1 Introduction

- In this presentation, we describe the CP-domain in Guébie, an Eastern Kru language.
- We argue for an articulated approach to the Guébie left periphery generally along the lines of Rizzi (1997).
- We show that our analysis of the Guébie facts has implications for two key aspects of syntactic theory:
  ▷ Interrogative force is marked lower in the clause in Guébie than expected from most accounts of the left periphery.
  ▷ The presence of clause final particles sensitive to Ā-operators at the left edge of the clause provides a potential counterexample to the Final-over-Final Constraint (Biberauer, Holmberg, and Roberts 2008; 2009; 2010).
- Guébie is an Eastern Kru language spoken in southwest Côte d’Ivoire.
  ▷ Number of speakers: 7,000
  ▷ One remaining monolingual speaker
  ▷ Most Guébie speakers speak French, many also speak Dida Lakota or another neighboring Kru language.

Thanks to our Guébie consultants, especially Sylvain Bodji, Ines Gnahren, Olivier Agodio, Serikpa Emil, Laureine, Frank, and Gnakouri. We use the following abbreviations: SG = singular, PL = plural, IRR = irrealis, PROG = progressive, IMPF = imperfective, PFV = perfective, ACC = accusative, Q = polar question particle, 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person.
• The data in this talk come from eight months of work with a speaker in the US, plus two field trips to Gnagbodougnoa, Côte d’Ivoire.
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### 2 Data from the C-domain in Guébie

- Basic word order in Guébie is S AUX O V. When there is no overt auxiliary we see SVO order.

  (1) S AUX O V alternates with SVO
  a. ɔ ʒi3 3a31 li3
     3.sg will coconuts eat
     ‘He will eat coconuts.’
  b. ɔ li2 3a31
     3.sg eatPFV coconuts
     ‘He ate coconuts.’
  c. *ɔ ʒi3 3a31 li2
     3.sg coconuts eatPFV
     Intended: ‘He ate coconuts’

- Guébie is demonstrably head-final inside the verbal domain.

  ▶ OV order, Postpositions, Genitive Noun order, Noun Determiner order, etc.

- Despite the head-final nature of the VP domain, the Infl(ection) head is initial (Sande 2014).

  (2) IP
  \[\text{SUBJ} \quad V+I \quad VP \quad \text{OBJ} \quad \text{tv}\]

- Questions about headedness arise in the C-domain.

  (3) **Distribution of elements in the C-domain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause initial</th>
<th>Clause-medial (Infl)</th>
<th>Clause final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementizer <em>gba</em></td>
<td>Polar question marker <em>se, gbe</em></td>
<td>Wh-particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-words</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relative clause particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Embedded clauses are introduced with a clause-initial complementizer, /gba^1/.

(4) Embedded clauses

a. jaci^23 1 la^2 (gba^1) ɔ^3 me^3 dabara^44 ko^3
   Djatchi say that 3.sg go market to
   ‘Djatchi said that he went to the market.’

b. e^4 jira^2 jaci^23 1 gba^1 (ɲɔkpɔ^3^1) ɔ^3 bisi^41 dabara^44 ko^3 na^2
   I ask that (person) 3.sg visit market to NA
   ‘I asked who visited the market.’

The complementizer gba is used in both declarative (4a) and interrogative embedded clauses (4b).

Focused constituents surface initially in both main and embedded clauses.

(5) Focus: clause-initial

a. [touri^1112] ɔ^3 kɔpa=ɔ^232 bag^w e^31
   Touri he send.pfv=him book
   ‘It’s TOURI who sent him a book.’

b. [bag^w e^31] ɔ^3 kɔpa=ɔ^232
   book he, send.pfv=him
   ‘It’s a BOOK he sent him (as opposed to a letter).’

c. e^4 jisa^2 jaci^23 1 gba^1 ɛbɔ^31 ɔ^3 ni^4 (ɛbɔ^31) k=ala^42 me^3 ji^3
   I know that Djatchi 3sg see him farm on see
   ‘I know that it’s Djatchi he saw on the farm.’

Note that in (5c), the focused element in an embedded clause surfaces to the right the complementizer gba.

Subjects are obligatory resumed by an agreeing subject pronoun, (5a); objects must correspond to a gap, (5b).

