the structure into something like (58) below.

The derivation in (58) is an intermediate one. The rule of cooccurrence restriction has to apply. This must take place in order for (58) to be grammatical. The complementizer lāti, the habitual māa and the progressive ɗ cannot cooccur in any acceptable Yorùbá sentence. However, the complementizer and the habitual aspect can cooccur. Consider:

(59) Adé fèràn lāti māa ɗ se ɖja.

The complementizer lāti and the progressive ɗ cannot cooccur as we remarked earlier. Though it does not
occur in the surface structure configuration, the progressive marker is an indispensable component in the deep structure as its presence or absence makes a semantic difference (see Rule 4 above). Consider the following:

(60) Add m̀a se ɛja (habitual)
Add (habitually) cooks fish.

(61) Add m̀i se ɛja (progressive)
(Add -ing cook fish)
'Adé is cooking fish'.

3.1.1 Complementizer, Progressive and Habitual Markers.

Sentences (62-68) show the cooccurrence and non-cooccurrence of the complementizers, the habitual and the progressive markers:

(62) Add ìfàn látì m̀a se ɛja (comp. + habit)
(Adé likes to usually cook fish)
'Adé likes to cook fish'.

(63) Add ìfàn pékí Ade m̀a se ɛja (comp. + Habit)
(Adé like that Ade usually cook fish)
'Adé likes cooking fish always'.

(64) Add ìfàn kí Adé m̀a se ɛja (comp. + habit)
(Adé like that Ade usually cook fish)
'Adé likes cooking fish always'.

(65) * Add ìfàn látì m̀a ń se ɛja (comp. + Prog. + Habit)
(Adé like to usually -ing cook fish).

(66) * Add ìfàn pé kí Adé m̀a ń se ɛja (comp. + habit + Prog.)
(Adé like that Adé usually -ing cook fish).

(67) * Add ìfàn látì ń se ɛja (comp. + prog.)
(Adé like to -ing cook fish).

(68) * Add ìfàn pé kí Adé ń se ɛja (comp. + Prog.)
(Adé like that Adé -ing cook fish).
It should be noted that the rules that apply in the derivation of the sentences in (42) are Equi-NP Deletion, object copying, Pronominalization, Pronoun copying, Progressive and Habitual markers deletion. All these deletion rules as they are known, are not ordered as ordering is of no consequence to the aspect we are dealing with at the moment, that is, gerundive reduplication. Consider:

(69) Adé féràn ʧja sise
(Adé likes fish cooking/cooked) 'Adé likes cooking/cooked fish'.

For convenience we repeat (42)(a) here as (70) to see how gerundive reduplication is formed.

(70)

The infinitival complementizer lāti and the aspect marker māa have to be deleted. Up to this stage, we have taken for granted the presence of the complementizers. The elements were inserted rather arbitrarily by a complementizer placement rule under Rossembaum's (1967) analysis. However, Awobuluyi (1967) has shown that infinitives introduced by e.g. lāti 'to' are derived automatically when their subjects disappear either by deletion or by movement and that the formation of the infinitive is restricted invariably to factive and emotive verbs. (See Chapter V below). However, this does not explain the presence of néخيل, né and خيل which we assume to be
as equally important as láti. Notice that while we do not need a complementizer placement rule, we actually need some form of complementizer deletion rule which will account for the deletion of the pékí, pé and kf complementizers in the language.

Now, if láti is deleted in (70) we have the ungrammatical (71).

(71) * Adé féran maa se ọja.

Again, if the habitual aspect marker is deleted, (72) results:

(72) * Adé féran se ọja.

We posit that it is the deletion of the habitual marker maa that triggers the gerundive partial duplication. If after the deletion of maa, gerundive partial duplication does not occur the sentence automatically blocks. However, a very important semantic information to save the formation is the habitualness of cooking. Gerundive partial reduplication therefore applies to the verb ẹ̀ to which carries the meaning of cooking - and then we have cǐ + se = sǐsǐ as in (73) below:

(73) Adé féran sǐsǐ ọja.

The final process the gerundivization undergoes is the gerundive hopping. A native speaker knows the difference between a sentence that has a gerund to the left of a noun and one that has a gerundive adjective that occurs to the right of the noun. Consider:

(74) Noun Gerund Gerund Noun Noun Gerund Adj. Ẹja sǐsǐ sǐsǐ ọja ọja sǐsǐ fish cooking cooking fish fish cooked, i.e. cooked fish.
3.1.2 Distribution of Gerunds.

It is noteworthy that almost all verbs in Yorùbá can undergo gerundive reduplication. The reduplication can apply to a single verb as in (75) or to a set of serial verbs as in (76).

(75) lọ - lilo
    to go - going.

(76) bá lò pọ - bìba-lọ-pọ
    'to cohabit with' 'cohabitation'.

Preservation of information is usually maintained by gerunds whether they be the results of derivation from simple verb or a set of serial verbs.

There are at least four broad construction types where gerunds occur in Yorùbá, namely:

(a) after prepositions.
(b) as topicalised predicates.
(c) after verbs of perception, or state.
(d) in factive clefted constructions.

3.1.3 Gerunds After Prepositions

In many languages, including English, any verbal form after a preposition is invariably a gerund. Yorùbá is not excluded in observing this rule. Consider:

(77) Fi ọkàn sì kìka iwé rẹ
    (put mind to reading book your)
    'pay attention to your studies'.

(78) Fi ojú sì ọna fùn dìdè rẹ
    (put eye to road for coming his)
    'Expect his arriving'.

(79) Fi eti sì kikọ Olùkọ rẹ
    (put ear to teaching teacher your)
    'Listen to the teaching of your teacher'.

3.1.4 Gerunds as topicalized predicates.

The language has a peculiar copying phenomenon when it comes to gerund formation. The matrix verb is copied. This could be a single verb or series of verbs. Consider:

(83) Dídá kiló ni erin dá kiló
(Silence it is elephant silent)
'It is being silent that the elephant does'.

(84) Pípa ni mo pa á
(killing it is I kill it)
'It is the case that I killed it'.

(85) Dídùn ni ọ dún ni à n'á fá ó rẹ ọrá
(being sweet is it sweet that we habitually with friend eat vegetable)
'It is being sweet that makes one to partake of a friend's vegetable'.

3.2.0 Gerund after Verbs of Perception or State.

After verbs of perception, an underlying predicate reduces to a gerund as witnessed by the following:

(86) Mo rí jíjú rẹ.
(I see burning/dancing it/she/he)
'I saw/it burning, him/her dancing'.

(87) Mo gbọ kiké ọmọ na
(I hear crying child the)
'I heard the crying of the child'.
It is observed that most of the gerundive forms from stative verbs especially predicative adjectives occur after prepositions as abstract nouns. Consider:

(89) Adé mọ ni ịwọnba ni kikurùd
(Adé is in moderate in shortness)
'Adé is moderately short'.

(90) Adé ju ọjọ ni ọgwa
(Adé excel ọjọ in tallness)
'Adé is taller than ọjọ'.

(91) Adé ná tọ jịjụ egba ná wọ
(Adé also taste eating stick that see)
'Adé also experienced the thrashing'.

3.2.1 Gerund in Factive Clefted Constructions.

The type of the construction involved here is the equivalent of the English; The fact that $S$ structure. This is discussed in full in Chapter V. There are two types involved, they are:

(92) Sisun ti ọ sụn kọ dára
(Sleeping that he sleep not good)
'The fact that he sleeps is not proper'.

(93) Lilọ ti ọ lọ dára
(going that he go good)
'The fact that he went is good'.

Notice that Yorùbá, like English, has a peculiar way of turning infinitives into gerunds after prepositions. Examples are:

English: (94) (i) I decided to go.
          (ii) I decided on going.
(95) (i) I forced John to do it.
   (ii) I forced John into doing it.

Yorùbá:  (96) (i) Ọ wù mí látì lọ
         (It please me to go)
         (It pleases me to go'.

   (ii) Ọ wù mí ní lọ lè
         (It please me in going)
         'I am enthralled in going'.

This observation further supports our belief in
the existence of a Universal Base Hypothesis (UBH) in
linguistics.
4.0.1 CONJUNCTION AND RELATIVIZATION

In this chapter we propose to discuss conjunction in relation to relativization. These two structures are very crucial to the present work as we shall see in the three chapters that follow in succession. However we do not intend to dwell too much on conjunction but to discuss it as briefly as it is relevant to the present study.

In Yorùbá, as in many other languages, all conjoined sentences contain a number of constituents connected in the surface structure. It is possible to join utterances into coordinating sentences with structures involving ti, àti, ìjẹ, pèlú, sl, all meaning 'and' in various constructions at varying degrees. That is, strictly speaking they do not constitute free variants as we shall see later in this section. We can also join utterances with conjunctive adverbials, thus we have bí ó ti lè jé pé 'although', ní ìyin na ‘then’. Of all these, àti and sl are the most frequently used in the language.

We are concerned with the derivation of surface structures from logical structures by means of conjunction reduction rules in this section. In Yorùbá as well as in

---

Rowlands (1969: 203) argues that sl 'and' is better glossed as 'also rather than and' on the strength of this, we presume, Awobubi (forthcoming) clearly omitted it, even though he argued in favour of it as a conjunction in Awobubi (1967). However, we make the claim in this section that it is better glossed as 'and' rather than the overt omission.
in English conjunctions mainly function in showing particular types of relationships existing between pairs or sets of language elements. The relationships they show are of two types namely, that of association and that of dissociation; i.e. 'that of togetherness and that of separateness' respectively. Consequently the two types of conjunctions there in Yorùbá correspond to these relationships, namely to show associative relationship we have the conjunctions and to show dissociative relationships we have the disjunctions.

The full list of the associative conjunctions is as follows:

(1) (a) àti
(b) òun
(c) pèlú
(d) ti
(e) si

For the disjunctions we have the following:

(2) (a) sàgbón/àmọ 'but'
(b) àbi/tàbí 'or'
(c) àfi 'but for, except, unless, apart from'
(d) àbọntóri/à bóso bọsi 'much less'
(e) bóyá² ... tábí 'whether ... or'
(f) yála ... tábí 'either ... or'

¹ This is not the same ti as the Relative Marker, for that see the section on Relativization (later in this chapter).

² There is another type of bóyá which does not co-occur with tábí. It is a sentential which is glossed as 'maybe' consider: Bóyá mà a di olóyè ní ìlòra ní ì ó mó
'Maybe I am destined to rule, who knows?'
The pairs 2(a), (b) and (d) are variants, the elements broken by dittoes invariably co-occur in the structure of the language except in questions.

Associative conjunctions relate elements that constitute a unit in the language as will be demonstrated soon.

\textit{Ati} joins nouns, nominalizations and adverbials.

Consider the following:

(3) (a) \textit{owo \textit{Ati} asp} \textit{that is, noun + noun}  
\hspace{2em} 'money and clothes'

(b) \textit{\textit{Alku \textit{Ati} airi} \textit{nom + nom}}  
\hspace{2em} (the fact of not dying and the fact of not seeing)'indestructible and invisible'

(c) \textit{ni ilé \textit{Ati} ni oko} \textit{adverbial + adverbial}  
\hspace{2em} 'at home and on the farm'

A double occurrence of \textit{Ati} is possible in most of the elements it is capable of joining, that is, nouns, nominalizations and adverbials. This occurrence invariably makes for emphasis as witnessed by

(4) \textit{\textit{Ati onilé \textit{Ati} alejó}}  
\hspace{2em} (and the native and the foreigner)  
\hspace{2em} 'both the native and the foreigner.'

(5) \textit{\textit{Ati owó \textit{Ati} omọ, mo fẹ bẹ}}  
\hspace{2em} (and money and child I want like that)  
\hspace{2em} 'both money and children I like that.'

\textit{Bun} and \textit{pélú} constitute free variants in the limited range of elements they conjoin, that is, nouns and nominalizations. Consider:

(6) \textit{\textit{Ikú \textit{Bun} arùn kò ni fi ilé rẹ ẹ sẹ ọdẹ}}  
\hspace{2em} (death and illness not \textit{ni put house your \textit{āọ outing}})
i.e. 'May your house never be visited by death or illness.'

(7) Ikú pélú árun ni i jọ rìn
(death and illness it is together walk)

i.e. 'death and illness walk hand in hand'

(8) riríje ìbùn rírímu
(the fact of getting something to eat and getting something to drink).
'a state of plenty'

(9) riríje pélù rírímu
(the fact of not getting something to eat and not getting something to drink)
'a state of abject poverty'

'ti is used to connect clauses comprised mainly of nouns and/or nominalizations. Double occurrence is prevalent in block language.' Consider:

(10) ti ajá ti ọran
(and dog and animal)
'every Tom, Dick and Harry'

(11) ti egbó ti egbó
(and root and root)
'roots and all'

(12) ti ọmọ ti ọmọ
(and child and child)
'children and all'

Like Ati, ti is also used for emphasis as witnessed by the following:

(13) ti pêp ti aya
(and husband and wife)
'husband and wife'

1 For details on block language see Quirk et al. (1972:414).
(14) ti agbára ti agbára  
(and force and force)  
'violently'  
(15) ti ḍsán ti bru  
(and day and night)  
'both day and night'  

However, a single occurrence of the conjunction is permissible in the examples that follow:  
(16) ó kú ti ṣlkú ni esú gba okọ rẹ  
(he die and not-die it is locust get farm his)  
'No sooner had he died than the locusts swarmed his farm'  
(17) ó dẹ ti hídé ni wọn gbe'ara  
(he arrive and not-arrive it is they carry body)  
'No sooner had he arrived than they moved'  

The first parts of (16) and (17) present the combination of sentences and nominalization, that is, (16) repeated in part as (18) will be:  
(18) ó kú CONJ ṣlkú  
which is represented in the logical structure as:  

