

SHORT CONTRIBUTION

The Limits of the DP/CP Parallelism: Evidence from Tiv

*Michael Terhemmen Angitso**

University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

1. Introduction

Following Abney (1987), there have been several propositions about the structure of nominal constructions. Abney (1987) basically made two observations about the nominal domain. The first observation is that the head of a nominal construction is the Determiner (D). Secondly, the nominal domain is structurally similar to a clause. Following these lines, Ihsane and Puskás (2001), Aboh (2004), Haegeman (2004), Giusti (2005) and Hsu (2014) argue that the D projection can be disintegrated just like the Complementizer (C) projection within the clausal domain. This is because the D projection is the locus of discourse information, and it inherently possesses functional projections that encode this information. The C projection was also disintegrated when it was discovered that there is inherent discourse information in the projection (Rizzi 1997; Cinque and Rizzi 2008).

The Focus and Topic projections have been identified within the D projection (Ihsane and Puskás 2001; Aboh 2004; Haegeman 2004; Giusti 2005; Hsu 2014). The arguments begin with the view that the focus marker is semantically similar to a definite marker, while a topic marker in the clause is semantically similar to a specificity marker. The second argument is based on the similarities of the scrambling/distribution of constituents within the clause and the nominal domain as well as the existence of licensing functional heads for focus and topic interpretation in both domains (Hsu 2014). They argue that if these interpretation and structural

* Email: senseimyk@gmail.com

I wish to acknowledge and appreciate Julius I. Angitso and Theresa T. Angitso for funding this research and other studies on the Tiv language, culture and politics. I wish to also acknowledge and dedicate this paper to my deceased informant Mama Regina Mamkaa Tsavza.

similarities are true in the clausal and nominal domains, then it implies that there are Topic and Focus projections within the D projection.

This paper supports the idea that the clausal and nominal domains are similar in that they both contain internal discourse projections that are headed by operators which are responsible for the discourse information of both constructions (Bernstein 2001; Giusti 2005). The paper also supports the decomposition of the nominal discourse information layer. However, this paper recognizes and argues that there are limitations to the extent to which the clausal and nominal domains can be similar beginning from the functional projections and their licensing behaviours through syntactico-semantic patterns to the cartography of the morpho-syntactic items within both domains. The paper focuses on D and excludes the Number and Quantifier projections since the scope of this paper does not include accounting for the amount of entities.

The paper is organised as follows. Section one introduces the paper. Section Two examines determiners in Tiv¹. Section three gives a brief overview of topic and focus constructions in Tiv and further provides some pieces of evidence for the limitations of the clausal and nominal domain parallelism. These pieces of evidence also suggest the nonexistence of Topic and Focus projections within the left periphery of the Tiv nominal domain. Section four concludes the paper.

2. Determiners in Tiv

Tiv does not have definite and/or indefinite determiners, but it has demonstratives *né* ‘this’ and *lá* ‘that’ (Abraham 1933, 1940; Jockers 1991), as in (1).²

- (1) a. wán nè
 child this
 ‘this child’

¹ The Tiv people are located in the north central region of Nigeria. They are basically found in the Benue valley (Benue state), alongside other languages such as Idoma, Igede and Etulo, Akpa, and Nyifon. These languages are not mutually intelligible. The Tiv have a total land mass of 22,004 sq. Km in Benue state. Tiv people are also found in Nassarawa state, Taraba, and part of Kogi states. Tiv is a Benue Congo language. It has well over 2,500,000 speakers all over the country. In fact, it is rated the fourth largest ethnic group in Nigeria, and the largest language family (Tivoid) within the Niger Congo family. Tiv is a language with a basic word order of SVO.

² List of the abbreviations in the glosses: AGR = (Subject) Agreement; COP = Copular; DEF = Definite; EMP = Emphasis; FOC = Focus marker; FUT = Future; GEN = Genitive; IPFV = Imperfective; NCL = Noun class; NEG = Negative Marker; NMLZ = Nominalizer; PL = plural; PRN = Pronoun; PST = Past; RES.PRN = Resumptive pronoun; SG = Singular; SPEC = Specificity Marker; TOP = Topic marker.

- b. wán là
 child that
 'that child'

In (1a) the demonstrative *nè* 'this' indicates the spatial proximity of *wán* 'child' to the speaker as non-distal, while *là* 'that' in (1b) indicates that the distance between the child and the speaker is distal.