Topics, like Focus, surface initially. More than one topic is possible in the same clause (6b). Topics, like focus, follow the complementizer in an embedded clause (6c).

(6) Topic: clause-initial^1

a. [ŋudi-ja^313] ɔ^3 wa^2 jere-lili^4222
   man-def he like spice-food
   ‘As for the man, he likes spicy food.’

b. [(k)uɓə^31] kɔɡʊlɪɲɔ^4222 e^4 ni^4 ɔ^2 ji^3
   yesterday farmer I see.pfv=3.sg.acc see
   ‘Yesterday, a/the farmer, I saw him’

c. e^4 jisa^2 jaci^23 1 gba^1 touri^1113 ɔ^3 li^3 saka^33
   I know that Touri 3sg eat rice
   ‘I know that Touri, he at rice (but what did everyone else eat?)

^1The example in (6b) involves a splitting verb construction, where in a verb-movement context, only one syllable of the verb /niji/ ‘see’ undergoes movement.
Unlike focus, both subject and object topics must be resumed with the appropriate pronoun, as underlined in (6a-c).

When a single clause contains both a topic and focused element, topic precedes focus.

(7) **Topic before focus**

a. \(\text{ŋudi-ja}^{3.1.3} \text{jere-lili}^{3.2.2.2} \text{wa}^2\)
   man-DEF spice-food 3.SG like
   ‘As for the man, spicy food, he likes.’

**Wh-questions** involve fronting of a wh-phrase to initial position and require the final question particle /na\(^2/).

The pattern of resumption in wh-questions is the same as in focus fronting: Subject must be resumed, (8a-b). Object questions require a gap, (9a-b):

(8) **Subject Wh-questions**

a. \((\text{ŋɔkpɔ}^{31})\) \(\text{ni}^4 \text{ju-wa}^{4.4} \text{joku}^{2.3} \text{na}^2\)
   person see.PFV boy-DEF see NA
   ‘Who saw the boy?’

b. *\((\text{ŋɔkpɔ}^{31})\) \(\text{ni}^4 \text{ju-wa}^{4.4} \text{joku}^{2.3} \text{na}^2\)
   person see.PFV boy-DEF see NA
   Intended: ‘Who saw the boy?’

(9) **Object Wh-questions**

a. \((\text{ɓɛɓa}^{3.1})\) \(\text{ɔ}^3 \text{pia}^{3.1} \text{na}^2\)
   (thing) 3.SG buy NA
   ‘What did he buy?’

b. *\((\text{ɓɛɓa}^{3.1})\) \(\text{ɔ}^3 \text{pia}^{3.1} \text{na}^2\)
   (thing) 3.SG buy= 3.SG.ACC NA
   ‘What did he buy?’

Question words \(\text{ŋɔkpɔ}^{31}\) ‘who’, \(\text{ɓɛɓa}^{3.1}\) ‘what’ are actually generic indefinite nouns used in wh-questions. As seen in (8-9), they are optional and can be omitted\(^2\).

Other wh-phrases, such as \(\text{jọra-gba}^{2.2.1}\) ‘how many’ and \(\text{ɔnɛɟa}^{2.4.3}\) ‘why’ cannot be omitted:

(10) **Non-optional wh-phrases**

a. \(\text{diɓo-di}^{3.1.3} \text{jọra-gba}^{2.2.1} \text{li=se}^{3.4} \text{na}^2\)
   banana-fruit how.many 3.SG eat-(Q) NA
   ‘How many bananas did he eat?’

b. \(\text{ɔnɛɟa}^{2.4.3} \text{wa}^3 \text{fito}^{2.2} \text{na}^2\)
   why 3.IMPS flee NA
   ‘Why did someone/he run away?’

\(^2\)Guébie word /\text{danɛ}/, ‘where’ is a generic noun meaning ‘place’. It can also be omitted.
- Wh-phrases must be clause initial; they cannot be in situ, (11a-b). The clause-final particle is always required, (12b).

(11) **No in situ wh-questions**

a. *ɔ³ pia³.1 [ɓeɓa³.1] na²

3SG buy thing NA

Intended: What did he buy?

b. *ɔ³ li=se³.4 dibo–di³.1.3 ɗar–gba².2.1 na²

3.SG eat–(Q) banana-fruit how.many NA

Intended: 'How many bananas did he eat?'