(19) 

```
CONJ [ti ]

So

CONJ [i ]

S1  VP  S2

NP  VP  NEG

'he'  'die'  'the fact of'  'die'

However, this should be regarded as 'block language' thus:
The fact that it is the \( \text{J}i \) prefix that constitutes the negative element has no foundation at all. And, to justify our claim we offer the following arguments. If it were (that is, the \( \text{J}i \)-element) it will be seen as performing three functions at the same time. First, it will turn the constituents onto which it is matched into a nominalization. Second, the nominalization will be negativized and finally the nominalization will be factive. Rather we conceive of \( \text{J}i- \) as a compound consisting of two entities. The \( \text{J}i- \) is a factive nominalizing prefix while \( \text{i-} \) is a negative element as we have seen in the example we gave in Chapter I repeated here for convenience:

\[
(20) \quad \text{Ji-i-mb}
\]

\( \text{(fact-not-know)} \)

i.e. 'The fact of not knowing'

Other examples supporting our claim abound in the language. Consider:
(21) (a) á-bá 'would have'
(b) á-báà 'even if'
(c) kó-í-lop 'not gone yet'

However á alone has not provided a single instance of functioning as a negative marker: Consider:

á-wá-í-lop 'fact-come-not-go'
á-lé-í-bá 'fact-chase-not-catch up with'

4.0.3 The Disjunctives.

Before we discuss the conjunction in full, in relation to relativization, it is necessary to give a brief account of the disjunction observable in the language.

The disjunctions in the language as listed earlier in the preceding section, are treated individually thus:

áfi (áyáfi) is used normally with nouns and adverbials (Prep. Phrases). Consider the following.

(22) N kó ní ọlọrun mejí áfi Ọba mímọ
(I not have god two but king holy)
'I have no other God but the Holy King'

(23) Kó sí ewu ní oko áfi giri ápárd
(not exist danger in farm apart from rustle partridge)
'There is no danger on the farm apart from the partridges taking off'

However, more often than not, the elements related by this disjunction are left unexpressed as witnessed by such examples as:

(24) áfi emi áfi eniyàn áfi kínikarára tí dá ọrụ
bá kiniúní
(except me, except man except kinikanara that
strike terror to lion)
'Except man and me, the lion, that frighten
the lion'

(25) ṣe ẹdọ́ ẹtú ọdún yěbọ́ ọ́gọ́
(but this that you again carry come this)
'But for this new development introduced by you'

Amó and sugbón are used to relate sentences only.

Consider:

(26) ọmọ ẹdọ́ ọmọ n kọ mú ọ
(I see it but I not take it)
'I saw it but I did not take it'

(27) ọmọ ẹdọ́ sugbón n kọ kí i
(I see him but I not greet him)
'I saw him but I did not greet him'

In the case of yálà and bóvá, the first of the two elements
related by tābí are preceded by them, that is, either of
them always pairs with tābí. The only difference is, bóvá
normally precedes a sentence only. This is not the case
with yálà. Consider the following examples

(28) Yálà mo ọpọlọpọ tābí n kọ ọpọlọpọ ẹdọ́ ọ
(whether I go or I not go I will see you)
'Whether I go or not I will see you'

(29) Wá yálà ní ọnì tābí ní ọ́bọ́a
(come either in today or in tomorrow)
'Come either today or tomorrow'

(30) Ohun tì a ọrọ gbọ ní bóvá ó wá tābí kọ wá
(thing that we want to hear is whether he come
or not come)
'All we want to hear is whether he came or not'

The reduplicated tābí is normally nominalized
like the so-called ideophones (see Chapter V in this study)
thus:

(31) kò si tabi tabi ni ibẹ
(no exist or or in there)
'There is no doubt about it'

Furthermore it occurs in the environment of nouns, adverbials and sentences. Consider:

(32) Igbà wo ni o' ni ṣàm tabi ni alẹ?
(time which is you -ing go in afternoon or in evening)
'When are you going, in the afternoon or in the evening?'

(33) Mú ilú tabi iyè
(take death or life)
'Choose one, death or life'

The last on our list is Ọgbọọ with its variants Ọgbọọrọ and Ọgbọibọsi. It normally occurs with nouns and adverbials. Examples are:

(34) Kò ni aya Ọgbọibọsi omo
(He not has wife to talk less child)
'He has no wife to talk less of children'

(35) Kí i sùn ni alẹ Ọgbọọrọ ni ṣàrù
(not not sleep in night to talk less in morning)
'He does not often sleep at night to talk less of in the morning.'

4.0.4 Conjunction Reduction.

In recent times generative semanticists focus our attention on two major questions in the treatment of conjunction. The first is, is there a logical structure between a conjoined sentence such as (36):

(36) Bayọ wà ni ile Bisi sì wà ni ọjà
(Bayo exist in home Bisi and exist in market)
'Báyò is at home Bísí is at the market' and other conjoined sentences? The second question is if there is any such relationship, what is the distinct rule 'schemata' required to derive these other conjoined structures?

The answer to the first question is that there is a choice between two possible sources for sentences such as (37):

(37) Adé èti Bísí ló
     (Ade and Bisi go)
     'Ade and Bisi went'

We either generate (38):

(38) Adé èti Bísí
     'Adé and Bisi'

by means of phrase structure rule (7) below

Rule 7  Conjunction Schemata

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \quad \text{NP}^* \\
\]

which represents infinite schemata generating in the first instance structures like (39):

(39)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CONJ} \\
\{ èti \} \\
\{ 'and' \}
\end{array}
\]

which will yield the structure (40):

(40)
This structure, however, represents 'phrasal conjunction', or we might generate it from the rule generating co-ordinate structures in the base as in (41):

(41)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{CONJ} \\
\text{ati} \\
\text{and'} \\
\text{Ade \text{I}o} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{Bisi \text{I}o} \\
\end{array}
\]

which involves identity deletion and regrouping. Gapping (Ross, 1967) rule deletes indefinite number of main verbs in co-ordinate structures. Ross, in addition, proposes a directionality constraint which states:

'The order in which Gapping operates depends on the order of elements at the time that the rule applies: if the identical 'elements are left branches, Gapping operates forward; if they are on right branches, it operates backward.'¹ We observe, however, that this directionality constraint holds not only for verbal reductions but also for all other reduced coordinations as well. Consider the following examples:

(42) Bisi \text{I}o Ade \text{si I}o
(Bisi go Ade and go)
'Bisi went and Ade went'

Obeying Ross' directionality constraint on verbal reduction (43) will be reduced by Gapping to (43):

(43) Bisi ati Adé \text{I}o

¹ Ross (1967; 5)
and (44) Bisi fo Bisi si jo
( Bisi jump Bisi and dance) 'Bisi jumped and Bisi danced'  

Contrary to Ross' directionality constraint the nominal elements will be reduced to:  

(45) Bisi fo o si jo
( Bisi jumped she and danced) 'Bisi jumped and she danced'  

by pronominalizing the second occurrence of Bisi. However, English provides a better example of the violation of Ross' directionality constraint where (45) will be:  

(46) Bisi jumped and danced.

It is observable that in Yorùbá there is a conspiracy of the second occurrence of the subject in a conjoined structure to resist deletion. What takes place is pronominalization as mentioned above. The second rule that applies to the structure is the conjunction postposing rule which places the conjunctive element ìì after the pronominalized subject. Notice however, that the coreferential condition must be met before pronominalization could take place. Conjunction postposing rule operates on the structure irrespective of whether pronominalization takes place under NP identity or not, in the case of non-identity NPs.

Consider:

(47) Bisi lo ata Bayò si ìì ììga
( Bisi grind pepper Bayo and cook fish) 'Bisi ground pepper and Bayo cooked fish'  

As our intention here is just to show what conjunction does within nominalization via relativization we hope to end the

\footnote{Hudson (1975; 27-8).}
discussion of conjunction here and refer to it from time to time as occasions call for it.

4.1.0 The Relative Marker.

In English, the set of relative pronouns is the same as the set of question words. This is not true in Yorùbá. Yorùbá has only one relative marker which is quite distinct from question words. It is ọjọ translatable in English as 'which, who, that, when and why'. Much of the confusion that surrounds relativization in Yorùbá stems from the fact that the relative marker ọjọ has the freedom to refer to both animate and inanimate objects.

As pointed out earlier in this study, relativization is very crucial to a great majority of Yorùbá syntactic structures. The following, according to our investigation, are the constructions which derive from relative clauses.

i. The genitive construction;
ii. The opposition construction;
iii. The gerundive adjectives (as NP modifiers)
iv. The restrictive relative clause constructions and the non-restrictive relative clause constructions;
v. The attributive adjectives.

Before we discuss (i-iv) in some detail, we deem it necessary to present what the nature of the relative clause itself is in Yorùbá.

The study of relative clauses is clearly a rich field of enquiry which has attracted a wide range of
intensive work by good minds over a long span of the history of linguistics. To the searching minds, nothing is ever conclusive. This is observed even in the case of well-studied and well-documented English and other European languages where the results currently accessible are uneven. Transformational Grammarians are not agreed on what the nature of the relative clause is. Chomsky (1965), Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1968), G. Lakoff (1969), and Ross (1967) all agreed that the appropriate underlying representation for a relative clause is a sentence embedded into a noun phrase. A similar view is held by some Yoruba grammarians. This proposal can be represented in the deep structure as: (48)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(48) \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{S} \\
\end{array}
\]

4.1.1 Nominalization and Relative Clauses.

We have our doubt as to the appropriateness of this claim, we have just referred to above. Rather, we suggest tentatively that the appropriate underlying representation for a relative clause is a sentence conjunction. There is a set of structural distinctions between relative clause constructions and those complex

---

1 Rowlands (1969; 87-91), Awobuluyi (1967; 165-179), Bamgbose (1966; 115-120).
sentences which are clearly realizations of structures containing embedded sentences (see 5.0.0 below), viz. those containing sentential subjects or objects such as:

(49) Ṣe Ọjọ Ọràn ẹ̀tí māa se ẹ́ẹ́ja ńájú
    (that Ọjọ like to usually cook fish obvious)
    'That Ọjọ likes to cook fish is certain'

(50) Mo ńrb pé Ọjọ Ọràn ẹ̀tí māa se ẹ́ẹ́ja
    (I think that Ọjọ like to usually cook fish)
    'I think that Ọjọ likes to cook fish'

For sentences like (49) and (50) an embedding analysis is well motivated since the embedding sentence is required as an obligatory argument of the verb. It plays a role with respect to the verb which is the objective role and without which the verb cannot stand. Furthermore, the verb governs both the occurrence of clause and the type of clause which can occur. These conditions, it should be noted, do not hold for the relative clause sentences. This is the basic point that eludes some Yorùbá grammarians¹ and which has led them into confusing nominalization with relative clause construction.

A relative clause, we hold, is always structurally superfluous, it plays no role whatever with respect to the main verb and no morphemes in Yorùbá are marked as requiring it. A relative clause construction is equivalent to two independent predications on the same argument. These differences are captured by an analysis in which sentential subjects and objects are instances of underlying embedding.

¹ Awobuluyi (1972, 1975, a & b), Bamgbọse (1975).
and relative clauses are only superficially embedded. See Chapter V below.

In order to present the schematic outline for forming relative clause sentences, two assumptions must be made explicit. The difference between parts of the sentences such as the following:

\[(51) \text{Mo mpl kuhrin kan tì maa fun ipè} \]
\[(I \text{ know man a who usually blow bugle}) \]
\[\text{'}I \text{ know a man who blows the bugle'}\]

\[(52) \text{Mo mpl kuhrin nà tì maa fun ipè} \]
\[(I \text{ know man the who usually blow bugle}) \]
\[\text{'}I \text{ know the man who blows the bugle'}\]

will be assumed to be introduced at some level of derivation other than the one at which 'content morphemes' and the relations among them are specified. We leave open the question of just where such a distinction must be made, for the present study, it suffices to point out that (51) and (52) must have identical representations in so far as the meanings of the nouns and verbs and the relations among them are concerned, definite and indefinite articles apart. We shall further assume that the choice of the definite determiner will in general correlate with certain presuppositions which the speaker makes about the extent of his listener's knowledge.

4.1.2 Numerals and Quantifiers.

We propose here that numerals and quantifiers must be introduced outside the clause in which they ultimately appear. This is illustrated by the fact that the sentences of (53) are not matched by their respective
pairs in (54).

(53) (a) Mo ni ṣrẹ mọta ti ń je ata
     (I have friend three who -ing eat pepper)
     'I have three friends who are eating pepper'

     (b) Kọ mo ẹniyàn diọ ti máa je obi.
     (I know people some who usually eat kola nut)
     'I know some people who eat kola nut'

     (c) N kọ ri obirin ti ó pupa.
     (I not see woman who pron. red)
     'I saw no woman who is light (in complexion)'

(54) (a) Mo ni ṣrẹ mọta
     (I have friend three)
     'I have three friends'
     ṣrẹ mọta ń je ata
     (friend three -ing eat pepper)
     'Three friends are eating pepper'

     (b) Kọ mo ẹniyàn diọ
     (I know people few)
     'I know few people'
     ẹniyàn diọ máa je ata
     (people few usually eat pepper)
     'Few people eat pepper'

     (c) N kọ ri obirin.
     (I not see woman)
     'I saw no woman'
     kọ si obirin ti ó pupa.
     (not exist woman who pron. red)
     'No woman who is light (in complexion)'

Returning to our proposal for deriving relative clause constructions from conjunction we suggest that underlying (55) is a structure like (56).
4.1.3 Presupposition in Clauses.

The choice of the clause to become the relative clause correlates with certain presupposition on the part of the speaker about what the hearer knows, and accordingly with the choice of the determiner. Consider (56) again. If the speaker presupposes that the hearer knows neither about the meeting a man nor about a man speaking Hausa, then both the following conjunction realizations of (56) are possible.

(57) Mo pàdè ọkuhrin kan ó sì í sọ Haúṣá
     (I meet man a pron. and -ing speak Hausa)
     'I met a man and he is speaking (speaks) Hausa' 

(58) Ọkuhrin kan wá tì ó n sọ Haúṣá mo sì pàdè rọ
     (man a exist who pron. -ing speak Hausa I and meet him)
     'There is a man who is speaking (speaks) Hausa and I met him'.

as well as both of the following relative clause constructions with indefinite head nouns:

(59) Mo pàdè ọkuhrin kan tì ó sọ Haúṣá
     (I meet man a who -ing speak Hausa)
     'I met a man who is speaking (speaks) Hausa' 

(60) Ọkuhrin kan tì mo pàdè ó sọ Haúṣá
     (man a who I meet -ing speak Hausa)
     'A man whom I met is speaking (speaks) Hausa'.
If on the other hand, the speaker presupposes that there is a man such that it is known by the hearer that he met him, the relative clause construction corresponding to this presupposition will have the conjunct containing *pādē 'to meet' as a relative clause, and the head noun will be definite. Consider:

(61) Ọkuhrin nà tí mo pādē n' sọ Haūsā
(man the who I meet -ing speak Hausa)
'The man who I met is speaking (speaks) Hausa'

Similarly, if the speaker presupposes that his hearer knows about the man who speaks Hausa, the corresponding relative clause construction will have the conjunct containing *sọ Haūsā 'speak Hausa' as the relative clause, and again the head noun will be definite. Consider:

(62) Mo pādē Ọkuhrin nà tí n'sọ Haūsā
(I meet man the who -ing speak Hausa)
'I met the man who is speaking (speaks) Hausa'.

It should be noted however, that *ti 'who' of (59) is not all that different from the *ti 'and' of (19) above. (59) is represented here as (63):

(63)
The fact that ti is a conjunctive element can be accounted for by its being able to be replaced by gi 'and' in structures such as (57).

4.1.4 The Genitive Construction.

This construction can be said to derive from the relative clause source. First, let us consider the nature of a genitive construction. It is an endocentric structure with two nouns, the first of which is the head and the second the attribute. For details on this see \[7.3.3\] below. For the moment, let us consider (64)

\[(64) \text{ Aṣọ Adé} \]
\[\text{clothes Ade} \]
\[\text{Ade's clothes} \]

(64) derives from either (65) or (66):

\[(65) \text{ Aṣọ ti O jọ ti Adé ni eyi} \]
\[\text{(Clothes that pron. be of Ade is this)} \]
\[\text{'These are Ade's clothes'} \]

\[(66) \text{ Aṣọ ti i ṣe ti Adé ni eyi} \]
\[\text{(Clothes that be of Ade is this)} \]
\[\text{'These are Ade's clothes'} \]

Both (65) and (66), after deletion has taken place, will produce the intermediate structure of (67).

\[(67) \text{ Aṣọ Adé ni eyi} \]
\[\text{(Clothes Ade is this)} \]
\[\text{'These are Ade's clothes'} \]

which eventually becomes (64)

\[(64) \text{ Aṣọ Adé} \]
\[\text{(Ade clothes)} \]
\[\text{'Ade's clothes'} \]

\[1\] The section on 'The Possessive Construction'.
Notice that in (65) and (66) the high tone \( \tilde{t} \) is the relative marker 'that' and the midtone \( \check{t} \) is the genitive marker glossed as 'of'.

4.2.0 The Appositive Construction.

The genitive construction and the appositive construction share many characteristics in common. First, like the genitive construction, the appositive construction is an endocentric structure of two nouns the first of which is the head noun and the other the modifier or attribute. An example is:

\[(68)\] Ade gb\(\check{\text{e}}\)gb\(\check{\text{e}}\)n\(\text{a}\) ku

(Ade carpenter die)

'Ade the carpenter died'

which derives from two sentences thus:

\[(69)\] Ade ku

(Ade die)

'Ade died'

\[(70)\] Ade j\(\check{e}\) gb\(\check{\text{e}}\)gb\(\check{\text{e}}\)n\(\text{a}\)

(Ade is carpenter)

'Ade is a carpenter'

Both of which have the relativized form (71):

\[(71)\] Ade ti \(\tilde{\text{o}}\) j\(\check{\text{e}}\) gb\(\check{\text{e}}\)gb\(\check{\text{e}}\)n\(\text{a}\) ku

(Ade who pron. is carpenter die)

'Ade who is a carpenter died'

Notice that just as in the genitive construction example (65) above \( \tilde{\text{o}}\) j\(\check{\text{e}}\) 'who he is' has to delete in (71) to derive (68).

However, it is observed that both the genitive and appositive structures are different in some characteristics. One such difference is that the condition for
coreference is met in the appositive constructions while it is never met in the case of a genitive structure. We discuss the differences in full in Chapter VII.

4.2.1 **The Gerundive Adjectives (as NP modifiers).**

The Gerundive Adjectives are derived from predicative adjectives by means of regular gerundive reduplication. The process is repeated here for convenience. A syllable which consists of a copy of the initial consonant of a verbal stem, and a high tone /i/ is prefixed to the verb stem:

Example:

(72) (i) fé 'to be broad'
(ii) fifé 'broadness'

Yoruba, unlike English, invariably has gerundive adjectives in post nominal positions. Notice that this type of gerundive structure is quite different from the one that is from a complement source. The latter invariably hops on the noun to assume the position of the former as demonstrated in Chapter III above. The gerundive adjectives come from restrictive relative clause sources. Consider:

(73) ṙogbé pípón
(banana red)
'ripe banana'

underlying it is (74)

(74) ṙogbé tì ọ jë pípón ṃun
(banana which is red sweet)
'banana which is ripe is sweet'

Again, notice that the relative marker and the anaphoric pronoun Ọ 'it' are deleted to derive:
(75) ṣogọdọ pípón dún (banana red (be) sweet) 'ripe banana is sweet'
A further evidence that justifies our claim that (74) is a relative clause construction lies in the fact that it could take on another head noun (our classifier in Chapter VI below) as in:

(76) ṣogọdọ evi tí ó jé pípón dún
(Banana the one that it red sweet) 'This banana that is ripe is sweet'.

4.2.2 Restrictive/Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses.
Just as in English, Yorùbá restrictive relative clause has distinct characteristics which mark it out as different from the non-restrictive relative clause. In English the restrictive relative clause construction permits that as a relative pronoun but the non-restrictive relative clause construction does not. Restrictives do not require comma intonation after the head NP whereas non-restrictives do. Restrictives may modify any + N but not the non-restrictives. Consider (77):

(77) *Any plane, which crashes, is a failure.
Restrictives do not modify an entire proposition but non-restrictives do. Example:

(78) He said he would leave the service which I think is a good idea.
Restrictives do not modify proper nouns that have no determiners while non-restrictives do. Consider:

(79) *John that came early left early.

In Yorùbá, no article occurs between a noun modified by a relative clause if the latter is restrictive. For instance, (80-82) below cannot be restrictive relative clause constructions since some articles occur between the
head nouns and the relatives, whereas in the restrictive relatives the main articles usually occur after the relatives. Examples are:

(80) Eni kan, ti ó rò pé-dun gbón, kò mọ ùtün yàtò si ìsi.
(person a, who pron. think that he wise, not know right different to left).
'a (certain) person who considers himself wise cannot distinguish between left and right'

(81) ëni yèn, ti a ì so òrò rò
(person that, we -ing speak word his)
'that man about whom we talk'

(82) Òkuñrin yì ti ó ñ pa irop
(man this, who he -ing kill lies)
'This man who tells lies'

in (83-84) where the articles do not precede the relatives.

(83) ëni ti a ì so òrò rò yèn
(person who we -ing speak word his)
'that man we talk about'

(84) Òkuñrin ti ó ñ pa irop yìl
(man who pron. -ing kill lie this)
'this deceitful man'

The article can precede the surface form of non-restrictive relatives mainly because Yorùbá non-restrictive relative constructions can be replaced with an appositive noun phrase whereas the restrictive relative clause constructions cannot be so replaced. Thus examine the following pairs. The (a) forms of the structures (85-87) are restrictive relative clause constructions while the (b) forms are non-restrictive. Consider:
(85) (a) Ọkuhрин ti kọ fẹràn ọwọn ọmpọ rẹ ụmụ

(man who not love plur. child his that)
'That man who does not love his children'

(b) Ọkuhрин ụmụ, ti kọ fẹràn ọwọn ọmpọ rẹ.

(man that, who not love plur. child his)
'That man who does not love his children'

(86) (a) ọwọn ọlàkọ ọgàbà tị ó n jịjaka ịpọ wọnyen

(plur. teacher elder who pron. -ing struggle position those)
'Those lecturers who are obsessed with posts'

(b) ọwọn ọlàkọ, ọgàbà wọnyen, tị wọn n jịjaka ịpọ

(plur. teacher elder those, who pron. -ing struggle position)
'Those lecturers, who happen to be obsessed with posts'.

(87) (a) Ilé ti mo kọ

(house which I build)
'The house which I built'

(b) Ilé kan, ti mo kọ

(house one(s), which I build)
'The house, which I built'

The (b) forms of (85-87) are non-restrictive. Each of them can be replaced with a NP particularly those starting with ọvị tị 'the one which' in the singular definite, ọkan tị 'one which' in the singular indefinite, or ọwọn tị 'those ones which' in the plural definite (where ọwọn tị is alternatively interpreted as 'those which'). Thus the (b) forms of (85-87) can respectively be realized as (88) if we substitute appositive NPs for them.

(88) (a) Ọkuhрин ụmụ ọvị tị kọ fẹràn ọwọn ọmpọ rẹ

((man that this who not love plur. children his)
'That man, the one who does not love his children'
(b) Awon oltuọ agba wọhyen, awon ti won n ji:jadu ipo
(plur. teacher elder those, they who pron.
-ing struggle post)
'those lecturers, the ones who are obsessed with posts'.

(c) ile kan, ṣkan ti mo kp.
(house a, one which I build)
'A certain house, one which I built'.

From (85-87) we observe that where we have non-restrictive relative clause constructions, the pronoun which follows the relative marker ti and which is coreferential with the modified noun must agree in number with the latter. But this requirement does not hold for the restrictive relative clause constructions. Thus in (86) (a) we have the relative as either ti o n jijadu ipo or ti won n jijadu ipo whereas in (86) (b) only the latter, that is, ti won n jijadu ipo is grammatical the former, that is, ti o n jijadu ipo is not acceptable in the language. But if the non-restrictive is replaced with a NP as in (86) since the plural from awon ti 'those who/which' is used instead of singular form ebi ti e.g. in (86) (b) the coreferential pronoun which follows the relative marker ti could be either singular or plural since number agreement has already been satisfied through the employment of awon ti in that structure. The fact that number agreement is obligatory for non-restrictive relative construction actually specifies an appositive construction rather than the modification of the noun that is supposed to be modified by the relative. Since a restrictive relative construction and the noun it modified are dependent on each other, number is shown in the principal element modified by the relative, whereas for non-restrictive the independence of the relative from the noun shows that it
is a separate detachable construction, and explicitness in number is expected in such constructions in case detachment takes place.

So, one really significant point about (88) is that non-restrictive relative constructions could be considered as versions of appositive constructions which must normally be in concord with the nouns they are in apposition to, whereas the restrictive relative constructions and the nouns they modify are integral parts of a single noun phrase. Consider:

(89) Adé rí igí tì ó ṣa
(Ade see tree which it high)
'Adé saw a tree which was high'

(90) Adé jí asp tì a rà
(Ade steal cloth which we buy)
'Adé stole the cloth which we bought'

Notice that (89-90) are restrictive relative clause constructions by our analysis. The relativized NP in (89) is an embedded subject while that of (90) is an embedded object. The deep structure of (89) is (91):

(91)

