

**M.T. Lamidi**  
*University of Ibadan*  
*Ibadan, Nigeria*

## **Switch Junctions in Yorùbá-English Code-Switching**

**Abstract.** Studies in languages in contact have identified switch junctions and their patterns in Code-switching (CS). However, the Yorùbá-English language contact is yet to attract such scholarly attention. Working against the backdrop of scholars' claims that certain features of CS are universal and using Chomsky's Principles and Parameters theory as well as Myers-Scotton's Main Language Framework, this paper discusses possible switch junctions in Yorùbá-English code-switching. A corpus of data from Yorùbá-English bilinguals was utilized. The study concludes that switches in Yorùbá-English code-switched grammar are possible along morphemic, categorical, phrasal and clausal junctions, contrary to what obtains in Spanish-English and Arabic-French code-switched varieties.

**Keywords:** code-switching, switch junctions, Universal Grammar, switch direction, language contact

### **1. Introduction**

Studies such as Poplack (1980), Sankoff & Poplack (1981), Myers-Scotton (1993) and Pfaff (1979) have shown that switches in code-switched languages are not arbitrary; they follow specific patterns, guided by some constraints. Lamidi (2004) alluded to this in the case of Yorùbá-English code-switching (CS) when he argues that heads determine the nature of lexical or functional items that they subcategorize. In this paper, we explore the switch junctions, the

patterns of switches, the direction of switches, and the constraints guiding them.

This paper works within the precincts of Myers-Scotton's (1993) Main Language Framework (MLF) theory, which proposes the existence in the code-switched grammar of a main language and an embedded language. The main language, usually the Mother Tongue, serves as the host (or base) language while the embedded language is the more prominent or dominant language of the two or more languages in contact. In this work, Yorùbá is considered the host while English is the dominant language. This study is based on a corpus of data on Yorùbá – English CS collected by Lamidi (2003).

The motivation for the study is that some constraints put forward by scholars such as Poplack (1980), Bentahila and Davies (1983), Woolford (1983), Di Sciullo et al (1986) etc, are said to be universal. The paper examines these and other constraints in Yorùbá-English CS. The status of Yorùbá-English CS vis-à-vis other pairs of CS languages has either positive or negative consequences for the universality of grammar enunciated in transformational grammar. If positive, it strengthens the concept of Universal Grammar; otherwise, it weakens the concept. In what follows, we discuss the theoretical framework and review some literature before proceeding to analyse our data.

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

One of the basic assumptions in transformational grammar is that language is universal (Chomsky 1981, Cook & Newson 1996). This is based on the notion that languages the world over have the same principles guiding them, though there may be variations in the realizations of these principles. In natural languages as well as code-switched expressions, structures are universal to the extent that certain features such as phrase structure, tense, switching etc recur in different structures. However, these are realized in different ways within different languages.

This phenomenon is encapsulated in the concept of Universal Grammar (UG) (Chomsky 1981, Cook and Newson 1996). UG is “the system of principles, conditions, and rules that are elements or properties of all languages” (Chomsky 1976:29). It refers to the common features languages share regardless of their variety (Cook and Newson, 1996). Chomsky (1981) discusses these in terms of Principles and Parameters. He identifies principles as the core linguistic values that form a pool which different languages share. Each core principle is, however, parameterized in the sense that different languages set different parameters for the realizations of the principles. Thus, a speaker of a language is assumed to know a set of principles that apply to all languages and parameters that vary within clearly defined limits from one language to another (Cook and Newson 1996: 2).

In code-switched grammars, structures are formed through changing of codes between two (or more) languages that are in contact in the environment of language use. The resultant grammar is said to be guided by specific rules that enable such structures to be judged grammatical and acceptable or otherwise. This means that each CS grammar conforms to specific rules. However, we need to know to what extent such rules are universal across languages; and if there are variations, to what extent the rules vary. In essence, we want to explore how universal these rules are. In this paper, we consider switches/switch junctions in CS structures. The relevant questions are:

- (1) Where do switch junctions occur in Yorùbá-English CS?
- (2) To what extent do the occurrences of these switch junctions tally with the occurrences of switch junctions in other CS structures?

These questions form the basis of our discussions in this paper.

### 3. Literature Review

Poplack (1980), using both linguistic and extra-linguistic data on the competence of Spanish-English bilinguals has discussed two major constraints in Spanish-English CS. The first is the Free Morpheme Constraint; the second, the Equivalence Constraint. In the first, ‘codes may be switched after any constituent that is not a bound morpheme’ (p 585-586). This means that switches are allowed at all possible switch junctions except where affixes are merged with root morphemes. Poplack exemplified this with *EAT-iendo* ‘eating’ (p 586), which contains an intra-word switch and is therefore considered unacceptable.

The second constraint is the Equivalence Constraint, in which ‘code-switches tend to occur at points in a discourse where the juxtaposition of L<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub> elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e., at points around which the surface structure of the two languages map onto each other’ (p 586). This constraint allows switches to occur where the two codes share similar structures. Bentahila and Davies (1983) have criticized this constraint, for, despite the structural differences between Arabic and French monolingual sentences, (Arabic has VSO order; French has SVO order), the code-switched variety followed only the VSO order of Arabic. They also claim that there are intra-sentential switches (e.g., in noun phrases) which in both languages are different. It will be illuminating to know how these constraints apply in Yorùbá- English CS.

Bentahila and Davies (1983) also studied Arabic-French code-mixing of Moroccans who are bilingual in the two substrate languages. The study explored the syntactic boundaries where switches are allowed and proposed two interwoven constraints. The authors propose that the subcategorization restriction of a word must be satisfied and code-switching is not allowed across word-internal morpheme boundaries. These mean that switches are permitted at all

boundaries above that of a word, on the condition that such switches do not violate the subcategorization restrictions.