(12) **Clause-final /na/ required**

a. *(ɓeɓa³.1) ɔ³ pia³.1

thing he buy

Intended: What did he buy?

b. *dibo–di³.1.3 ɗar–gba².2.1 ɔ³ li=se³.4

banana-fruit how.many 3.SG eat–(Q)

Intended: 'How many bananas did he eat?'

- Because the initial Wh-word is optional, we might expect ambiguity between subject and object questions; however, the pattern of resumption makes subject and object questions distinct, even when there is no wh-word.

(13) **Subject pronoun, object pronoun**

a. [ (person) ] [ he_/i j saw he_/i j ] na ]

b. 'Who saw him?' /*'Who did he see?'

(14) **Subject pronoun, object gap**

a. [ (person) ] [ he_/i j saw ___/i j ] na ]

b. 'Who did he see?' / *'Who saw him?'

- Embedded Wh-questions are identical to main clause wh-questions. The embedded-clause-initial wh-word surfaces after the complementizer gba. The complementizer is optional.

(15) **Embedded Wh-questions**

a. e¹ jira²-3 (gba¹) [ɓeɓa³.1] ɔ³ bisi⁴.1 daba³a⁴.4 ko³ na²

I ask GBA (person) 3.SG visit.borrowed market to NA

'I asked who visited the market.'

b. e¹ jira²-3 (naj⁴) gba¹ ɗar–gba².2.1 mobii-a¹.2.1.1 e³ ɗi(=se)³.4 liji¹.3 na²

I ask myself GBA how.much car-DEF 3.SG.FRONT will–(Q) cost NA

'I wonder how much a car costs.'

- Long-distance wh-movement is also possible, (16a-b). The complementizer gba is optional with non-subject extraction, (16a). It cannot occur with subject extraction, a that-trace effect, (16b):
(16) **Long distance wh-questions**

a. ɓɛ3 e4 na41 gba1 ɔ3 niji4.3 na2 thing I say GBA 3.SG see NA

‘What did I say he saw?’

b. ɲɔkpo3.1 e4 na1 (*gbaba1) ɔ3 ni=ɔ4.2 joku2.3 na2 person I say (*that) 3.SG see-3.SG.ACC see NA

‘Who did I say saw him?’

- Wh-words are in complementary distribution with fronted focused elements.

(17) **No focus in wh-questions**

a. *ɟaci23 (ɓɛɓa3.1) ɔ3.3 pia3.1 na2 Djatchi (thing) 3.SG buy NA

Intended: ‘What did DJATCHI buy?’

- Otherwise, the complementizer gba, focus, topics, and Wh-questions can all co-occur freely. When they all occur in the same clause, the order is as follows:

  ▷ gba ▸ Topic ▸ Focus/wh-word ▸ S AUX O V / SVO ▸ na

- **Polar question** word order is identical to main clause word order, except for the addition of a post-auxiliary (or verb in SVO clauses) polar question particle.

- The polar question particle inflects for tense: gbe for past and se for non-past.

(18) **Polar question markers**

a. e2 le=li=gbe2.2 ja31

2SG.NOM eat.PFV-Q.PST coconuts

‘Did you used to eat coconuts?’ (when you were a child living in the village)

b. e2 le=li=se2.4 ja31

2SG.NOM eat.IMPF-Q.PST coconuts

‘Do you eat coconuts?’

c. e2 le=se2.4 sukulu-ju1.1.2−1 (*na2)

you be-Q school-boy *NA

‘Are you a student?’

d. ɔ3 jira2.3 gba1 e2 le=se2.4 sukulu-ju1.1.2.1 (*na2)

3.SG ask GBA you be-Q school-boy *NA

‘He asked whether you are a student.’

- The final wh-particle is ungrammatical in polar questions, (19a-b).

(19) **Polar marker + na**

a. e2 le=se2.4 sukulu-ju1.1.2−1 (*na2)

you be-Q school-boy *NA

‘Are you a student?’

b. ɔ3 jira2.3 gba1 e2 le=se2.4 sukulu-ju1.1.2.1 (*na2)

3.SG ask GBA you be-Q school-boy *NA

‘He asked whether you are a student.’
• For some speakers, the polar question particle /se, gbe/ can surface as an enclitic on Infl in wh-questions (20).

