Tayo Lamidi,
Department of English,
University of Ibadan, Nigeria
tayolamidi@yahoo.com

Pronoun choice and grammaticality in Yorùbá–English code–switching

Studies in Yorùbá–English code–switching have shown that functional heads (such as Inflection, Determiner, pronoun and Complementizer) from the English language are often barred from the resulting code–switched grammar. However, no adequate explanation has been provided for this, nor any reasons adduced. This study therefore explains why pronouns, as functors, are barred from Yorùbá–English code–switching. Working within the frameworks of transformational grammar and autosegmental phonology, the study suggests that certain features facilitate the occurrence of English words and smooth switching from a code to the other in Yorùbá–English code–switching The unacceptability of pronouns in this grammar is traced to the absence of vowel lengthening and floating tones which usually accompany both Yorùbá and English words at specific switch junctions.

1. Introduction

It is a generally attested feature of code–switched grammars that functional elements from the host language dominate those of the other substrates in the resultant grammar (Myers–Scotton 1993, Pfaff 1979). The same phenomenon is observed in Yorùbá–English code–switching where functional elements such as determiners, inflection elements (tense, modal, aspect, agreement, etc.) from English grammar are barred in favour of those from Yorùbá (Banjo 1993, Lamidi 2003). Following Radford (1997), pronouns form a class of determiners that serve as functors. These pronouns are observed to be barred in Yorùbá–English code–switching (henceforth CS) as in the following; (For purposes of identification, the English parts of the CS expressions are typed in italics.)

223

1.	a.	*He travel.	'He travelled'
	b.	*They pray.	'They prayed'
	c.	*You sneeze.	'You sneezed'
	d.	*We wise	'We are wise'
2.	a.	Ó travel	'S/he travelled'
	b.	Wọ́n pray	'They prayed'
	c.	O sneeze	'S/he sneezed'
	d.	A wise	'We are wise'

The examples in (1) are unacceptable in Yorùbá–English CS. The problem with the sentences can be traced to pronouns as the grammaticality of (2) confirms. It means that the English pronouns are not allowed to co–occur with Yorùbá verbs (or more precisely, the functional elements under INFL) (Lamidi 2003). The relevant question then is: why are pronouns of Yorùbá origin permitted whereas those of English are not? In pursuing answers to this question, data were generated largely through introspection (as the researcher is bilingual in Yorùbá and English) and these compare favourably with other bilingual speakers with whom the researcher has interacted. This study is divided into different sections, and the analyses follow the classifications of pronouns in traditional English grammar as personal (subject, object and possessive), reflexive, reciprocal, and honorific pronouns.

2. Functional Heads

The primacy of heads has often been emphasized in the X' sub–theory of the Principles and Parameters theory. Heads of phrases are either functional or lexical. Functional heads have Argument Grammatical Function whereas lexical heads have Non–Argument Grammatical Function (Webelhuth 1995). Functional heads are words or affixes which are syntactic elements that serve as frames for linguistic structures in a language. They serve to carry information about the grammatical function (such as Case, number, person and gender) of particular types of expression within the sentence (Radford 1997: 37) and maintain the structural integrity of phrases in which they occur.

Different functional heads have been identified by scholars. These include pronouns, determiners, possessive agreement elements, complementizers, focus markers, genitive markers, emphasis markers, conjunction, echo, determiner, INFL, etc (Abney 1987; Awoyale 1995; Chomsky 1995; Radford 1997). The INFL may also be split into further categories such as Tense, Agreement, Negative "or perhaps more broadly, a category that includes an affirmation marker and others as well" (Chomsky 1993: 7). Each head is said to be obligatory and may have optional Specifier and Complement.

Panagioditis (no date) has also discussed the internal structure of pronouns, one of the identified functional elements. The author demonstrates that singular pronouns have the bare distribution while third person singular pronouns are rather different. (*http://www.geocities.com*). While some pronouns such as

we and *you* behave like determiners such as *this* and *these* by taking complements; some like *he* and *she* do not. This position is partly in line with Radford's (1997) view that pronouns are a kind of determiner. Radford argues that the pronoun lacks descriptive content; encodes a set of grammatical properties such as person, number, and case; belongs to a closed class; and does not have any obvious antonyms just like other functional heads, especially the determiner.

At issue in this paper is the rejection in Yorùbá–English code–switched structures of pronouns of English language origin where those from Yorùbá language are not rejected. The question is why are pronouns of English language origin barred?

3. Personal Pronouns

Personal pronouns are of two types: subject and object. We shall start with the subject.

3.1 Personal Pronoun Subject

Consider the examples under (3).