Working within Spanish-English code-switching, Pfaff (1979:306) has also argued that adjectives modifying a noun must occur in the same language as that noun. Woolford (1983) also arrived at that conclusion in her discussion of Spanish-English CS. While she agrees to Poplack's Equivalence Constraint, she observes that no switches occur between a noun and a following modifying adjective. This means that both the noun and the modifying adjective must come from the same language in a CS grammar. Closely related to this is the claim by Di Sciullo, et al (1986) that a lexical governor and the governed maximal projection must come from the same language. However, when the syntactic coherence principle of government does not hold, the lexical element may be drawn from different lexicons. In view of the foregoing, we shall proceed to discuss Yorùbá-English CS and bring out similarities and differences.

#### **4. Switch Junctions in Yorùbá-English Code-Switching**

Switch junctions are the syntactic points in a code-switched structure at which switches (from one language to the other) are allowed, though it is not compulsory that switches occur there on all occasions. The switch junction can occur at different places such as morpheme, word, phrasal or clausal boundaries. Taking the morpheme as the smallest unit for purposes of grammatical analysis, we shall start our analysis of Yorùbá-English CS data from there up to the level of the sentence. We discuss first the features which are common to morphemic switches before we proceed to other structures.

##### **4.1 Switches at the Morpheme boundary**

Following Lamidi and Ajongolo (2001), switches can occur at morpheme boundaries in Yorùbá-English CS. Here are examples; the English components are in italics:

- 1 a. Pataki+*lise*  
important+ affix  
'make important'
- b. Yoruba+*nise*  
Yorùbá + affix  
'make to become Yorùbá'
- 2 a. a+kó+*letter*  
one:that+collect+letter  
'mail runner'
- b. al+*icewater*  
owner:of+icewater  
'ice-water seller'
- 3 a. un+kó+*able*  
not +gather+able  
'unfathomable/splendid'
- b. dis+fara+hàn  
affix+usebody+appear  
'disappear'

In (1), the switch occurs after Yorùbá words which are free morphemes. Lamidi (2003) observes that *-ise/-ize* which are bound morphemes are used to form verbs in Yorùbá-English CS (as in English (Selkirk 1982)). Notice that /l/ and /n/ are variants of the same phoneme, which, in Yorùbá language depends on its environment for the realization as either /l/ or /n/. This explains the differences between *-lise* and *-nise* in (1a&b). They serve the function of linking the suffix with the free morpheme. Note further that Yorùbá does not have suffixes; and this possibly explains why the /n/ or its variant is required to form acceptable structures. The examples in (2a) show switching between two free morphemes: *kó* 'collect' and *letter*; and in (2b) *al-*, a prefix, is derived from *oní-* 'owner of', a Yorùbá morpheme. When *oní-* is prefixed to *ice-water*, its last vowel /i/ is deleted, leaving *on-*; and the first vowel assimilates to the sound of the first vowel of *ice-water*. Hence we arrive at *an-*. Due to environmental factors conditioned by vowel harmony, the sound /n/ is realized as [l] and *al-* occurs as a prefix. In (3a) the switch occurs twice: after *un-* and after *kó* 'gather'. In (3b), it occurs after the prefix, *al-*. If the ideas here are taken with those

in (1 & 2), it means that switches can occur before and after free and bound morphemes. This is contrary to Poplack and Shana's (1981) observation on Spanish–English CS that switches are not permitted at morpheme boundaries and Bentahila and Davies' (1983) observation that switches are permitted at boundaries above the word. It suggests that the feature attested in Spanish-English and Arabic-French CS may not be universal.

#### 4.2 Switches at Word Boundary

The word can be described as the categorial elements of which phrases, sentences and texts are composed. Words in grammar have been categorised along the cline of parts of speech: nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections and verbs (Freeborn 1996, Kuiper and Allan 1996). In transformational grammar, they have also been classified as lexical and functional items (Abney 1987). In this section, we explore how words behave in regard to switching. Banjo (1983) and Lamidi (2003) observe that functional heads usually occur in Yorùbá while lexical heads may be in either Yorùbá or English language. These seem to be confirmed in the following examples:

- 4 a. Mi ò *like* bí *friend* ẹ ẹ se ñ *treat* mi.  
I NEG like how friend your CONT treat me  
'I don't like the way your friend treats me.'
- b. Ó *insist* pé *man* yí *assault* òun *inside* the car.  
3sg insist that man this assault 3sg inside the car  
'He/she insisted that this man assaulted him/her inside the car.'
- c. Ó *call* mi *but* kò *write*.  
3sg call me but NEG write  
'She/he called me but s/he did not write.'

As the sentences show, nouns (*friend, man*), verbs (*like, treat, insist, assault*), conjunctions (*but*), and adverbs (*inside*) may be in either Yorùbá or English, and switches may occur before and after them. However, pronouns, tense, aspect, negative marker, complementizers and modals usually occur in Yorùbá language. The items in the first part come under the class of lexical

heads while those in the second class are referred to as functional heads. When functional items co-occur in the same sentence (cf *Mi ò* (4a) which is pronoun + negative marker), switches are usually not permitted between them. Rather, switches are permitted between them and lexical heads (as in 4b &c). This conclusion is also confirmed in Lamidi (2004), where functional heads specify features that must be met by adjacent lexical heads they subcategorize.

#### 4.2.1 Switches within the Determiner Phrase (DP) Constituents

Switches within the constituents of a sentence such as Determiner Phrases are also permitted in Yorùbá-English CS.

First, switches are permitted between determiners and other components of a DP such as nominals, adjectives and numerals. Consider (5).

- |   |    |                                         |                                 |
|---|----|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 5 | a. | <i>question</i> kan                     | ‘one question’                  |
|   | b. | <i>approach</i> wa                      | ‘our approach’                  |
|   | c. | <i>cassette</i> yẹn                     | ‘that cassette’                 |
|   | d. | ẹyin <i>girls</i> dúdúú <i>class</i> yí | ‘you black girls in this class’ |

In these DPs the noun complements occur in English (5a-c) while the determiners (D) are in Yorùbá. A switch is permitted between them. According to Bentahila and Davies (1983: 316) two Ds can precede the N<sup>o</sup>. This is confirmed in our data as the sentences in (6) show.