Since Tiv is a noun class language, the two above-mentioned demonstratives can be inflected for different noun classes as dictated by the noun in the nominal constructions (Abraham 1933, 1940; Jockers 1991). This is shown in (2).

- (2) a. wán ngù-n(é)
 child NCL.SG-this
 'this child'
- b. wán ngù-lá
 child NCL.SG-that
 'that child'
- c. mbà-yév mbá-n(é)
 NCL.PL-young NCL.PL-this
 'these children'
- d. mbà-yé-v mbà-lá
 NCL.PL-young-NCL.PL NCL.PL-that
 'those children'

When an article is to be used to bring out the semantic effect of definiteness, *là* would be used, as in (3).

- (3) Kwàgh-yá-n là ngù shá tébùù.
 thing-eat-IPFV that COP on table
 'That food is on the table.'

In (3), *là* is a demonstrative marker but it is inherently definite. Hence, definiteness is part of the compositional features of demonstratives in Tiv. In this regard, the demonstrative would be used when definiteness is to be discussed and it would be labeled as DefM.

Tiv makes a distinction of discourse anaphoric nominals: Non-discourse anaphoric nominals are bare nouns, as in (4a), because they are non-specific, while

discourse anaphoric nominals are not bare nouns but are marked by a specificity marker *shún*, as in (4b).

- (4) a. wán-yé
 child-young
 'child'
- b. wán-yé shún
 child-young SPEC
 'the child'

The specificity marker *shún* does not have a definite interpretation, and therefore it only produces the construal of pre-establishment in the discourse, as in (5).

- (5) Wán-yé á vé héén. Wán-yé shún á témá
 child-young AGR.PRN come.PST here. child-young SPEC AGR.PRN sit.PST
 shá tébùù.
 on table
 'A child came here. The child sat on the table.'

The demonstrative marker *là* is used for definite interpretations. It can co-occur with the specificity marker *shún* in constructions such as (6).

- (6) Òr shún là ngù à vá gá?
 man SPEC that COP AGR.PRN come NEG
 'Has that (very) man not come?'

In constructions such as (6), the order of the articles is rigid such that *shún* cannot occur after *là*. The semantic output of their co-occurrence is the production of a reinforcement interpretation.

3. Topic and Focus in Tiv

A Focus projection in a clause is headed by the focus marker *ká* in Tiv which assigns semantic prominence to an item that falls within its scope, as in (7b), where the subject *Sésùgh* moves into the focus projection in the clausal left periphery. In (7c), it is the

predicate that receives the prominent scope over the rest of the clausal constituents. Basically, (7b) and (7c) are derived from (7a).³

- (7) a. Sésùgh á yám kwàgh yá-n.
 Sésùgh AGR.PRN buy.PST thing eat-IPFV
 ‘Sésùgh bought food.’
- b. Ká **Sésùgh** Sésùgh á yám kwàgh-yá-n yé.
 FOC Sésùgh Sésùgh AGR.PRN buy.PST thing-eat-IPFV EMP
 ‘It is **Sésùgh** that bought food.’
- c. Ká ù yám-én kwàgh-yá-n Sésùgh á yám
 FOC to buy-IPFV thing-eat-IPFV Sésùgh AGR.PRN buy.PST
~~ù yám-én kwàgh-yá-n~~ yé.
 to buy-IPFV thing-eat-IPFV EMP
 ‘It is/was **buying food** that Sésùgh did.’

(7b) and (7c) differ from (7a) basically because none of the clausal constituents in (7a) has semantic prominence over another. In predicate focusing, it is an embedded infinitival clause that moves, as shown in (7c).

Topicalization is the process of inducing an “aboutness” interpretation about a particular entity in a clause. Different languages have different strategies for marking this “aboutness” either by the use of a grammatical marker and/or the use of prosodic devices such as pitch (i.e., tone and/or intonation), pauses, and stress.

In Tiv, topic constructions are syntactically marked by fronting a constituent to a higher projection headed by the topic marker *yô*, as in (8).

- (8) Sésùgh yô Áòndò wàsè-n Sésùgh ún.
 Sésùgh TOP God help-IPFV Sésùgh him
 ‘Sésùgh, God helps him.’

Topicalization in a clause can affect the subject of the construction as in (9a), a verb as in (9b), an object as in (9c) and a prepositional phrase as in (9d).