3. a. Ó *travel*.
        s/he travel
        'S/he travelled'

   b. Wọ́n *pray*
        They pray
        'They prayed'

   c. A *try*.
        We try
        'We tried'

   d. Ẹ *right*
        you right
        'You are right'

   e. Mò ń´ *travel*
        I CONT travel
        'I am travelling'

In contrast to the subjects in (1), the subjects in (3) are Yorùbá pronouns and they bear tone marks. Again, when compared to Yorùbá language, which is syllable–timed, English is a stress–timed language. In the CS grammar, the syllable timed feature of Yorùbá is adopted. Thus, the Yorùbá pronouns (in 3) have different tones: high for 3rd person (as in 3 a&b) and mid for 1st and 2nd persons (as in 3 c,d&e). Variations may occur in tone marking. This depends on the structure. For instance in (3e) *mo* 'I' (first person singular) co–occurs with a continuous aspect marker and the tone on *mo* changes to low.

Notice, however, that this is optional as both tones are acceptable in that context. English pronouns are generally usually unstressed and so do not have the same suprasegmental features as Yorùbá pronouns. Given the spec–head agreement relation that obtains between the subject and the INFL, we can say that the Yorùbá INFL features of person, number and gender agreement, although they are not phonetically realized, demand that the subject pronouns bear a tone (mid, high or low) in the Spec of CP. This is apart from having the requisite nominative Case feature. The English pronoun is not morphologically conditioned to occur in Yorùbá morphological patterns. While Yorùbá INFL requires a tone in the spec position, the English pronouns in (1) are not tone–marked. They still occur with the unstressed feature that they have in the stress–timed rhythm of English. Since they do not meet the requirement of the INFL they are consequently resisted in Yorùbá morphology.

Curiously, however, although English personal pronouns (subject) are barred, their corresponding nouns are usually allowed. One may wonder why English nouns (especially names) are acceptable as in (4)

4. a. *Thomson pray.*
   'Thompson prayed.'

   b. *Teacher punish* Akin.
   'The teacher punished Akin'

   c. *Pastor pray* fun Ojo.
   '(The) Pastor prayed for Ojo.'

   d. *Tea* ti tán.
   tea ASP finish
   'The tea has been exhausted.'

   e. *Fowl* kú.
   'The fowl died'

   f. *Fuel* wón.
   Fuel expensive
   'Fuel is expensive.'

   g. *Ink* dànù.
   ink spill
   'The ink got spilt.'

   h. *Motor* ní *accident.*
   vehicle has accident
   'The vehicle was involved in an accident.'

   i. *Egg* wà.
   egg exist
   'There are eggs.'

   j. *Tailor cheat* mi.
   'The tailor cheated me.'

k. *Computer crash.*
     'The computer crashed.'

The first observation on (4) is that the final vowel in each of the subject nouns is lengthened on a high tone. Notice that the final sounds on third person singular (3sg) subjects in (4) are unstressed. The closest suprasegmental feature to this in Yorùbá is the low tone; and the sounds are so realized (phonetically) by CS speakers. This low tone is consequently lengthened on a high tone to conform to the acceptable CS structure as in the following representations reproduced from (4):

5. a. *Thomson **ín** pray.*
        'Thompson prayed.'

    b. *Teacher **á** punish Akin.*
        'The teacher punished Akin'

    c. *Pastor **ọ́** pray fun Ojo.*
        '(The) Pastor prayed for Ojo.'

    d. *Tea **í** ti tán.*
        tea ASP finish
        'The tea has been exhausted.'

    e. *Fowl* /fao**ól**/ kú.
        'The fowl died'

    f. *Fuel* /fuɛɛl/ wọ́n.
        Fuel is expensive.'

Jowit (1991: 72) has observed that Nigerian speakers of English often blur the distinction between short and long RP English vowels, with short vowels becoming longer. Thus, within CS, speakers may lengthen vowels such as /ɛ/, /ʊ/ and /i/. Hence, the (final) vowel of words in closed syllables such as *fuel* and *egg* in (4 g&j), is lengthened on a high tone such that we have /fuɛɛl/ and /ɛɛ´g/ with options of inserting /í/ after the consonant. For *tea,* the long vowel /i:/ is further lengthened on a high tone. Notice that the items in bold in (5) are the lengthened vowels. The conclusion that we reach here is that the lengthened vowels facilitate the accommodation of nouns in Spec–IP.

The phenomenon of vowel lengthening has also been observed in Yorùbá monolingual discourse. Here are some examples:

6. a. owó ni
        Money foc.
        'it is money'

    b. ep(o) ó wà
        fuel exist
        'There is fuel'

    c. ejò ó kú
        snake died
        'The snake died'

The original final tones on *owó*, *epo* and *ejò* are high, mid and low respectively; but there are some changes in the tone marking of the final vowels in (6) as a result of their environments. In (6a), the assumption is that there is no lengthening, but we may argue that the final vowel is lengthened on a high tone, following Bamgbose's (1980) suggestion that the high tone syllable is assimilated to the final vowel of the subject. In (6b) lengthening occurs; and assimilation also follows after lengthening because the mid tone gives way to a high tone. In (6c) the final vowel is lengthened on a high tone and assimilation is neither required nor permitted.

