

The head of the relative clause in (1a) *l-bint* ‘the girl’ is the antecedent of the pronominal *-ha* ‘her’ that appears in the *wh*-trace position. Similarly, in (1b), the object of the preposition *-av* ‘him’ appears as a pronominal and is associated with the head *ha-?iš* ‘the man’ which is outside the relative clause. In some languages the trace is in complementary distribution with the resumptive pronouns. The Palestinian examples below illustrate this.

- (2) a. *l-bint ?illi šufti-ha* (Palestinian)
 the-girl that (you.F) saw-her
 ‘the girl that you saw’
- b. **l-bint ?illi šufti*
 the-girl that (you.F) saw
 ‘the girl that you saw’
 (Shlonsky 1992:445)

Sentence (2a) has an object pronominal clitic *-ha* ‘her’ on the verb. Without this pronominal clitic the relative clause construction is not grammatical, as (2b) clearly demonstrates. Therefore, the resumptive pronoun is obligatory.

In other languages, resumption and trace are two alternative options, as in the Irish example below where both a gap and a resumptive pronoun are possible.

- (3) a. *an ghirseach a ghoid na síogaí t*
 the girl aL stole the fairies
 ‘the girl that the fairies stole away’
- b. *an ghirseach ar ghoid na síogaí í*
 the girl aN-[PT] stole the fairies her
 ‘the girl that the fairies stole away’
 (McCloskey 2002:189)

Both sentences are grammatical, the first (3a) with a trace, while the second (3b) has a resumptive pronoun *t* ‘her.’ In both cases the head is *an ghirseach* ‘the girls.’ Therefore, resumption is optional in Irish.

Perhaps the most widely discussed feature of resumptive pronouns within the generative tradition is the fact that they exhibit immunity to island constraints. Below is an example of a Lebanese Arabic adjunct island in which we find the resumptive pronouns.

- (4) *ha-l-muttahame tfeeʒaʔto [lamma/laʔanno ʔræfto ʔanno hiyye nhabasit]*
 this-the-suspect.SF surprised.2P when/because know.2P that she imprisoned.3SF
 ‘This suspect, you were surprised when/because you knew that she was imprisoned.’
 (Aoun et. al. 2001:575)

The topicalized phrase *ha-l-muttahame* ‘this suspect’ is the antecedent of the resumptive pronoun *hiyye* ‘she’ which appears in an adjunct island. The adjunct is marked with square brackets.

In Bantu languages, resumptives appear in unbounded dependencies, i.e. constructions in which there are gaps licensed by structures in higher positions. The resumptives appear as clitics attached to prepositions or connective. The following examples from Kindendeule¹ illustrate such clitics in relative clauses².

¹ All Kindendeule and Kiswahili examples are supplied by the author of this paper.

² Abbreviations

FV	Final vowel	INF	Infinitive marker	LOC	Locative marker
OM	Object marker	PT	Past tense	RM	Relative marker
RP	Remote past	SM	Subject marker		

- (5) a. n'-geni aki-hik-a na b-ana.
1-guest PT-arrive-FV with 2-child
'The guest came with children.'
- b. b-ana b-a-aki-hik-a na-bo n'-geni ba-bok-ite
2-child 2RM-1SM-PT-arrive-FV with-2 1-guest 2SM-leave-PF
'The children that the guest came with have left.'

Sentence (5a) is simple, while (5b) has a relative clause. The relativized noun in (5b) is the complement of the preposition *na* 'with.' The site of extraction is marked by the resumptive clitic attached on the preposition³.

Resumptive pronouns raise many theoretical questions (see for example McCloskey 2002; Shlonsky 1992; Boeckx 2003). One of the questions is that since resumptives are related to *wh*-traces, which are created by movement, are resumptives created by movement, given that they are found in environments where extraction movement is apparently prohibited? The appearance of resumptive pronouns in syntactic islands has led to the conclusion that the antecedent is not generated in positions where extraction and movement is disallowed, such as inside the island (Shlonsky 1992). However, several studies of the phenomenon in some languages have revealed that they exhibit the same movement and binding properties as *wh*-traces (see, for example, Koopman 1982; Engdahl 1985; Zaenen et. al. 1981). For example, they exhibit weak crossover effects, they do not block the linking of parasitic gaps, and exhibit reconstruction effects. In the following sections examples of resumptive constructions from some Bantu languages are considered.