- (9) a. M̀yóm yô ~~M̀yóm~~ ún á vá gá.
 M̀yóm TOP M̀yóm he AGR.PRN come.PST NEG
 ‘M̀yóm, he will not come.’

³ The focused elements in (7b–c) are in **boldface** because focused elements in Tiv are generally pronounced with heavy stress.

- b. Í-wúésé yô Áòndò kùmà ù-wuésé.
 NCL.SG-praise TOP God worthy to praise
 ‘Praise, God is worthy to be praised.’
- c. Í-kyárën yô, Sésùgh á ngér íkyárën.
 NCL.SG-Examination TOP, Sésùgh AGR.PRN write examination
 ‘As for examination, Sésùgh wrote it.’
- d. Shín tsuà yô, M̀yòm á g̀idí ch̀inkáfá shín tsuà gá.
 in pot TOP, M̀yòm AGR.PRN cook.PST rice in pot NEG
 ‘In the pot, M̀yòm will not cook rice.’

In topicalizing the subject, verb, object, or preposition, the topic marker obligatorily occurs after the topicalized constituent.

Having briefly defined topic and focus constructions in Tiv, the following subsections will put forth different pieces of evidence from typical behaviours of topic and focus constructions, and DPs to ascertain the attendant disparities between them.

3.1. Functional Projection Licensing

The focus marker *ká* in the clausal left periphery is not the sole functor in assigning semantic prominence to constituents within a declarative clause. *ká* co-occurs with the emphasis marker *yé*, which appears at the clause final position as in (7b) and (7c). Consider (10a–b).

- (10) a. *Ká Sésùgh á yám kwàgh-yá-n.
 FOC Sésùgh AGR.PRN buy.PST thing-eat-IPFV
 Intended ‘It is **Sésùgh** that bought food.’
- b. *Ká ù yám-én kwàgh-yá-n Sésùgh á yám.
 FOC to buy-IPFV thing-eat-IPFV Sésùgh AGR.PRN buy.PST
 Intended ‘It is **buying food** that Sésùgh did.’

The functor *yé* is not an optional element in focus constructions, thus (10a) and (10b) are ungrammatical. Therefore, for any declarative clause to be defined as focus construction, *ká* and *yé* must be present in the clause initial and clause final positions, respectively.

The comportment of the focus marker in Tiv in relation to the emphasis marker implies that the emphatic marker licenses the focus in Tiv. Likewise, the focus marker licenses the emphatic marker as in (11); otherwise the construction would be ungrammatical as it can be seen (11b) where the focus marker *ká* is not found:

- (11) a. **Ká Sésùgh** á zé yé.
 FOC Sésùgh AGR.PRN go.PST EMP
 'It is **Sésùgh** that went.'
- b. *Sésùgh á zé yé.
 Sésùgh AGR.PRN go.PST EMP

Since the Focus projection licenses the projection of the Emphasis projection in the clause, the Focus projection should be able to license an Emphasis projection or an equivalent of the Emphasis projection within the DP. However, this is not the case as the occurrence of *yé* in (12b) renders the DP ungrammatical.

- (12) a. wán ù M̀yóm
 child GEN M̀yóm
 'M̀yóm's child/the child of M̀yóm'
- b. *wán ù M̀yóm lá yé
 child GEN M̀yóm that EMP
 Intended. 'that child of M̀yóm'

In synopsis, the Focus projection licenses the occurrence of an Emphasis projection. However, the definite demonstrative marker *là* cannot licence an Emphasis projection or its equivalent in the nominal domain. This suggests that the definite demonstrative marker and the focus marker differ in terms of licensing functional projections.

Focus constructions in Tiv can only occur without an emphasis marker *yé* in two obvious contexts. First, in interrogative-focus constructions the emphasis marker *yé* may not be found, as in (13a).⁴ Otherwise, the occurrence of the emphasis marker *yé* gives rise to ungrammaticality, as in (13b).

- (13) a. **Ká áná** nàn zé mákérántá?
 FOC who RES.PRN go.PST school
 'Who went to School?'
- b. *Ká **áná** nàn zé mákérántá yé?
 FOC who RES.PRN go.PST school EMP

⁴ In focusing question words, the interrogative feature is valued before it moves into the focus projection. This implies that the Focus Projection is higher than the interrogative force projection in Tiv, and it is possible to have an interrogative construction without focusing.

If the Emphasis projection does not occur in interrogative constructions, as shown in (13), it is implied that the emphasis projection is in complementary distribution with the interrogative projection in the clausal left periphery. This paper would not push this further because it is not in the scope of the present research.