Bamgbose (1980) and Awobuluyi (1992, 2004) have discussed the foregoing phenomenon in Yorùbá. However, while Bamgbose sees the lengthened vowel (or the High tone in cases where assimilation has taken place) as a concord marker, Awobuluyi sees the lengthened vowel as a High Tone Syllable (HTS), which may be assimilated to the final vowel. The lengthened vowel or tone may not be a concord marker since it does not occur in every environment as the following sentences show:

7. a.   epo ni
           fuel be
           'It is fuel'

    b.   ata   dà?
           pepper Q
           'Where is pepper?'

In (7), neither vowel lengthening nor tone occurs to serve as concord markers. Awobuluyi (1992: 32) has argued that the HTS occurs between the subject and its verb. The HTS, realized as *ó,* may occur independently as in (6c) or be assimilated as in (6b). The major distinguishing feature is the high tone. Following this discussions, therefore, we confirm that there is vowel lengthening with HTS in Yorùbá.

How do we account for this lengthened vowel and high tone within the context of Yorùbá–English CS? Studies on tones have shown that syllables and tones are usually merged in a pair–wise fashion. However, while some tones spread because other vowels have been accommodated, some float because their segments are not attached to any vowel (Goldsmith 1990). Within the CS grammar, both options are not possible. The fact is that contrary to the situation in which a vowel is deleted, the words of English language origin do try to adapt to the Yorùbá sentence frame. In the process, they assume a new tone (without a corresponding vowel). The new tone has no segmental tier and is therefore considered floating. How is this possible? The English language has a stress–timed rhythm. It is assumed that the last tone in the subjects spreads and adopts a high tone since the last consonant limits the activity of the vowel (lengthening). That is why Yorùbá monolinguals often insert /i/ or /u/ in consonant clusters and after words that end in consonants to adapt them to Yorùbá morphology. Hence, floating tone would make it easier to adapt the English words to the tonal patterns of Yorùbá; thereby satisfying the requirements mid–way. Why do these tones seem to lengthen the last vowel? The reason is

228

that the tone has to be associated with a vowel. Since the tone floats adjacent to the final vowel, it is axiomatic that it will assimilate to the sound of the vowel.

We can assume that this feature is borrowed into the Yorùbá–English CS from Yorùbá language. This is possible if the CS subject ends in a consonant which is consequently broken down in two ways:

(a) by lengthening the final vowel that in a closed syllable; or
(b) by lengthening the final vowel of the noun, which comes next to the INFL as in (8 a–c). Notice that in Yorùbá language, HTS is maintained between the subject and the INFL.

8. a. *Teacher* á wá
Teacher VL come
'The teacher came'

   b. *Pastor* ọ́ pray
Pastor VL pray
'The pastor prayed'

   c. *rice* tà
rice sell
'Rice sells'

   d. Adé *pass*
Ade pass
'Ade passed'

   e. Delé *try*
Dele try
'Dele tried'

As (8) shows, *teacher, pastor* and *rice* end in 'low' tone and so require vowel lengthening (henceforth, VL). *Rice* ends in a consonant; therefore, its internal vowel is lengthened. This tone attached to the lengthened vowel is prominent in spoken sentences, but is not represented morphologically and hence is considered to be a floating tone (henceforth, FL). When the morphemes are included (as in 8 a&b), the English words become morphologically integrated as in Yorùbá monolingual discourse. Such English words become borrowed words, quite distinct from switched forms. Notice that the Yorùbá names, *Adé* and *Délé* (8 d&e) end in high tone but have assimilated the HTS to the final vowel. Notice further that VL is not required when words of English or Yorùbá origin occur before negative and some tense markers in the CS:

9. a. *Flour* kò tó.
flour NEG enough
'The flour is not enough.'

   b. *Pastor* kì í wá
Pastor neg HAB come
'Pastor does not come'

    c.   *Teacher* n'   *pray*
             teacher CONT pray
             'The teacher prays/is praying'

    d.   *Pastor* yóò *pray*
             pastor FUT pray
             '(The) Pastor will pray'

The structures above agree with what obtains in Yorùbá monolingual discourse.

Although the HTS is written out in (5 and 8 a&b), it may not occur morphologically. The following are examples reproduced from (4):

9. a.   *Fowl* kú   'The fowl died'
    b.   *Fuel* tán   'The fuel finished'
    c.   *Ink* dànù   'The ink spilled'
    d.   *Egg* wà   'There are eggs'

The major feature of the English words in (9) is that the final vowels occur in closed syllables. Hence it is difficult for them to have the HTS realized as ó. Rather, the final vowel takes on the tone of the HTS as a floating tone. Thus we assume that in the process of assimilating the HTS, the English words generated FTs (with the option of having a syllable tied to it in case of borrowing).

Given this position, English pronouns are ruled out in a CS structure on two levels:

    a.   they do not have a high tone and
    b.   their final vowels cannot be extended on a high tone

The tone approximating to the unstressed pattern in English pronoun is low (as observed in 8 a,b&9), and the pronoun has no facility to change this to a high tone. This inability is rejected in Yorùbá–English CS.