3. Resumption in Bantu

The clitics illustrated above are found in relative clauses, topicalization, infinitival relatives, and cleft constructions. Generally, resumptives prevent these constructions from stranding prepositions. This paper discusses only such clitics. Object markers that appear between the tense marker and the verb stem are not considered part of the resumptive clitics discussed in this paper.

3.1 Relative clause constructions

Bantu languages are generally SVO languages. In relative clauses, the head appears before the relative clauses. The following examples show one form of relativization in Kiswahili.

- (6) a. Amina a-li-wa-on-a wa-geni.
Amina 1SM-PT-2OM-see-FV 2-guest
'Amina saw the guests.'
- b. Tu-li-wa-it-a wa-geni [a-li-o-wa-on-a Amina]
We-PT-2OM-call-FV 2SM-guest 1SM-PT-2RM-2OM-see-FV Amina
'We called the guests that Amina saw.'

The relativized nominal *wageni* 'guests' in (6b) exhibits agreement with the verb in the form of the relative marker *-o-*, a Class 2 relative marker appearing after the tense marker⁴. Notice the existence of the gap or *wh*-trace in postverbal object position. When the relativized phrase is an oblique object, the

³ The co-occurrence an object nominal phrase and the object marker in some of the Bantu languages is sometimes discussed under the rubric of resumptive pronouns. In this paper we examine only cases of resumption in relative clauses.

⁴ There are three relative clause constructions in Kiswahili defined by where the relative marker is located (Barrett-Keach 1986; Ngonyani 1999). The examples in this paper make use of only one form. The behavior of the resumptive pronominal clitics is the same in all three constructions.

gap is replaced by a resumptive pronominal clitic as demonstrated in the contrast between (7a) and (7b).

- (7) a. Amina a-li-end-a na wa-geni
 Amina 1SM-PT-go-FV with 2-guest
 ‘Amina went with the guests.’
- b. Tu-li-wa-it-a wa-geni [a-li-o-end-a na-o Amina]
 We-PT-2OM-call-FV 2-guest 1SM-PT-2RM-go-FV with-2 Amina
 ‘We called the guests that Amina went with’
- c. *Tu-li-wa-it-a wa-geni [a-li-o-end-a na Amina]
 We-PT-2OM-call-FV 2-guest 1SM-PT-2RM-go-FV with Amina
 ‘We called the guests that Amina went with’

The object of the preposition *na* ‘with’ is relativized in (7b). In its place, we find the clitic *-o* leaning on the proposition. Example (7c) demonstrates that the preposition *na* ‘with’ is stranded, and that results in an ungrammatical sentence. This constraint against preposition stranding is also observed in other *wh*-constructions, namely, topicalization, infinitival relatives, and cleft constructions.

3.2 Topicalization

Topicalization also has a similar effect on the representation of the oblique objects as examples from Chiluba illustrate.

- (8) a. Kamfunti w-e-enhz-íl-i na-kahébi
 Kamfunti 1SM-PT-bring-RP-FV with-12basket
 ‘Kamfunti came with the basket.’
- b. Kamfunti w-e-enhz-íl-i ná-ku
 Kamfunti 1SM-PT-bring-RP-FV with-12
 ‘Kamfunti came with the basket.’
- c. Kahébi Kamfunti w-e-enhz-íl-i ná-ku
 12basket Kamfunti 1SM-PT-bring-RP-FV with-12
 ‘A basket, Kamfunti came with.’
 (Kawasha 2002:51)

These examples show topicalization in (8c) with a clitic on the preposition similar to the Kiswahili example. We also notice that the same form of the clitic *-ku* a Class 12 pronominal is found in the topicalization construction (8c) as in the non-topicalized construction (8b).