Secondly, a focus construction can only occur without the emphasis marker *yé* when it is a truncated answer to a focused question as in (14) where (14b) is a truncated answer to (14a). If the answer is not truncated, the emphasis marker *yé* is obligatory as in (14c), otherwise the construction would be ungrammatical, as in (14d):

- (14) a. *Ká áná nànzé m̀ákérántá?*
 FOC who RES.PRN go.PST school
 'Who went to school?'
 b. *Ká M̀yóm.*
 FOC M̀yóm
 'It is M̀yóm.'
 c. *Ká M̀yóm á zé m̀ákérántá yé.*
 FOC M̀yóm AGR.PRN go.PST school EMP
 'It is M̀yóm that went to school.'
 d. **Ká M̀yóm á zé m̀ákérántá.*
 FOC M̀yóm AGR.PRN go.PST school

The inability of an emphasis marker to occur in the nominal left periphery further implies that the definiteness within the nominal domain vary greatly from the semantic prominence that is found in focus constructions. If the degree of definiteness in both domains is similar, then we expect (15c) to be grammatical. This is not true.

- (15) a. *Ká Sésùgh á lám yé.*
 FOC Sésùgh AGR.PRN speak.PST EMP
 'It is Sésùgh that spoke.'
 b. *wán là*
 child DEF
 'the child'
 c. **wán là yé*
 child DEF EMP

In (15a) the definiteness markers in a focus construction, *ká* and *yé*, are mutually dependent such that *ká* needs *yé* syntactically and semantically to make sense in a

complete declarative sentence. However, the determiner *là* can occur within a nominal domain on its own, as in (15b), without the emphasis marker *yé* to emphasize its definiteness, as in (15c).

3.2. Edge Feature Composition

Aboh (2004:1) submits that “the noun system involves an articulated left periphery, comparable to the clausal complementizer system.” This implies that if the determiner in the Tiv nominal left periphery is similar to the focus marker in a clause, the behaviour of the determiner should be similar to that of a focus marker in the clause in terms of subcategorization feature (i.e., the edge feature) that licenses a similar word order to the clausal left periphery.

In Tiv, the focus marker *ká* has a lower edge feature as in (16a). An edge feature is a word-order feature that accounts for the position of a particle (a probe) in relation to the items that fall within its scope (the goal) after movement. The lower edge feature is a feature that licenses a moved item to merge below the probe, while an upper edge feature licenses the merge of a moved item above the probe. In a lower edge feature context, the probe c-commands the probe after movement, while in an upper edge feature context, the goal c-commands the probe after movement. Since the focus marker *ká* has a lower edge feature, it does not license the merge of constituents above it in the bottom to top computation system as in (16b). However, determiners in Tiv have a higher edge feature, thereby placing the determiner after the noun in the bottom to top computation system as in (16c).

- (16) a. [Ká Sésùgh] á zé yé.
 [FOC Sésùgh] AGR.PRN go.PST EMP
 ‘It is **Sésùgh** that went.’
- b. *[Sésùgh ká] á zé yé.
 [Sésùgh FOC] AGR.PRN go.PST EMP
- c. [wán là]
 [child DEF]
 ‘the child’
- d. *[là wán]
 [DEF child]

(16d) has a similar word order to the bracketed part of (16a), but it is ungrammatical. The data implies that there is a disparity in the edge feature

composition of the determiner in the Tiv nominal left periphery and the focus marker in the Tiv clausal left periphery.

3.3. Determiner Clustering and Movement Licensing

The determiners in Tiv can be clustered to mark reinforcement as in (17a), but the focus marker cannot be clustered with the topic marker as in (17b).

- (17) a. wán shún là
 child SPEC DEF
 'the/that very child'
- b. *Sésùgh yô ká á zé yé.
 Sésùgh TOP FOC AGR.PRN go.PST EMP
 'It is this very Sésùgh that went.'

From the data, the clausal topic and focus markers behave differently from the specificity and definite markers: the specificity marker *shún* and the definite determiner *là* can co-occur in (17a) to produce a reinforcement reading. However, their respective clausal counterparts *yô* and *ká* cannot co-occur to produce a reinforcement reading or its equivalent in the clause. If the specificity marker and definite marker in Tiv can co-occur to produce a reinforcement reading, how come is this reading alien to its clausal counterpart from the fact that the topic and focus markers in a clause cannot co-occur? Since the topic and focus markers cannot co-occur to produce a reinforcement reading or a corresponding reading, it implies that the left periphery of the clause differs from the left periphery in the nominal domain.