3.2 Personal Pronoun Object

Pronouns also occur in the object position of verbs. Compare (10) with (11).

10. a.   *Ade write* me.
     b.   *A kó *it*
     c.   *Olu *call you*
     d.   *Wọ́n *fine us*
     e.   *Ó *hit you*
     f.   *Ife *need us*
     g.   *Ẹ kórira *her/him/it*
     h.   *O *defeat them*

11. a.   Ade *write* wa
           Ade call us
           'Ade called us'

b.   A *build* ẹ̀
we build 3sg
'We build it'

c.   Olu *call* ẹ
Olu call you
'Olu called you'

d.   Wọ́n *fine* wa
They fine us
'They fined us'

e.   Ó *hit* wọ́n
3sg hit them
's/he hit them'

f.   Ó *need* wa
3sg need us
'H/she/it needs us'

g.   Ẹ *hate* ẹ̀
You hate 3sg
'You hate him/her/it'

h.   Ó *defeat* yín
3sg defeat you
'S/he defeated you'

The CS sentences in (10) are unacceptable but the corresponding versions in (11) are acceptable. The first observation in (10) is that the verbs are in either English or Yorùbá, and this is replicated in (11). This means that we cannot trace the problem of ungrammaticality in (10) to the verbs. The next option is the pronouns which occur as English words in (10) and Yorùbá words in (11).

What is the nature of the problem in (10)? First, as in the previous section, the tones also play a part. While the 3rd person pronoun singular and the 2nd person plural have low and high tones respectively (11 b&h); other personal pronoun objects are on a mid tone. These features tally with the requirements for subject pronouns to be acceptable in Yorùbá English CS. In addition, the verbs of English origin are lengthened either vowel internally or vowel finally. The verbs, such as *call* /kol/ and *write* /rait/ are pronounced with length on the vowel with the consequent final floating tone. This lengthening of the final vowel of the English verb and the resultant floating mid tone facilitate its co–occurrence with Yorùbá pronouns. If the verb is Yorùbá, the vowel may also be lengthened on a mid tone as in:

12.   a.   Ó pàde e wa
3sg meet VL us
'He met us'

b.   Olu gbagbé e Kike
        Olu forget VL Kike
        'Olu forgot Kike'

c.   Ade rí Bolá
        Adé see Bola
        'Ade saw Bola'

d.   Funmi pa ejò
        Funmi kill snake
        'Funmi killed a snake'

While lengthening occurs in (12 a&b), it does not occur in (12 c&d). Perhaps, we may attribute this to the fact that the verbs in (12 a&b) behave like a verb + noun combination; the nominal part of which triggers vowel lengthening.

For English verbs, this does not seem to be so. Why do English verbs lengthen their vowels? The verb is the (lexical) head of the VP and therefore subcategorizes for NPs that follow. Our assumption is that the lengthening is a device for screening out illegitimate (unacceptable) objects. Notice that this feature is peculiar to the CS: it does not occur in English. The feature also applies partially in Yorùbá. Perhaps, it is also a means of mitigating the stress –timed rhythm/pattern English pronouns. We can therefore conclude, tentatively, that the contact between stress and tone is usually settled through vowel lengthening and floating tones, perhaps to douse the conflict!

How do verbs of English origin relate with adverbs and adjectives? Consider (13):

13.   a.   Ade *rise, steadily*
          'Ade rose, steadily'

      b.   Ó *win, convincingly*
          3sg win convincingly
          'S/he won convincingly'

      c.   A *play, continuously*
          'We played continuously'

14.   a.   Ó *remain loyal*   'S/he remains/remained loyal'

      b.   Wón *strive hard*   'They strived hard'

      c.   Ó wà *disrespectful*.   'It is/was disrespectful'

      d.   O *show* o *love/concern*   'S/he showed love/concern'

What these examples show is that the verbs in the CS grammar may not use vowel lengthening at all times. There may be a pause between the verb and an adverb; but neither pause nor vowel lengthening occurs between a verb and an adjective. However, vowel lengthening occurs between a verb and the noun or (sometimes, Yorùbá) pronoun it subcategorizes. We may then say that vowel lengthening involving verbs is a feature of verb – object relations in the CS.

So why are pronouns barred in the object position? First, they do not have tones and therefore cannot be linked to the head through vowel lengthening as required by transitive verbs. Second, assuming the verb lengthens its vowel; the pronoun will have stress (more than is due to it) and therefore be emphasized. The result is that they will behave like nouns as in (15).