(20) Polar question particle in wh-clause

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad e^4 \text{jira}^{2.3} \, \text{najie}^{3.3} \, gba^1 \, \text{ne}^{3.2:2.3} \, \text{ja}^3 \, wa^2 \, \text{na}^2 \\
& \quad I \, \text{ask} \, \text{myself} \, \text{GBA} \, \text{why} \, \text{3.SG} \, \text{like} = \, \text{3.SG.ACC} = \, (Q) \, \text{NA} \\
& \quad 'I \, \text{wonder \ why \ he \ likes \ her.'}
\end{align*}
\]

• As far as we can tell, the presence of the polar question particle is always optional in wh-questions.

• Relative clauses are post-nominal. The relative clause itself is marked with the clause-final relative particle /ne/, which occurs in the same position as the wh-particle /na/:

(21) Clause-final relative operator

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad ju^4 \, [CP \, e^4 \, ji(sa)^{2.3} \, \text{ja}^3 \, \text{li}^2 \, ja^{31}] \, \text{REL} \, \text{3.SG} \, \text{eat.IMPF} \, \text{coconuts} \\
& \quad \text{boy} \, \text{I} \, \text{know} \, \text{REL} \, \text{3.SG} \, \text{eat.IMPF} \, \text{coconuts} \\
& \quad 'The \, \text{boy} \, \text{that} \, \text{I} \, \text{know} \, \text{eats} \, \text{coconuts}.'
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. & \quad ju^4 \, [CP \, a-lio^{2.4} \, \text{niyi}^{3.4} \, \text{ja}^3 \, \text{li}^2 \, ja^{31}] \, \text{REL} \, \text{ko}^3 \, g\text{e}wa^{1.1} \\
& \quad \text{boy} \, \text{my-friend} \, \text{see} \, \text{REL} \, \text{live} \, \text{Gagnoa} \\
& \quad 'The \, \text{boy} \, \text{my} \, \text{friend} \, \text{saw} \, \text{lives} \, \text{in} \, \text{Gagnoa}.'
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
c. & \quad e^4 \, ji^2 \, ju^4 \, [CP \, (\text{ja}^3) \, \text{li}^2 \, ja\text{ba}^{3.1} \, \text{ja}^3 \, \text{li}^2 \, ja^{31}] \, \text{REL} \, \text{sa}^3 \\
& \quad \text{I} \, \text{know} \, \text{boy} \, (\text{3.SG}) \, \text{eat} \, \text{coconuts} \, \text{REL} \, \text{know} \\
& \quad 'I \, \text{know} \, \text{the} \, \text{boy} \, \text{who} \, \text{is} \, \text{eating} \, \text{a} \, \text{coconut}.'
\end{align*}
\]

• Relative clauses display a slightly different pattern of resumption:

▷ Relativized objects are never resumed by a pronoun, (21a-b).
▷ Relativized subjects are only optionally resumed by a pronoun, (21c).
▷ They therefore differ from focused subjects and wh-subjects.

• Relative clauses never surface with the complementizer gba, and they do not co-occur with topics or focus.

• In the next section, we turn to our analysis of the the Guébie data.

3 Structure of the Guébie Left Periphery

• The table in (22) summarizes the data we have seen in the previous section.

(22) Summary of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(gba)</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>(gba)</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar question</td>
<td>(gba)</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>=Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>(gba)</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>(=Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>=Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• We argue that each of the positions to the left of SUBJ in (22) corresponds to a projection in an articulated left periphery (Rizzi 1997). We propose the ordering of projections above IP in (23). A tree is given in (24)
• The complementizer *gba occurs in C0.
• Topics are hosted in Spec-TopP.
• Focus, wh-words and relative operators are hosted in the specifier of FocP3.
• We argue that FocP is right headed.
• Final particle *na occurs when Spec-FocP hosts a wh-word.
• Final particle *na occurs when Spec-FocP hosts a relative operator4.
• The polar question particle is merged directly above IP in an interrogative projection, InterP
• Inter lowers to the V+I complex in the morphology.

Topics are base generated in Spec-TopP, as evidenced by the fact that both topicalized subjects and topicalized objects must be resumed. See (6), above.

There is evidence from island effects that operators reach Spec-FocP via movement.