3.3 Infinitival relatives

Infinitival relative constructions are DPs that are formed by a nominal followed by an associative (also known as connective) and an infinitival VP. The nominal that precedes the VP parallels the head of a relative clause and the VP may contain an object gap. The construction is illustrated in Kiswahili in (9b) below.

- (9) a. ni-li-som-a ki-tabu
 I-PT-read-FV 7-book
 ‘I read a book.’

- b. ki-tabu cha ku-som-a ni hiki
 7-book 7a INF-read-FV is 7this
 ‘The book to read is this one.’

Sentence (9a) contains a verb *nilisoma* ‘I read’ and the object *kitabu* ‘book.’ In the second example, the verb *kusoma* ‘to read’ is preceded by the associative marker *cha* which agrees with the nominal that precedes it. The object position after the verb is empty because of movement of the object to the initial position. When an oblique object is involved, a resumptive clitic must appear.

- (10) a. ni-li-zungumz-a na Juma
 I-PT-talk-FV with Juma
 ‘I spoke with Juma.’
- b. m-tu wa ku-zungumz-a na-ye ni Juma
 1-person 1a INF-talk-FV with-1 is Juma
 ‘The person to speak with is Juma.’
- c. *m-tu wa ku-zungumz-a na ni Juma
 1-person 1a INF-talk-FV with is Juma
 ‘The person to speak with is Juma.’

As in relative clauses, the preposition inside the VP requires a clitic, as in (10b). In this case the clitic –*ye* ‘him’ agrees with the nominal that precedes the associative marker, namely, *mtu* ‘the person.’ A stranded preposition is ungrammatical, as (10c) shows.

3.4 Cleft Constructions

A cleft sentence is formed by dividing a clause into two parts. The first is a copula with the subject ‘it’ and the complement of the copula is a relative clause. Such a construction is illustrated in (11) from Kindendeule.

- (11) a. Humale ndi [ywa-a-yabw-i ku-n’-gönda lukela.]
 Humale is indeed 1RM-1SM-go-FV 17-3-farm morning
 ‘It is Humale that went to the farm in the morning.’
- b. Ku-n’-gonda ndi [kwa-a-yabw-i Humale lukela].
 17-3-farm is indeed 17RM-1SM-go-PF Humale morning.
 ‘It is to the farm that Humale went in the morning.’

The relative clause part is marked by square brackets. Notice that unlike other relative clauses, the relative form here is not preceded by its head. The head appears as the subject of the copula. The copula appears between the head and the subordinate clause. As in other wh-constructions, when the object of the preposition is relativized, a pronominal clitic whose antecedent is the head of the construction appears on the preposition.

- (12) a. Humale aki-tam-a na mbuya.
 Humale PT-live-FV with 1grandmother
 ‘Humale lived with grandmother.’
- b. Mbuya ndi Humale aki-tama na-ko
 Grandmother is-indeed Humale PT-stay-FV with-3rdSG
 ‘It was grandmother that Humale stayed with.’

- c. *Mbuya ndi Humale aki-tama na
Grandmother is-indeed Humale PT-stay-FV with
'It was grandmother that Humale stayed with.'

In (12b), the oblique object *mbuya* 'grandmother' is clefted, leaving behind the preposition *na*- 'with' to which the pronominal clitic is attached. Example (12c) is without the resumptive pronominal clitic making it ungrammatical.

All examples of resumption illustrate that the resumptive pronominal clitic appears in positions where we would otherwise expect a gap in possessor positions or in oblique object positions. The clitics do not form an independent series just for resumptives. They are the same as non-resumptive pronominal clitics. This is illustrated with examples from Kiswahili.