15. a.   *O call 'me   'You called me'
     b.   *Ó write 'you   'S/he wrote you'
     c.   *Wọ́n fine 'us   'They fined us'
     d.   *Ó defeat 'you   'S/he defeated you'
     e.   *Ó hate 'him/'her/'it   'S/he hates him/her/it'
     f.   *Ó hit 'them.   'S/he/it hit them'

If these structures are to be distinct from English language structures, especially in pronunciation, their oral production will be aberrant in Yorùbá–English CS. The verb will have a lengthened vowel but the pronoun will be emphasized (pronounced with a lot of energy). If, however, the emphasis is removed, the English normal unstressed pattern will be introduced, contrary to the dictates of the host language used as the base for the CS. Hence the English pronouns are barred.

3.3 Possessive Pronouns

Possessive pronouns in English are *my, our, your, his, her, its* and *their*, while those from Yorùbá are *mi, wa, rẹ, yín, rẹ̀* and *wọn*. A major difference between the two languages is in the word order and this is reflected in the occurrence of pronouns in the examples. While they occur before nouns in English, they occur after nouns in Yorùbá. In Yorùbá/English CS, they also occur after the noun; thus following the Yorùbá language word order pattern. Consider the following examples for instance:

16. a.   *teacher* [a] wa
            Teacher FT us
            'our teacher'

     b.   *colour* [ọ] rẹ̀
            colour FT 3sg
            'its/her/his colour'

     c.   *coat* [u] yín
            coat FT your
            'your coats'

     d.   *neighbour* [ọ] wọn
            neighbour FT them
            'their neighbour'

     e.   *friend* []mi
            friend my
            'my friend'

233

f. *sister* []ẹ
   sister your
   'your sister'

g. *motor* []mi
   vehicle my
   'my vehicle'

17. a. *friend my   b. *colour his
    c. *sister your   d. *teacher our
    d. *coat our   e. *colour his/her/its

The examples in (16&17) show that Yorùbá possessive pronouns are preferred to English pronouns in possessive DP structures. The first reason for rejecting the English pronouns is that English DP is head first whereas the CS grammar follows the Yorùbá DP pattern which is head last (taking Det as head). Given the change in word order, the structure can be predicted, *a priori,* to be ungrammatical. The second reason is that VL (enclosed in square brackets) and the consequent FT occur between the noun and the possessive pronoun in each structure in (16); but such vowel lengthening does not occur in (17). The vowel lengthening in (16) is similar to Owolabi's (1976) associative marker in noun–noun constructions. It is therefore possible that this feature was borrowed from Yorùbá by the CS grammar in order to break the resultant unnaturalness (stiffness) that may occur at switch junctions between English and Yorùbá. Note again that vowels are lengthened before pronouns that begin with consonants, but they are not lengthened before pronouns that begin with vowels. The lengthened vowel must be identical with its parent (from which it was derived) except that its tone differs. In addition, in some cases, the lengthened vowel may be quite obscure (16 e–g), being less prominent than what obtains more regularly with other pronouns (16 a–d). In (16e), we may assume that the lengthened vowel is obscure because the final vowel of the word is followed by another word which begins with a vowel; but it is not clear why the vowels in (16 f&g) are obscure. Perhaps we may consider it an accidental gap that the VL/FT does not occur there.

3.4 Indefinite pronouns

Indefinite pronouns in English include *none, nothing, many, another, one, someone, somebody, anybody, everybody, nobody, everyone, anyone,* and *anything.* In Yorùbá, these words are usually realized as nouns. Such words include *ohunkóhun* (anything), *èyíkéyìí* (whichever) and *ẹnikẹ́ni* (anyone). In the CS, many English indefinite pronouns are often used possibly because of their numerical strength over nouns that are their translational equivalents from Yorùbá. Witness:

18. a. Wọ́n *settle everybody*
    They settle everybody
    They settled everybody (i. e. They bribed everybody)

234

      b.   A *invite everybody*   'We invite(d) everybody'

      c.   *Everybody face business* è
           everybody face business 3sg
           'Everybody faced his/her own business'

      d.   *Anybody* le *try luck* ẹ̀
           Anybody can try luck 3sg
           'Anybody can try his or her luck'

      e.   Kò fẹ́ rí *anybody*
           NEG like see anybody
           'He/she does not want to see anybody'

      f.   Kò *impress anybody*
           NEG impress anybody
           'S/he does not impress anybody'

      g.   *Anything* ló lè *happen*
           Anything FOC: 3sg can happen
           'Anything can happen'

      h.   Kò sí *anything* nibẹ̀
           NEG exist anything there
           'There is nothing there'

19.   a.   **One* fẹ́ *contribute.*
      b.   **Nothing* ò lè *happen*
      c.   **None* ò sí níbẹ̀
      d.   **Nobody* ló fẹ́ *assist*

As we can see, some of the pronouns (18) are acceptable while others (19) are not. The acceptable ones (18) can be understood as items that have generic reference; hence their acceptability. However, the unacceptable ones have semantic problems. In (19a) *one* is ambiguous between two meanings: the numeral *1* and an incomplete phrase *one... (man, boy, etc)*. If *1* is meant, there is a problem of meaning; if *one...* is meant, the problem is syntactic since *one* has to qualify a noun. For both reasons the sentence is barred. In (19 b–d) *nothing, none* and *nobody* have no direct referent in the contexts of occurrence or in the outside world. Semantically, therefore, the sentences are rather meaningless.