```
    So
     \   /  \\
      \ /  \
       \ti
         
  S1  S2
     /   \  /
   Adé rí igí igí ṣa

Ade see tree      tree (be) high
```

This as could be seen at a glance, adheres to our conjunction hypothesis. In further support of our claim S2 can
still be extended by supplying a further head noun thus:

(92) Òyì tì ò ga  

"the one which is high"

which is a reduced form of (93):

(93) Òyì tì ò jẹ i gi tì ò ga  

(this which it be tree which it high)  

"The one which is a tree which is high"

See Chapter VI for details about this type of construction.

Even for the non-restrictive relative clause constructions the conjunction hypothesis is far stronger than in the restrictive relative constructions. Consider (94) which has the deep structure (95).

(94) Àdè gè i gi ni àn à tì mo ni kò gbóṣọ ìyẹ  

(Ade cut tree in yesterday which I say not must do)  

"Ade cut the tree yesterday which I said he must not do'.

(95) 

Ade cut tree in yesterday
Notice that in order to drive (94) S7 of (95) deletes under identity with S3, S6 undergoes subject-to-subject raising with gbôdô thus becoming a preverbal element. The negative kô is then placed in its place by negative element movement rule.

4.2.3 Stacked Relatives

When the Noun Phrase relativized is itself a relative clause construction, the result is a stacked relative clause construction. However, native speakers differ in their judgements on the acceptability of some of these sentences. Witness:

(96) Agô ti ò hun ti ò fi ò ò gôdîn dára pûpô
(cloth which he weave which he put do festival good much)
'The cloth which he wove which he wore for the festival was very good'.

However the acceptability of (97) is doubtful.

(97) ? (a) Mo ti pâdê âwôn ènîyôn ti wôn sô pê âgbâdo
(I already meet they people who they say that maize
Ôsìngîn dûn pûpô (b) papê âwôn ti wôn jê âgbê
fresh sweet much, particularly they who are farmers
âti (c) âwôn ti wôn nê shê dârùkê
and (c) they who they -ing do village trade
i.e. 'I have met people who say fresh maize is very sweet, especially those who are farmers and those who are female village traders'.

Notice that the anaphoric pronoun wôn 'they' of (a), (b) and (c) could be ô if it is so marked and makes no difference in the meaning of each of the clauses in which it
occurs. Compare (97) with (98).

(98) Mo tigbó lènu awọn eniyànn, awọn ti won jè
I already meet they people, they who they be
àgbẹ àti awọn ti won ì se dàrùkè, pé
farmer and they who they -ing do village trade that
àgbàdo ìsìngin' dànn pùpò
maize fresh sweet much

i.e. 'I have heard from some people especially farmers
and female village traders, that fresh
maize is very sweet.'

Notice that the two relative clauses are immediately to
the right of the matrix sentence they modify and to the
left of the nominalization introduced by the complementizer
pè 'that'. Both (97) and (98) are heard in everyday speech
but (98) is preferred to (97). This proves that stacking
tends to be clumsy.

4.2.4 Recursive Structures.

These are relativized structures involving
recursive use of tree structures. Consider (99):

(99) Èyi ni Ọkunrin ti ó lu obihrin, obihrin ti ó
ta ajá, ajá ti ó lè kọ̀lọkọlọ, kọ̀lọkọlọ ti ó pa
akùkọ, akùkọ ti ó jè àgbàdo, àgbàdo ti Bọsẹ rà

i.e. This is the man who beat the woman, the
woman who sold the dog, the dog who chased the
fox, the fox which killed the cock, the cock
which ate the corn, the corn which Bọsẹ bought.

Notice that for (99) there is no problem of interpretation
since each modified NP is repeated in the relevant surface
structure construction, that is, obihrin, ajá, kọ̀lọkọlọ,
ákúkó and ágbáádo (woman, dog, fox, cock and corn respectively).

Consider (100)

(100) Òyí ni ọ́kùnrí ́n ti ó ́lu ̀bíhnrín, ti ó ́ta ́a jā ti ó le kòlòkókó ti ó pa lákúkó ti ó se jé ágbáádo ti Bọ́sẹ́ rà

i.e. 'This is the man who beat the woman who sold the dog that chased the fox that killed the cock that ate the corn that Bọ́sẹ́ bought.'

As opposed to (99) ọ́kùnrí 'man' performed all the actions except the last in (100) 'that is, buying' whereas he performed only one action in (99) that is, beating of the woman. Note that (99) and (100) constitute different structures in Yorùbá. This is an important area in which Yorùbá structures differ considerably to English structures. While the two can be given the same structure representation in English and be distinguished only through intonation features, their underlying differences are well illustrated in the surface representations in Yorùbá without the necessary assistance of intonation features.

This type of structure is the right branching recursive construction which has the schema:

Rule 8 \[ Z \rightarrow A + B (+ Z) \]

i.e. 

Spelled out (99) will be represented as in (101) excluding the head noun Òyí 'this'.
Notice that (101) proves beyond reasonable doubt that relative clause constructions result from conjoined sentences. Our conjunction hypothesis seems to be the only way to resolve the 'relativization or nominalization' arguments that are currently raging among Yoruba scholars. Professor Bamgbose (1975) follows the traditional NP — S configuration. Recall that we reject this configuration (see 4.1.1 above and 5.0.0 below) on the ground that the frame is that of a nominalization. Schachter, P. (1973, p.19) proposing 'promotion hypothesis' for constructions involving relative clause constructions, writes:

"Evidence is presented showing that, while neither (i.e. focus and relative clause constructions) constructions can be derived from highly similar underlying configurations, and that the derivation of both constructions involves the PROMOTION of material from an embedded into a matrix sentence."

Notice that his 'underlying configurations' consist of two sentences viz. the matrix and the embedded sentences. Also recall that we pointed out the fact that embedding in relative clause construction is superficial while embedding in nominalization is underlying (see 4.1.1 above). Professor Awobuluyi (1972: 16) agrees with Schachter on
this hypothesis; he writes:

"It is here proposed as such an alternative that relativization be redefined as a syntactic process operating selectively on elements of sentences in such a way as to turn such sentences into noun phrases, that is, more explicitly, noun-plus-qualifier constructions."

It should be noted that it is sentences that are to be reduced to noun phrases, and as we remark in 5.0.0 (Examples 35-39) sentences are essentially noun phrases. So, instead of weakening our points the arguments of the aforementioned scholars lend support to our conjunction hypothesis.

Another reason for the confusion in relativization and nominalization is that writers do not always give full sentences in order to show that the construction is limited to a context where the matrix verb is factive.

Many of the structures they regard as relative clause constructions are nominalizations. This is discussed at length in the chapter that follows.
CHAPTER V.

5.0.0 FACTIVE/NON-FACTIVE NOMINALIZATION.

In an attempt to characterize the syntax and semantics of complement structures, we make a distinction between factive and non-factive verbs on one hand and emotive and non-emotive verbs on the other hand. We posit that in many respects, the syntactic form of a complement depends on whether or not the speaker presupposes the truth of the complement (cf. Kiparskys 1968). It is observed that where a speaker presupposes the truth of the complement, the verbs are invariably found to be factive, and where the speaker does not presuppose the truth of the complement the verbs are usually found to be non-factive.

Here, we intend to subsume under the category verb, the predicative adjectives, some of the pre-verb modifiers, the modals and the so called 'verb nominal collocation' or verb-noun contraction.¹ In so doing, we observe that there is nothing to lose but much to gain. In our considered opinion this makes for simplicity and descriptive adequacy² as we shall demonstrate later in this section.

It is noticed that some of the factive and non-factive verbs take sentential subjects which are usually non-animate, and also most of them are intransitive subject embedding verbs.

In English only factive predicates allow the noun "fact" with a sentential complement consisting of a that clause or a gerund to replace the simple that clause as

---

witnessed by:

(1) The fact that Julie went during the night;
(2) The fact of Julie's going during the night:

can be continued by such factive predicates as, is significant, bothers me but not by non-factive predicates as: is likely, it seems to me. (cf. Kiparsky's 1988).

In Yorùbá, it is observed that the factive predicates which are the equivalents of English The fact that S structures are as follows:

(a) Pé that

(3) Pé Adé ṇ lù ilù kò ḥọ ni lọjú
   (that Adé -ing beat drum not seem one in eye).
   'That Adé is beating the drum, is not surprising'.

(4) Pé mo lọ bì wọn ní ínú
   (that I go turn them in Stomach)
   'That I went, annoyed them'.

(5) Pé Ọjọ sùn dára
   (that Ọjọ sleep good)
   'That Ọjọ slept, was good'.

In the above sentences, it should be noted that Pé is an essential element, it can not be deleted without doing violence to the structures. Consider:

(6) * Adé ṇ lù ilù kò ḥọ ni lọjú
   * Adé -ing beat drum not seem one in eye.
   * 'Adé is beating the drum is not surprising'.

(7) * Mo lọ bì wọn ní ínú.
   * I go turn them in stomach
   * I went annoyed them.

In some other constructions with factive verbs pé 'that' deletes optionally, and this will be demonstrated in
the paragraphs that follow:

(b) Kiki (dá (pé)) S. (The mere fact that S).

As indicated by the brackets, dá and pé can be deleted in the environment of kiki without loss of meaning in the constructions in which they could appear. Consider:

(8) Kiki dá pé Old sun ębün dun Ĭjó
(the mere fact that Old issue cry pain Ĭjó)
'The mere fact that Old cried hurt Ĭjó'.

(9) Kiki dá Old sun ębün dun Ĭjó
(the mere fact Old issue cry pain Ĭjó)
'The mere fact that Olu cried, hurt Ojo'.

(10) Kiki pé Old sun ębün dun Ĭjó
(the mere fact Olu issue cry pain Ojo)
'The mere fact that Olu cried, hurt Ojo'.

(11) Kiki Olu sun ębün dun Ĭjó
(the mere fact Olu issue cry pain Ojo)
'The mere fact that Olu cried hurt Ojo'.

In effect, it is observed that the most essential element, that is, the nominalizer, in the types of constructions above is kiki which is capable of selecting both or either dá or pé or of doing away with both without loss of meaning.

(c) Asán (pé) S (The mere fact that S).

This could be a substitute of kiki in some structures, but it should not be taken as an absolute free variant of kiki. Consider the following:

(12) Kiki dá pé Adún ni ędë ni ọ bọ Adùkẹ ni inú.
(the mere fact that Adún has beauty is it -ing turn Adùkẹ in stomach).
'The mere fact that Adun is beautiful is what Adukẹ is annoyed about',
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but not

(13) *Asán pé Adùn ní òwà ni ó bì Adúkè ní inú.
   (the mere fact that Adùn has beauty is it -ing
   turn Adúkè in stomach).
   'The mere fact that Adùn is beautiful is what Adúkè
   is annoyed about'.

However it could replace kiki in (8-11) above without result-
ing in any difference in meaning as witnessed by;

(14) Asán pé Old sun òkùn dun Òjó
   (the mere fact that Olu issue cry pain Ojo)
   'The mere fact that Olu cried hurt Ojo'.

It should be noted that (13) is unacceptable because Asán,
occurring with the stative verb ni 'to have', 'possess' and a
qualitative noun object òwà 'beauty'.

(a) Ògèdè pé S ('The fact that S').

(15) Ògèdè pé a lò pà wọn ni àiyà.
   (the fact that we go bald them in chest)
   'The fact that we went gave them concern'.

(16) Ògèdè pé Old lò dàn mì.
   (the fact that Olu go pain me)
   'The fact that Olu went hurt me'.

It is observed that Ògèdè and kiki are free variants
except that the former can not cooccur with dà in the same
environment as the latter can; even then, as mentioned
earlier, dà is optional where it occurs.

(e) tí, Non tí S. (The fact that S).

Yorùbá has a peculiar copying phenomenon which
involves copying either a cognate noun or an ideophone, in
front of a sentence. Followed by tí 'that'. The function
of this element is still a matter of unresolved controversy
among Yorùbá grammarians. First, it is regarded as a variant
of the relative marker (RM) \textit{ti}. We reject this claim on the ground that it has nothing to do at all with the relative clause construction. Second, it is also thought to be the \textit{ti} that occurs in structures involving topicalization, that is, emphasis. Abraham (1958p.xxvii) argues that:

'\text{The reduplicated verbal noun is commonly used for emphasis plus the verb from which it is derived:}'

e.g. Yiyy \textit{ti} a yop afbë

'as soon as we appeared there'.

Jijáde \textit{ti} mo báde

'On my going out'.

Rowlands (1969: 189) observes that:

"\text{When followed by the relative word \textit{ti} or the emphasizing word ni, this form (that is, the cognate noun) is used to emphasize the verb e.g. Jifjáde \textit{ti} ó jáde ni ó ri mi: 'the coming out that he came out it is he saw me' as soon as he came out he saw me".}

Awobuluyi (1973: 21) after noticing that the coreferential relationship that is expected in a relative clause construction is not met in structures involving a cognate noun and \textit{ti}, argues that 'That category can be called Predicates; so that — (such) expressions can easily be seen to be examples of the relativization of Predicate, rather than of 'verbs' or verbal nouns'. His conclusion, apparently, is that it is still a form of relative clause construction.

A claim which we do not subscribe to on the ground that \textit{ti} just like its English gloss \textit{that} functions as a relative marker as well as a marker of other clauses. Consider:

(17) The road that/which Joe made is broad.
It is obvious that there is a relative marker and in:

(18) He said {that} Peter came
it is a complementizer.

The presence of ti in constructions involving a cognate noun or an ideophone is not an instance of relativization as claimed by the previous writers, but an instance of factive nominalization. Consider the following:

(19) Mo gbọ ti o sọrọ
(I hear that you talk)
'I heard you talking'.

(20) Mo gbọ ni gbà ti o sọrọ
(I hear at time that you talked)
'I heard when you talked'.

(21) Mo ri sisì kan ti ọ jọ kusimiláiyà
(I see lady one who she dance kusimiláiyà)
'I saw a lady who danced kusimiláiyà'.

In (19) above ti 'that' marks an indicative clause which is a pure example of plain reporting as opposed to (20) which is a time clause. ti 'that' in (21) is a relative marker as could be deduced in the coreference of Sisì 'She' and Sisì 'lady' in the matrix sentence.

Factive nominalisation

(22) Pípa ti mo pa ajá rẹ dìm ùn
(Killing that I kill dog his pain him)
'The fact that I killed his dog hurt him'.

(23) Pípa ti mo pa ajá rẹ ni ọ fú binú si
(Killing that I kill dog his it is he -ing annoy for)
'The fact that I killed his dog is what he is annoyed about'.

In (22) above ti is a relative marker as it could be deduced in the coreference of the subject of the clause and its subject of the matrix sentence. In (23) ti is a factive nominalizer as it is the subject of the clause and the subject of the matrix sentence.
Let us apply extraposition and an 'it' insertion to (22-23) to test the credibility of our claim.

(24) O düm òn pé mo pa ajá rë
(It pain him that I kill dog his)
'It hurt him that I killed his dog'.

(25) O n bínú sì pé mo pa ajá rë
(he -ing annoy for that kill dog his)
'He was annoyed that I killed his dog'.

However, it should be noted that after extraposition has applied and an 'it' insertion has taken place tì 'that' of (22-23) is obligatorily deleted and pé 'that' is inserted to produce the grammatical structures of (24-25) as opposed to:

(26) * O n bínú sì tì mo pa ajá rë
(he -ing annoy for that I kill dog his)
'He was annoyed that I killed his dog'.

which is unacceptable in the language. Sentences (22-25) are all instances of nominalization because first, the tì 'that' in (22-23) is not a relative marker as it can be substituted with, pé. Second, it is the nominalization that takes pé 'that' complementizer in the analysis above.

Hitherto, we have been discussing factive nominalization. Now we want to examine non-factive.

(27) Ṫgedé pé mo lọ jẹ iṣẹ 'nonfactive'
(The fact that I go is false)
'The fact that I went is false'.

(28) Ṫgedé pé mo lọ dün Ojọ -factive
(The fact that I go pain Ojo)
'The fact that I went hurt Ojo'.

(29) O bùrú pé Ojọ i rọ -factive
(It bad that rain -ing fall)
'It is bad that it is raining'.
(30) O dâbî pé ðjð n r ô -Non-factive
'It appears that rain -ing fall')
'It appears that it is raining'.

It is noticed that by uttering sentences (27) and (30), the speaker does not assert the proposition of either of the utterances whereas in (28) and (29) the propositions are asserted.

The factive and nonfactive distinction could also be deduced from the fact that only a factive complement allows extrapolation and still retains its acceptability without change of meaning whereas nonfactive resents extrapolation as witnessed by the following:

(31) Pé ðjð n r ô burû
'(that rain -ing fall bad)
'That it is raining is bad'.

After extrapolation we have:

(32) O burû pé ðjð n r ô
'It bad that rain -ing fall)
'It is bad that it is raining'.

Both (31) and (32) are acceptable sentences in Yorùbá and they both mean the same thing. As mentioned above, if extrapolation were to apply in the case of a nonfactive complement the result will be an unacceptable sentence. Consider:

(33) O ñô pé ðjð n r ô
' (It seems that the rain -ing fall)
'It seems that the rain is falling'.

(34) *Pé ðdû ñ r ô ñô.
'(that rain -ing fall seems)
'That it is raining seems'.

Just as the glosses show sentence (33) is acceptable while (34) is ungrammatical. Below we give examples of factive
and non-factive verbs:

Factive

Predicative Adjectives

dára 'to be good'
burú 'to be bad'
tóbi 'to be big'
dúdú 'to be black'
pupa 'to be red, ripe'
kúrú 'to be short'
kórá 'to be bitter'
gbóná 'to be hot'.

Non-Factive

Se 'to be possible'.
jé iró 'to be false'.
jé ótí ptó 'to be true'.

Verbs

to 'suffices'
jó jú 'amazes'
pé 'pays'

dàbi 'seems'
jásí 'turns out'
jó 'seems'

Pre-verb modifiers (with verbs of past tense)

tilé 'even'
tún 'again'
kúkú 'nevertheless'

Modals

gbódó 'must'
lè 'can'
máa 'will'

Factive and non-factive object embedding verbs.

Factive

gbágbé 'to forget'
ránti 'to remember'
mó 'to know'
frán 'to love/like'
kórirá 'to hate/dislike'

Non-Factive

léró 'to suppose'
wóye 'to figure out'
só 'to say'
gbágbó 'to believe'
fré 'to want'.

It is observed that because there are no underlying transitive predicative adjectives, pre-verb modifiers and modals, it is only the surface verbs that show up in this last group.
The examples we have given so far by no means exhaust the available ones in the language. Nevertheless, they present extremely productive representation of factive and non-factive predicates in Yorùbá.

We propose, basically, two deep structures for factive and non-factive nominalization in the following paragraphs.

We observe that sentences are essentially NP's because they could be pronominalized as witnessed by the following:

(35) Adé mọ Pé Ojo Jẹ Omúgọ Òmí na sì mọ BE
(Adé know THAT OJO IS FOOL I also and know SO)
'Adé knows THAT OJO IS A FOOL and I also know IT'.

(36) Ṣọ Pẹ O Tí DÈ. Q. KINI Ọ WÌ?
(He say THAT YOU ALREADY ARRIVE. Q. WHAT he say?)
'He said THAT YOU HAD ALREADY COME. WHAT did he say?'.

(37) Q. WH. Òwọ ni o Ọ̀fọ̀? Ìtì Tete Ọ̀n Òmi Ìtì Tete Jì?
(WHICH is you want? TO SLEEP EARLY or TO WAKE EARLY)
'WHICH do you like? TO SLEEP EARLY or TO WAKE EARLY'.

Moreover, if structures such as gerundives and infinitivals are assumed to be full sentences at a deeper level of analysis. Then sentences can fit into the slots of NP's as in the following examples.

(a) SUBJECT:
(38) Rírin Kiri ní Òrugànjò ni ewu.
(ROAMING ABOUT IN NIGHTDEAD has danger)
'ROAMING ABOUT IN THE DEAD OF THE NIGHT is dangerous'.

(b) OBJECT:
(39) Ọ so Pẹ Ọ Sọ Òun
(He say THAT IT TIRE HIM)
'He said THAT HE WAS FED UP'.

---
On the basis of these facts we take nominalization as an S that functions as an NP and propose the following deep structures for factive and non-factive nominalization in Yorùbá.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Factive} & \quad \text{Non-Factive} \\
S & \quad S \\
\{\text{pe} \}_{\text{NP}} & \quad \text{NP} \\
\{\text{KiKi dà} \} & \quad \{\text{Asán} \} \\
\{\text{Ọgẹdè} \} & \quad \\
\end{align*}
\]

Presumably, our proposed structure for the factive predicates will go a long way to solving the controversy that has been on for quite some time among Yorùbá linguists on the status of nominalization and relative clause construction (cf. Bamgboye (1975) and Awobuluyi (1975 (a) and (b))). Essentially, both factive nominalization and relative clause construction have identical surface structures but they are dissimilar in the deep structures as pointed out earlier in this section.

It is noticed in English that a 'fact-deletion' rule can account for why 'fact' does not always appear at the surface structure. Consider:

\[(40) \ (a) \ \text{The fact that Adé went hurt me.} \\
\quad \text{(b) That Adé went hurt me.}\]

After the fact-deletion rule has applied to (40) (a) we get (40) (b) which is a paraphrase of it without change of meaning. In Yorùbá there are even more ways of expressing the fact however, if 'KiKi dà, Ọgẹdè and Asán' all meaning 'the fact', are deleted just as the English 'The fact that leaving nè' are deleted just as the English 'The fact that leaving nè'
'that' behind the structures in which they are deleted will still remain acceptable.

5.0.1 Adverbs and 'Ideophones'

Another advantage that accrues from our factive deep structure proposal is that we are able to dispel the misconception that shrouds the functions of some of the so called 'adverbs' and 'ideophones' in Yorùbá once and for all.

Words like ṭọ̀rọ̀rọ̀rọ̀ 'quickly' and ọ̀fọ̀ 'before' are regarded as adverbs by traditional grammarians in the following sentences:

(41) ọ̀ṣẹ̀ è wọ̀rọ̀rọ̀rọ̀
(he do it quickly)
'He did it quickly'.

(42) Adè lò Èkò ọ̀fọ̀
(Adé go Èkó (Lagos) before)
'Ade had been to Lagos before'.

(43) Adè lò Èkó ọ́fọ̀ ìàà
(Adé go Lagos on yesterday)
'Ade went to Lagos yesterday'.

If we apply the topicalization test to the three sentences the result will amaze us considerably because one of them, that is, ọ̀fọ̀ 'before' will be marked out as not belonging:

Consider:

(44) Wọ̀rọ̀rọ̀rọ̀ ní ọ̀ṣẹ̀ è
(quickly topic-marker he do it)
'He did it very quickly'.

---

Considering the dissimilarity in the behaviour of the two kinds of adverbs under topicalization we posit tentatively that adverbs like the one in (41) are adverbials, that is a prepositional phrase consisting of a preposition and a noun in the deep structure while adverbs like the one in (42) are indeed adverbs. The fact that the category 'adverb' has traditionally been a catch-all term confuses the issue. However, it is observed that the preposition Ní never occurs in Yorùbá except directly preceding a noun or a pronoun. Consequently, each of the words it precedes in the examples that follow is thereby unambiguously identified as a noun.

Consider the following:

\[(46)\]  
\((a)\)  O lọ kiákiá  
\((b)\)  O lọ ni kiákiá  
\((a)\)  Bárẹdá ti a gé pẹlẹbẹpẹlẹbẹ  
\((b)\)  Bárẹdá ti a gé ni pẹlẹbẹpẹlẹbẹ  

i.e. sliced bread.
(48) (a) O dé wé ré wé ré
       (he arrive quickly)
       'He came quickly'.

       (b) O dé ni wé ré wé ré
           (he arrive in quickly)
           'He came quickly'.

(49) (a) O ni té ilé girigiri
       (he -ing step ground girigiri)
       'He walked about in girigiri manner'.

       (b) O ni té ilé ni girigiri
           (he -ing step ground in girigiri).

(50) Şe mi pèlè (ambiguity)

       i. (do me gently) ii. (Greeting to a guest as he
       approaches the host's house).
       'Treat me gently'.

(51) (a) Şe pèlè (warning)
       (do gently) 'Be careful'.

       (b) Şe ní pèlè (do in gently) 'Be careful'.

The examples given above are all surface structure
utterances. Moreover, the (b) member of each pair contains
a so-called adverbs which is preceded by the preposition ni.
Out contestation is that traditional adverbs like pèlèpèlè,
kískíkí and girigiri occur preceded always by the preposition