- |   |    |                                |                              |
|---|----|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 6 | a. | <i>approach</i> wa yẹn         | ‘that approach of ours’      |
|   | b. | <i>question</i> wa yẹn kan náà | ‘that same question of ours’ |

The difference between these and Bentahila and Davies’ ideas is that the order is different and more than two Ds can post-modify a noun in Yorùbá-English CS. While the determiner preceded the noun in their analysis, nouns precede determiners in ours, and while they have a maximum of two, ours range from one to four as in (6). This is also confirmed by Lamidi (2003, 2004)



In addition, switches may not be permitted between the determiners of Yorùbá-English CS, unlike what obtains in Bentahila and Davies' Arabic-French code-switching. This can be tested as in (7).

- 7
- a. \**question* wa *that* kan naa
  - b. \**question* wa yẹn *one* naa
  - c. \**question* wa yẹn *one the*
  - d. \**question* wa yẹn kan *the*
  - e. \**question our* yẹn *the*

Still within the DP, Pfaff (1979:306) and Woolford (1983) have argued that adjectives modifying a noun must occur in the same language as that noun in Spanish-English code-switching. This seems to be true for most of our data but the following structures are counter examples.

- 8
- a. Hẹn, *normal* s̄bí-ọbẹ.  
'Yes, (it is) the normal stew-spoon.'
  - b. *ordinary* ewé, *fresh* ewé  
'ordinary leaf, fresh leaf'

While the English adjectives *normal*, *ordinary* and *fresh* occur, they are attributes of the nouns they modify. However, other examples in our data are in (9).

- 9
- a. *girl illiterate* kan      'an illiterate girl'  
girl illiterate one
  - b. aṣọ *blue* yẹn      'that blue dress'  
dress blue that

These confirm that for some adjectives, switches are permitted between them and the noun.

However, adjective phrases also occur in DPs without switching, as in (10).

- 10
- a. Ó wà *morally bankrupt*.      's/he is morally bankrupt.'
  - b. Ó wà *totally different*.      'It was totally different.'
  - c. Tunde wà *unusually silent*.      'Tunde is unusually silent.'

In these examples, the words *morally*, *totally* and *usually* are adverbs that precede the adjectives *different*, *bankrupt*, and *silent*, and they follow the English Adjective Phrase pattern. Hence, no switch occurs between them.

Within a genitive phrase, switches can occur before or after the specifier and after the genitive marker as in (11).

- |    |    |                                      |                             |
|----|----|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 11 | a. | <i>break motor</i> yèn               | ‘the vehicle’s break pedal’ |
|    | b. | òrẹ̀ẹ̀ <i>neighbour</i> mi           | ‘my neighbour’s friend’     |
|    | c. | <i>room</i> tí <i>muslim brother</i> | ‘a muslim brother’s room’   |

In (11) the switch occurs after *break* with the introduction of Yorùbá vowel lengthening (in which the final vowel of *break* is lengthened as /breek/ as a result of the genitive relationship between the two adjacent words). The genitive marker may not be phonetically realized in Yorùbá as in (11a). In (11b) the only switch occurs after the genitive marker *ẹ̀*; i.e., before *neighbour* which serves as the complement of the genitive marker. Note that a switch occurs after *motor* and *neighbour*. In (11c) the switch occurs before and after *ti* the genitive marker. So, the switch junction occurs before and after *ti* in (11c).

Having studied the switch junctions within DPs, we can conclude that switches are permitted at all category boundaries with the exception of a few adjective + noun, adverbial and adjectival phrases:

- |    |    |                           |                   |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 12 | a. | * <i>fine</i> ọ̀mọ̀kùnrin | ‘fine boy’        |
|    | b. | * <i>big</i> ilé          | ‘(a) big house’   |
|    | c. | * <i>very</i> ga          | ‘very tall’       |
|    | d. | * <i>extremely</i> gùn    | ‘extremely long’. |

The major criterion is that the heads subcategorize and select their complements.

#### 4.2.2 Switches within Serial Verb Constructions

Switches are also possible in serial verb constructions (SVCs). As in standard practice, the first verb bears the tense (Lawal (1982), Collins (1997)). In our data, the same process obtains as in (13). Switches may occur on the first verb (after INFL) in an SVC structure.

Consider:

- 13 a. **Ó stammer kú** ní. 'He stammered till he died.'  
3sg stammer die FOC
- b. Ade **fetch** omi **tà**. 'Ade fetched and hawked water.'  
Ade fetch water sell
- c. Bọla **smile lọ** sí bank. 'Bọla smile to (the) bank.'  
Bọla smile go to bank
- d. Titi **grumble dé** school. 'Titi grumbled (till she got) to school.'  
Titi grumble reach school

The serial verbs are in bold typeface. The verbs *stammer*, *fetch*, *smile* and *grumble* are the verbs that occur immediately after INFL. They are switched into English. Furthermore, the verbs *kú*, *fún* and *dé* that follow them in the SVC pattern are all in Yorùbá. This confirms that the switches can occur before and after the first verb in an SVC structure.

Switches can also occur before and after the second verb as in (14).

- 14 a. **Á lọ report** fún *principal*.  
3sg go report to principal  
'S/he will go and report to the principal.'
- b. Ó ní òun **fẹ dust** Ph.D 'un.  
3sg say 3sg want dust PhD 3sg  
'S/he said s/he wanted to dust his/her Ph.D.'
- c. Tó bá **fẹ call** fún *another one*....  
If:3sg - want call for another one...  
'If s/he wanted to call for another one....'

In (14), the serial verbs are in bold. The verb *lọ* cannot be changed to *go* in the context of (14a). The verb *fẹ́* ‘want’ can also not be changed to English because *want* is not permitted in the code-switched grammar. The verbs *lọ* and *fẹ́* also bear the tense features and the switch may occur after them.

Switches may also occur after the second verb in an SVC structure as in (15).

- 15 a. **Ó fẹ́ lọ teach** àwọn *students* yẹn.  
3sg want go teach pl students that  
‘S/he wants to go and teach those students.’
- b. Mo **fẹ́ lọ shave** beard mi.  
I want go shave beard my  
‘I want to go and shave (my beard).’

Thus, when there are three verbs in an SVC structure, the switch can occur before and after the first, the second or the third verb. Notice, however, that the first and the middle verbs in the SVC construction may not be switched into English.