- (13)a. Wa-li-zungumz-a na m-geni
2SM-PT-talk-FV with 1-guest
'They spoke to the guest.'
- b. Wa-li-zungumz-a na-ye
2SM-PT-talk-FV with-1
'The spoke to her/him'
- c. Ni-li-end-a nyumba-ni kwa Juma.
I-PT-go-FV 9house-LOC of Juma
'I went to the house of Juma.'
- d. Ni-li-end-a nyumba-ni kwa-ke.
I-PT-go-FV 9house-LOC of-3sg
'I went to his/her house.'
- e. Ni-li-nunu-a vi-oo vya ma-dirisha
I-PT-buy-FV 8-glass 8of 6-window
'I bought the glass for the windows.'
- f. Ni-li-nunu-a vi-oo vya-ke
I-PT-buy-FV 8-glass 8-3sg
'I bought its/their glass.'

In these examples, we see nouns are replaced by class-specific clitic on *na* 'with' (13b) and a generic *-ke* on the connective or associative (13d, f). The clitic on *na* marks agreement with the class of the antecedent. The clitic on the connective *-a*, on the other hand, makes only a two-way distinction, namely, human plural *-o*, and the rest (human singular and all other classes) *-ke*. This behavior is also found in Kindendeule. The same clitics are found as resumptives, demonstrated in these examples.

- (14)a. b-aki-longel-a na n-geni
2-PT-speak-FV with 1-guest
'they spoke with the guest'
- b. n-geni b-aki-longel-a na-ko
1-guest 2-PT-speak-FV with-him/her
'the guest they spoke to her/him'
- c. b-aki-longel-a na-ko
2-PT-speak-FV with-him/her
'they spoke to her.'

The resumptive pronoun *-ko* 'him/her' that appears as a result of topicalization in (14b) is the same as the one the appears in non-resumptive construction (14c). Therefore, the same forms of clitics found in

non-resumptive pronouns are also found in resumptive forms. The behavior of the resumptive pronominal clitic might shed some light on other pronominals. For this we turn to an examination of movement properties associated with the resumptive pronominal clitics.

4. *Wh*-trace Properties of the Resumptive Pronominal Clitics

One of the properties of resumptive pronouns is that they may appear in syntactic islands. This suggests that they do not created by movement. However, they exhibit syntactic properties of *wh*-traces, traces that are created by *wh*-movement. Diagnostics for *wh*-movement include reflexive binding, ATB extraction from coordinate structures, parasitic gaps and reconstruction effects. This section explores parasitic gaps in Kiswahili and reconstruction in Kindendeule.

Parasitic gaps have received very little attention in the study of Bantu languages (Mchombo 2001). They provide a source of evidence of movement in resumptive construction that reflects movement that leaves behind a *wh*-trace. Consider the following examples of parasitic gaps in Kiswahili.

- (15)a. Tu-na-tak-a vi-tabu a-li-vyo-som-a bila ku-nunu-a
 we-PR-want-FV 8-book 1SM-PT-8RM-read-FV without INF-buy-FV
 ‘We want the books that she/he read without buying’
- b. Tu-na-tak-a vi-tabu a-li-vyo-nunu-a bila ku-ondok-a na-vyo
 we-PR-want-FV 8-book 1SM-PT-8RM-buy-FV without INF-leave-FV with-8
 ‘We want the books that she bought without leaving with them.’
- c. *Tu-na-tak-a vi-tabu a-li-vyo-nunu-a
 we-PR-want-FV 8-book 1SM-PT-8RM-buy-FV
 m-geni a-li-ye-ondok-a na-vyo
 1-guest 1SM-PT-1RM-leave-FV with-8
 ‘We want the books that the guest bought who left with them.’

In the first two sentences (15a) and (15b), each relative clause contains two verbs. In (15a), there is *alivyosoma* ‘that she/he read’ in the higher VP and *kununua* ‘buying’ which appears in the lower VP. The gap in the object position of the lower verb is parasitic on the gap in the object position of the higher verb. In (15b) the two verbs are *alivyonunua* ‘that she/he bought’ in the higher VP and *kuondoka* ‘leaving’ in the lower one. In a similar manner, in (15b), the pronominal clitic of the oblique object is bound by the null object of the higher verb. The ungrammatical sentence (15c), however, results from a subjacency violation. The head *vitabu* ‘books’ cannot be extracted from the complex NP. In this respect, therefore, the resumptive pronominal clitic behaves in a manner that is identical to a *wh*-trace.