3.5 Reciprocal and Reflexive Pronouns

In current linguistic studies, reciprocal and reflexive pronouns are classified as anaphors because they have referents within or outside their immediate clauses. (cf Binding Principles). The reciprocals are *each other* and *one another*. The reflexives include *myself, ourselves, yourself, yourselves, himself, herself, itself,* and *themselves*. In Yorùbá/English CS, only the reciprocals are allowed, the reflexives are barred. Consider:

20.   a.   A *inform each other.*   'We informed each other'
      b.   Wọ́n *insult one another.* 'They insulted one another'

Really, these two reciprocals are used by educated bilinguals who know the difference between them (that *each other* is used for two people while *one another* is used for three or more people). Notice that the specific number is not deduced from the subject (except a conjoined subject appears and is linked to *each other*). The vowel of the verb (whether it is of Yorùbá or English origin) may be lengthened; though Yorùbá monosyllabic verbs tend to resist such lengthening.

    21.   a.   Wọ́n féràn an *each other*
                   They like LV each other
                   'They like each other'

            b.   Wọ́n pe *one another*
                   they call one another
                   'They called one another'

For the traditional reflexives, consider the following examples:

    22.   a.   *Ó *hurt himself*
                   S/He hurt himself

            b.   *Mo *praise myself.*
                   I praised myself

            c.   *O *drive yourself*
                   You drove yourself

            d.   Wọ́n *drive by themselves*
                   they drive by themselves
                   'They drove (the vehicles) by themselves'

            e.   Ó *prepare* è *by herself*
                   3sg prepare 3sg by herself
                   'S/he prepared it by herself'

            f.   Mo *treat* è *myself*
                   I treat 3sg myself
                   'I treated it myself'

The English reflexive may not be acceptable if it occurs directly after, and functions as the object of the verb. This conclusion is derived from the fact that the verb is lengthened if the DP functions as the object. If (22 a–c) are barred, why are (22 d–e) allowed? They are allowed because of two reasons: (a) a Yorùbá pronoun functions as the direct object; (b) the reflexive is shielded from the verb by a preposition. By virtue of the second position, the reflexive occurs in an embedded language (following Myers–Scotton 2003). However, the structure may be somehow acceptable if the English verb has no direct object but is followed by an embedded language (22d) in which the anaphor occurs. Such embedded language is usually a prepositional phrase introduced by *by* (22 d&e). The preposition, being the head of a phrase, staves off the effects of the verb. More importantly, the sentence may also be acceptable if the verb

has an object followed by the *by*–phrase in which the preposition is deleted, generating examples such as (22f).

So what happens to Yorùbá anaphors? They are all allowed as in the following examples:

23. a.   Ó *love* ara– è   'S/he loves herself/himself'
     b.   Wón *hate* ara–wọn   'They hate themselves'
     c.   A *like* ara–wa   'We like one another'
     d.   O *feed* ara–ẹ   'You fed yourself'

The first observation on (23) is on the morphology of the anaphors. The English anaphors in (22) are made up of a personal pronoun and *self* combination. Thus there is correspondence between a co–referential DP subject and the pronoun that is merged with *self*. In (23), they agree in person and number, but not in gender (because Yorùbá, the host language, does not mark gender on its pronouns). In Yorùbá–English CS, there is first a change in morpheme order of the reflexives – the pronoun follows *ara* in the reflexive, contrary to the word initial position taken in English. The second is that although the pronouns agree in person and number, they do not agree in gender. Rather the Yorùbá features conflict with those of English. Notice further that the pronouns merged with *self* in English still have some of the features associated with personal pronouns above (as regards stress and vowel lengthening); and that the plural forms of the pronouns are reflected morphologically (ourselves, yourselves, themselves). All this accounts for the unacceptability of the reflexive pronouns. Note that reflexives in (22 d–f) are acceptable because they are protected from the verb by the preposition *by*, whether or not it is phonetically realized.

3.6 Relative Pronouns

Relative pronouns in English are realized as *that, who, whom, which* and *whose*. In Yorùbá *tí* is the recognized relative clause marker. For *whose*, however, *tí...* + a relevant personal pronoun that refers to the antecedent of *ti* is often used. The use of the pronoun has to do with possession. Thus *tí...* + pronoun may be considered the possessive form of the relative pronoun. In CS, relative pronouns from English are barred. Compare (24) and (25)).

24. a. **Boy whom* a *help*   = *boy* tí a *help*
    b. **lady who* o *drive*   = *lady* tí ó *drive*
    c. **contract which* a *win*   = *contract* tí a *win*
    d. **vehicle which* o *miss*   = *vehicle* tí o *miss*
    e. **stories that* a gbó   = *stories* tí a gbọ́
    f. **girl whose teacher shout*   = *girl* tí *teacher* è *shout*.
    g. **man whose shirt* ya   = *man* ti *shirt* è *ya*.
    h. **house whose windows open*   = *house* ti *windows* rè *open*.
    i. awọn *boys whose parents travel* = awọn *boys* tí *parents* wọn *travel*.