#### 4.2.3 Switches in Conjoined Structures

Conjunctions are used to join segments of equal status. In Yorùbá–English CS, they can join words, phrases and clauses. When they occur, they can be in English or Yorùbá. In compound sentences, switches can be in two forms (i) English-Yorùbá and (ii) Yorùbá-English switch patterns. In English-Yorùbá switch pattern, the first clause occurs in English and the second occurs in Yorùbá as in (16), but the conjunction may be in either language.

- 16 a. *The man shouted on top of his voice*, **ṣùgbón** wọn ò fún un lésì.  
the man shouted on top of his voice but they NEG give him reply  
‘The man shouted on top of his voice but they didn’t answer him.’
- b. *Everybody wants money*, **ṣùgbón** ìka ò dọgba.  
everybody wants money but fingers NEG equal  
‘Everybody wants money, but fingers are not equal.’
- c. *I needed two rooms* **but** ẹyọ kan ni wọn fún mi.  
I needed two rooms but unit one FOC they give me  
‘I needed two rooms but only one was allocated to me.’

In (16) each conjoined clause is in a single language. The switches occur at the end of each clause. As we can observe the conjunction can form part of the second clause and switches into English occur after them as in (a & b). However, in some cases, the conjunction may form part of the first clause so that they are not switched into Yorùbá as in (c). Thus switches can occur before the conjunctions (a & b) and after them (c).

For the Yorùbá-English Switch Pattern, the first clause occurs in Yorùbá and the switch to English occurs at the clausal boundary. Witness (17):

- 17
- a. Yàrá kan ni mo fẹ̀ tẹ̀lẹ̀, **but** *the man wouldn't let out one room.*  
room one FOC I want initially, but the man wouldn't let out one room  
'Initially, I needed a room, but the man wouldn't let out only a room.'
  - b. Ọ̀pọ̀lọ̀pọ̀ nnkan ló    ti ẹ̀, **bẹ̀ẹ̀ ni** *he never told anybody.*  
many things FOC:he ASP do, yet he never told anyone  
'He had done many things yet he never told anyone.'
  - c. Ó sọ pé òun fún Jide, **ṣùgbón** *he denied it vehemently.*  
3sg say that 3sg give Jide but he denied it vehemently  
'She said she gave it to Jide but he denied it vehemently.'
  - d. Ajayi ò mọ̀ ìwé, **yet** *he was promoted.*  
Ajayi NEG know book, yet he was promoted  
'Ajayi is not brilliant, yet he was promoted.'
  - e. Idayat jókòó síbí, **but** *she didn't say anything.*  
Idayat sit here, but she didn't say anything  
'Idayat sat down here but she didn't say anything.'
  - f. Mo lọ sí Eko, **àmó** *I didn't see him.*  
I go to Lagos, but I didn't see him  
'I went to Lagos but I didn't see him.'

As in (17) the switches occur after the first clause. The Yorùbá conjunctions form part of the first clause in (17b, c & f) while the English counterparts form part of the second clause in (17a, d & e). This confirms that switches can occur before and after a conjunction in a compound sentence. The grammaticality of (16 & 17) shows that the switch patterns adopted may not necessarily make the structure ill-formed since the switches go either way.

Bentahila and Davies (1983) have criticized Kachru (1977), who claimed that when conjunctions occur in code-switched structures, the conjunctions occur in the language of the second clause as in (16 & 17) above. However, as (18a) here shows, the conjunction *àti* ‘and’ can also occur in the language of the first clause. Alternatively it can be the only switched item as in (18b & c) where *but* and *and* stand out. Consider (18).

- 18 a. *Secretary ni mo prefer láti máa bá discuss; àti pé Baba may not be available.*  
 Secretary FOC I prefer to CONT with discuss, and that Baba may not be available  
 ‘It is the secretary that I prefer to discuss with, and that Baba may not be available.’
- b. *Aà ní jẹ kó jóná o, but tó bá ti gbá diè...*  
 we:NEG. HAB let it burn EMPH, but when:3sg ASP fry little...  
 ‘We won’t let it burn, but when it is slightly fried....’
- c. *Wọn ò account fún un, and a gbọ pé wọn ti gbowó lẹwọ PTF.*  
 they NEG account for 3sg, and we hear that they ASP collect:money from PTF  
 ‘They did not account for it and we learnt that they had collected money from the PTF’.

In (18a) the connector from Yorùbá *àti* is part of the second clause which is in English. In (18b & c) the connectors *but* and *and* are from English and they occur in structures where neither of the adjacent clauses or words are in English. It follows that Kachru’s constraints are not supported by our data.

#### 4.2.4 Switches in Phrasal Verb Constructions

Apart from the SVC, switches occur in phrasal verb constructions. Consider (19).

- 19 a. *Ó write debt yẹn off .*  
 3sg write debt that off  
 ‘He wrote off that debt.’
- b. *....students ló yẹ kí wọn hand è over lé lẹwọ.*  
 ...students FOC fit that they hand 3sg over on hand  
 ‘...they ought to hand it over to students.’
- c. *Ọlọrun dẹ mọ ibi tó ti máa make up tó bá change.*  
 God and know where 3sg FUT make up if:3sg change  
 ‘And God knows how He will make it up for her if she changes (from her bad ways).’

- d. Wọn *wake everybody up*.  
they wake everyone up  
'They woke up everyone.'

In (19) the phrasal verbs are never changed to Yorùbá. Perhaps, they are the English counterparts of SVC. They permit switching in the sense that a (Yorùbá) complement can intervene between the verb and its particle (19a, b & d). What is remarkable is that neither the verb nor the particle is switched into Yorùbá.

### 4.3 Switches along Phrasal Boundaries

#### 4.3.1 Parenthetical Switch

Parenthetical items which are usually Determiner Phrases usually permit switches at their constituent boundaries. Switches may occur before and/or after the parenthetical element as in (20).

- 20 a. Àá wá da omi, *a very small quantity of water*, tó lè jinnáa kinní yẹn...  
'We will then pour water, a very small quantity of water, which can get that thing cooked'.