3.4. Agreement Sensitivity

The canonical clausal agreement marker in Tiv *á* is sensitive to movements that target the projections in the clausal left periphery (i.e., Focus and Topic projections). When a subject DP is to be fronted to either the Focus or Topic projections in the clause, the agreement marker *á* which also has pronominal properties always shows up, as shown in (18).

- (18) a. M̀yóm vëndà mátù.
 M̀yóm reject.PST car
 'M̀yóm rejected a car.'
- b. Ká M̀yóm á vëndá mátù yé.
 FOC M̀yóm AGR.PRN reject.PST car EMP
 'It is M̀yóm that rejected a car.'

- c. Ká **mátù** M̀yóm á véndá **mátù** yé.
 FOC car M̀yóm AGR.PRN reject.PST car EMP
 'It is a **car** that M̀yóm rejected.'
- d. *Ká **M̀yóm** véndá mátù yé.
 FOC M̀yóm reject.PST car EMP
- e. *Ká **mátù** M̀yóm véndá **mátù** yé.
 FOC car M̀yóm reject.PST car EMP
- f. M̀yóm yô, á véndá mátù.
 M̀yóm TOP, AGR.PRN reject.PST car
 'M̀yóm, he rejected a car.'
- g. M̀yóm yô véndá mátù.
 M̀yóm TOP reject.PST car
 'M̀yóm, he rejected a car.'
- h. Mátù yô M̀yóm véndá **mátù**.
 car TOP M̀yóm reject.PST car
 'A car, M̀yóm rejected.'

(18a) is the base form of (18b–h). The focusing of the subject *M̀yóm* in (18b) and the object *mátù* in (18c) leads to the occurrence of the subject agreement marker *á*. Without the subject agreement marker, the constructions would be ungrammatical as in (18d) and (18e), respectively. The topicalization of *M̀yóm* also leads to the occurrence of *á* in (18f). However, a topic construction may survive without the agreement marker *á* as in (18g) and (18h). Let us concentrate on focus constructions!

Being that the focus marker which heads the Focus projection should be similar to the definite determiner in the nominal domain, it should be expected that the movement of a subject DP in meaning relationship nominal constructions, such as the genitive construction, to the edge of the determiner license the occurrence of an agreement and/or a pronominal morpheme in the nominal construction. However, this is not possible, as shown in (19).

- (19) a. wán Ùkàn
 child Ùkàn
 'Ùkàn's child/the child of Ùkàn'
- b. *wán là ù Ùkàn
 child DEF GEN Ùkàn
- c. *wán là Ùkàn
 child DEF Ùkàn

- d. wán Ùkàn là wán—Ùkàn
 child Ùkàn DEF child Ùkàn
 ‘the Ùkàn’s child/the child of Ùkàn’

Wán is the subject of the genitive construction in (19a). In (19b), *wán* is focused and a corresponding noun class agreement marker *ù* is made to appear, but this yields ungrammaticality. In (19c), there is not an agreement marker and only the subject *wán* is moved to the edge of the definite marker *là* which is similar to the clausal focus marker, but that also yields ungrammaticality. In (19d), the entire genitive construction moves to the edge of the definite marker, but only leaves behind a null copy. If the movements targeting the nominal left periphery (at least the definite projection) do not exhibit similar agreement and pronominal sensitivity as movements targeting the clausal left periphery, then the projections in the Tiv left peripheries differ.

3.5. Reconstruction Operations

Movements targeting the clausal left periphery in Tiv have the tendency of invoking a special reconstruction operation of DP resumption. In this case, when an argument such as *Sésùgh* in (20a), *iyô* ‘snake’ in (20b) and *áná* ‘who’ in (20c) are extracted out of argument positions, a pronoun takes over the argument position as the controller of the lower chain of movement.

- (20) a. Sésùgh yô, Áòndò wàsè-n ún.
 Sésùgh TOP, God help-IPFV him
 ‘Sésùgh, God helps him.’
- b. Ká iyô ì wàsé-n ún yé.
 FOC snake it help-IPFV him/her EMP
 ‘It is a **snake** that helps him/her.’
- c. Áná M̀yòm á yílá ǹàn?
 Who M̀yòm AGR.PRN call.PST RES.PRN
 ‘Who did M̀yòm Call?’