25. a. *Boy* tí a *help*   'the boy whom we helped'
    b. *lady* tí ó *drive*   'the lady that drove'
    c. *contract* tí a *win*   'the contract that we won'

237

d. *vehicle* tí o *miss*   'the vehicle that you missed'
e. *stories* tí a gbọ́   'the stories that we heard'
f. *girl* tí *teacher* rẹ̀ shout   'the girl whose teacher shouted'
g. man ti *shirt* rẹ̀ ya.   'the man whose shirt got torn'
h. *house* ti *window* rẹ̀ *open*   'the house whose windows are open'
i. àwọn *boys* tí *parents* wọn *travel* 'the boys whose parents travelled'

The English relative pronouns are barred in (24 a–i). First, the Yorùbá relative pronoun is relatively invariant across subject and object. While English reflects nominative, accusative and genitive Cases (for *who, whom* and *whose* respectively as in 24 a,b&f), Yorùbá and CS use *ti* for the first two and the frame *tí... +relevant personal pronoun* for the genitive. Second, relativization is said to involve movement of the relative pronoun *tí* from one position to another (Spec CP) (Awobuluyi 1978, 2004; Yusuff 1995). In English, the movement leaves a trace, but in Yorùbá there is controversy as to whether it leaves a trace or a resumptive pronoun. In CS, we assume that the movement leaves a resumptive pronoun. Third, the possessive form of the relative pronoun is usually pied piped with its noun antecedent in English. In CS, the possessor noun is changed to a pronoun (a possessive) that agrees with the antecedent in number and person. And the possessed noun occurs between the relative pronoun *tí* and the new (possessor) pronoun as in 25 f&h). Notice that English relative pronouns are acceptable when they occur in an embedded language (a wholly English structure/constituent used in CS).

3.7 Royal Pronouns and Pronouns of Plurality

Pronouns have a system of number as singular and plural. The erstwhile plural forms are, however, often subjected to varying uses in discourse. These are as power pronouns (Brown and Gilman 1962), which include royal pronouns (that are prevalent in the Elizabethan/Shakespearean English) and the honorific pronouns which still feature in Yorùbá monolingual discourse.

Within the Yorùbá–English CS grammar, these features are merged. Consider (26).

26 a. àwọn *teachers* 'teachers'
  b. ẹ̀yin student   'you students'
  c. àwa labourer(s) 'we labourers'

The examples in (26) show the ordinary plural usage. In addition, it will be observed that the nouns in (26 a&c) have plural markers from English and Yorùbá. Thus, we can say that the Yorùbá pronouns preceding the nouns emphasize the nouns. The identical feature from both substrates is that they optionally take plural marking on nouns (English has zero plurals, among others; and Yorùbá does not inflect nouns for purposes of marking plural). If the pronouns could occur in the same position as seen in (26), then they should substitute for each other. This is, however, not the case because the Yorùbá pronouns, especially *àwọn,* have wider meaning than the English plural forms.

The use of Royal pronouns is no longer prevalent in modern English. In contemporary usage, the pronoun is used to show that the speaker is speaking for a team. Conversely, the royal pronouns are used for honorific purposes in

Yorùbá language. Such pronouns are used to locate people on the social ladder in terms of usage – master/slave/junior/senior/elders in the society. This usage is carried over to Nigerian English, prompting Yusuf and Olateju (2004) to propose the usage of *they* as a singular pronoun.

In the present study, *àwọn* functions as an honorific title as in the following:

27 a. àwọn *daddy* 'Daddy'

  b. àwọn *Mister Dauda* 'Dauda 'Mr Dauda'

In these examples, *Daddy* and *Mister Dauda* are honoured with the use of àwọn. Notice that each of the nouns in (27) is singular. Furthermore, another personal pronoun can occur where *àwọn* occurs as in (28)

28 c. àwọn *daddy* wa 'our daddy'

This clearly brings out the fact that *àwọn* is purely honorific in (27).

4. Conclusion

Having looked at various pronouns and their interactions in various environments, we observe that subjects are lengthened on a high tone in subject position; the verb is lengthened on a mid tone when it has an object, and the first word in a genitive construction lengthens its vowel on a mid tone. Consequently, we need to distinguish between HTS which, following Awobuluyi (1992, 2004) occurs in Yorùbá language and the phenomenon of vowel lengthening in Yorùbá–English CS. It is true that the feature HTS is borrowed into the CS grammar, but the phenomenon is better understood as vowel lengthening rather than HTS. The first reason is that HTS is peculiar to subject verb relation whereas vowel lengthening occurs in spec–head, genitive and verb–object positions. Second, HTS does not seem to recognize floating tones, but this is recognized in the CS, especially with English words. Third, in Yorùbá it is phonetically realized; but in the Yorùbá/English CS, there are two options: (1) When the lengthened vowel comes from a Yorùbá word, it might be realized as a HTS; (2) if it comes from an English word, it may not be phonetically realized. Given this peculiarity, we identify the Yorùbá HTS as vowel lengthening (when it occurs physically) and as floating tones when it does not.