ni in the deep structure, and may or may not occur in the
same way in the surface structure.

However, it should be noted that not all these
so-called adverbs do adhere to the principle of occurring in
post-preposition position. Consider the following:

(52) (a) O ga fioffio (it be-tall fiofio)
       'It is tall in fiofio manner'.

       (b) * O ga ni fioffio (it be-tall in fiofio)
           'It is tall in fiofio manner'.

(53) (a) O  rif roboto (It appear round) 'It is round'.
    (b) * O  rif ni roboto (It appear in round) 'It is round'.

(54) (a) Mâa ta félefèle ni ɔdɔ rɛ (do -not bounce félefèle in presence his/her/its.)
    'Don't behave in félefèle manner in his/her/its presence'.
    (b) * Mâa ta ni félefèle ni ɔdɔ rɛ (do -not bounce in félefèle in presence his/her/its.)
    'Don't behave in félefèle manner in his/her/its presence'.

(55) (a) O  funfun lāu (it be -white lau) 'It is snow white'.
    (b) * O  funfun ni lāu (it be -white in lau) 'It is snow white'.

(56) (a) O  ba jôkô jëjë (he/she/it happen sit-down peacefully) 'And he/she/it sat down quietly'.
    (b) * O  ba jôkô ni jëjë (he/she/it happen sit-down peacefully) 'And he/she/it sat down quietly'.

(57) (a) O  pupa fòo (it be -red foo) 'It is red in foo manner'.
    (b) * O  pupa  ni fòo (it be -red in foo) 'It is red in foo manner'.

There is no doubt that the examples of (52) to (57) fail the test of the ni - insertion rule. But this does not preclude them from belonging to the same category of the so-called adverbs, as (46-48). For, they are partially the same both from the standpoint of their phonological and morphological constitution and from the semantic properties ingrained into them. Furthermore, the relation between any
particular 'adverbs' and the verbs in the structure in which they both occur is exactly as for the 'adverbs' and verbs in the other utterances. That is, to say, (46-48) and (52-57) actually illustrate the same kind of construction. This fact must be reflected in any explanatory grammar of the language, and the only conventional way to do this is to derive them in exactly the same way. Below we propose the ni-deletion rule to account for the derivation of the (a) sentences from their (b) counterparts as in (58).

(58) Ọ sùn ni ilèlè | Ọ sùn ilèlè
     'He slept on the bare floor'.

Rule 9: The ni-Deletion

SD: \( \not= \) X - v - (ni) - NP - Y \( \not= \)
   1 2 3
SC: \( \not= \) X - 1 0 3 Y \( \not= \)
Condition: 2 is the preposition ni and it precedes an NP. It should be noticed that rule 9 carries out only one simple elementary transformation of deletion. Note also that rule 9 is intentionally formulated to be neutral, that is, it can apply either optionally or obligatorily depending on the SD of the given structure. Thus, it applies optionally in the derivation of the following (a) sentences from their (b) counterparts:

(59) (a) Ọ ni gbé ọkè ọjá
     (he -ing reside ọkè ọjá)
     'He lives in oke ọjá'.

(b) Ọ ni gbé ni ọkè ọjá
     (He -ing reside in ọkè ọjá)
     'He lives in Ọkè Ọjá'.

1 It is possible to regard (46-48) as exceptions and describe them separately from (52-57). But such an approach will be counter-intuitive.
(60) (a) ṣ mọ ti ọtito (be know that of truth)  
'He in fact knows'.
(b) ṣ mọ ní ti ọtito  
'(he know in that - of truth)  
'He in fact knows'.

(61) (a) ṣ ọrọ iṣe (it be -difficult doing)  
'It is difficult to do'.
(b) ṣ ọrọ ní iṣe (it be -difficult in doing)  
'It is difficult to do'.

(62) (a) ṣ rin iǹǹọ (he walk nudity)  
'He walked in the nude'.
(b) ṣ rin ní iǹǹọ (he walk in nudity)  
'He walked in the nude'.

For the obligatory application of the rule, each of the (b)  
sentences will be the input to get each of the (a) sentences  
as output of the following structures:

(63) (a) ṣ ọrì bẹ̀ (it appear so) 'It is so'.
(b) ṣ ọrì ní bẹ̀ (it appear in so) 'It is so'.

(64) (a) ṣ wí bẹ̀ (he say so) 'He said so'.
(b) ṣ wí ní bẹ̀ (he say in so) 'He said so'.

---

1 We are led to this assumption and, a fortiori, of the presence  
of the preposition ní in the deep structures of the (b) sen-  
tences by the fact that the so-called adverbs, that is, our nouns,  
can be topicalized thus:

(i) (a) ṣ ọrì bẹ̀ (it appear so) 'It is so'.
(b) Bẹ̀ ní ọrì (so emph-marker it appear)  
'So it is'.

(ii) (a) ṣ wí bẹ̀ (he say so) 'He said so'  
(b) Bẹ̀ ní ọ wí (so emph-marker he say)  
'So he said'.

---
Our next argument is based on the fact that many of the so-called adverbs can be qualified by qualifiers. Consider:

(65) Jéjé mí ni mo jōkō
(peacefully my it is I sit-down)
'I sat down in my usual peaceful manner'.

(66) Má ta félelé le ré dé ibí yí o
(do -not bounce félelé your reach place this)
'Do not behave in your félelé manner here'.

(67) O sé dédé ré (it be dédé its)
'It fits it exactly'.

(68) Jé ké wón máa sé wódùwóò dú wón kiri
(let that they continue do wódùwóò their about)
'Let them go about behaving in their wódùwóò manner'.

(69) Wódùwóò yí kò ràn o lówó
(waduwadu this not help-up in hand)
'This waduwadu manner does n't help you'.

(70) N sé ni ó n yán kóndúkóndú ré kiri
(-ing do it is he -ing strut kóndúkóndú his about)
'He indeed went about strutting in his kóndúkóndú manner'.

Note that jéjé is qualified by mí 'my', félelé by ré 'your', dédé by ré 'its', wódùwóò by wón 'their', waduwadú by yí 'this' and kóndúkóndú by ré 'his' in that order in sentences (65-70). Thus, it follows that since adverbs do not occur qualified by qualifiers in Yorùbá the lexical items in question cannot be rightly labelled adverbs. And since it is the prerogative of nouns to select qualifiers with which they are semantically compatible, words like félelé, wódùwóò, jéjé and the like can be nothing else but nouns. Any meaningful analysis of the so-called adverbs and 'ideophones' can only be presented against this pragmatic background. And this we hope, we have done.
Furthermore, there are quite a number of words in Yoruba with which the so-called adverbs share very important syntactic characteristics. Such words are:

- ojojumọ 'everyday'
- ọjoṣẹ 'every week'
- ọdọdàn 'every year'
- ọjọmọ 'three at a time'
- méjimẹjil 'two at a time'
- ọbijji 'suddenness'
- ọgàn 'suddenness'.

There is no doubt about it that all the above lexical items are nouns because they all occur in the environment of the preposition ọjì, and, as pointed out earlier any word that collocates with it is definitely a noun. Consider:

(71) Ọ n ọjị ọjojumọ (* Ọ n ọjị ojojumọ)
     (he -ing work in day-day)
     'he works everyday'.

(72) Ade má wọn ní méjimẹjil (*Ade mí wọn méjimẹjil)
     (Ade take them in two-two)
     'Ade took them two at a time'.

(73) Ọ bá ní ọbijji (* Ọ bá mí ọbijji)
     (it react me in suddenness)
     'It caught me unaware'.

(74) Ọ dè ní ọgàn (* Ọ dè ọgàn)
     (he arrive in suddenness)
     'He came suddenly'.

(75) Ọ n ọọ ọjoṣẹ (* Ọ n ọọ ọjoṣẹ)
     (he -ing go in week-week)
     'He goes every week'.

It should be noted that the similarities between the nouns in (71-75) and the so-called adverbs are of a different sort. First, they both occur in the environment of the preposition ọjì as in (46-51) and (71-75). The nouns
in (71-75) do so with few exceptions\(^1\) while those in (46-51) do so with many obvious exceptions.

Second, both sets of words are severely restricted in their capability to cooccur with qualifiers. The nouns in (71-75) are more restricted in this respect than many of the so-called adverbs. Nonetheless, the only few examples we know of are recorded here below:

(76) Kikó von ní méjíméji yí kò níi yá tó

gathering them in two-two this not be it quick enough

'This act of removing them two at a time will not be quick enough'.

(77) Wíwá ní ojojúmọ rẹ kò yé mi

(coming in everyday his not clear me)

'His coming everyday puzzles me'.

The noun méjíméji is qualified by 'yí' 'this' in (76), and ojojúmọ by the genitival qualifier 'rẹ' 'his' in (77).

Third, both sets of words normally do not function as subject and/or object of verbs\(^2\). Thus, there are no strings like the following where the non-terminal symbols could actually be replaced by appropriate lexical items:

\(^1\) Words like àgbàgbà and ìgbàgbọ̀n are such exceptions we know of.

\(^2\) They invariably occur as the objects of the verb da/di 'to become' as in (i) Ò dì ojojúmọ rẹ (it -ing became everyday your)

'It is becoming an everyday occurrence with you'.

(ii) Ò dì kitàkità (it become kitàkità)

'Things suddenly turn into kitàkità'.
Finally, by virtue of the function they perform in sentence structure both sets of words can be topicalized and nominalized identically. Consider:

(80) Adé lọ kiákiá. (Adé go quickly) 'Adé went quickly'.

Corresponding with the following:

(81) Kiákiá ni Adé lọ (quickly emph-marker Adé go) 'Adé went without any delay at all'.

(82) Kiákiá ti Adé lọ dára (quickly that Adé go good) 'The fact that Adé went quick was good'.

And, (83) and (84) below correspond to (75).

(83) Osọsọ ni sọ lọ (every-week emph-marker he -ing go) 'He goes every week'.

(84) Osọsọ ti sọ n lọ kọ dára (every-week that he -ing go no good) 'The fact that he goes every week is not good'.

However, it should be noted that although in the gloss of (84) it is written 'fact of going' it is really the act of going that is not good'.

Thus, we conclude that both sets of words fit in primarily into the slots of NP's as implied in this section.

5.0.2 The Ideophones

Hitherto, what is known about the so-called ideophones is purely conjectural. Rowlands (1970) who gives a penetrating insight into the surface appearances of the phenomena, 'to which it has been found convenient to give the name of ideophones' comes near our analysis of the phenomena by referring to some of them as nominals and
complements. We intend to refer to the relevant parts of the existing works in passing if and when they throw light on our argument in the present study. A close examination of these works shows a non-concensus of opinion as to what the nature of the phenomenon called the 'ideophone' is. Whitehead (1964; Reprinted) says it is an 'indeclinable adjective', Torend (1921) says it is a 'mimic noun' and 'onomatopoeic substantive'. It is left for Doke (1954) to label them, first as 'descriptive radicals' and finally as 'ideophones', the label they carry up till now.

Note that all the aforementioned authors worked on African languages. Using evidences from English and French we will demonstrate that the phenomenon belongs to the Universal Base Hypothesis (UBH) and it is not just a characteristic of a particular language or a group of languages.

The following, we presume, could be regarded as 'ideophones' in English.

(85) clikety-clack dilly-dally gumbo-limbo
clippety-clop nush-mash peeh-pooch hotch-potch
ding-dong slip-shod highty-tighty
criss-cross tom-tom froggy-woggy
dum-dum wishy-washy wig-wag
flip-flop willy-nilly rifty-tufty
higgledy-piggledy whittie-whattie
hugger-mugger knick-knock flim-flam
hush-hush rip-rap tick-tack
hurdy-gurdy hanky-panky helter-skelter
goody-goody riff-raff tick-tock
hanky-panky tip-toe topsy-turvy
see-saw tip-top shilly-shally
zigzag dilly-dally dum-dum¹
wish-wash tag-rag

¹ Many of these are recognized as adverbs, and few as nouns, adjectives and verbs in English, here our choice is based on phonological criteria.
These examples are picked at random from OED. Our first observation is that it is not enough to call all of them onomatopoeics because, as could be seen at a glance most of them are not echoes. Our justification for calling them ideophones is as follows: first, they show instances of reduplication which is rare in English, second, certain vowels alternate and finally, the alternation of the consonants seem to be of the pattern (+ grave) (- grave) in many cases just like the Yorùbá 'ideophones'.

The French examples we suspect to be ideophones are as follows:

(86) passe-passe 'sleight of hand'
fur-furace 'scurfy'
tic-tac 'tick-tack'
mic-mac 'underhand dealing, foul play'
zig-zag 'zig-zag'
cache-cache 'hide-and-seek'
flic flac 'crack (of a whip')
cabin-caha 'so-so, slowly, poorly, slowly'.

5.0.3 Phonology of the So-called Ideophones.

From the above discussion of the phenomena, it is obvious that what marks them out distinctly, regardless of the syntactic and semantic properties, is their phonological surface appearance. We deem it necessary therefore, to discuss the phonology as briefly as it relates to the present study. However, we do not intend to discuss it in relation to what we consider to be non-productive to the present work, by this we mean, cries of animals,¹ birds and insects; sounds of automobile engines and babbling of children. All these and the like sounds are unique, and almost every human being can

¹ Samarin (1967: 36-7).
respond to them whether articulated or mumbled because they\(^1\) are universal rather than part of any human language.

Hitherto, and to the best of our knowledge, there is only one work in existence on the phonology of the phenomena\(^2\) (a \& b) and this of course, is not meant to be a full scale work. And neither do we pretend to present a lengthy work, as remarked earlier, as that is beyond the scope of the present work. What we propose to do is to augment the existing works. Set out below is our observation.

5.0.4 Syllable Constraint of the Ideophones.

First, the phenomena obey the open syllable constraint, the only seeming exception to this constraint, however, is the presence of intervocalic syllabic nasal in the polysyllabic 'ideophones'. But then, there is evidence which suggests that the syllabic nasal is not an underlying feature in either the so-called ideophonic and non-ideophonic forms, hence, the double pronunciation for many of the non-ideophonic forms: Consider:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
(87) & \text{kèrègbè} \quad \text{kè- ì - gbè} \quad \text{(gourd)} \\
& \text{prùnlá} \quad \text{ò - n - lá} \quad \text{'dried okro'} \\
& \text{brùne} \quad \text{ò - ì - gbè} \quad \text{'thirst'} \\
& \text{gógòrdò} \quad \text{gógò - ì - gbò} \quad \text{'Adam's apple'} \\
& \text{dìde (v)} \quad \text{ì - de} \quad \text{'stand up'} \\
& \text{pèlè} \quad \text{ì - lè} \quad \text{'form of greeting'}. \\
\end{array}
\]

Furthermore, we observe that both the 'ideophones' and 'non-ideophones' observe the following: (i) CV syllable structure,

\(^1\) However, it is noticed that cries of animals and the like are certainly different from language to language for instance, cats do not make the same noise to an Englishman and a Frenchman.

\(^2\) (a) Courtenay (1968) Appendix: (b) Cyclaran (1971), quite accurately does not label them ideophones. However, both Courtenay and Cyclaran posit a sort of sequence structure conditions (SSC) for 'non-ideophones' but lack of adequacy in their handling SSC for ideophones is apparent. (See below).
(ii) non-nasal vowel-initial and (iii) non-vowel-vowel sequence structures. Besides these, the so-called 'ideophones' have the following peculiarities (a) abundant reduplication (b) there are no vowel-initial canonical 'ideophones' (c) no single syllabic elements can constitute an ideophone (d) and finally, the canonical CIC|CIVl sequence is peculiar to Yorùbá 'ideophones'. It is observed furthermore, that a sequence of identical consonants always has identical vowels, but not vice versa. It is found necessary to explain this constraint why the penultimate identical consonant deletion does not apply to this sequence, except of course if it is fully reduplicated. Consider:

(88) pòpò / pòpò + pòpò / - pòpòpò 'of falling in succession'.

gôgô / gôgô + gôgô / - gôgôgôgô 'of being costly'.

The identical consonant deletion rule will be discussed later in this chapter.

5.1.0 Consonant Sequence of the Ideophones

The much neglected area, in discussing the ideophones in many languages, is the sequences. It is the order of the day to concentrate on the vowels by the various authors who care to discuss the phenomena. The frequency of occurrence of consonant alternations we observe in the case of Yorùbá is the voicing harmony.

This alternation, that is, of voicing, seems to be confined to disyllabic, trisyllabic and quadrisyllabic 'ideophones' as will be demonstrated soon in this section. It is more of a device rather to create further 'ideophones' than for alternate pronunciations. The different forms are not quite interchangeable, but they display a striking feature of
having sets of voiced and voiceless consonants acting as syllable frames for identical or non-identical vowels. Examples are:

(89) b-r-gb-: b-r-p bɔrɔgbɔ: bɔrɔpɔ of being big and heavy.
gb-m-gb: p-m-p gbəngbɔ: pəmpɔ of being large and thick.
r-gb-d: r-p-t ṭɔgbɔdɔ: ṭɔpwdɔ of being of stately bearing/formless.
g-d-gb: k-t-p gudɔgbɔ kɔtɔpɔ of stamping hoofs
gɔdɔgbɔ: kɔtɔpɔ of being round/of being round and big /and deep.

g-n-g : k-n-g ɡɔŋɡɔ / kɔŋɡɔ curved stick for /plucking fruits/beating drums.
g-n-g : k-n-k ɡâŋɡə: kânkə of being tall and huge: of being huge.
j-g-d : j-k-t įɛɡɛdɛ įɛkɛtɛ of being crest fallen.
r-g-d : r-k-t rogo do: rokoto of being/round: bright.
b-r-k-t:k-r-b-t birikiti: kiribiti of being round.
barakata: karabata of being round and hefty.

These type of alternations are also noted in common nouns of 'ideophonic' nature. Consider:

(90) g-d-gb k-t-p - gudɔgbɔ: kɔtɔpɔ a poisonous potato-like tuber: a low ass
gidɔgbɔ: kɔtɔpɔ of head butting: a small earthenware.
Again, these 'non-ideophonic' nouns are more akin to the 'ideophonic' ones in their being consonant initial. This fact further justifies our claim that the so-called ideophones are nothing more than just nominals and nominalization; an issue which we will take up later in this chapter.

5.1.1 Vowel Sequences.

Unlike the consonant sequences, this is an area on which much that is of interest has been written by earlier writers as pointed out in the preceding section.

As we mention later in this study, (Chapter VII), many of the Yorùbá nouns, apart from the basic nouns, are derived from verbs by prefixation and others are derived via reduplication (gerunds and 'ideophones' and serialization of verbs).

What is peculiar to the so-called ideophones is a sequence of identical vowels, it is most remarkable that all the vowels in the language both oral and nasal have characteristics of occurrences in the so-called ideophones. However, we find that while a sequence of identical consonants usually has identical vowels, on the contrary, a sequence of identical vowels does not always guarantee the occurrence of identical

1 These are loan words from Hebrew and Hausa respectively.
consonants. This is why it has not been possible to state a
sequence constraint on identical vowels. Consider:

(91) gbàràgàda 'of being broad'
fèrègèdè 'of being broad'
mìnrìngìndìn 'of being stately' (occasion)
bàràkàtà 'of being heavy and sloppy'
rògòdò 'of being round and small'
kòròbòtò 'of being plump and awesome'
kùrunìsù 'powder'
rògòdò 'of being round and big'
rògòdò 'of being round and small'
gùgùrù 'pop corn'

The following are the sequence of occurrence we
observe:

(92) (i) V1-V2-(V2)

kòngí 'rock'
yàngí 'granite rock'
filà 'cap'
gbèdu 'a type of drum'
dùgbè 'name of market'
gádko 'for the whole period'
kàngá 'well'
bàkitì 'of being big'
yàngídì 'of being hefty'
pàkitì 'a type of mat'
sàwòro 'a jingling object'.

(ii) V1-V1-V2-(V2)

kùkùtè 'tree-stump'
pàtákò 'hoof'
pàtákò 'plank'
bètèkùn 'of being big'
gùnnàkù 'of being tall and bumpy'

¹ Note this saying which is common in Yorùbá: Kòròbòtò bí Òká, 'plump and awesome like a Cobra'.
këlêbô 'of being big-headed'
bìrikòtô 'of being small and round' (e.g. a hole)
bìrikòtô 'of being large and round' (e.g. a hole)
bùrògìdi 'of being bare'
klirìkòtô 'a kind of drum'
bùròkìni 'a respectable man'

(iii) V₁-V₂-V₁-V₂
This group is rare in the language the examples we have in our list are
kòbìkòbì {† of being knotty.
kòdìkòdì

(iv) V₁-V₂-V₃ (V₃)
bàtiyê 'of being wide (e.g. feet)'
patiyê 'a whip'
yánnibo 'a female tortoise'
lágiḍò 'a chimpanzee'
jàkùtè 'elephantiasis'
fìngbàdì 'of being huge'
ràkùnmì 'a camel'
bàtìkàn 'of being huge'
làkùrégbé 'rheumatism'

(v) V₁-N-V₁-(V₁)
As indicated by (v) the sequence has an intervening syllabic nasal. Consider:

gbànitìgbà 'of being wide and heavy'
gòngò 'a type of insect'
bìmbìbì 'of being rotund'
bìmbìbì 'a type of drum'
bìmbè 'of being small (e.g. piece of cloth)
kòngò 'a curved stick for beating drum'
pòmpò 'a club'

† The two examples are found in Delano (1958: 127), as previously mentioned, the pattern is rare in the language hence our suspicion that they may be cases of reduplication.
'a sieve'
'God: the name of a bird'
'of being expansive'
'of being few'.

As we pointed out earlier, there is an independent evidence which suggests that the syllabic nasals are not underlying features. We shall take up this issue later.

(vi) $V_1-N-V_2-(V_2)$

'ləmtə 'of being heavy'
jəmhə 'of being big'
bəmtə 'a triangular-shaped men's underwear'
sənələ 'of protruding object'
pəmsukə 'stool'

(vii) $V_1-V_2-V_1-V_1$

pəkətsərə 'a small earthenware'

(viii) $V_1-V_2-V_1-V_2$

pagidarə 'fancy that'

(ix) $V_1-V_1-V_2-V_1$

gbədəmukə 'of being ceremonial'

(x) $V_1-V_2-V_1-V_3$

jəkərədə 'of inferior quality'

(xi) $V_1-V_1-N-V_1$

gbalanja 'of being long and slim'

Kόνκότο as a traditional god is associated with the children hence the song: Kόνκότο ơriŋə ëwe/ /If Kόνκότο ɨ r'odd

'Kόνκότο the god of kids/ /When Kόνκότο is going to the stream'

Ma r'ogędə ma r'ëkə
'I will buy bananas I will buy ɘkə'
(a type of corn paste).

Why it should share its name with a bird is not clear.
pèlèŋkè 'of being slim'
jèlèŋkè 'of being easy and pleasurable'
șálôgá 'pit latrine (salga)'
gôgôngó 'Adam's apple'.

(xii) $V_1-V_1-N-V_2$
dódbôngbá 'locust bean fruit'
yêlônkú 'of unsteady running'

(xiii) $V_1-V_1-N-V_1-V_2$
Fabanbârì 'alasí'
kàlámbarì 'name of an ethnic group in S. Nigeria'.

The above thirteen patterns are the only possible sequences of occurrences in the language. By this, we mean the only meaningful possible patterns of sequence of occurrences because the sequence is very productive, but there it ends, because beyond the thirteen sequence of occurrences analysed above the productivity results in meaningless Yorùbá lexical items.

5.1.2 Syllabic Forms of the Phenomena.

It is necessary to show different types of syllabic forms of the 'ideophones' for ease of reference rather than for an explanatory insight.

Two types of 'ideophones' are prevalent in the language namely: those we regard as 'regulars' are basically the monosyllabic, trisyllabic and quadrisyllabic ones. They are not difficult to identify because they more often than not have identical vowels and could be nominalized by prefixation. However, among this group only the monosyllabic ideophones are severely restricted because of their shortness. But they always have identical long vowels. The 'irregulars' are quadrisyllabic in nature and we have some longer ones in the
language. The criterion for our classification is the number of syllables an 'ideophone' has before it undergoes syntactically and semantically conditioned reduplications if it is necessary for it to do so.

5.1.3 Monosyllabic 'Ideophones'.

These are mainly of one single consonant and a vowel. The vowel which is always long phonetically can be kept short in the lexicon and the length be extracted as a prosody or feature to be added by a phonological rule of vowel lengthening. This could be justified by the fact that the lengthening is both syntactically and semantically motivated. However, this set of the so-called ideophones could still be further lengthened for topicalized effect. Consider:

(93) (i) gbîl 'of something hitting the ground'
gbâå 'of malleting something'
gbû ñ 'of a collision'
wê 'of being relieved'
tôô 'of outstretched hand'.

This same type of phenomena is found in disyllabic 'ideophones' as witnessed by:

(ii) yōnmûn 'of chewing hastily'
gbûññ 'of pulling out'
dûgôô 'of carrying something sloppily'
sîtâ 'of bumping into something'.

However, it is observed that these disyllabic forms are capable of undergoing 'distributive' reduplication when their vowels are not lengthened as in the following:

(iii) yōnymûnymû
    gbûññgbûññ
    dûgôôdûgôô