(25) Island Effects
a. *ɲɔkpo3ː1 e2 ni4 ju4 li2 ja31 (a)-ne3ː2 ji3
   person 2SG see.PFV boy eat coconuts REL see
   Intended: 'Who did you see the boy who eats coconuts?'

Having presented our analysis of the Guébie lel periphery, we turn to two theoretical consequences of this analysis in the next section.

4 Theoretical Implications

• In this section, we briefly examine two theoretical consequences of the Guébie data.
• Consequence 1: Selection and Interrogative Force
• Consequence 2: Final-over-Final Constraint.

4.1 Position of Interrogative Force and Selection

• The illocutionary force of a clause is generally thought to be positioned very high in the CP-domain, i.e. Rizzi’s (1997) ForceP.

3We do not take a position here on whether Guébie relative clauses are derived by head raising or by null operator movement.
4One way of capturing this relationship would be to posit that different features can be merged on Foc0 to attract different types of operators, and those features determine the spell out of the head.
• Aboh (2004) and Aboh and Pfau (2008) argue that interrogative force is encoded by a distinct head, InterP, which is situated between ForceP and the Topic/Focus field:

(26) \[ \text{ForceP} \succ \text{InterP} \succ \text{TopP} \succ \text{FocP} \succ \ldots \]

• However, we have seen that in Guébie, interrogative force is marked lower in the clause. The (polar) question particle \textit{gbe/se} cliticizes to the finite verb/auxiliary:

(27) \textbf{Question particle}
   a. \(\text{e}^2 \ \text{li=} \text{(se)}^{2.4} \ \text{ja}^{31} \)
   \(2\text{SG.NOM} \ \text{eat.IMPF-Q.PST} \ \text{coconuts} \)
   ‘Do you eat coconuts?’
   b. \(\text{du-gba}^{4.1} \ \text{village-which} \ \text{me=} \text{(se)}^{2.4} \ \text{ko}^{3} \ \text{na}^2 \)
   ‘Which village did he go to?’

• We’ve argued that the question particle spells out Inter\(^{e}\), and that it \textit{lowers} to adjoin to \(I^e\) in the morphology\(^{5}\).

• Lowering is subject to a strict locality condition: a head \(X\) can only lower to the head of its complement Embick and Noyer (2001).

\(\triangleright\) If the lowering analysis of \(=\text{gbe/se}\) is on the right track, Inter\(^{e}\) selects IP in Guébie.

\(\triangleright\) See (24), above.

• So, interrogative force is much lower than we expect it to be based on other cross-linguistic work on the encoding of illocutionary force.

• Furthermore, this analysis has a consequence for the mechanics of selection in Guébie.

• Recall that complementizer \textit{gba} occurs in both embedded declaratives, (28a) and embedded wh-questions, (28b):

(28) a. \(\text{ja}^{23.1} \ \text{la}^2 \ \text{(gba}^{1}\) \text{) s}^{3} \ \text{me}^{3} \ \text{dabar}^{a.4.4} \ \text{ko}^{3} \)
   \(\text{Djatchi say that 3.SG go market to} \)
   ‘Djatchi said that he went to the market.’

b. \(\text{e}^4 \ \text{jira}^{2.3} \ \text{(gba}^{1}\) \text{) (nokp}^{3.1}\) \text{) s}^{3} \ \text{bisi}^{4.1} \ \text{dabar}^{a.4.4} \ \text{ko}^{3} \ \text{na}^2 \)
   \(\text{I ask that (person) 3.SG visit market to NA} \)
   ‘I asked who visited the market.’

• The verb ‘ask’ in cannot select a declarative clause, as seen in (29). Yet in (28b) its complement is still headed by \textit{gba}.

(29) \(\text{*e}^4 \ \text{jira}^{2.3} \ \text{naje}^{3.3} \ \text{gba}^1 \ \text{s}^{3} \ \text{me}^{3-4} \ \text{dabar}^{a.4.4} \ \text{ko}^{3} \)

\(\text{I ask myself GBA he go-Q market to} \)
   Intended: ‘I asked myself that he went to the market.’

• \textbf{Upshot}: The complementizer \textit{gba} cannot encode declarative force the way that English \textit{that} does.

\(^{5}\text{See Sande (2014) for detailed discussion.}\)
If it did encode declarative, we would expect it to be impossible for ‘ask’ to select a $gba$ clause in (28b).