Our discussions of the different pronouns in the context of CS grammar reveal that English pronouns are usually barred from Yorùbá–English CS structures because of the stress (imposed on them by English) and due to their non–adaptability to the Yorùbá – frame being used in the CS. The study identified the absence of the lengthening of the final vowels as well as floating tones in switch boundaries (between pronoun subject and INFL; between possessive pronoun and their NPs and between the verb and its pronoun object) as the major factor that usually accounts for the rejection of pronouns in the CS grammar. It suggests that vowel lengthening and subsequent floating tone screen out English pronouns.

Acknowledgements

References

Abney, Steven Paul (1987) *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect,* PhD Thesis, MIT

Awobuluyi Oladele (1978) *Essentials of Yoruba Grammar* Ibadan: Oxford University Press

Awobuluyi Oladele (1992) 'Aspects of Contemporary Standard Yorùbá in Dialectological Perspective' in Akinwumi Ishola (ed) *New Findings in Yoruba Studies* J. F. Odunjo Memorial Lecture Series. Pp 1 – 77.

Awobuluyi Oladele (2004) 'Subjectless Sentences in Standard Yoruba' in Kola Owolabi and Ademola Dasylva (eds) *Forms and Functions of English and Indigenous Languages in Nigeria: A Festschrift in Honour of Ayo Banjo.* Ibadan: Group Publishers Pp 347 – 356.

Awoyale, Yiwola (1995) 'The Role of Functional Categories in Syntax: The Yoruba Case' in Kola Owolabi (ed) *Language in Nigeria.* Ibadan: Group Publishers, 113–127'

Bamgbose, Ayo (1980) 'Pronouns, Concord and Pronominalization' *Africa und Übersee, Band LXIII*: 189–198.

Banjo, Ayo (1983) 'Aspects of Yoruba/English Language Mixing' *Journal of Nigerian Languages* No 1: 17 – 26.

Brown R. and Gilman A. (1962) 'The pronouns of Power and Solidarity' in Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed) *Language and Social Context* Harmondsworth: Penguin: 252–282.

Chomsky, Noam (1993) 'A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory' in Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyservb (eds.) *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honour of Sylvain Bromberger,* Cambridge Mass: MIT Press, 1–52.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Goldsmith, John. A. (1990) *Autosegmental and Metrical Phonology* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Jowit, David (1991) *Nigerian English Usage* Lagos: Longman

Kaye, J. (1989) *Phonology: A Cognitive View* New Jersey: Lawrence; Erlbaum Associates.

Lamidi, Mufutau Temitayo (2003) *The Head Parameter and Grammaticality in Yorùbá–English Code–Switching among Undergraduates in selected Nigerian Universities.* PhD Thesis, University of Ibadan.

Myers–Scotton, Carol (1993) *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code* Mixing Oxford: Claredon Press.

Owolabi, Daniel Kolawole Olaitan. (1976) *Noun–Noun Constructions in Yoruba* PhD Thesis, University of Ibadan.

Panagiotidis, Phoevos (no date) 'The internal Structure of Pronouns' Accessed from *www.geocities.com* March 13, 2007.

Radford, Andrew 1997 *Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction* Cambridge: University Press.

Webelhuth, Gert (1995) X–Bar Theory and Case Theory' in Gert Webelhuth (ed.) *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist* Program Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

Izbor zamjenice i gramatikalizacija u prebacivanju kodova u jorupskom engleskom

Studije prebacivanja kodova u jorupskom engleskom pokazale su da funkcionalne glave (fleksi-ja, determinator, zamjenica, dopunjač) iz engleskog jezika često ne ulaze u »prebačenu« gramatiku. Unatoč tome, ovo stanje nije prikladno objašnjeno. Ovaj rad želi objasniti zašto zamjenice, kao funkcionalne riječi, nisu prisutne u prebacivanju kodova u jorupskom engleskom. U okvirima transformacijske gramatike i autosegmentalne fonologije, rad pokazuje da neke osobine olakšavaju pojavljivanje engleskih riječi i jednostavno prebacivanje iz jednoga u drugi kod u prebacivanju kodova u jorupskom engleskom. Neprihvatljivost zamjenica u toj gramatici pripisuje se nepostojanju dulje-nja vokala i plutajućim tonovima koji obično prate riječi iz jorube i iz engleskoga u specifičnim točkama prebacivanja.

Ključne riječi: zamjenice, prebacivanje koda, tonski jezici, fonologija, jorupski jezik, engleski jezik
Keywords: pronouns, code–switching, tone languages, phonology, Yorùbá, English language