with almost the same meanings except for topological. That is to say, that the vowel lengthening and the distributive reduplication are mutually exclusive. It should be noted however that the vowel lengthening is not peculiar to the so-called ideophones alone there are many other instances in the language as a whole. It is this fact that leads to our conclusion that it is syntactically and semantically motivated. Other occurrences of the vowel lengthening we observe are as follows: (a) in desiderative matrix verbs after the application of Equi-NP Deletion rule (see Chapter III for details). Consider:

\[(94) \quad \text{'he want he go'}\]

which derives from \[(95)\].

\[(95)\]

After Equi-NP Deletion rule has applied the subject of the embedded sentence is erased. The dangling NP node is automatically occupied by the lengthening of the vowel of the desiderative verb.

To justify our theory of the source of the extra syllable constructions like \[(94)\] above cited below \[(96)\] is an example of a structure that has no desiderative verb,
which derives from (97).

Note that: (a) The subject of (96-97) is inanimate; (b) Vowel lengthening occurs also in echo questions; (c) in an expression of sincere denial

\[ \text{e.g.} \quad \text{mi o rli i} \]
\[ \quad (\text{me not see sincerely it}) \]
\[ \quad \text{'Sincerely, I did n't see it'}; \quad \text{and} \]

(d) in certain prepositions

\[ \text{e.g.} \quad \text{mi un \un \lps} \]
\[ \quad (\text{put it on ground}) \]
\[ \quad \text{'Put it on the ground'} . \]

It is possible that all these instances of vowel lengthening are part of the same phenomenon but their functions are different and contextual. We do not intend to go further on the status and sources of vowel lengthening in Yorùbá as it is a wide enough topic to constitute a thesis by itself. Suffice it to say that its role in the so-called ideophones is for intensity and the sound effect of the activities concerned.
5.1.4  **Disyllabic 'Ideophones'**

The disyllabic 'ideophones' have a CVCV structure, where the consonants, the vowels and the tones may be identical, that is, identical consonants - identical vowels + identical tones. E.g. papa 'field'; where we have C1-V1-C1-V1 and (+H) + (+H). Or everything may be different: Consider:

gbáko 'a whole period'
where we have C1-V1-C2-V2 and (+H) + (-H)

Other examples are:

(99) (a) wàrè 'quick'  (b) dòdò 'fried plantain'
(c) fòrò 'of bursting out'  (d) pèrè 'only/of being cute'.

However, it is observed that many of the so-called ideophones of disyllabic forms can undergo prefixation and reduplication to provide further nominalization. The following are a few examples:

(100) (a) ò-yàlà 'loose garment'
       yàlàyàlà 'of being very loose'
(b) ò-fófó 'tale bearing'
       fófó 'of being fast of mouth'
(c) a-jere 'a perforated container'
       jerejere 'of having holes'
(d) ò-kókó 'straight ahead'
       kókó 'of being fast'.

5.2.0  **Tri-syllabic 'Ideophones'**

The ideophones in this category are of the sequence CV CV CV where the vowels and the tones may be identical. It is rare to find identical vowels in the category. Examples:
5.2.1 **Quadrисyllabic 'Ideophones'**

These ideophones have the sequence CVCVCVCV which may reduce to CVVCVCV, CV - N - CVCV, and CV CV -N-CV on the surface where only the tones, and the vowels are identical. It is observed that many of the quadrисyllabic ideophones have no identical consonants. In fact, there is not a single one in our list. It should be noted that many, if not all, of the examples with identical consonant sequences are products of one form of reduplication or another. Consider:

(102) (a) gągągągą' of being huge'
(b) rorɔrɔrɔ'speechlessness'

and

(c) fɛfɛ - /fɛfɛ + fɛfɛ / - fɛfɛfɛ

i.e. 'distributive' reduplication with penultimate consonant deletion. Examples of quadrисyllabic ideophones:

(103) (a) bɔrɔkɔtɔ'of being fat'
(b) kɔrɔbɔtɔ'of being coily, fat and awesome'
(c) dɔdɔgɔbɔ'locust bean tree'
(d) pɔmpɔla'a type of tree'
(e) porogodo'of being finished (matter/material)'.

5.2.2 **Reduplication**

Just like its sister, the gerund, the 'ideophonic' reduplication is very productive. However, there are two
types of reduplication which should be recognised in generative grammar. One is the morphologically-conditioned reduplication, which is usually partial-reduplication. The other is the syntactically-conditioned reduplication.

Morphologically-conditioned reduplication is unanalyseable and non-recoverable. It usually involves copying a whole syllable. It is correctly labelled as 'frozen' reduplication. It is difficult to tell whether the process of copying is forward or backward. Consider the following:

(104) (a) kókóóro insect
(b) kókóóró key
(c) dóóé fried plaintain
(d) gbágbárá of being huge
(e) pépé field (see 5.1.4 above).

As there is no obvious way of showing how copying rules apply to produce these forms, we suggest therefore, that they remain in the lexicon in these forms.

But on the contrary, there are those that are of syntactically-semantically conditioned reduplication. This group is predictable, analyseable and recoverable. They are more productive than the morphologically conditioned ones. The reduplication is both full and partial, as well as forward and backward. They could be 'distributive', tone-conditioned or of partial-reduplication.

The distributive reduplication covers a lot of reduplicative processes in the language. It is always full and forward. It covers almost all forms of nominalization in the language, as witnessed by:

1 Courtenay (1968: 115).
(105) (i) gbomgbom (gbé omó - carry child) 'kidnapper'
woléwolé (wo-ilé - look house) 'Sanitary Inspector'
pejepëja (pa eja - kill fish) 'fisher man'.

(ii) tómétomó † (ti omó - of child) 'children and all'
túnútúnú (ti inú - of stomach) 'sincerely'
tilétile (ti-ilé - of house) 'all the household'.

(iii) méjiméjí (mú éji - take two) 'in twos'
çoçođon (çođün çođün - year year) 'every year'.

Note that those under group (i) are agentive, (ii), prepositional and (iii) numerals and quantitative nominalizations.

Next is the reduplication of the so-called ideophones:

(106) (a) gbágidi (basic) 'of being huge'
    gbágidi - gbágidi (distributive) 'of several huge things'

(b) kërë (basic) 'of moving quietly'
    kërë-kërë (distributive) 'of moving quietly several times'

(c) gbirigidi (basic) 'of rolling on the ground'
    gbirigidi-gbirigidi (distributive) 'of rolling along on the ground'.

5.2.3 Partial Reduplication.

This type of reduplication is about the most productive in the language. It is basically of two types the first being the gerundive reduplication which involves prefixing a copy of the first consonant of the verb stem, and a high-tone / i / on the stem itself, this type has already been discussed in Chapter III and also as cognate nouns at the early part of this Chapter. Examples are:

† See Chapter IV for the formation of this type.
The second type of partial reduplication which is peculiar to the so-called ideophones involves copying a syllable CV, either final or initial on the stem. Consider:

(108) (i) gogoro - gogorogo: 'loftiness' (copying the initial syllable)
pepere - peperepe: 'of being cute' (copying the initial syllable)
keşre - keşreke 'of dragging something' (copy the initial syllable)

(ii) fôregôdê - fôregôdê 'of being wide' (copy the final syllable)
 gbâgidî - gbâgidîl 'of being bulky' (copy the final syllable)
 rûbûtû - rûbûtûl 'of being round and thick' (copy the final syllable).

5.2.4 Phonological Rules.

Like many other lexical items the so-called ideophones have almost the same sets of phonological rules, in actual fact, even less phonological rules than most of the other lexical items as will be demonstrated soon.

5.3.0 The r-Deletion Rule

Let us consider personal names/cognomens\(^1\) first.

\(^1\) These are personal *Orich's* some of which are taken as personal names by some people. (Cf. Abraham 1958: 482-3).
(109) (i) Awọrọ - Awọ (one who is wasked to stay)
Akànrọ - Akànọ (one who is nailed to stay)
Adérìbigbé - Adérìbigbé (crown finds a place to live)
Adégoróyè - Adégoróyè (crown mounts chieftain).

(ii) Basic Nouns:
agbàra - agbáa 'strength'
ágbàra - agbá 'erosion'
ábára - ábá 'a slap with open palm'.

(iii) The so-called ideophones:
fèrègèdè - fèrègèdè 'of being broad'
fàràrà - fàrà 'of fast motion'
porogodo - pòogodo 'completely'
dùròmi - dùròmi 'of being long'.

It should be noted, however that this rule does not apply to many other Yorùbá nominals. Consider:

(110) kerewà 'bracelet'
hóróbo: worobo 'confectionery'
yèrèpè: wèrèpè 'an itching plant'.

The rule then is as follows:

Rule 10: /r/ deletion
/r/ - (V) CV - V (CV CV).

5.3.1 Identical Penultimate Consonant Deletion Rule.

This is another rule which covers almost all nominals in Yorùbá besides the so called ideophones. It could be regarded as a general rule: Consider the following examples:

(111) ótító - óító - óótó¹ 'truth'
ótító - óító - óótó 'stamp'

¹ This is also noticeable in personal names such as: Ajékìgbé - Ajéìgbé - Ajéégbé (money not perish) 'an outlay will never be a total loss'. Òlákitàn - Òlákitàn - Òláetàn (honour not finish) 'honour can never end'. (See Abimbọla, W., Cyléaran, O. (1975: 54).
agogo - aogo - aogo 'clock/bell'
èrifì - ìrifì - èrì 'dirt'
egigun - eigun - eggun 'bone'
diyà - ìiyà - ìdíyà 'comb'
deđi - ìđi - ìđì 'cork'
bódodo - ì déjà - ìdodo 'truth'
dódòdè - ìdòdè - ìdídè 'hall-way'
dóló - ìóló - ìóló 'a dough made of beans'.

However there are examples which the rule does not apply to even though the SD is met; some of the exceptions are:

(112) òyàyà 'cheerfulness'
óddòdò 'flower'
órintrín 'chilly period'
òbòbè 'fan'.

5.3.2 Vowel Deletion.

As we mentioned earlier in this chapter, the syllabic nasal is not underlying the so called ideophones. Hence, the following examples have alternative pronunciations in the language:

(113) (a) pòrípóla - pòhpóla 'a kind of tree'
(b) òrígbórọ - òhpógbórọ 'loosely'
(c) akèrègbè - akè ògbè 'gourd'
(d) kàrègbè - kè ògbè 'gourd'
(e) gbègbìgbì - gbègbìgbì 'Adam's apple'
(f) kòrikò - kònkò 'wolf'
(g) kòrikò - kònkò 'grass'

The rule we posited for the vowel deletion is this:

Rule 11: Vowel Deletion Rule:

V ø /C - CV (CV).
5.3.3 **Metathesis**

This is found in the following words in which there are transpositions of penultimate and terminal consonants. Examples of such words are:

- eruku ekuru 'dust'
- kodoro korodo 'of being bare'
- kọdọrọ  kọrọdọ } 'of bent object'

These are the only examples we have in our list, why the transposition is restricted to /k/ and /r/; and /d/ and /r/ is not clear. This, however, is a matter of interest for further research as the scope of the present study excludes an elaborate discussion of Yorùbá phonology.

5.3.4 **The so-called Ideophones and Factive Nominalization**

So far, we have been discussing the nature of the phenomena known as ideophones by some Yorùbá linguists. This discussion we hope, serves two purposes; First, we know the nature of the phenomena. Second, knowing the nature puts into true perspective our discussion of nominalization in Yorùbá.

Earlier in this chapter, we argue that our deep structure proposal for the factive nominalization will solve once and for all, all the mysteries that shroud certain structures in Yorùbá. One of the structures being the so-called ideophones. It should be noted, however, that the phenomena are not more ideophonic than any other Yorùbá lexical items (especially those we have argued to be nouns) of similar phonetic realizations in the language. Bamgbose (1966: 127) says of them, 'adverbs for which no independent
translations are given are ideophones. Their meanings' he contends, 'depend on the verbs with which they are in collocations'. However, no penetrating account of the phenomena is given. Newman (1968: 117) remarks 'ideophonic words in Hausa, whatever their function, are lexically tied to particular verbs or adjectives. This is common feature of ideophones, in African languages' he concludes, 'Tera ideophones, by contrast, are not lexical adjuncts of particular nouns or verbs-ideophonic words may freely co-occur with any word with which they are semantically compatible'. What is observable in these types of remarks is the author's identification of the phenomena with verbs and adverbs, and nothing can be far from truth than this.

As remarked earlier in this section, we are in sympathy with Mr Rowlands conclusion that the so-called ideophones be analysed as nominals. Thus, we discover that they can be qualified by a possessive pronoun and a relative clause. They could be used as adjectives as well they could follow the derived nominal forms of a verb that can follow the verb. Consider the following examples:

(114)  Kòbòtò rẹ ni kọ jọ kọ ś le rin
(flaby his/her/its is not let that he/she/it can walk)

'His/her/its rotundity retards his/her/its movement'.

(115)  Òmọ kàbítì yen ni agbàra (child hefty that has power)

'That hefty child is strong'.

(116)  Òífùnufùn bálàn rẹ wọ ní (being white snow its appeal me)

'Its being snow white pleased me'.
(117) Omọ roboto na wá a kí mì
c (child cute the come to visit me)
"The cute child came to visit me".

Note that the examples given are the following; the
phenomenon qualified by a possessive pronoun (114), modifies
a noun (115), follows the derived nominal of a verb (116) and
used as an adjective (117) respectively. (116) is conventionally
represented as (118).

(118)

That the so-called ideophones are nominals is
obvious in that many of them function as factive nominaliza-
tion. Consider the following:

(119) Roboto rè dára
(round and sizeable her good)
"Her being round and sizeable is good".

(120) Dúdú minjọ rè wù mì
(being black and smooth its please me)
"Its being black and smooth pleased me".

(121) Roboto rè wù mì
"Her being round and sizeable pleased me".
(122) Pé ó ñàìígbôn dára (that he tall and hefty good) 'That he is tall and hefty is good'.

(123) Ò dára pé ó ñàìígbôn
(It good that he tall and hefty) 'It is good that he is tall and hefty'.

(124) ñàìígbôn rọ dára
(being tall and hefty his good) 'His being tall and hefty is good'.

The structures (122) - (124) display the complement structure that + Indicative to show factive nominalization as argued in the earlier section of this Chapter.

Now, let us go back to factive and non-factive verbs. It is observed that while the verbs in the two groups are capable of talking pé 'that', it is only the subject embedding factives that take kikik i dá pé 8 complements. However, it is the presupposition that makes the distinction between object-embedding factives and the non-factives; but not the fact that the factives can take kikik i dá, ìsàn and ìgàdè as witnessed by the following examples:

(125) Factive
Mo gbàgbé pé ó wá (I forget that you come) 'I forgot that you came'.

Non-factive

(126) Mo fura pé ó lọ̀ (I suspect that you go) 'I suspected you went'.

Note that 'you came' in (125) is presupposed whereas it is that not true of (126)'that you went'. is presupposed. Further tests to (125) by negating and questioning it prove that the presupposition is unaffected. Consider:

(127) N kò gbàgbé pé ó wá (I not forget that you come) 'I did not forget that you came'.
On the basis of this analysis we recommend that factivity be ingrained in the grammar of the language.

5.4.0 **Emotive/Non-Emotive Nominalization.**

In conventional generative grammar, Rosembaum (1967) proposed that *for-to* and *Poss-* were the features on the heads of sentential complements. These are arbitrarily inserted by a complementizer placement rule. The infinitives, for instance, are derived by a for-deletion rule. This is unworkable in Yorùbá because Yorùbá does not recognize the placement rule since the appearance of the complementizers in Yorùbá, that is; *pè 'that' pè.kí that + subjunctive*, and *láti/ati 'to'* depends on some crucial semantic facts about the matrix verbs as we have demonstrated in showing the distinction between factive and non-factive verbs.

The factive and non-factive distinction already outlined can explain the occurrence of *pè (that + indicative)* in several factive and non-factive nominalizations. It also explains the copying phenomenon peculiar to some verbs and a sub-set of nominals labelled as the ideophones by some Yorùbá grammarians.

The emotive complements are those to which the speaker expresses a subjective, emotional or evaluative reaction, in fact, all predicates which express the subjective value of a proposition rather than knowledge about it or its truth value (cf. Kiparskys (1968: 363), Stockwell et al (1973: 345)). The distinction between the emotive and non-emotive verbs cuts across the factive/non-factive distinction because
there are factive emotive and non-emotive verbs. It will not
be out of place here, if we do what we did for the factive/
non-factive verbs. Consider the following:

Factive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotive</th>
<th>Non-emotive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>factic</td>
<td>non-factive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| as subject-embedding | Kórirá: 'hate' gbàgbé 'forget' |
| as subject-embedding | férán: 'like' sì pé 'make explicit' |
| as subject-embedding | kò : resent: fì sòkàn 'bear in mind'. |

Non-factives

| as object-embedding | ípọ 'eager' sìwọ: 'stop' |
| as object-embedding | súlór 'pray' |
| as object-embedding | gẹ́pẹ́ 'curse' sọ: 'say'. |

The question, one may ask, is how relevant this
second distinction we provide, is. The answer to this
question is not so hidden to be difficult to get at. The
distinction, we observe, provides the source for the other
complementizer, pé kí 'that + subjunctive' which we have
treated in Chapter III above.
The pë, kì complements belong to the emotives 'to which the speaker expresses a subjective, emotional, or evaluative reaction'. Sometimes it alternates with fùn- láti 'for-to' as in the following examples.

(129) (a) Ọ tọ pë kì n lọ
(It fit that I go)
'It is befitting that I go'.

(b) Ọ tọ fùn mì láti lọ
(It fit for me to go)
'It is befitting for me to go'.

(130) (a) Ọ dára pë kì n lọ (It good that I go)
'It is good that I go'.

(b) Ọ dára fùn mì láti lọ
(It good for me to go)
'It is good for me to go'.

In the (b) sentences of (129-130) the occurrence of fùn can be accounted for as due to an insertion rule which applies whenever subject-to-object raising applies to delete and raise the embedded subject mo 'I' to the object position of the matrix verbs tọ 'to be fit' and dára 'to be good' while the remaining parts of the sentences become infinitives. (See Chapter III above for details).

Notice that pë 'that' is semantically empty in this environment since it could be optionally deleted by semantic redundancy rule to convert the (a) - sentences of (129-130) to (131 (a) & (b)) respectively as witnessed by:

(131) (a) Ọ tọ kì n lọ (It fit that I go)
'It is befitting that I go'.

(b) Ọ dára kì n lọ (It good that I go)
'It is good that I go'.
Notice also that it appears that पेँ 'that' can be inserted whenever there is an embedded sentence which is not a relative clause. This possibility suggests itself more strongly since of all the complementizers, पेँ 'that' has the least strict cooccurrence restriction with tense and aspect markers. Consider the following:

\[(132)\]

(a) \(\text{सो पे सुन ना लो} \) (he say that he -ing go)
'He says that he is going'.

(b) \(\text{सो पे अव ना ना लो} \)
(he says that अव - habitual- - fut-1p)
'He says that Ade usually goes'.

(c) \(\text{सो पे के ना ना लो} \) (he says that I go)
'He says that I should go'.

(d) \(\text{सो पे के ना माना लो} \)
(he say that I should go)
'He says that I should keep going'.

Quite unlike पेँ the complementizer के cannot cooccur with tense and aspect markers. It should therefore be pointed out that the rule that inserts पेँ is more general than the one that inserts के. Notice that in (132 (a) & (b)) the verb सो 'to say' is not quite the same as in (132 (d) & (c)). In the former it is plain reporting whereas in the latter it is desiderative, hence, it can take the के-complementizer.

Similarly कु न 'for' occurs only after emotive complements, and that, we presume accounts for its insertion in the (b) sentences of (129-130).

In this Chapter we have used the semantic classes of verbs to determine the types of complements they are capable of taking and thereby clear the mist that has surrounded
previous analyses by some Yorùbá Grammarians.

The True Adverbs

The lexical items that are true adverbs in Yorùbá are only four in number. These are (i) ná 'certainly', (ii) ndf 'for a minute', ndf 'ever again' and ná 'ever before'. These are post verbal elements. They can occur with any verb or group of serialized verbs.

---

1 Professor Awobuluyi (1967: 61) arbitrarily subcategorizes the verbs into three groups 'according to which of the two embedded sentences they take thus':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sọ 'to say'</td>
<td>fẹ 'to want'</td>
<td>sọ 'to say'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wọ 'to say'</td>
<td>gbà 'to agree'</td>
<td>gbà 'to agree'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re 'to realize'</td>
<td>jẹ 'to permit'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gbọ 'to hear'</td>
<td>jẹ 'to hear'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j 'to be'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To group one verbs, he assigns the frame [+ - a /s /s] for sentences whose objects are introduced by nà. He assigns the frame [+ - (ti) OC] to the second group of verbs whose objects are always introduced by ki.

Notice that this is a classification of convenience since it is not motivated either syntactically or semantically. First, we observe that it is not enough to sub-categorize verbs because their complements take nà and almost all embedding complements in the language are susceptible to taking nà. Second, note that two of the three examples quoted in the second group of verbs also take jẹti to introduce infinitives, that is, fẹ and gbà. Finally, we do not see any difference between his second and third groups noting the fact that nà is a much more general subordinator, and that the verbs in the two groups are desiderative verbs.
6.0.0 THE ARTICLE

In this chapter, we propose to discuss the classifier system in Yorùbá. In the first section we discuss the article, and the term 'article' should be understood to mean all the determiner elements in this work. So, we shall make no distinction between 'determiner' and 'article' since all the items discussed in this section are recognized as 'articles'.

The items that are treated include those that are called 'the deictic' and 'post-deictic' qualifiers in Bamgbose (1966)\(^1\), namely:

(1) the deictics

(a) \textit{yì}

'this'

(b) \textit{wọnyì}

'these'

(c) \textit{yẹn}

'that'

(d) \textit{wọnyẹn}

'those'

(e) \textit{wọ}

'which'

\(^1\) Bamgbose (1966; 114).
(2) the post-deictics
   (a) 'ná' ¹
       'exactly; even'
   (b) Ṽaنكá
       'too'
   (c) ḡikan
       'alone'
   (d) Ṽboŋbo
       'all'
   (e) k̄̄
       'even'

These items constitute the 'full list' in Professor Bamgbose's analysis, and they are determined by the surface structure phenomenon of occurring as the last set of elements in surface Yoruba Noun Phrases. Thus, the criteria of determination are surface (see Chapter I for discussion of the inappropriateness of the surface analysis). The criteria we use in this section to separate the two classes, that is, Bamgbose's deictics and post-deictics are the presence of a syntactic feature which we designate as £+ intensive £ for post-deictics and the nominalizability of the deictics. Thus, the items that can be nominalized turn up on the surface structure as Bamgbose's deictic qualifiers and those that cannot be nominalized turn up as the post-deictic qualifiers. It is observed that the nominal counterparts of the deictic qualifiers are respectively:

(3) (a) Ṽvî
       'this, this one, the one'

¹ We use the standard autography instead of 'nọ̀' and 'ọ̀nọ̀'. 
Notice that the nominal form ṣ̣viri 'that one' is apparently a compounding of ṣ̣vi 'the one' with ṣ̣li 'that'. This, however, is immaterial to the claim we make, the significant thing is that it is the nominal form of ṣ̣li 'that'.

We observe, however, that the 'full' lists in 1 and 2 constitute just a part of the Yorùbá determiner system since other deictic categories like that of person for personal pronouns (cf Lyons, J. (1968:276-8)) are not considered as deictics in Bamgbose's analysis and there are determined features like specificness which are not accounted for in Bamgbose's system because they are not represented by formatives in surface structure representations. Besides, personal names are generally definite, but they are rarely followed by the definite article at the surface level. Thus no adequate treatment of the Yorùbá determiner system can be carried out at the surface level.