The pronouns that resume an extraction site in Tiv are usually ordinary pronouns. This implies that there are no special resumptive pronouns in Tiv. Hence, the pronoun *ún*, *ì*, and *ǹàn* in (20) are ordinary pronouns agreeing in person and number.

The phenomenon of DP resumption is particular to movements targeting the left periphery of a clause, but it cannot be found in A-movements.

- (21) a. [TP Tso la á mílé tsò-lá]
 [TP ship DEF AGR.PRN sink.PST ship DEF]
 ‘The ship sank.’
- b. *[TP Tso la á mílé tsò lá ì]
 [TP ship DEF AGR.PRN sink.PST ship DEF it]
- c. [TP Sésùgh ngù ínjá èr [TP Sésùgh á vôôr nàhán]]
 [TP Sésùgh COP sense like [TP Sésùgh AGR.PRN tired so]]
 ‘Sésùgh seems to be tired.’
- d. [TP Sésùgh ngù ínjá èr [TP Sésùgh ún á vôôr nàhán]]
 [TP Sésùgh COP sense like [TP Sésùgh he AGR.PRN tired so]]
 ‘??Sésùgh seems to be tired.’
 ‘Sésùgh is as if he will be tired.’
- e. [TP Sé ná vé jìghjìgh [ForceP ér [TP vé á hìdè m̀-béè
 [TP we give them faith [ForceP that [TP they AGR.PRN return.FUT NMLZ-end
 ù Láàdì]]]
 GEN Sunday]]]
 ‘We believe that they will return at the end of the week.’

From the data, it can be seen that the DP resumption is not a reconstruction operation triggered by argument movement. (21a) is an ergative construction where *Tsò lá* moves from the object position of the verb to the subject position without leaving a resumptive pronoun. In (21b), however, a pronoun is left at the extraction site of *tsò lá* which makes the construction ungrammatical. (21c) is a subject to subject raising construction, where *Sésùgh* raises to the edge of the raising predicate *ínjá èr* without leaving a resumptive pronoun. However, in (21d) where a pronoun occurs, the interpretation of the construction is affected because in that case, the embedded clause would have a future temporal interpretation, and it would no longer be an infinitival embedded clause. (21e) is a typical instance of argument-movement-specific reconstruction operation which would be referred to as partial copying. In (21e) the pronoun *vé* has been copied from the subject position of the embedded clause to the object position of the matrix clause leaving behind a phonologically overt copy. This implies that DP resumption in Tiv is a reconstruction operation peculiar to movements targeting the clausal left periphery, other than leaving behind a null copy, while partial copying is a reconstruction operation peculiar to movements targeting argument positions in the clause, other than leaving behind a null copy.

Being that the nominal left periphery should be similar to the clausal left periphery, movements targeting the nominal left periphery should be able to invoke a

special reconstruction operation such as DP resumption or a similar strategy just like movements targeting the clausal left periphery. However, this is not the case, as shown in (22).

- (22) a. *Sésùgh lá tér ù ún
 Sésùgh DEF father GEN him/her
 Intended. ‘the father of Sésùgh/Sésùgh’s father’
- b. *wán shún ún
 child SPEC him/her
 Intended. ‘the child’

There are no cases of DP resumption within the nominal domain in Tiv as in the genitive construction (22a) where *ún* resumes the position of *Sésùgh* after the movement of *Sésùgh* to the nominal left periphery. (22b) is not a meaning relation construction, but a simple nominal construction where *wán* is fronted to the edge of *shún* to receive a specificity reading. The ungrammaticality of the construction arises from the fact that a pronoun resumes the extraction site of *wán* as it would have resumed an extraction in a topic construction. By implication, there are no anaphoric relations within the Tiv nominal domain: there are no binding conditions in the nominal domain as it is in the Tiv clausal domain.

3.6. Other Movement Operations

Generally, the clausal left periphery can license certain movement operations that cannot be licensed by the nominal left periphery. The left periphery of the clause, basically the Topic and Focus projections, can license the partial or complete movement of an adjunct to the edge of the topic marker *yô* as in (23a) and (23b), and the focus marker *ká* as in (23c) and (23d).