In this sentence, the parenthetical element is in English. The switch occurs at the onset of the parenthesis and at the end. Bentahila and Davies (1983:310) also confirm that parenthetical switch occurs in Arabic-French CS.

#### 4.3.2 [Spec, IP] and INFL Switch

First, Yorùbá-English CS grammar permits switches between the specifier (DP) and any or all INFL (Inflection) components within a sentence. Witness (21):

- 21 a. Iyẹn *is just one part*  
'That is just one part'  
b. *Casual workers* yarı  
'The casual workers refused/disagreed'  
c. *Assassin* confess  
'The assassin confessed'  
d. Owóo wa *has low market value*  
'Our currency has low market value'

- e. *Woman* kan bèèrè rẹ  
 woman certain ask you  
 ‘A certain woman asked after you’

In (21) switches occur between the DP and the [+ Tense] INFL. In (21a&d) the INFL is in English while the Spec is in Yorùbá and in (21b, c & e) the Yorùbá DP has an English Noun which co-occurs with Yorùbá INFL. It follows that switches between Spec and INFL are in two ways: Yorùbá-English and English-Yorùbá.

Recall that, as in Yorùbá language, Tense has no morphological realization in Yorùbá-English CS. This accounts for our claim of the presence of tense in (21b, c & e especially). Since the [+Tns, +AGR] features of the Yorùbá word *yarí* are used in (21b), a switch occurs between the Spec and the INFL. In (17d) the DP structure, *Owóo wa*, is Yorùbá but the [+Tns, +AGR] features of INFL are from English verbs. Thus there is a switch from Yorùbá to English too. We can then confirm that the switch can be either way: Yorùbá-English and English-Yorùbá, but this is determined by the INFL features on the matrix verb. When the INFL is English, the DP subject may be in Yorùbá; and when the INFL is Yorùbá, the DP subject may be English. Nevertheless, the switch is not always permitted. When a pronoun subject occurs, switches are not usually permitted between Spec and I' as in (22).

- 22 a. *Ó mean pé....*  
 ‘It means that ....’  
 b. *Mo realize pé....*  
 ‘I realized that....’

Here, the pronouns occur in Spec and they are Yorùbá. The INFL too has Yorùbá Tense features. In essence both the pronouns and the INFL features come from the same language, and hence, there is no switch. A change of the pronoun or INFL to English will result in ungrammatical sentences like (23).



- 23 a. \**It mean pé* ....  
 b. \**Ó meant pé* ....  
 c. \**Mo realized pé* ....

The ungrammaticality of (23) confirms that switches may not occur between a pronoun subject and the INFL (but occurs between a pronoun subject and a verb). This position, however, contrasts with the contention of Timm (1975) and Gumperz (1976) cited in Bentahila and Davis (1983: 312-313) that switching is not possible between a verb and its pronoun clitic (subject).

### 4.3.3 INFL and VP Switch

Switches are also possible between the INFL and VP. We recall that INFL contains many different functional heads (Lamidi 2003). Many, all, or only one of these (in this case Tense) may occur, and switching between it and the VP is permitted. Let us take them one after the other.

A switch is possible between Neg(ative) and VP. Since Tense is an obligatory complement of Neg (Zanuttini 1996) we shall discuss the two together. Consider (20).

- 24 a. *È è need lati kùn ún.*  
 You NEG need to paint it  
 ‘You don’t need to paint it.’  
 b. *Kò easy lati jòmòkùnrin.*  
 NEG: easy to be-male: child  
 ‘It is not easy to be a man (i.e. Much is expected of men).’  
 c. *Mo realize pé....*  
 I realize:pst that....  
 ‘I realized that....’
- 25 a. *Ìyẹn is just one part.*  
 ‘That is just a part.’  
 b. *So, matter yẹn is worth pursuing.*  
 ‘So, that matter is worth pursuing.’

In (24a), the INFL elements are Neg (marker) and Tense. They occur in Yorùbá while the verb which serves as the head of the complement to Tense is in English. The same goes for (24b)

except that the Tense there is present. In (24c) only tense is represented and a switch occurs between it and the verb *realize*. In (24), therefore, all the INFL elements are in Yorùbá. In (25), however, the INFL elements are in English. In addition, switches are not permitted between English INFL elements and the VP because the INFL which is reflected on English verbs cannot be reflected on Yorùbá verbs. It follows that only the occurrence of Yorùbá INFL with English verbs can facilitate switching and the switch is one way: Yorùbá–English.

It might be difficult to propose a switch between English INFL and Yorùbá VP. The [+INFL, +AGR] morpheme in English is not a free morpheme; it is only perceived on verbs that have already undergone morphological changes for Tense and agreement in English. This is, however, not possible for Yorùbá where such morphological changes have not been reported.

Aspect markers are part of INFL; and they often take on Yorùbá forms when they occur in Yorùbá-English code-switched sentences. As the following examples show, those from Yorùbá may permit switching to English when their complements are lexical verbs but those from English may not.

- 26 a. Ade yòd ti *boil* omi.  
Ade FUT have boil water  
'Ade will have boiled the water.'
- b. *Armed robbers* máa n *disturb* wọn.  
armed robbers HAB. CONT disturb them  
'Armed robbers disturb them.'
- c. Yomi ti máa n *worry* jù.  
Yomi ASP HAB. CONT worry excess  
'Yomi worries himself a lot.'
- d. Àwọn *experts* ti n *package* è.  
Pl experts ASP CONT package 3sg  
'(Some) experts have been doing its packaging.'

- e. Bòbó yẹn n̄ *feel somehow*....  
fellow that CONT feel somehow....  
'That fellow feels somehow (uncomfortable)....'
- f. Àwọn *teachers nàà have been paid*.  
'Teachers too have been paid.'
- g. *Issue yẹn is generating a lot of arguments*.  
issue that is generating a lot of arguments  
'That issue is generating a lot of arguments.'
- h. *Passport è must have been seized*.  
'His passport must have been seized.'