It should be noted that in treating the articles within the transformational generative work, four main positions have been taken. The first position makes the
articles occur as the terminal symbols in grammar. In Chomsky's framework, articles are handled like other lexical items except that they form a closed set while others constitute an open set. However, in Chomsky (1965) where articles were treated the same way like any other lexical items another step was taken, that is, the system of matching features of terminal nodes of articles, for instance, those of agreements, with other lexical items. Thus, if $N$ is specified as $\{\alpha\text{Number}, \beta\text{Gender}, \gamma\text{Case}\}$, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ could be an integer, the article is similarly specified. One should note also that articles are still treated as other lexical items in Chomsky (1970) and (1971) although all the symbols of grammar (including the articles) are now regarded as 'complexes of features',¹ which brings about the idea of second lookup.

Thus, the suggestion about a transformational derivation of articles (especially definite articles) is beset with innumerable difficulties. Considering these difficulties, we deem it unnecessary to embark on the process of deriving articles transformationally from deleted sentences.

Yoruba articles are not content words (Contentives) since they do not have features of contentives² like the possibility of constituent negation, or the possibility of $\{\delta\text{stative}\}$ distinction, or possibility of occurrence as

---

¹ Chomsky (1970: 207-8).
² For more information on contentives see Bach, E. (1968:115).
the partitive of other items. What is more important is that there is no rule ART → ART and ART, which is similar to NP → NP and NP, or S → S and S. Notice that what we refer to as the nominal forms of articles here are the Demonstratives in traditional grammar.

Now, it is these nominal forms that can be conjoined. Consider:

(4) Wù ìyi ati iyen wá
    (bring this-one and that-one come)
    'Bring this and that!' 

but not

(5) *Wù yi ati yen wá
    (bring this and that come)
    'Bring this and that.' 

6.0.1 **Definite and Indefinite Features.**

As observed in the last part of the preceding section, a proposal of a sentential derivation for articles is not very desirable, as such a proposal will lead to an infinite derivational circularity. For instance, the underlying representations, that is, sentential, will still include articles. The type of sentential derivation we propose for (6) below is treated fully in the latter part of this chapter. Now, if for the definite article, we have the sentential substitute (6).

(6) ìyi tí ó dajú
    (the-one which is definite)
    'that which is definite'

Notice that the first item in the proposed logical structure ìyi 'the one' still contains the equivalent of the definite
article as the English gloss even suggests. Notice that it is only what is definite that can be referred to as \(\text{ayi}\) in the language. Now, in the logical structure of the definite article portion of \(\text{ayi}\), the whole of (6) will be repeated. That is, we shall get another \(\text{ayi}\) and the whole process will be repeated \textit{ad infinitum}.

The definite article \(\text{n\^a} '\text{the}'\) presents no problem as it behaves just like the English equivalent 'the', except that its occurrence is post nominal while the English definite article occurs prenominal. Consider:

(7) \(\text{Om\^ok\^unrin n\^a l\^o}\)
\(\text{(boy the go)}\)
\'The boy went'  

Notice that the noun \(\text{om\^ok\^unrin 'boy'}\) is identified for us as one special known example of the species whereas in (8)

(8) \(\text{Om\^ok\^unrin kan l\^o}\)
\(\text{(boy a go)}\)
\'A boy went'  

the noun is not identified for us in which case it could be any \(\text{om\^ok\^unrin 'boy'}\). However, Yoruba invariably deletes this article optionally in many expressions. Consider:

(9) \(\text{B\^ab\^a r\^e j\^e jagun jagun (father his is soldier)}\)
\'His father is a soldier'

(10) \(\text{B\^ab\^a r\^e j\^e jagun jagun kan (father his is soldier a)}\)
\'His father is a soldier'  

Notice that \(\text{kan 'a'}\) in (10) is not the same as its homophonous singular cardinal number as this will not be semantically compatible with the noun \(\text{jagun jagun} \) in (10).
However, (10) can be given the interpretation of 'a certain warrior'.

6.0.2 The Determiners.

The remaining determiners in Yorùbá consist of

(11) (a) ṣọọṣọ 'single'
(b) káká 'shere, hardly'
(c) papa 'especially'
(d) péré 'only'
(e) ganan 'specifically, exact'
(f) nikan 'alone'
(g) mélokan 'some, a few'

The determiners ṣọọṣọ and péré occur with quantity nouns only, however, the occurrence of ṣọọṣọ is severely restricted to the environment of the singular cardinal number only while péré is not so restricted. Consider the following:

(12) Mo mú ṣọọṣọ (I take one only) 'I took one only'

but not

(13) *Mo mú méwa ṣọọṣọ (I take ten only) 'I took ten only'

rather, (13) will be acceptable if péré is substituted for ṣọọṣọ thus:

(14) Mo mú méwa péré (I take ten only) 'I took ten only'

Professor Awobuluyi (forthcoming) rightly observes that classifiers in general narrow down the conceptual range or meanings of nouns. However, there are general and specific classifiers and this is the focus of the next section. In the meantime let us give further examples of the determiners.

(15) Ágbára káká ni ó fì lè rù ú
(force shere it is he put can carry it)
'He could hardly carry it'.
(16) Ojo fẹran AppComponent, papa ọwọ damasi
(Ojo like clothes, especially garment damask)
'Ojo likes clothes, especially damask garments'

(17) Ọyan gan an ni mo rẹ (that exact it is I want)
'I want the exact one'

(18) Mo lo ṣiṣẹ mélokan ni Eko ni ẹsi
(I use day few in Lagos in last year)
'I spent a few days in Lagos last year'

(19) Ade nikan ni o lọ
(Ade alone it is he go)
'Ade went alone'

In concluding this section, we suggest that ọyi and ọyan be treated as the determiner ọṣẹ in the component features but different from ọṣẹ with respect to the feature ɔ + DEM and differing from each other only by a single feature ɔ + FAR.

6.0.3 Classifiers.

In this section we made a distinction between basic and derived nouns. As observed later (Chapter VII) an examination of the internal structure of more complex nominal pieces reveals that it usually incorporates the major grammatical relations found in a whole sentence. That is, within the complex subject of a sentence, for example, we might find the transformed subject, verb, and object of an underlying sentence. The basic nouns on the other hand, are defined as nouns whose derivational histories are obscure. Bach (1968: 92) made a case for deriving all common nouns (basic and derived) from relative clauses and indicated that such derivations make for simplicity and
descriptive adequacy. He decided to postulate that all nouns (at least common nouns) are derived in one way, namely from structures of roughly the form:

(20) Det. + one + S

where S is further developed into a sentence by Rule 12 thus:

Rule 12  Sentence Extension.

Det + one + Aux + be + Predicate Nominal.

This could be further extended by a rule that will insert Relative Marker i.e. rule 13 below:

Rule 13  Relative Marker Insertion.

Det + one + RM + Aux + be + Predicate Nominal (see Chapter IV above for details on Relative structures). Thus, suppose the predicate nominal in Rule 12 were to dominate a lexical item like 'anthropologist' ultimately, the NP 'the anthropologist', will be derived by Rule 13 thus:

(21) the one who is an anthropologist

assuming that the mapping of (20) onto Rule 13 had already taken place. So, from Bach's proposal, common noun structures will have underlying structures that look like (20) and we will derive them by the application of Rules 12 and 13.

Thus the surface forms:

(22) (a) the man, (b) the teacher, (c) the school,
        (d) the pen, (e) the idea ...

would be derived respectively from:

(23) (a) the one who is a man
       (b) the one who is a teacher
       (c) the one which is a school
       (d) the one which is a pen
       (e) the one which is an idea etc.
6.0.4 Derived and Basic Nouns

We find the general form of Bach's argument not all that necessary to warrant our discussion here because it will unnecessarily impede the progress of this study. However, if we adopt Bach's proposal for Yorùbá there will be a common underlying treatment for both basic and derived nouns. It should be noted that at least two of the English nouns (21) and (22) (b) are derived. Thus, 'an anthropologist' could be 'one who is closely connected with anthropology' while 'a teacher' could be 'one who teaches'. But in the representation (23), there is no distinction in the underlying representation of derived nouns like 'teacher' and basic nouns like 'man'. Hence, if Bach's proposal were used for Yorùbá we would have representations like:

(24) (a) eyi ti ó je ẹniyan (the-one ti - he is person)
    'the one who is a person'
(b) eyi ti ó je ọkhrin 'the one who is a man'
(c) eyi ti ó je ọkọwé 'the one who is a clerk/writer'
(d) eyi ti ó je onipẹgún 'the one who is a doctor'
(e) eyi ti ó je ẹpọniyàn 'the one who is a murderer'
(f) eyi ti ó je ilé 'the one which is a house'

In the representation (24) no distinction is made between basic and derived nouns. In order to show the difference between derived and basic nouns, the derived nouns after je 'to be' could be represented with the proposed underlying forms in the representation (24) e.g.

---

(25) (a) eyi ti ó jë eni ti ó na ko íwé
   (the one ti-he is person ti-he ing write book)
   'the one that is a person who writes books'

(b) eyi ti ó jë eni ti ó pa ioni n
   (the one ti-he is person ti-he ing kill people)
   'the one that is a person who kills people'

I he type of representation in (25) were used
for derived nouns while basic nouns have only the type of
representation in (24) it will be possible to have underlying
sentential representation for all Yoruba common nouns while
still maintaining the distinction between basic and derived
nouns. First, the basic nouns will be those that are
introduced directly by the verb 'to be' of Rule (12), while
the derived nouns will be those formed from the NP representa-
tions that are introduced by the verb 'to be'. In other
words, for the basic nouns, the verb 'to be' directly
introduces lexical items which are nouns, whereas for the
non basic or derived group, it is the nominalization that
is introduced by the verb 'to be'.

Secondly, as we mentioned earlier, nominalizations
contain some verbal elements (e.g. verbs or 'predicative
adjectives') in these cases, e.g. na 'kill' in aqMwba
'murderer' ko 'write' in akọwe writer, clerk, du 'be black'
in Aqulójú 'one who is dark on the face' etc. The verb 'to
be' on the other hand does not occur in the final forms of
the nouns that have it in underlying representation e.g. the
nouns that follow je 'to be' in each of the representations
in (24). Thus, one difference between derived and basic
nouns illustrated by representations (24) and (25) is that
basic nouns are commonly introduced in underlying representations by ọni 'the one' plus the verb 'to be' both of which disappear in the final forms of the lexical items, whereas in addition to this, the derived nouns also have their internal structures represented there. In particular, nouns and nominals derived from verbs and verb phrases have the verbal elements that later occur in their surface forms represented as verbs in underlying representations. In order to make this second observation general, nominalizations that do not come directly from VP's would have to be given representations that have internal structures by the use of Rule 14:

**Rule 1.4 Oni + N1 Structure.**

This could be stated thus:

\[ N_2 \to /-\text{oni}/ + N_1 \]

This rule will be used to derive nouns like:

(26) 0- ni- iṣu  
Agent-has-yam  
'one who has/sells yam'

(27) 0- ni- ọgbón  
Agent-has-wisdom  
'one who is wise'

(see 7.0.4 below)

or the use of word linker /ki/ to derive pejorative/ indefinitizing nominalization thus:

**Rule 1.5 /ki/ Insertion.**

\[ N_2 \to n_1+/\text{ki}+/N_1 \]

The rule is used to derive such nouns as:

(28) aṣo - ki - aṣo  
(cloth- ki - cloth)  
'aṣokáṣo'  
'any/useless cloth'

(29) ẹniyàn - ki - eniyan  
(person - ki - person)  
'ẹniyankéniyàn'  
'any/useless person.'
For the factive negative abstract nominalization, Rule 16 is proposed.

**Rule 16. Negative Abstract Nominalization.**

The rule is formulated thus:

\[ h_1 + v (VP) \]


This could further be given a more abstract underlying representation as: (31 a and b) below:

(31) (a) *Ịya pè kì a mà *Igbóràn* (state (indicating) that we do not obey) (The fact of not obeying) 'disobedience'

(31) (b) *Ịya pè kì a màa* *Igbóràn* (state (indicating) that we continue-to obey) (The fact of obeying)‘obedience’

For other nominalizations, plausible underlying representations could be proposed, and for different nominalizations e.g. those represented by (31), ways of making minute distinctions could be found when necessary. But it is not always necessary to make such distinctions. For instance, in one of their senses, nouns derived through the /a/+VP nominalizations (Chapter VII below) could be synonymous with occupational nominalizations by duplication e.g. the occupational sense of *apàniyàn*. Note that it is when *apàniyàn* 'murderer' has the occupational sense that it can really be replaced with its occupational nominalization counterpart *paninani* or *pàniyànpàniyàn* 'professional killer'. A similar proposal can be made for *agànjànjà* 'professional soldier' and *aajànjà* 'one who fights battles'. It seems a more detailed analysis

---

1 Cf Factive/Non-factive nominalizations in the next chapter.
of all nominalizations along these lines could be undertaken in syntactic descriptions that are wholly devoted to nominalizations.

So, we find that common nouns could be sententially derived as suggested above. We also observe that this can even be done without losing sight of the distinction that exists between Yoruba nouns that are derived through very productive syntactic processes and those that are basic. It seems the same suggestion could be made for Yoruba proper nouns, and we may direct our attention only to the Yoruba personal names discussed in (32 a-c) below. For names that are derived through NP's, we can have representations similar to those derived by rule 13 while one that looks like (21) can be proposed for the few exceptions, which are given to children born in unusual circumstances (e.g. Ajayi - the name given to a child born face downwards). Sentence names can also come from representations that look like (25) such that the surface sentences are already dominated by NP's at certain stages in derivation.

6.1.0 Place Names

It may be noted however, that some place names are also derived e.g.

(32) (a) Ògùnrẹmí = Ògùn rẹ mí (Ogun comforts me)  
'Ogun comforts me'

(b) Igbedayê = igbe di ayê. (Crying becomes joy)  
'Sorrow is turned into joy'

(c) Qlápádé¹ qlá pàdá qlá (honour meets honour)  
'Nobility conjoins with nobility'

¹ Incidentally, there is a village in Òyo North which bears the same name as the author.
(d) Wásimi = wá simi (Come rest) 'Come and rest'

and NP names like:

(33) (a) Òba òdn = Òba òdn (vicinity savana)
' the vicinity of the savana'

(b) Abôkúta - Abôkúta (underneath stone)
' the underneath of the rock' the city under
the Olumo Rock

(c) Òlèsh-ile Òriṣa (home idol)
' the home of the gods'

(d) Ògbóìrílélọọgọ = Ògbóìrílélọọgọ, Ìnì tì ò gbé ori Òlèmọọgọ
(person who he carry head Elemeso)
' the carrier of the head of Elemeso'

Some of the town names were personal names originally e.g.
(32) (a) and (c) and (33) (d). The town names which are
identical with sentence personal names still remain as
personal names. Nevertheless, it appears that our proposal
for common nouns can also be suggested for town names although
we refrain from discussing town names here. Thus, the town
names which are NP's can have representations determined by rule
13 while those that are sentences could have had the sentences
dominated by NP's at earlier stages in derivation. For town
names that are neither NP's nor sentences e.g. Eko - 'Lagos'
one could propose underlying representations that are
analogues of (24).

It is possible to suggest from the similarity of
many place names to personal names as indicated in the
representations (32) and (33) that no distinction should be
made between personal names and other proper nouns in
description, but it appears that in use (or on the performance
level) Yorùbá people make certain noticeable distinctions
between them. For instance, all truly abbreviated Yorùbá personal names are disyllabic e.g. Tòndé - 'come again', Délé - 'arrive home' Kòlé - 'build house' Mándé 'looks for me at home' Opé - gratitude, thanks, Tóyín - is praiseworthy.

Ayọ - 'joy' etc. whereas place names are not abbreviated even when they are identical with personal names. Thus, Òlépàdè - personal name can be abbreviated as Òlè or Pàdè but when it is a town's name as in (32) (a), it is never abbreviated. Note that what appears to be trisyllabic abbreviated personal names e.g. Délùmọ for Adélùmọ 'royalty unites' Pólàhàn for Olúpólàhàn 'God displays His honours' etc. are not really regarded as abbreviations since such abbreviated forms (if they can so be called) are often regarded as full names.

Thus, Pólàhàn as a full name will mean 'display your honours' while Káyọdè will imply 'bring joy home' rather than Olúkáyọdè 'God brings joy home' etc.

Another distinction between personal names and town names is that the former refer to objects specified in an Aspects type grammar as \[ + \text{human} \] whereas this specification does not apply to place names. Hence, there may be reasons for discussing personal names and place names separately, especially with regard to the selection of classifiers.

At this stage, we can examine the types of underlying distinctions already made for Yorùbá names. All nouns are introduced in underlying representations by classifiers where a classifier system can be defined as:

(34) 'The system of noun-classification for the purpose
of enumeration and individuation.\(^1\)

As pointed out by Lyons, 'some of the classifiers are very general and may be regarded as semantically empty. Others are specific to certain classes of nouns, and they may even be used themselves elsewhere as nouns.'\(^2\) Lyons illustrated the specific classifiers by suggesting the possibility of using English words like thing, person, tree etc. The classifiers are used in many languages of southeast Asia.

The distinction between general and specific classifiers is actually present in the representations above. For instance, only \(\text{\(\text{\(\\text{n}\)}\)}\) 'the one' in (24) has been used as a general classifier for all common nouns so far. Note that the \(\text{\(\text{\(\\text{n}\)}\)}\) in (24) is used for all classes of common nouns e.g. human, non-human, abstract etc. Hence to some extent, it may be regarded as being semantically empty, and it may even be replaced with 'common noun' if this system of representation were to be generalized. On the other hand \(\text{\(\text{\(\\text{n}\)}\)}\) 'person' and \(\text{\(\text{\(\\text{o}\)}\)}\) 'position' in chapter II above are specific. While \(\text{\(\text{\(\\text{n}\)}\)}\) can only be used for 'human beings' or objects regarded as 'persons', \(\text{\(\text{\(\\text{o}\)}\)}\) can only be used for 'positions'. But while it will be interesting to explore the distinction between general and specific classifiers and the way they can be utilized in any syntactic analysis like this one, it will be enough to merely suggest for further speculation the opinion that classifiers might have been 'inserted' at an earlier stage in derivation than the final lexical items.

\(^1\) Lyons 1968: 288.
\(^2\) Ibid.
they introduce by rules 12 and 13 above. Thus, it is possible that classifiers actually exist in the underlying representations of all languages (and the senses and syntactic contents of these classifiers are fairly equivalent to the sets of specified syntactic features e.g. [+ human], [- Abstract] etc. found in an Aspects type deep structure analysis). However, the further development of the classifier system within a universal syntactic framework can only be left for speculation since the discussion here can only be suggestive. It cannot be conclusive.

Before we close this section, we may summarize the types of classifier conscious underlying representations observed for nouns in Yoruba syntax. For all common nouns, we had structures that use a general classifier eyi 'the one' and the verb 'to be'. Let us represent the verb je 'to be' as COP (copula) in this summary. Then all common nouns have one or two representations:

(35) eyi ... COP N or
(36) eyi ... COP NP

where (35) introduces basic nouns while (36) introduces derived nouns and the NP in (36) is further developed in one of the possible ways for the nominalizations in chapter VII. For instance, for those that refer to human beings, the NP could start with eni 'person' for the /s/ + VP nominalizations giving representations like:

(37) eyi ... COP eni ... V ...

(37) can be generalized by the application of rule 17.
Rule 17  General Classifier Attraction

\[ \text{GC} \ldots \text{COP} \quad \text{SC} \ldots \text{V} \ldots \]

where GC = general classifier', and V could be a verb or a 'predicative adjective'

The generalization made in Rule 17 is necessary since representations like (26), (29), (31) (a) and (b) actually show that specific classifiers may vary a lot for (31) (a) and (b) we used the classifier byeh 'state', and for (26) the oni + N nominalization, only oni 'person' could be used to drive:

\[ \text{oni ti o ni nkan pe pbelu N} \]

'one who has something to do with N'

However, in structures like (29), there may even be no common classifying element apart from general terms like 'noun' since almost any common noun can acquire the pejorative sense or be indefinitized. Hence, since the second classifier in rule 17 (vis-a-vis structures like (35) which have no second classifiers) also shows that we deal with derived nouns, we may then decide that the second classifier should be called the derived nominal classifier - DNC and modify Rule 17 as rule 18 below:

Rule 18  Derived Nominal Classifier Attraction

\[ \text{GC} \ldots \text{COP} \quad \text{DNC} \ldots \text{V} \ldots \] (where GC need not be distinct from DNC). The DNC is then any classifier that introduces any derived noun, and it may be identical with the general classifier.

When rule 17 is stated in the normal form for transformational grammar, variables will be used instead
of '...', and rule 17 can be combined with rule 18 in a general rule for the underlying derivation of nouns.

**Rule 19**  
**General Underlying Derivation of Nouns**  
\[ \text{GG COP } \left\{ \text{DNC Y V } Z \right\} \rightarrow \text{NP} \]

(where GC and DNC are as defined earlier, and Y, and Z are variables (see Chapter I for variables)).

The way surface NP's are derived from structures through the application of rule 19 or representations like 1 and 2 is not examined here although it will involve a series of deletion and other transformational operations. Since this work deals with nominalizations' underlying representations, we deliberately minimise the comments we make about surface structure realizations.

Earlier, we suggested that the GC and DNC of both 20 and rule 12 may be non distinct. What constitutes a DNC for some classes of common nouns may be a GC for proper nouns. For instance, all place names can have *ibi* 'place' as their general classifier (GC) while all personal names could have *gni* 'person' as their GC since all personal names are primarily applicable to 'persons' (even if these names are later applied to animals or places). Thus, personal names may even have underlying representations in which two *gni* forms occur if the first were interpreted as the GC and the second as the DNC in the manner of Rules 18 and 19.