- **Problem!** Selection is thought to operate very locally between a head and its complement. But if $gba$ is not interrogative in (29), then what does ‘ask’ select?

- A potential solution could be that selection can operate at a distance, perhaps via the operation Agree (Chomsky 2001).

  - Agree is *relativized*; it only looks for certain features. Irrelevant features are ignored (Preminger 2014).
  - We could say that $gba$ simply doesn’t carry a relevant feature, and is therefore skipped.

(30)  

  a. **English:** [ ask $\left[\text{CP whether}\ [\text{TP} \ldots]\right]$]
  b. **Guébie:** [ ask $\left[\text{CP} \ gba \ ... \ [\text{InterP}\ \text{Inter}\ [\text{IP}\ ...]\right]$]

- The difference between English, (30a), and Guébie, (30b), is that the features selected by ask reside directly on $C^0$ in English, while Guébie $C^0$ does not have any relevant features, and they can be accessed further down in the clause.

- We leave this account open to further work.

### 4.2 The Final-over-Final Constraint

- In a series of papers examining the cross-linguistic distribution of ‘disharmonic’ word orders, Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (Henceforth BHR; 2008; 2009; 2010) posit the constraint in (31):

(31) **The Final-over-Final Constraint (FOFC; Biberauer et al. 2010)**

A head-final phrase $XP$ cannot dominate a head-initial phrase $YP$, where $X$ and $Y$ are heads in the same extended projection.

- The FOFC rules structures of the type in (35). See Biberauer et al. (2010) for detailed discussion of evidence that such structures are cross-linguistically rare.

(32) **✓ Initial-over-Initial (Harmonic)**

(33) **✓ Final-over-Final (Harmonic)**

(34) **✓ Initial-over-Final (Disharmonic)**

(35) **✗ Final-over-Initial (Disharmonic)**

- One major claim made by BHR is that there are very few (if any) VO languages with clause final complementizers.
Dryer (2009) finds no languages with VO word order and clause final complementizers of the *that*-type.

Using WALS, Biberauer et al. (2010) find only two languages with predominantly VO word order and clause final ‘adverbial subordinators’

Guébie fits this description: *gba* precedes the entire clause and so do adverbial subordinators like ‘while’.

- BHR (2010) do discuss a number of types of clause final particle that occur in VO languages and that could be analyzed as being part of the CP-domain. These include:
  - Polar question particles
  - Negation
  - Mood/Force

- If these particles are heads in the CP domain, they would be a counter example to the claim to *[[ V O ] C]*.

- BHR don’t present a concrete analysis of how to deal with these particles, and the ultimate answer is probably non-uniform. Options they present include:
  - These particles may be ‘categorically deficient’ (lacking a specification for [±V]) and therefore excluded from their formalization of the FOFC, which is based on categorical features.
  - The particles might actually act as ‘doubles’ for an abstract null initial head in the left periphery:
    \[
    (36) \quad [\text{InterP} \text{Inter}^e \cdots [\text{TP} \cdots] \text{PARTICLE }] \quad \text{DOUBLING}
    \]

- **But!** The Guébie-type of clause final particles has not figured into the discussion of the FOFC.
  - The particles *na/ne* occur when there is an Ā-operator in the left periphery
    \[
    (37) \quad [\text{Op}_i [\text{IP} \cdots t_i \cdots] \text{na/ne}]
    \]
  - Such particles are usually analyzed as C-heads when they precede the rest of the clause:
    - Aboh and Pfau (2008) analyze the focus particle *wɛ̀* in Gungbe as the head of a head initial FocP:
      \[
      (38) \quad \begin{align*}
      \text{a. } \text{Mɛnù } & \quad \underbrace{\text{wɛ̀}} \quad \text{wá}? \\
      \text{who } & \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{come} \\
      \text{‘Who came?’} & \\
      \\
      \text{b. } [\text{FocP} \text{Mɛnù} \quad [\text{Foc} \quad \text{wɛ̀} \quad \cdots [\text{TP} \quad \text{wá}]]]
      \end{align*}
      \]
  - It seems to us that this should be the default analysis for *na/ne* in Guébie: the particles are heads of the projection that host Ā-operators.
  - If this analysis is on the right track, it places *na/ne* **squarely in the CP-domain.**
    - This would mean that we have an example of a head final CP-projection which dominates a series of head-initial projections

---

6 They base this claim on the WALS feature “Order of adverbial subordinator and clause” (Dryer 2011). WALS does not record the order of *that*-type subordinators and the clause.