Examples (26a-c) contain Yorùbá aspect markers *yòò ti*, *máa n̄* and *ti máa n̄*, but the lexical verbs *boil*, *disturb* and *worry* are all in English. The same applies to (26d & e). This confirms that switches can be from Yorùbá Tense/Aspect into English verb. The examples in (26g-h) are, however, different since the aspect markers *have* (26 f & h) and *V-ing* in (26g) are from English. No switch occurs in these examples. To test the veracity of this statement, consider (27) below:

- 27
- a. \*Olè *would have disturb* wọn.
  - b. \*Yọmi *has been worry* jù.
  - c. \**Passport è yòò ti seized*.
  - d. \**Issue yẹn generating a lot of controversy*.

The ungrammaticality of (27) shows that English aspect markers trigger the occurrence of English structured VPs while those from Yorùbá trigger the occurrence of Yorùbá and Yorùbá-English structured VPs. This also confirms Lamidi's (2003) claim that both English and Yorùbá tense features occur in code-switched constructions.

From the sentences above in (20-25), we observe that more than one functional head like Tense, Negative and Aspect can co-occur in a single sentence. When this occurs, switching is not permitted within the Yorùbá functional heads. Rather, switching occurs between the functional head that is closest to the verb and the verb itself. The only condition is that the INFL must be in

Yorùbá while the switch is to English. Thus the one-way switch to English is maintained.

Consider (28).

- 28 a. *Sé millionaire ló **máa n** dress báyî?*  
 Q millionaire FOC:he HAB CONT dress like this  
 ‘Does a millionaire dress like this?’
- b. **Kò lè tî máa** *travel.*  
 NEG can ASP:HAB travel.  
 ‘S/he cannot yet be travelling.’
- c. **Ó lè má** *occur.*  
 3sg can NEG occur  
 ‘It may not occur.’

In (28) the words in bold are heads under INFL. Both *máa n* (a), *kò lè tî máa* (b), and *lè má* (c) are stretches of heads within INFL. In all cases switches occur only after the last item: in (28a) Tense + Asp/ V switch, in (28b) NEG + Tense + ASP/ V switch and (28c) NEG + tense/ V switch. Thus the following structures are ill-formed, since switches are usually not permitted within components of INFL.

- 29 a. \**Ó can má occur*  
 b. \**Ó lè not occur*  
 c. \**Se millionaire ló will n dress báyî?*  
 d. \**Se millionaire ló máa dressing bayii?*

Thus, although Lipski (1977) and Timm (1975), cited in Bentahila and Davies (1983: 314) and Myers-Scotton (1993), say that switches between the auxiliary and main verb are not permitted, Pfaff (1979: 300) agrees that it is possible. From our data too, we also confirm that such switches are indeed possible.

#### 4.3.4 Verb – Complement/Adjunct Switch

Within the VP, switches are permitted between the verb and its complement or adjunct.

#### 4.3.4.1 *Verb – CP Complement Switch*

First, switches occur between a lexical head (verb) that subcategorizes a Complementizer Phrase (CP) and the adjacent C in the CP when the Specifier position is empty. Consider (30).

- 30 a. *How do we now understand pé babaláwo tó pọ̀fọ̀...*  
 how do we now understand that medicine-man that say:incantations  
 ‘How do we now understand that a medicine-man that said incantations...’
- b. *Wọ̀n insist pé boy yẹ̀n rude.*  
 they insist that boy that rude  
 ‘They insisted that that boy was rude.’
- c. *Ó possible kí company wa ta shares wọ̀n.*  
 3sg possible that company our sell shares them  
 ‘It is possible for our company to sell its shares.’
- d. *Àwọ̀n writers plead pé kí government support wọ̀n.*  
 Pl writers plead that that government support them  
 ‘Writers pleaded that the government should support them.’
- e. *Everybody knows wípé parcel bomb dangerous.*  
 everyone knows that parcel bomb dangerous  
 ‘Everyone knows that parcel bomb is dangerous.’

In these examples, the lexical verbs *understand*, *insist*, *possible*, *plead* and *knows*, which are in English, subcategorize CPs which are headed by Yorùbá complementizer *pé*, *kí*, *pé kí*, and *wípé* respectively. The matrix verbs are in English. They may also be in Yorùbá while the complementizer may or may not be in Yorùbá. Consider (31).

- 31 a. *Ó mọ̀ pé lady yẹ̀n ti wed.*  
 3sg know that lady that ASP wed  
 ‘He knows that that lady is wedded.’
- b. *Ade fẹ̀ kí matter yẹ̀n die down.*  
 Ade want that matter that die down  
 ‘Ade wants that matter to die down.’
- c. *Bola rò wípé classes ti commence.*  
 Bola think that classes ASP commence  
 ‘Bola thought that classes had commenced.’

- e. Idaya ní **kí** a pray.  
 Idaya say that we pray  
 ‘Idaya said we should pray.’

The main verbs *mò*, *fẹ́*, *rò* and *ní* subcategorize *pé*, *kí*, *wípé* and *kí* respectively in (31). These are all grammatical. However, when some complementizers in (30) and (31) are changed to English there are different consequences as in (32) and (33). Data in (32a-e) are reproduced from (30), while (33a-d) are from (31).

- 32 a. *How do we now understand that* babaláwo to pofò...  
 b. Wọn *insist that* boy yẹn *rude*.  
 c. \*Ó *possible that* company wa ta *shares* wọn.  
 d. ?Àwọn *writers plead that* ki *government support* wọn.  
 e. \*Àwọn *writers plead pé that* *government support* wọn.  
 f. *Everybody knows that* parcel bomb *dangerous*.
- 33 a. \*Ó *mò that* lady yẹn *ti wed*.  
 b. \*Ade *fẹ́ that* matter yẹn *die down*.  
 c. \*Bola *rò that* classes *ti resume*.  
 d. \*Idayat ni *that a pray*.

As we can see, all sentences in (32) except (32c & e) are grammatical after the complementizers have been switched into English. In (33), however, all the structures are ungrammatical after the switch. One possible reason for the ungrammaticality of (33) is that the complementizers change to English.