- (23) a. Shá kòn yô Térésò ò á ún ò.
 on tree TOP Térésò AGR.PRN climb.FUT
 ‘On the tree, Térésò will climb.’
- b. kòn yô, Térésò ò á ún ò shá mín.
 tree TOP, Térésò AGR.PRN climb.FUT on it
 ‘The tree, Térésò will climb on it.’
- c. Ká shá kòn Térésò ò á ún ò yé.
 FOC on tree Térésò AGR.PRN climb.FUT EMP
 ‘It is **on a tree** that Térésò will climb.’

- d. Ká **kón** Térésòò á úndè shá mín yé.
 FOC tree Térésòò AGR.PRN climb.FUT on it EMP
 'It is a **tree** that Térésòò will climb on.'

These examples are typical instances of pied-piping and preposition stranding. Keep in mind that a PP cannot move into an argument position in Tiv. Pied-piping and preposition stranding does not occur in the Tiv nominal domain. This is shown in (24).

- (24) a. kwásé ù ké ì-yóù
 woman GEN in NCL.SG-house
 'the woman in the house'
- b. *ké ì-yóù lá/shún kwásé ù ké ì-yóù
 in NCL.SG-house that/SPEC woman GEN in NCL.SG-house
 Intended. 'the/that woman in the house'
- c. *ù ké ì-yóù lá/shún kwásé ù—ké—ì-yóù
 GEN in NCL.SG-house that/SPEC woman GEN in NCL.SG-house
 'the/that woman in the house'
- d. *ì-yóù lá/shún kwásé ù ké ì-yóù
 house that/SPEC woman GEN in NCL.SG-house
 Intended. 'the/that woman in the house'

In (24a), *ké ìyóù* is a preposition complementing *kwásé*. However, in (24b) the preposition phrase *ké ìyóù* has been extracted to the edge of either the definite determiner *là* or the specificity marker *shún*, as it would have been done in the clause, but the result is ungrammaticality. In (24c), *ké ìyóù* has been pied-piped with the genitive marker *ù*, but the construction is still ungrammatical. In (24d), the preposition *ké* has been stranded, yet the nominal construction is ungrammatical. These instances that are licensed by the clausal left periphery are not licensed by the nominal left periphery in Tiv. The implication of this analysis is that if the topic and focus markers in the Tiv clausal left periphery can license left-periphery-specific movement operations, and they cannot do the same within the nominal domain, then they are not existent in the nominal domain.

4. Conclusion

The nominal domain and the clausal domain both have discourse-pragmatic layers where extra grammatical information can be packed. This does not imply that there are no limitations to this observed parallelism between the nominal and clausal left peripheries. The projections that carry the discourse information within the clause and the nominal domain can vary and be limited in their morpho-syntactic behaviours. The paper presented the prospective aspects which the nominal and clausal domain parallelism can be limited. Hence, it proposes that the autonomy should be granted to the discourse-pragmatic projections in the nominal domain. The discourse-pragmatic projections in the nominal domain should have their own labels.

References

- Abraham, R.C. 1933. *The grammar of Tiv*. Kaduna: The Government Printer.
- Abraham, R.C. 1940. *The principles of Tiv*. London: Crown Agents for the Colonies.
- Abney, Steven. 1987. The English NP in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Aboh, Enoch. 2004. Topic and Focus within D. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 21:1–12.
- Bernstein, Judy. 2001. The DP hypothesis: Identifying clausal properties in the nominal domain. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 536–561. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cinque, Guglielmo, and Luigi Rizzi. 2008. The cartography of syntactic structures. *Studies in Linguistics* 2:42–58.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2005. At the left periphery of the Romanian noun phrase. In *On space and time in language*, ed. by Martine Coene and Liliane Tasmowski, 23–49. Cluj Napoca: Clusium.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2004. DP-periphery and clausal periphery: Possessor doubling in West Flemish. In *Peripheries*, ed. by David Adger, Cécile de Cat and George Tsoulas, 211–240. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hsu, Yu-Yin. 2014. Nominal internal and external topic and focus: Evidence from Mandarin. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20(1):148–160.
- Ihsane, Tabea, and Genoveva Puskás. 2001. Specific is not definite. *GG@G (Generative Grammar in Geneva)* 2:39–54.
- Jockers, Heinz. 1991. *Studien Zur Sprache der Tiv in Nigeria [Studies on the Tiv language in Nigeria]*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

To cite this article:

Angitso, Michael T. 2015. The limits of the DP/CP parallelism: Evidence from Tiv. *Semantics-Syntax Interface* 2(2):141–156.