Moreover, when other relevant information enters into the underlying representations, it is possible to have more abstract representations than rule 19 suggests.
For instance, if the information that the condition of the home determines a child's name were to be intergrated into the underlying representation of personal names at a stage earlier than the one we deal with here, it is possible to have more abstract underlying representation for nominals e.g. (38) eni tí itàn ilé rř fihan pé ṣun Ṣẹ eni tí ó ní qi lá yan (person who story home his show that he-ing use honour stride) 'one whose home condition shows that he is a person who marches about with honour' for Afoláyan. Note that the two eni representations already suggested for personal names earlier actually occur in (38). Although it may be profitable to examine what further developments in underlying representations are still possible, we intend to end the speculation here with the observation that our proposal for common nouns can in fact be developed in conjunction with an integrated classifier system as applied to all classes of nouns and nominalizations in the Yorùbá language.
CHAPTER VII

7.0.0 NOMINAL COMPOUNDS.

Hitherto, we have presented nominalization at lexical, clause and sentence levels. We have looked at the various parameters of Yorùbá nominalization like factive non-factive complements, infinitives, gerunds and relative clauses. In fact, we have covered almost all the processes in the language by which sentences are reduced or embedded; and processes in the language by which means verbs serialize. However, we now turn our attention to the last, and perhaps the most complex aspect of nominalization viz: nominal compounds.

Nominal compounding serves the important pragmatic function of achieving compactness of expression without loss of essential information. It is equally important to note that the same pragmatic function is served by two other syntactic configurations particularly in Yorùbá and natural languages in general. The first of these two other configurations is the genitive NP (see 4.1.4 above). This construction, consisting of an NP containing superficially, two non-conjoined nouns of which one is the head and the other the attribute, appears in many, perhaps most of the world languages. It serves to compress underlying propositions into shorter surface configurations and in so doing, it is typically prone to creating syntactic and semantic ambiguity. The last means of compounding is the appositive construction attributive nouns (see 4.2.0 above).
7.0.1 **Compounding by Affixation.**

All writers on Yorùbá without exception recognize prefixation as the most basic means of nominal compounding in the language. Ward (1952: 54) writes: "The great majority of nouns in Yorùbá begin with a vowel which is frequently a prefix added to a verb root". This is perhaps the most pertinent observation in the prefixation theory for Yorùbá, because all the seven except one oral vowel (see 1.1.1 (b)) above can be prefixed to a verb stem for form a nominal. The only exception in Standard Yorùbá is the vowel /ʊ/ which does not occur initially in any nominal.¹

Formulating a prefixation theory for Yorùbá is not as easy as it first appears. Much that is involved both syntactically and semantically has to be accounted for by such a theory. This, precisely, is what the previous writers on Yorùbá have not been able to capture. Professor Bamgbọ̀se (1966: 103) has this to say:

à - 'that which is -ing'.
a - 'one who'.
ì - 'that which is -ing'
mì - 'not -ing'
hàti - 'to'

while Professor Awobuluyi (1967) presents four types of prefixes:

1. /a/ Agent: and derives the following from it:
   (a) /a/ - Adájọ 'a judge'
   (b) /ó/ - Òbẹ̀ 'a knife'
   (c) /ò/ - Òbí 'parents'
   (d) /e/ - Épá 'antidote'

¹ Òñó, Ekittí, Òwọ and Akókó have /á/ for the standard /i/ e.g. Òbẹ̀rẹ̀ for Òbẹ̀rẹ̀ 'squatting'.
ii. /i/ - "that which is used for X" and it has the following allomorphs: /i - à - 'ê-o/

iii. /ê/ has the past participial meaning: 'that which was X-ed' and the following are its allomorphs: /ê - Ñ - î - /

iv. The numerals."

Why one prefix should be basic and others allomorphs remains a matter for conjecture. We quoted these scholars to drive in our point on how difficult it is to formulate a prefixation theory for Yorùbá nominals.

Notice that in Chapter VI we formulate rules for deriving lexical items particularly Yorùbá personal names. Here in this section, we are concerned primarily with the syntax and semantics of prefixation, and of course, the stems onto which these prefixes are attached to form nominal compounds.

7.0.2 Agentive Nominalization

This is perhaps the most productive form in the language. It has many manifestations of which two forms viz: [a-] and [ô-] are basic. [a-] is the more productive because it gives the most literal meaning and can occur in almost all instances where [ô-] occurs. However, [ô-] on the other hand sounds idiomatic wherever it occurs. Moreover [ô-] invariably depicts the habitual or professional agent. The [a-] nominals are the most literal. They invariably retain the tones and the base meanings of the forms in which they occur. We consider it basic because, in its class, it is the most productive; where a different vowel substitutes for it, for example, vowel harmony rule,
it is always recoverable since the change is contextually determined. Consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-idiomatic</th>
<th>Idiomatic</th>
<th>Verb-nominal collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (a) adędọ́</td>
<td>ọdẹdọ́</td>
<td>dẹ̀ odọ̀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent-hunts in the river</td>
<td>agent - professionally hunts in the river</td>
<td>hunt river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) ajiṣẹ́</td>
<td>ọjọṣẹ́</td>
<td>jẹ́ isẹ́</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent runs errand</td>
<td>a messenger</td>
<td>run errand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) adáran</td>
<td>ọdaran</td>
<td>dá drán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent causes trouble</td>
<td>a criminal</td>
<td>cause trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) agbọ́pọ́</td>
<td>ọgbọ́pọ́</td>
<td>gbọ́ ifọ́</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent understands speech interpreter</td>
<td>understand speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) amutí</td>
<td>ọmọtí</td>
<td>mu ọtí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent drinks a drunkard wine</td>
<td>drink wine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that the examples given in (1) come about by verb-nominal collocations taking prefixes. These collocations are unique phenomena in the language, where it is possible for verbs to colligate\(^1\) with nouns (that is, their objects). In several cases such colligations result in frozen idioms which function independently as verbs in the surface structure.

These agentive prefixes invariably attach to subjectless surface verb-phrases. These may consist of a single verb, two or more serial verbs, or verb nominal colligations. In these cases, the polysyllabic verbal stems are easier to deal with than the monosyllabic stems.

---

\(^1\) See Bamgboye (1964: 27-32); Afọlọyẹ̀ (1970: 120 Footnote 2).
(2) is an example where the prefix $\sqrt{a-}$ is attached to a subjectless verb phrase.

(2)  

$a-$  

pa-  

ni-  

cú  

agent kill person die  

One who kills a person completely.

The deep structure of (2) is (3).

(3)  

The deep structure (3) is meant to show that (2) is causative; that is, what someone does causes another person to die. Both the agent and the action leading to death are not specific in (2). Subject-to-subject raising applies to S3. By causativization and inchoativization the features of both the inchoative verb and causative verbs are combined with their verbs. It is at this stage that the verb pa 'kill' is inserted. The subject of the embedded sentence

---

1 See McCawley (1968b).
will have to be raised to derive (4).

\[(4)\]

\[
\text{S} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP}
\]

\[
/\text{pro}_.7\]

\[
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP}
\]

\[
\text{pa} \quad \text{\text{-\text{eni}}} \quad \text{kú}
\]

\['kill' 'person' 'die'\]

It is only at this stage that prefixation can apply. It must be noted that prefixation applies to constituents, and it is after raising has applied that \text{pa-\text{eni}-kú} becomes a constituent. Prefixation does not apply to sentences whose subjects are already specified. (5) for instance, cannot be an input to the transformation rule.

\[(5)\]

\[
\text{Ojo pa \text{-\text{eni}} kú}
\]

(Ojo kill person dead)

'Ojo killed a person dead'

7.0.3 Causative Constructions

Every language provides a means of expressing ideas involving the notion of causation. However, forms may differ, but the comparable ideas are expressed cross-linguistically. The causative situation can be said to consist of two phases, "the causing and the caused phase" that are brought into causal relation. The causing phase usually involves an activity, and the caused phase, either another activity or a change of state. Both phases are in causal relation if the realization of the latter is assumed by the speaker to have taken place and that its occurrence
is wholly dependent upon the occurrence of the former.

Both situations, necessarily, allow us to infer that if the former had failed to take place, the latter could not have taken place. Consider:

(6) No mí kí Adé lọ
    (I say that Ade go)
'I told Ade to go'

Note that (6) does not in any way express a causative situation since the sentence does not commit the speaker to the assumption that Ade's going has taken place.

Similarly, sentence (7) cannot constitute a causative commitment on the part of the speaker.

(7) ó dhn mì pé Adé lọ
    (It hurt me that Ade go)
'It hurt me that Ade went'

The event expressed by Adé lọ 'Ade went' in (7) is not dependent on the feeling of the speaker, whereas in (8) below the event expressed by Adé lọ 'Ade went' is dependent on the speaker's causing him to go.

(8) No mú kí Adé lọ
    (I take that Ade go)
'I made Ade go'

Further examples are:

(9) Adé mu qtí yó
    (Ade drink wine full)
'Ade is drunk'

(10) Adé tan Ojọ lọ
    (Ade trick Ojo go)

(a) 'Ade tricked Ojo and Ojo went (without Ade)'
(b) 'Ade tricked Ojo and they both went'
(11) Mo mú Adé lọ
   (I take Ade go)
   (a) 'I did something which caused Ade to go' (causative).
   (b) 'I took Ade with me and we went'. (comitative)

(12) Adé fa Ojó lọ
     (Ade drag Ojo go).
     (a) 'Ade did something which took Ojo away (causative)'
     (b) 'Ade dragged Ojo along with him'. (comitative).

(13) Òmọ ṣe ìsẹ ilẹ náda
     (character horse it is do death kill horse)
     'It is the behaviour of the horse that kills the horse'

(14) Opó mú ilé ró
     (pillar take house stand erect)
     'The pillar makes the house to stand erect'.

(15) Ojó jẹ kí ilé jó
     (Ojo let that house burn)
     'Ojo caused the house to burn'

(16) Ojó jo ilé na
     (Ojo burn house the)
     'Ojo burnt the house'

Notice that (a) can be interpreted to mean (14) (a) because both interpretations are causative, but on no account can (a) be interpreted to mean (11) (b) because (11) (b) is not causative but comitative. (9) - (16) except the (b's) of (10) - (12) are causatives in varying degree. Lakoff (1970) develops a logical structure for causative verbs whereby only sentences can be their subjects and objects. In (9) it is the drinking that causes Ade's being 'full up'. Notice that (9) is a case of inchoativization, where there is only
one agent for both the causing phase and the causes phase, that is to say, it is Ade's drinking that makes Ade become drunk.

**Rule 20 Inchoativization Rule**

\[
\begin{align*}
SD & \quad X - NP \quad V \quad N \quad NP \quad V \quad Y \\
SC & \quad X - 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\
& \quad \phi \quad (5 + inchoat) \; Y
\end{align*}
\]

Conditions X-Y Variables

\[1 = h\]

Rule 20 converts the sentence \(\text{Ade mu oti Ade vo}\) to \(\text{Ade mu oti vo}\). The logical structure of (9)\(_3\) (17) below:

\[(17)\]

The features of the inchoative verb merge with the verb vo thereby creating one node for the verb. This rule, as we have mentioned above, is called 'inchoativization'. The next rule that applies is the Eppi-NP-Deletion rule which
deletes one of the two NPs to give (18).

(18)

Ade drank wine

At this stage, the features of the inchoative and causative verbs are combined by the inchoativization rule which ultimately applies to the verb yo, so that what remains of the inchoative - causative sentence is the verb yo 'to be drunk'. Notice that the causal relation has been achieved in that the caused phase yo 'to be drunk' is dependent on the causing phase mu 'to drink'. Notice also that the causing phase is an action while the caused phase is a state. Ade cannot be in a state of being drunk 'unless he has actually being drinking'.

Three verbs, viz: mím (to take) 'made' (6) and sé (de) 'cause' (13) and jé (let) 'cause (15) are very common in causative constructions. Notice that (6) - (16)

1 Awobuluyi, O. (1973: 88 fn. 2).
cannot be candidates for prefixation because they are full sentences.

However, it is not always the case that prefixation just applies whenever there are constituents. While the condition of constituency is vital, all other syntactic requirements must be met. Prefixation, it should be noted, is just a routine process. Where the verb is transitive, this condition must be met before prefixation applies. Consider the following:

(19) * a- mϕ (agent - know) 'one who knows'
(20) * a- kϕ (agent - write) 'one who writes')

Note that since a-nominalization is the most literal, it seems to require that in the most literal sense too, the verbs must be transitive. Hence we have the following:

(21) a - mϕɛ (agent knows book) 'one who knows book'
(22) a - ʂɛɛ (agent - do good) 'one who does good'
(23) a - hϕɛ (agent write book) 'one who writes book or letter'.

Notice that we have more than one prefixes for agentive nominalization, that is, /a-/ and /h-/ . A pertinent question to ask at this juncture is how do we know the possible stems onto which these affixes are attached; and how do we differentiate the types of agents they signify? We have already started answering the first part of the question for /a-/ , which we consider to be more literal, a possible stem is one with all its complete syntactic requirements such as the transitivity of the verb or whether or not it can be a surface verb or has to be in a string as verbs in series. For example the instrumental verb ɨɨ hardly occurs as an independent verb,
and it cannot take on a prefix, as we have pointed out earlier on in this section, prefixation applies at the end of a derivation. It should be pointed out that since 

\textit{fi} always occurs in the company of other serial verbs, those other verbs have to be present before prefixation can apply.

The form \textit{/a-} refers to anybody who performs an action once, or twice or occasionally. The sequence of the action may be continuous or interrupted even though it is routine. In other words, the action may be performed but it has not become a characteristic. The \textit{/d-} form, on the other hand, refers to a permanent characteristic or feature. Consider the following:

\begin{center}
(24) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{a- mówé} & \textit{d- mówé} \\
'Agent has some knowledge' & 'a learned man'
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{a- dárán} & \textit{d- dárán} \\
'Agent tends animals' & 'a shepherd'
\end{center}

Notice that the choice of either of the forms is not arbitrary, it depends on the meaning and the intention of the speaker. Notice also that the patterns consistently maintain the differences between the literal and the idiomatic meanings conveyed by the prefixes.

It is not the case that the referents of these agentive prefixes must always be human and animate. The examples we have cited so far refer to human beings. The same agentive prefixes can be attached obliquely onto stems that do not refer to animate objects. Consider the following:

\begin{center}
(25) (a) \textit{a- jere} 'perforated earthenware for keeping smoked meat'
\end{center}
a - ṭẹ̀rẹ̀ 'basket'  (-tẹ̀rẹ̀ 'of dropping')

a - riwo 'noise'  (-riworíwo 'noise')

a - fẹ́fẹ́ 'wind'  (-fẹ́ 'to blow')

It is quite obvious, considering our analysis, that Professor Awobuluyi's allomorph hypothesis does not lead anywhere. The prefixes are, of necessity, different realizations with different semantic tokens.

7.0.4  *Possessive Nominalization*

The prefixation here is motivated by the occurrence of the verb ni 'to have' and a noun at the terminal. The frame is as follows: prefix + ni + noun. Like the agentive a-prefix we have just treated, it is a mid-tone /O-/. But for the fact that it is restricted to the context of the verb ni it could be regarded as a variant of the agentive a-prefix. It has various phonetic manifestations, all of which are contextually determined. There is a minor rule in the language whereby /n/ changes to /l/ whenever it is followed by any oral vowel except /a/. The rule applies across morpheme boundaries. Consider:

(26) (a) o-ní-ọlá  [o'là]
        (agent-has-honour)  'one who has honour'

(b) o-ní-íṣu  [o'íṣu]
        (Agent-has-yam)  'the one who has yam'

(c) o-ní-ṣẹ̀gbụ̀ra  [ẹ̀gbụ̀ra]
        (Agent-has-strength)  (a strong man)
        'one who has strength'
(d) 0-ni-etì /èlèti/  
(Agent—has—ear) 'one who has ears'

(e) 0-ni-imú /ònimú/  
(Agent—has—nose) 'one who has nose'

Note that we give direct glosses here to show the connection between the prefixes and the stems to which they are attached. It also shows how regressive assimilation affects the prefixes.

The basic meaning of any derivation involving this prefix is that of possession, either alienable or inalienable. On extension however, it includes having something to sell or having a particular characteristic. For example:

(27) (a) 0-ni-igi. /ònígi/  
(Agent—has—firewood).  
(i) 'one who has firewood'  
(ii) 'one who sells firewood'

(b) 0-ni-ógbón /òlógbon/  
(Agent—has—wisdom) 'one who is wise'

It is interesting to note that sometimes, all the normal activities associated with what is being possessed go to form the meanings of the derived nominal.

Consider:

(28) (a) 0-ni-épo /èlépo/  
(Agent—has—oil)

which may have the meanings

i. one who has oil
ii. one who sells oil
iii. one who makes oil.

(b) 0-ní-ókọ /òlıkọ/  
Agent—has—vehicle

i. One who has a vehicle
ii. One who sells a vehicle
iii. One who drives a vehicle.
That (a) i i i and (b) i i i have the variants:
(a) i i i a-fɔ-epo (Agent-washes-oil)
  'one who makes oil'
(b) i i i a-wa-qkɔ (Agent-drives-vehicle)
  'one who drives a vehicle'
is irrelevant to this analysis. Why the notions of ownership, sales and production have to be interwoven in Yorùbá economics is left open.

However, the following is the pattern of occurrence in the language.

(29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienable Ownership and selling</th>
<th>Inalienable Ownership only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aláta 'owner and seller'; Olójú 'one who has hands' of pepper'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elépo 'owner and seller'; Olójú 'one who has eyes' of oil'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eléwé 'owner and seller'; alápá 'one who has arms' of leaves'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oníṣu 'owner and seller'; onímú 'one who has nose' of yams'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oníyọ 'owner and seller'; onítan 'one who has thighs' salt'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>élékọ 'owner and seller'; élénu1 'one who has mouth' of corn dough'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that there is no restriction of animacy and inanimacy in these derived nominals. They could be used to describe the quality or characteristic of another

1 In its idiomatic use, it means a vain and boastful person.
noun as well as other nouns could be used to describe their qualities and characteristics. Consider:

(30) (a) ṣran oniyọ (meat agent-has-salt) 'salt mean'

(b) Olọgbọn ìwọ (Agent-has-wisdom-trick) 'a trickster'

The picture that emerges is not of derived nominals with totally intractable idiosyncratic properties, but of patterns of meanings. If we have to list all this information in the lexicon, the morphological component will be depleted of all its functions.

The only noticeable restriction on these possessive nominals, which is semantic rather than syntactic, is that a noun has to be preceded by ni 'has' otherwise the selectional restriction is violated. In other words, the condition of transitivity has to be met in order for any derived nominal, in which it occurs, to be acceptable in the language. It may be necessary to make a distinction between lexical meaning and lexical extension. The ownership meaning is what we consider lexical, while all other meanings are implied.

7.1.0 Factive Nominalization

This prefix is the low tone ḁ- its non-factive counterpart is the low tone ḃ. It should be recalled that in 5.0.1 above we define factive complements as those in which the speaker believes or presupposes the complements. The same is true of the derived nominals which result from the ḁ prefixation. Consider the following examples:

(31) à-rè-má-bọ kò ní jẹ ti wa.
(fact-go-not-return not will be of us)
The fact of going and not returning will not be our lot.

(32) à-pada-si-aburú kò ní bà wa.
(fact-return to evil no will overtake we)
'Returning to misfortune will not befall us!'

but not (30) and (31)

(33) * à-rè-má-bọ kò ní jẹ ti wa.
(Going and not returning not will be of us)
'Going and not returning will not be our lot'.

(34) * à-pada-si-aburú kò ní bà wa.
(returning to evil no will overtake us)
'Returning to evil will not befall us!

Notice that both (33) and (34) contain the same factual information as (31) and (32) but (33) and (34) are not grammatical because the non-factive complements occur in context where the speaker presupposes their truth. Let us examine more examples:

(35) à-dédé-ọp-yin kò mú ọgbọn dání.
(fact-just-go-yours not take wisdom hold)
'The fact of your just going is not reasonable!' but not

(36) * à-dédé-ọp-yin kò mú ọgbọn dání.
(just-go-yours not take wisdom hold
'Your just going is not reasonable'

(37) à-tọtọ-walé-yin bà vá lérù.
(fact-early-come your frighten us)
'Your coming home early frightened us'
but not

(38) * l-tete-wale-yin ba wa lera.

(early-come-home your us frighten).

'Your coming home early frightened us!

It is (37) rather than (38) that means:

(39) Fé e tete wale ba wa lera.

(that you early come home us frighten).

'That you came home early frightened us'.

or

(40) Tité wale yin ba wa lera.

(that early come home you us frighten).

'That you came home early frightened us'.

which is derived from (41)

(41) Tité wale ti e tete wale ba wa lera.

(That early come home that you early come home us frighten).

'The fact that you came home early frightened us'.

It is observed that the - can take most of the preverbal modifiers because it is a factive nominalizing prefix.

Consider the following:

(42) (a) é-wulė-lp (fact-vain-go).

'Fact of going in vain'.

(b) é-dédé-lp (fact-for the fun-go).

'Fact of going for the fun of it'.

7.1.1 Non-Factive Nominalization:

The prefix for this nominalization is /i/. We regard it as non-factive because (i) it cannot be prefixed to any of the preverb modifiers to make the resulting
nominalization factive. Consider:

(43) (a) * l-wulɔ-Ło (in vain went) 'going in vain'
(b) * l-dédé-Ło (for the fun of it-go) 'going for the fun of it'

Notice that (43 a-b) are not acceptable in the language because the speaker presupposes the truth of the utterances.

The non-factivity has to do with the blockage in contexts like (33 and 34) above.

Finally, notice that both factive and non-factive prefixes take the place of pro-NP's as subjects of verb-phrases. Consider:

(44) a-tête-sun (fact-early-sleep)
'The fact of sleeping early'

which has the following deep structure:

\[(45)\]