Another diagnostic tool for investigating the relationship between resumptives and movement is reconstruction. Reconstruction effects are properties exhibited by phrases which are attributed to a syntactic position other than the one in which they are pronounced. The effects are a result of syntactic movement. Binding and scope reconstruction effects are found in the interpretation of pronouns bound by quantified noun phrases (QNP) found lower in the relative clause as the following examples from Kindendeule show.

- (16)a. *Hokolo*_i i-tam-a na n-choko-*mundu*_i
 Grandpa 1SM-stay-FV with 1-grandchild-person
 ‘Grandpa stays with his grandchild.’
- b. n-choko-*mundu*_i wa kwanza ywa-i-lɔngel-a na-*ko*_i
 1-grandchild-person of first 1RM-1SM-talk-FV with-3sg

*kila hokolo*_i i-pat-a ma-langu
 every grandpa 1SM-get-FV 6-brains
 ‘His first grandchild who every grandfather talks to becomes very intelligent.’

The possessive affix *mundu* ‘person’ is inside the head of the relative clause. It is interpreted as a variable bound by QNP *kila hokolo* ‘every grandfather’ located inside the relative clause. It is generally assumed that the scope of a quantifier is determined by c-command relation at the level of LF. On the surface, the universal quantifier phrase does not seem to c-command the pronoun. For the QNP to take scope over the possessive, the head must be reconstructed at LF to the position inside the relative clause where it is c-commanded by the QNP. The surface position, therefore, is a result of movement.

The two diagnostics, parasitic gaps and scope reconstruction, demonstrate that both *wh*-traces and resumptive pronouns are products of movement in discontinuous dependencies, here illustrated by relative clause constructions.

5. Implications

These findings about resumptives and how they are linked to the antecedent through movement have important implications for raising analysis and the nature of the resumptive pronoun in relation to other pronouns.

In the Principles and Parameters framework, relativization was traditionally analyzed with a null operator binding a variable inside the relative clause. The head of the relative clause is base generated outside the relative clause. The derivation is presented in the following way.

- (17)a. ki-tabu amba-cho ni-li-som-a.
7-book amba-7RM I-PT-read-FV
‘the book that I read’
- b. [_{DP} D [kitabū] [_{CP} [amba-cho [_{IP} nilinunua e]]]]
- c. [_{DP} D [kitabū] [_{CP} Op_i [amba- [_{IP} nilinunua t_i]]]]

Kayne (1994), however, proposed a new analysis in which the head of the relative clause is raised from inside the relative clause.

- (18)a. ki-tabu amba-cho ni-li-som-a.
7-book amba-7RM I-PT-read-FV
‘the book that I read’
- b. [_{NP} [_{CP} [amba- [_{IP} nilinunua kitabu]]]]]
- c. [_{NP} [_{CP} [kitabū] [amba-cho [_{IP} nilinunua t_i]]]]
- d. [_{NP} [kitabū] [_{CP} [t_i] [ambacho [_{IP} nilinunua t_i]]]]

Evidence for this analysis comes from selectional features, binding and scope reconstruction, and idiom chunks (Kayne 1994; Bianchi 1999). Ngonyani (2001) presents three pieces of evidence from Swahili that support the raising analysis. The first piece of evidence reveals selectional relations between certain demonstratives and relative clauses. The second piece of evidence is quantified noun phrase-pronoun (QNP) binding which exhibit reconstruction effects. The third piece of evidence shows that the object of an idiom chunk is relativized and dislocated.

The analysis of resumptives presented here and in particular the reconstruction effects suggest that the head of the relative clause is base generated inside the relative clause and is subsequently raised to the specifier of CP position. This is consistent with the raising analysis advocated by Kayne.