Another reason is that *pé* a Yorùbá complementizer can occur in different environments including situations like (30a). Thus when it is changed to *that* the impact is not felt negatively in (32a, b, d & f). We also noted that *kí* may not occur in wholly English structures nor should it introduce past events, since it inherently introduces future events. These constraints are violated by *that* in (32c & e) where the meaning has changed from that in (30c & d). The major problem

with (33) is that all the CPs are subcategorized by Yorùbá main verbs. We can now infer that switches in verb/CP should be from English to Yorùbá and not vice versa.

#### 4.3.4.2 Verb – DP Complement Switch

Switches may also occur between a verb and its DP complement.

- 34 a. *Wo time-table ẹ.*  
look time-table your  
'Look at your time-table.'
- b. *Mo ní class ní two o'clock.*  
I have class at two o'clock  
'I have a class at two o'clock.'
- c. *Aina rí woman yẹn early this year.*  
Aina see woman that early that year  
'Aina saw that woman early this year.'

The verbs in these examples (*wo* 'look', *ní* 'have', *rí* 'see') are Yorùbá but they have noun complements from English.

Furthermore, certain verbs of Yorùbá origin often get contracted with nouns of English origin as in (31).

- 35 a. *Şé o l'account?*  
Q you have account  
'Do you have a (bank) account?'
- b. *...tó bá l'education*  
...if:3sg that have:education  
'...if s/he is educated'

The fact that switches are permitted between the verbs which are in Yorùbá and the complements which are governed by the verbs shows that Woolford's (1988) view, cited in Myers-Scotton (1993: 41) that the  $V^0$  and its complement must be in the same language is not confirmed by Yorùbá-English data. However, we have additional forms like the following (36).

- 36 a. *Ó máa take at least 15 minutes...*  
'It will take at least 15 minutes...'

- b. Wọn fẹ *impose* è.  
they want impose 3sg  
'They wanted to impose him.'
- c. Wọn máa *poison* è.  
they FUT poison 3sg  
'They will poison him.'
- d. Àwọn *rebels* ní àwọn ti *dislodge* è.  
Pl rebels say they ASP dislodge 3sg  
'The rebels said they had dislodged him'.

A comparison of (34, 35 & 36), shows that the main verbs, whether contracted or not in (34 & 35) are Yorùbá while those in (36) are English. This confirms that switches can be two-way: English-Yorùbá or Yorùbá-English. Note, however, that the switch pattern is one way for the verb-pronoun switch: it is English-Yorùbá because English personal pronouns are not permitted in the grammar.

#### 4.3.4.3 Verb – PP Adjunct Switch

The prepositional phrase boundary is another possible switch junction. Consider (37a - c).

- 37 a. Ó ti ní *in* *in* *mind* wipe....  
3sg ASP have 3sg in mind that....  
'He had had it in mind that ....'
- b. Ó wà *disappointed in* ẹnì to *introduce* è s'oun.  
3sg be disappointed in person that:3sg introduce 3sg to 3sg  
'S/he was disappointed in the person that introduced him to her.'
- c. Á sí máa *sişẹ* *towards* nnkan tóo sọ yẹn.  
3sg still FUT work towards thing that:you say that  
'S/he will still continue to work towards what you said.'

In (37) the switches occur before and after the prepositions (in bold) from English. The heads of the Prepositional Phrases are *in* (a & b) and *towards* (c), and both have Yorùbá DP complements. Alternatively, the PP head (P<sup>0</sup>) can be in Yorùbá while its complement is in English as in (34).

- 38 a. Tóo bá pẹ́ **fun** *two minutes*...  
if you – late for two minutes  
'If you are late for two minutes...'



- b. *Wọ̀n ní clash ní police station.*  
 they have clash at police station  
 ‘They had a clash at the police station.’

In these examples *ní* and *fún* are P<sup>0</sup> (Awobuluyi 1978:96-99) in their respective phrases. Just like those in (38), they permit switches between them and their complements. This contrasts with Pfaff’s (1979:310) observation that ‘prepositions are never switched’. In our data, prepositions from either language can occur and permit switches to the other language. Also DPs from either language can be the complement of the preposition.

In addition to the foregoing, two preposition heads from the two languages (English and Yorùbá) can occur within the same phrase. In this sense, both will come from the two languages and co-occur as in (35).

- 39 a. *Wọ̀n ti dispatch è ní on the tenth.*  
 they ASP dispatch 3sg at on the tenth  
 ‘They had dispatched it on the tenth (of the month).’
- b. *Ó n ọ̀ṣẹ̀ ní outside the country.*  
 3sg CONT work outside the country  
 ‘He works outside the country.’

As (39) shows, *ní* ‘at’ from Yorùbá co-occurs with *on* (39a) and *outside* (39b) which behave like adverbs. The former (*ní*) precedes the latter. The Yorùbá P<sup>0</sup> precedes the English P<sup>0</sup>, which dominates and governs a DP. Perhaps this co-occurrence of prepositions can be compared to the English complex prepositions like ‘out of’ and ‘on top of’.

Prepositional phrases can also occur sentence initially and they resemble the formulaic expressions. The difference is that formulaic expressions can be from any word group while the PP must begin with a P<sup>0</sup> and it need not maintain constant meaning. Witness (40):

- 40 a. *At least, o tiẹ confess*  
 at least, you even confess  
 ‘At least, you confessed.’
- b. *From experience, tẹ̀yàn bá bẹ àwọ̀n people yẹn...*  
 from experience, if person – beg pl people that...  
 ‘Experience has shown that, if one begs those people....’

These PPs have English structure and occur sentence initially, and switches occur after them.

Adverbials also permit switches at their constituent boundaries. Since they are mobile, wherever they occur they permit switching. These adverbials can be single words or phrases as in (41- 43).

- 41      Ó wá síbí (ní) *last week*  
           3sg come here last week  
           ‘S/he came here last week’
- 42      *Throughout Nigeria*, ẹni tí yóò dé ipò....  
           throughout Nigeria, one that will arrive position....  
           ‘Throughout Nigeria, one that will assume an office....’
- 43      a.      Bóyá ló lè *handle* ẹ *successfully*  
                   maybe FOC:3sg can handle 3sg successfully  
                   ‘It’s doubtful if s/he can handle it successfully’
- b.      *Untrue* niyẹn *now!*  
                   untrue that (emphasis)  
                   ‘That is untrue!’