\[\text{which obligatorily undergoes RAISING to derive (33)}\]

\[(46)\]
It is when \textit{tete-sun} becomes a constituent which satisfies the condition for affixation that the prefix is matched onto it to become nominalization.

7.1.2 Adverbial Nominalization.

This form of nominalization embraces manner, locative, instrumental, comparative, direction, benefactive and comitative cases. It is observed that the factive/non-factive distinction is restricted to manner adverbial, comparative and dative/possessive nominalization. Consider the following:

\[(47) \ (a) \ \text{a-fi-}\text{fige-}\text{se} \quad \text{(factive) (manner)}

\text{fact use care to do}

\text{(b) * i-fi-}\text{fige-}\text{se} \quad \text{(non-factive)}

\text{using care-do}

\text{ii (a) a-fi-kuku-pf\text{}\text{on} \text{(factive) (instrumental)}

\text{fact use fist - kill bushcow}

(Syncerus Caffer Beddingtonii}

\text{(b) i-fi-kuku-pf\text{}\text{on}

\text{use-fist-kill-bushcow}

\text{iii (a) a-lo-si-gbor\text{\text{o} \text{(factive) (directional)}

\text{fact-go-to oro-grove}

\text{(b) i-lo-si-gbor\text{\text{o}

\text{going-to-orogrove}

\text{iv (a) a-bani-ni-ab\text{\text{a} \text{(factive) (locative)}

\text{fact-meet one-in-hut}

\text{(b) i-bani-ni-ab\text{\text{a}

\text{meeting-one-in-hut}

\text{v (ii(c)) a-fi-kuku-pf\text{}\text{on} \text{(agentive)}

\text{agent-used-fist-kill bushcow}

(Syncerus Caffer Beddingtonii)
(a) a-bání-kédùn (factive) (Comitative)

fact-withone-sympathize

(b) i-bání-kédùn

withone-sympathize

vii(a) à-jè-łọ (factive) (Comparative)

fact-morethan-other

(i.e. superiority)

(b) * i-jè-łọ

vii (a) à-ní-mó-owó (factive) (dative/possessive)

fact-have-plus-money

(b) * i-ní-mó-owó

Notice that (47) (ib), (viib) and (viib) are not acceptable in the language because of the manner, comparative and dative/possessive constraints mentioned at the beginning of the section. This, in effect, shows that it is only the à- prefix that is possible in the contexts of the three nominalizations mentioned above. A further example is:

(48) i. à-fi-ọgbón-ẹ (factive) (manner)

fact-use-wisdom-do

ii. *i-fi-ọgbón-ẹ (non-factive)

7.1.3 Case Grammar

In the preceding section we have presented a number of arguments based on case grammar to support our hypothesis of adverbial nominalization. The theory of case grammar, however, cannot be incorporated bodily into a generative semantic analysis such as our own, because the two theories are mutually incompatible in a number of ways.
While a comparative evaluation of the two theories would be out of place here, it would nonetheless be desirable to show in what ways the generalizations (correctly) expressed on the preceding pages within a case grammar framework can be naturally captured, and hence preserved within a generative semantic analysis.

The semantic facts that are expressed within a case grammar analysis by a combination of case assignments and appropriately drawn underlying representation must be expressed within a generative semantic analysis by a combination of semantic predicates and the correctly drawn semantic structure within which they are arranged. Thus, for instance, the locative, the instrumental, the directional and the Dative/Possessive cases of the preceding section are expressed by the semantic predicates $P^1$ 'USE', $S^1$ 'TO' and $N^1$ 'HAVE' respectively, appearing in appropriate syntactic configurations as in (47 ii-iii and vii) above. One may argue that $P^1$ participates invariably in serialization, it indeed does, but that does not remove the fact that it is still a predicate. (See page 70 fn 2 above).

7.1.4 Stems or Constituents for the Prefixes.

Knowing the language presupposes an intuitive knowledge of the speaker about how to match a prefix onto a stem or constituent to form a meaningful compound. In other words, this means that predictability is involved in nominal compounding in Yoruba in particular, and any natural language of an agglutinative nature in general. If predictability is not involved, it will be possible for us to list
every word in the lexicon, and then speakers and learners will simply memorize all the forms. However, we have shown that everything is not idiosyncratic. The purpose of this section is an attempt in characterizing what can or cannot be a potential stem. Recall that we have already pointed out that a possible stem must be a constituent at the stage that prefixation applies, and must also meet the grammatical conditions of transitivity, serialization and semantic compatibility.

There are four conceivable sources for the stems, viz: a single verb, a whole verb phrase, an ideophone (see 1.2.2 above) and a gerundive form.

7.2.0 **A Single Verb Stem.**

The so much often stressed productivity of affixation is a severely restricted process with a single verb stem. By this we mean, first and foremost, that there is no one-to-one match, of the seven oral vowels in the language, with a single verb. If this were to be the case there would be the possibility of deriving fourteen new lexical items (nominals), taking into consideration the fact that affixes are only found with either a low or a mid tone. This is not the case, because, second, there is no [u]-initial noun in the standard Yoruba language as mentioned earlier in this chapter. Moreover, many of the remaining six oral vowels do not occur as prefixes with distinct meanings and functions. Consider:

(49) (a) ṣe de 'crown' (-dé 'to cover/crown')
(b) gbó ṣe 'wisdom' (-gbón 'to be wise')
(c) ṣe ró 'thought' (-ró 'to think')
Despite the fact that the nominals in (46) are clear cases of derivation from basic verbs, they are totally opaque. Notice that the prefixes and the tone on them have no semantic correlation. That the affixes are not predictable proves that they are not productive. The combinations have become frozen idioms in the language so much that they are taken to be basic nouns. The fact that such nouns are few in the language makes it easier for them to be listed in the lexicon. Again, note that we cannot take one of the stems and produce many nominals from it. Consider:

(50) -dé 'to cover/crown'

(a) a+ dé 'a crown'
(b) *à+ dé 'fact of crowning'
(c) *a+ dá 'one who crowns'
(d) *ò+ dé 'one who regularly crowns (a professional)'
(e) *i+ dá 'crowning'

It is observed that the non-conformity of (b-e) precludes treating the set of basic verbs in this class on case-by-case basis. However, there are exceptions but even then there is a severe restriction on them. Consider:

(51) a+ sá 'that which serves
a+ ta 'that which smarts'
a+ bë 'that which peels'
q+ dë 'one who hunts'

Notice also that some of them take two to three prefixes,
(52) tØ 'to urinate'

i. (a) i+ tØ 'urine'
   (b) å+ tØ 'semen'

ii. å+ tØ + sî 'gonorrhoea'

That ii comprises of the prefix å and the constituent tøsí is irrelevant. What we are concerned with in this section is the prefixation.

An admission of the unpredictability of these forms and listing them in the lexicon does not weaken our theory of prefixation. Rather, it clearly shows that although, some of them have apparent prefixes, the history of their derivations is not known.

7.2.1 Verb Phrase as a Stem.

By this, we mean any of the following: a verb-nominal collocation, serial verbs or a clause. It is assumed here, that for a stem or constituent to be productive it must allow for more than three options. These are
(a) å- factive nominalization (b) l- non-factive nomilization (c) s-; å- agentive nominalization and (d) å+ l- negativized factive nominalization. See the earlier part of this chapter for examples of (a - c) and 4.0.2 for examples of (d).

7.2.2 Verb Nominal Collocation as a Stem.

A stem of this type is a transitive active verb.

Both the tones and the pattern of contraction of the vowels are sensitive to the distinction between literal and frozen idiomatic senses. Consider:
(53) pa èniyàn -(a) * à-pà-niyàn
(fact-kill-people)
' the fact of killing people'

(b) a-pà-niyàn
(agent-kill-people)
'a murderer'

(c) i-pà-niyàn
(non-fact-kill-people)
'killing people'

(d) ò-pà-niyàn
(agent-kill people)
'an assassin/a professioner killer'

(e) ò-i-pànnyàn
(fact-not-killing-people)
'the fact of not killing people'

Notice that (a) is not acceptable because nà-niyàn cannot
be used factively as it cannot be presupposed as it is.
The killing has not occurred hence, the reference is generic.
However, the factive sense becomes conceivable and acceptable
when it is negativized as in (e).

The examples in (50) are starred because they are
not acceptable in the language. However, if we make them
verb-nominal collocations, they become grammatical. Consider:

(54) dé 'to cover/crown'

(a) a-dé-òmi- (a-démi)
(fact-cover-water)
'the fact of covering water'

(b) i-dé-òm (i-démi)
(non-fact-cover-water)
'covering water'.
(c) a-de-omi (a-démi)
   (Agent-cover-water)
   'one who covers water'

(d) ò-de-omi (ò-démi)
   (Agent-cover-water)
   'one who professionally covers water'

The difference between (54) and (50) is that the verb òé 'to cover/crown' is transitive in (54) and intransitive in (50). The violation of transitive restriction renders (50) ungrammatical. Notice that two nouns òdé 'crown' and ìdé¹ 'a lid' are derived from òé 'to cover/crown' but neither of their initial vowels have the predicted meaning of agentiveness and non-factiveness respectively. Similarly there are many nominals consisting of prefixes and verb nominals stems such as in (54). They are all idiosyncratic cases which should be listed in the lexicon rather than be derived.

Examples are:

(55) (a) a-bù-lé ilé
   'a hut' house

(b) a-tà-ri 'ori'
   'centre of head' 'head'

(c) a-gba-ra gbó, ara
   'strength' 'old', 'body'

(d) a-gba-ri gbo ori
   'skull' 'old' 'head'

7.2.3 Serialized Verbs² as Stems.

A stem of serial verbs consists of two or more semantically compatible verbs juxtaposed to undergo

¹ It should be noted that òdé though exists in the language it is rarely used. Instead 'èdídí or idéří are often used.
² For details on serialized verbs see Awobuluyi, O. (1976: 87-111).
prefixation to form nominalizations. It is observed that all the different meanings found in serial verb constructions like purpose, non-purpose infinitives, causative-inchoative, comparative and adverbial senses are found in this type of nominalization. Consider:

(56) (a) ə-jà-bó  purpose
(fact-fight-get loose)
'the fact of fighting to get loose'

(b) ə-jí-ki  non-purpose
(fact-wake-greet)
'fact of waking up to greet'

(c) ə-tàn-łô  causative-inchoative
(fact-deceive-go)
'fact of tricking one to go'

(d) ə-jù-łô  comparative
(fact-excelling-go)
'fact of excelling'

(e) ə-bá-łô  comitative
(fact-with/on behalf of-go)
'fact of going with or on behalf of'

(f) ə-mú-gó  instrumental
(fact-take-cut)
'fact of using to cut'

(g) ə-şe-fún  dative
(fact-do-give)
'fact of doing for'

(h) ə-bá-şe  benefactive
(fact-help-do)
'fact of helping to do'

(i) ə-mú-ώ-ɏ-fún  dative
(fact-take-come-for)
'fact of bringing for'

(j) ə-bá-mú-ώ-ɏ-fún  benefactive
(fact-help-take-come-give)
'fact of helping to bring for'.
These are a few serial verb forms which can undergo prefixation to derive nominalization. Notice that many of the so-called personal names (oríkì 'cognomens') are derived from serial verbs. Consider:

(57) (a) à-bọ-kọ (female)
(fact-beg-pet)
'fact of begging to pet'
(b) à-dù-kọ (female)
(fact-struggle-pet)
'fact of struggling to pet'
(c) à-tún-wá (male)
(fact-again-come)
'fact of arriving again'
(d) à-pin-kọ (female)
(fact divide-pet)
'fact of dividing to pet'

7.2.4 Ideophones as Stems:

Many nominal compounds have ideophonic stems. The productivity of ideophonic prefixation is however severely restrict. By this we mean that the process is not as productive as the verb systems. The reason is partly due to the fact that the ideophones do not have the type of factual information commonly given to derivations of verb systems. Examples are:

(58) (a) ò-bírikítí from -bírikítí
agent-round 'round'
(b) ò-péléngé -péléngé
agent-slim 'slim'
a slim person
(c) ó-geere  
   (fact-of running towards)  
   'running towards'
   'fact of running towards'

(d) ó-sùèrù  
   (fact-of gushing)  
   'gushing'
   'fact of gushing'

Notice that (a) and (b) are the same as the habitual agentive prefix $\delta$- we have already discussed while (c) and (d) behave like the factive $\lambda$- prefix also discussed earlier in 7.1.0. Although we cannot predict accurately what ideophonic stems will take what prefixes to derive nominal compounds, we do have access to the information on both prefixation and ideophonic stems. In the light of this, we suggest that such ideophonic nominal compounds be listed in the lexicon: but there should be filters in the grammar which will filter out the several possibilities to retain what actually occur.

7.3.0 Gerundive Form As A Stem.

There are many nominal compounds in the language which seem to have undergone both the gerundive reduplication and prefixation as witnessed by the following examples:

(59) Verb  Gerundive Constituent  Nominalized form

(a) ké  kiké  a-kiké  aké  
   'to cut'  'cutting'  'that which cuts'  'an axe'

(b) dí  didí  s-didí  edí  
   'to cork'  'corking'  'that which corks'  'a cork'

(c) tú  titú  s-titú  etú  
   'to discharge'  'discharging'  'that which is discharged'  'pus'
There are several forms that derive from this stem in the language. Notice that the process is neither productive nor recoverable. Even in cases where it is obvious that tone assimilation has applied to obliterate the underlying representation of the gerundive prefix, it is not clear how such a minor rule is to be formulated. Another problem is that the prefixes do not retain their lexical meaning at the simple surface structure. Notice that although the forms have recognizable verbal stems, prefixation has become so opaque that the process cannot be determined.

In the preceding sections we have attempted to show which nominal forms should be listed in the lexicon and which are to be derived. We have argued that all simple-stem nominals, nominal compounds with gerundive-form stems, and some verb nominal stems be listed in the lexicon. These are the unpredictable and non-productive

---

(1) These are spirits which perform the actions associated with their names.
forms. However, it must be noted that we cannot use the principle of analysability alone to determine whether one form should be listed in the lexicon or not.

7.3.1 The Genitive NP.

As observed earlier in this chapter (7.0.0) the genitive NP consists of two non-conjoined nouns of which one is the head and the other the attribute. The construction is an endocentric structure. It should be noted that the term possessive is severely restricted so much so that it is inadequate to describe this construction because it expresses many other notions besides that of possession. The following are some of the notions commonly expressed by the construction: habitation, material, location, content, container, for, to, during and cause.

The predicates of the adjoining nouns that express these notions are already deleted before their surface appearance: Consider the following examples:

(60) (a) iná (wá ní) ori iná ori Habitá
louse (be in) head' (louse head) 'head louse'

(b) 'iná (wá ní) aṣọ' iná aṣọ
louse (be in) clothes (louse clothes) 'clothes louse'

(c) 'eku (wá ní) ilé' eku ilé
rat (be in) house (rat house) 'mouse'

(d) ẹja (wá ní) ọkun ẹja ọkun
fish (be in) sea (fish sea) (Sea fish)

(e) eku (wá ní) ọko eku ọko
rat (be in) farm 'rat bush' 'rat'

(61) (a) ápó tí (tí a ìfí) ọgí (se) ápó tí ọgí Material
box (that one put) wood (do) (box wood) 'wooden box'
(b) asp (tì a fi) sányàn (hun)  asp, sányàn
   'cloth (that one put) silk cotton (weave)' cloth silk cotton cloth'

(c) ilé (tì a fi) yanrin (mọ)  ilé yanrin
   'house (than one put) sand (build)' house sand building

(d) ọtì (tì a fi) ọkà (pọn)  ọtì ọkà
   'wine (that one put) millet (brew)' wine millet
   'millet wine'

(62) (a) abé ilé 'under ground' Location
(b) ori ọke (head hill) 'top of the hill'
(c) iràwọ ilé (star ground) 'land star' (Borreria Rampisparsa)
(d) etí/apá ṣàkun (ear/arm sea) 'sea side'

(63) (a) epo ọgọ (oil bottle) 'bottled oil' content
(b) ọmu ọgọ (palm-wine bottle) 'bottled palm-wine'
(c) ọtì ọgbè (wine gourd) 'gourd wine'
(d) ọmu ọsà (palm-wine pot) 'pot palm wine'

(64) (a) ọgọ epo (bottle oil) 'oil bottle' container
(b) ọgọ ọmu (bottle palm-wine) 'palm-wine bottle'
(c) ọgbè ọtì (gourd wine) 'wine gourd'
(d) ọsà ọmu (pot palm-wine) 'palm-wine pot'

Additional groups could still be identified such as temporal group in which the deleted predicate might conceivably be NÌ '(occurring) IN' such groups will include NPs like those below.

(65) (a) ọjọ (nì) ọwùrọ (rain) (occurring) (in) morning
   'morning rain'
(b) ọrùn (nì) alẹ (sun) (in) (evening) 'evening sun'
(c) ọrùn (nì) ọwùrọ (dew) (in) (morning) 'morning dew'
7.3.2 The Pseudo-Possessive Constructions.

Even some of the genitive structures with overt possession interpretations have the 'recoverable deleted predicates' in their underlying structures. Consider the following examples:

(66) (a) ònà (sì) oko (road (to) farm) 'road TO the farm'
(b) ònà (sì) ìgbé (road (to) bush) (road (TO) the bush) 'footpath'
(c) ònà (fùn) òkkó (road (for) vehicle) 'motorway'
(d) òpá (fùn) ìṣàq (stick (for) cloth) 'yardstick'

What is clearly appreciable in the genitive construction is that the semantic relationship of modification is preserved by the syntactic configuration of post-nominal element plus head noun; a glance at the wide variety of post nominal nouns possible in Yorùbá, as illustrated above, indicates that all post-nominal nouns are interpreted as modifiers of the preceding nouns. So the transformation of a proposition to a two-element NP consistently preserves the information as to which element is the head noun and which is the modifier, by means of the syntactic device of word order.

7.3.3 The Possessive Construction.

The type of ambiguity that the genitive construction is open to is clearly evident in the possessive

---

1 This could mean either yardstick or a yard of cloth in some dialects but in SY it is 'yardstick'.

structures. Consider:

(67) eja òjó (fish ojo) 'Ojo's fish'

which has at the very least the following interpretations:

(68) (a) eja tí òjó ni (fish that Ojo has)
    'The fish which Ojo owns'
(b) eja tí òjó pa (fish that Ojo kill)
    'The fish which Ojo caught'
(c) eja tí òjó ñ sin (fish that Ojo -ing tend)
    'Ojo's pet fish'
(d) eja tí òjó rà (fish that Ojo buy)
    'The fish which Ojo bought'
(e) eja tí òjó á jẹ (fish that Ojo will eat)
    'The fish that Ojo will eat'

Similarly, are the nouns 'àwọrán 'picture' irolehin 'news'
and ìrọ 'statement' when they occur in possession constructions
involving nouns with features \(+\text{Animate}\) \(+\text{human}\).

Consider the following examples:

(69) (a) Awọrán Adé (picture Ade) 'Ade's picture'
    (b) Awọrán tí Adé yà (picture which Ade draw)
        'The picture drawn by Ade'
    (c) Awọrán tí Adé hàn ni bẹ (picture which Ade appear in there)
        'A photograph of Ade'
    (d) Awọrán tí Adé ní (picture which Ade has)
        'Ade's picture'

Notice that the only rule that applies to derive the
possessive constructions from relative clauses, is the
elementary rule of Deletion, which deletes every item
except the head noun and the attributive noun.
7.3.4 The Appositive Construction

Bamgbose (1966: 109) observes quite correctly that an appositive construction results 'if the nominal' that is the attribute, can be substituted for the head in the context. By this, he means that the two nouns that form the appositive construction are referentially identical. Consider:

(70) Ade gbénàgbénà (Ade Carpenter) 'Ade the carpenter'
(71) dòkità ìyínbó (doctor European) 'A European doctor'

Notice that (70) and (71) are derived from restrictive relative clauses (see Chapter IV above). In both cases, two verbs, namely ìse and ìje both meaning 'to be' are involved. Consider:

(72) Ade tí ìse gbénàgbénà wá sl ìbi
(Ade who he be carpenter come to here)
'Ade the carpenter came here'

which is the underlying representation of (70) while (73) below is the underlying representation of (71).

(73) Mo rí dòkità tí ì je ìyínbó
(I see dokita who he be European)
'I saw a European doctor'

Like the genitive structure discussed in the preceding sections the elementary rule of Deletion deletes all items of the relative clause leaving behind the two referentially identical nouns of the appositive construction.

To sum up, both the possessive and the appositive constructions are similar in that they are both endocentric structures consisting of two nouns of which one is the head and the other the modifier or the attribute. They are both
derived from the relative clause constructions. However, there is a major difference between the two. The attribute of the appositive construction is referrable to its head noun while the modifier and the modified nouns of the generative construction are not referentially identical.
CONCLUSION

The present study has been carried out with dual purpose viz: to provide an accurate account of the process of nominalization in Yorùbá, and from such an account make some useful general deductions about the natural language and theories about it. One justification for undertaking a Transformational Generative analysis of a language is the expectation that it might give greater insight into language by showing how grammatical categories fit together and by making some contribution to linguistic theory. This consideration has guided our approach to the analysis presented in this thesis. We have adhered to the principle of 'levels of adequacy for Grammatical theory', that is, observational, descriptive, and explanatory adequacies in our analysis.

We have strictly observed the language data and made it our guiding principle. Also we have resisted the temptation of forcing the Yorùbá language data into a descriptive mould designed for Indo-European languages, and, which may not necessarily fit Yorùbá as well as it fits, say, the English language; a temptation into which the traditional Yorùbá Grammarians had fallen.

Yet, if a linguistic theory has any value, it lies partly in its general applicability to any human language no matter wherever it is spoken. For example it is the case that all human languages have Noun Phrases, and Verb Phrases, and most if not all have such syntactic processes as Pronominalization, Relativization, Reflexivization, and probably Equi-NP Deletion. This leads naturally to our belief in the Universal Base Hypothesis. However, how each of these syntactic operations is formally characterised will surely vary from one
language to another.

Several conclusions are inevitable from our treatment of the syntax and semantics of Yorùbá nominalizations, and the implications for a theory of language. First, the processes that produce nominalizations produce infinite forms as the sentences of any human language. It is as impossible to write a dictionary of sentences as it is impossible to write a dictionary of nominalizations. What is needed is a mechanism which will produce nominalizations.

Our analysis of nominalization in Yorùbá has proved that morphology is essential to the derivational processes of compound nominala. (See Chapters II & VII). In fact, we hope that our description has shown that for a language like Yorùbá, a separate morphological component on the same level with the syntax-semantic and phonological components is needed in order to be able to give an adequate Yorùbá word derivation. Our theory has to be able to distinguish between information which has to be recorded in the lexicon, and the information which is predictable and can be obtained outside of the lexicon.

Chomsky and the lexicalists claim that only gerundive nominals but not the derived nominals could be generated by the same phrase structure rules of the base that generate sentences. We have demonstrated that these restrictions do not apply to Yorùbá because the characteristics of Yorùbá sentences are also found in the derived nominals in the language. We hope we have demonstrated successfully that syntactic transformations are possible before P1 level, that is, the phonological level at which, Chomsky argues, all syntactic transformations should take place.
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