7 Note that in clausal hierarchy, FocP dominates InterP which in turn dominates IP. We assume that InterP is head initial, though direct evidence for this is lacking, since Inter0 lowers to I0.
Furthermore, head order switches right back to head initial with TopP and CP.

- Note that BHR’s potential solutions don’t really seem to work for Guébie:
  - We have found no evidence that na/ne are categorically deficient.
  - Proposing that na/ne ‘double’ a null, head initial Foc just seems to move the problem down the road:

\[
\begin{align*}
&FocP \\
&\quad \downarrow \\hspace{1cm} \downarrow \\
&\quad Op_i \hspace{1cm} na/ne \\
&\hspace{1cm} Foc \hspace{1cm} \ldots \ t_i \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

  - Where does ‘doubling’ occur? Is na/ne adjoined in the syntax? If so why and how? If na/ne is inserted post-syntactically, how does that process work? BHR (2010) don’t discuss these details.

- So, a straightforward analysis of the Guébie facts provides a counterexample to the current formulation of the FOFC.

- This type of particle is not limited to Guébie. We know of at least two other languages that have clause final particles in the case of wh-movement or relativization.

  - Noon (Canging, Sengal) has a clause final particle ɗa that is used in relative clauses (Soukka 2000; personal fieldwork):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Noon (Cangin) final relative particle} \\
&a. \text{baay-faa oomaa-naa feek } \underline{\text{ɗa}} \\
&\quad \text{dog-DEF child-DEF beat REL} \\
&\quad \text{‘the dog that the child hit’} \\
&b. \text{oomaa-naa Kodu waad } \underline{\text{ɗa}} \\
&\quad \text{child-DEF.far Kodu like REL} \\
&\quad \text{‘the child that Kodu likes’}
\end{align*}
\]

  - Vata, another Kru language, also has a clause final wh-particle, (41a). There is also a relative particle which cliticizes to the verb, (41b).

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Vata (Kru) final wh-particle particle (cf. Koopman 1984:35)} \\
&a. \text{alɔ¹ \^ 1.4 kofì¹ \^ 1.4 \ e² \ jë¹ \ e⁴ \ la¹} \\
&\quad \text{who Kofi saw 3.SG PART WH} \\
&\quad \text{‘Who did Kofi see?’} \\
&b. \text{yɔ-ɔ² \^ 3.3 (mɔmɔ² \^ 2.3) kofì¹ \^ 1.4 je-bɔ⁴ \^ 41.3 \ e² \ je \ ...} \\
&\quad \text{child-DEF (3.SG-3.SG) Kofi saw-REL 3.SG PART ...} \\
&\quad \text{‘The child Kofi saw...’}
\end{align*}
\]

- We would like to suggest more attention be paid to the type of clause final C-level particle we have described for Guébie. Further investigation will be useful in testing the limits of the Final-over-Final Constraint.
5 Conclusions

- In this paper we have described the Guébie left periphery and proposed an initial theoretical analysis in terms of an articulated CP-domain.

- We have shown that not all elements in the C-domain in Guébie surface in the same place within a clause.

(42) Recap: Distribution of C-elements in Guébie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause initial</th>
<th>Clause-medial (Infl)</th>
<th>Clause final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementizer <em>gba</em></td>
<td>Polar question marker <em>se, gbe</em></td>
<td>Wh-particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-words</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relative clause particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We have also shown that despite wh-words being optional in Guébie, wh-questions without overt wh-words are not ambiguous due to gapping effects.

- We have also discussed serveral theoretical implications of the Guébie data.
  
  ▶ The position of the polar question marker has implications for where interrogative force can be indicated in the clausal hierarchy.
  
  ▶ This, in turn, suggests that selection in Guébie has to be able to operate at a distance, perhaps under Agree.
  
  ▶ The presence of clause final particles sensitive to Ā-operators at the left edge of the clause provides a potential counterexample to the Final-over-Final Constraint.

- Guébie is one of many African languages with clause-final particles and mixed-headedness.

  ▶ Further in-depth studies of the C-domain in African languages could shed light on theoretical principles, just as we have shown the as the Guébie data does here.
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