The raising analysis inevitably brings to the fore the question of the relationship between the extracted head and the resumptive pronoun. The extraction facts suggest an analysis in which the pronoun and the head are generated together (Kayne 2002). Resumptive constructions, therefore, involve movement of the head and the stranding of the pronominal (Boeckx 2001, 2003). Further investigation into the syntactic properties of the resumptive pronominal clitic may shed light on the nature of pronouns and DPs.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we set out to provide a description of resumptives in some Bantu languages. Resumptives examined in Kiswahili, Kindendeule and Chiluba are found in relative clauses, infinitival relatives, and in topicalization. In these unbounded dependencies, the resumptive pronominal clitics prevent prepositions from stranding. These are the only sites of resumptive pronominal clitics. The paper addresses another question regarding the relationship between the clitic and moved nominal. Resumptive pronouns have often been analyzed as a last resort device because they appear in position from which movement is prohibited. Examples of parasitic gaps suggest that the pronominal clitic behave like *wh*-traces. Using quantifier-NP binding, we demonstrated that resumptive pronominal clitics exhibit properties of bound variables. We conclude that reconstruction effects must be derived from movement extracting the antecedent from inside the dependent clause. The extraction facts support the raising analysis of relative clauses and suggest there are complex *wh*-transformations which may involve more than one step movement.

References

- Aoun, Joseph, Lina Chouery and Norbert Hornstein. 2001. Resumption, movement and derivational economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:371-403.
- Barrett-Keach, Camilia. 1986. Word-internal evidence from Swahili for AUX/Infl. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:559-564.
- Biachi, Valentina. 1999. Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. Islands and Chains: Resumption as Stranding. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2001. Resumptives as derivational residues. In Megerdoomian, Karine and Leora Anne Bar-el (eds). *Proceedings of the 20th West Coast Conference in Formal Linguistics*, pp. 97-108. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Press.
- Engdahl, Elizabeth. 1985. Parasitic gaps, resumptive pronouns, and subject extraction. *Linguistics* 23:3-44.
- Kawasha, Boniface. 2002. Grammatical Relations and Relativization in Lunda. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 23:31-62.
- Kayne, Richard. 1981. On certain differences between French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 349-371.
- Kayne, Richard. 2002. Pronouns and their antecedents. In Samuel D. Epstein and T. Daniel Seely (eds) *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 133-166.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koopman, Hilda. 1982. Control from COMP and comparative syntax. *The Linguistic Review* 2:365-391.
- McCloskey, James. 2002. Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality operations. In Samuel D. Epstein and T. Daniel Seely (eds) *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 186-226.
- Mchombo, Sam. 2001. On parasitic gaps in Chichewa. In Peter Culicover & Paul Postal (eds). *Parasitic Gaps*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Ngonyani, Deo. 1999. X⁰-movement in Kiswahili relative clause verbs. *Linguistic Analysis* 29, 1-2:137-159.
- Ngonyani, Deo. 2001. Evidence for head raising in Kiswahili Relative Clauses. *Studies in African Linguistics* 30, 1:59-73.
- Schachter, Paul. 1973. Focus and relativization. *Language* 49:19-46.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 1992. Resumptive pronouns as a last resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 3:443-468.
- Zaenen, Annie, Elisabet Engdahl, and Joan Maling. 1981. Resumptive pronouns can be syntactically bound. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:679-682.

Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics: Shifting the Center of Africanism in Language Politics and Economic Globalization

edited by Olaoba F. Arasanyin
and Michael A. Pemberton

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2006

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics:
Shifting the Center of Africanism in Language Politics and Economic Globalization
© 2006 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-57473-414-8 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Ngonyani, Deo S. 2006. Resumptive Pronominal Clitics in Bantu Languages. In *Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. Olaoba F. Arasanyin and Michael A. Pemberton, 51-59. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Ngonyani, Deo S. 2006. Resumptive Pronominal Clitics in Bantu Languages. In *Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. Olaoba F. Arasanyin and Michael A. Pemberton, 51-59. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1406.