In (41) switches occur from a Yorùbá preposition + adverb contraction *síbí* ‘here’ to the English adverbial phrase *last week*. The English adverbial occurs sentence finally and *ní*, another preposition (optional) occurs between it and the Yorùbá adverbial. The switch occurred before the English adverbial phrase.

In (42) the English adverbial phrase occurs sentence initially. The adverbial phrases both permit switches at their boundaries. The sentences in (43) contain one-word English adverbials which occur sentence finally and permit switches before them. Throughout our data, we found no case of internal switching within adverbial phrases.

Apart from the foregoing, certain words from Yorùbá often get contracted to English nouns. The Yorùbá words are usually verbs (discussed above) and prepositions, and the English words are nouns. Witness (44):

- 44      a.      *Şó wà l’office?*  
                   Q:3sg be in:office  
                   ‘Is it in the office?’

- b. Ó wá s' *office*.  
3sg come to: office  
'S/he came to the office.'
- c. Ó ṣiṣẹ̀ pẹ̀l' *action*.  
3sg work with action  
'He worked with action.'

In (44) *ní* 'at', *sí* 'to', and *pẹ̀lú* 'with' are prepositions which are reduced to *l'*, *s'* and *pẹ̀l'* respectively, and each merges with the noun it governs. The nouns are *office* (for a & b) and *action* in (c). The examples show that switches occur between the preposition and the English nouns. In these examples, the switches are one-way: Yorùbá-English. Consider (45) for the reverse case.

- 45 a. \*Ṣó wà *at* ilé-iṣẹ́?  
b. \*Ó wá *to* ilé- iṣẹ́.  
c. ?Ó ṣiṣẹ́ *with* akíkanjú.

The fact that only (45c) may be considered somewhat acceptable shows that English prepositions may not always precede Yorùbá nouns. However, as (45c) shows, some English prepositions can govern Yorùbá nouns.

## 5. Switch Directions in Yorùbá-English CS

Having discussed the switch junctions in Yorùbá-English, we have to take cognizance of the fact that the switches follow certain patterns if they must be considered grammatical. The sum total is that the direction of switch affects grammaticality. In this vein, there are two possibilities: the switch might be monodirectional as in English → Yorùbá and Yorùbá → English, or bidirectional, having the facility to switch to either Yorùbá or English at the same switch junction. In what follows, we take representative CS samples from these different types.

## 5.1 Monodirectional English → Yorùbá Switch Direction

The speech direction stipulated above permits a code to change from English to Yorùbá, but usually not conversely. This is true of lexical head/Complementizer switch and Noun/Determiner switch. Consider the following examples:

### 5.1.1 Head/Complementizer Switch

Lexical heads have been described as words with lexical content, a feature that distinguished them from functional heads which form the skeletal structure of sentences. Following Abney (1987) and Radford (1997), functional heads include complementizers, determiners, inflection elements and determiners. According to Banjo (1983) and Lamidi (2003, 2004), unlike lexical heads, functional heads are usually not switched into English. Otherwise, the structure may become ungrammatical. The complementizers in Yorùbá-English CS include *pé*, *kí*, and *wípé* and they occur in the following contexts, among others.

46. a. Ó *believe* pé Bola *hate* òun.  
3sg believe that Bola hate 3sg  
'He believes that Bola hates him.'
- b. Sola *decide* pé òun máa *travel*.  
Sola decided that she FUT travel  
'Sola decided that she would travel'
- c. Wole *insist* pé Ola *instigate* àwọn *students against* òun ni  
Wole insist that Ola instigate pl students against him FOC  
'Wole insisted that it is a fact that Ola instigated students against him'
- d. A *expect* kí o *commend* wa  
we expect that you commend us  
'We expected you to commend us'
- e. Wọn *prefer* kí teacher wọn *punish* wọn  
they prefer that teacher their punish them  
'They prefer that their teacher punish them'

In these examples, the matrix verbs are in English and the complementizers are in Yorùbá. Hence we can say that a switch from English to Yorùbá occurs between the verb that

subcategorizes a clause and the complementizer that serves as the head of the CP. Thus the switch pattern here is English–Yorùbá. Notice that Yorùbá–English is not allowed in this structure since the complementizer cannot be changed to English. If we change them, the structures become unacceptable as in (47).

47. a. \*Ó gbàgbọ́ *that* Bola *hate* òun.  
 b. \*Sola gbèrò *that* òun máa *travel*.  
 c. \*Wole ní *that* Ola instigate àwọn students against òun ní.  
 d. \*A retí *that* o *commend* wa.  
 e. \*Wọn fé *that* teacher wọn *punish* wọn.

This confirms that the switch here is one-way.

### 5.1.2 Noun/Determiner Switch

According to Radford (1997), nouns usually function as complement to a determiner in a DP. The noun as a lexical head has the facility to occur in either English or Yorùbá in a CS structure. However, the converse is the case for determiners. They occur as Yorùbá words. Furthermore, since the position of the determiner in relation to the noun component is relatively fixed, it is axiomatic that there will be a fixed switch pattern. Consider (48).

- 48 a. boy yẹn  
 boy that  
 ‘That boy’  
 b. *lawyer* wa yí kan náà  
 lawyer our this same the  
 ‘this same lawyer of ours’ (Lamidi 2004:85)  
 c. *friend* mi kan  
 friend me certain  
 a certain friend of mine’  
 d. box yí  
 box this  
 ‘this box’

As these examples show, the switch direction is also English–Yorùbá.

## 5.2 Monodirectional Yorùbá→ English Switch Pattern

The speech direction in this section is from Yorùbá to English. Examples of such include Complementizer /IP switch and INFL/VP switch.

### 5.2.1 Complementizer/IP Switch

Just like what obtains in section (5.1.1) above, the complementizer still occurs as Yorùbá words.

The difference here is that the complementizer is followed by an English word.

- 49
- a. *Ó necessary kí everybody ó respond.*  
3sg necessary that everybody respond  
'It is necessary for everyone to respond.'
  - b. *Aina sọ pé teacher wá bright.*  
Aina say that teacher our bright  
'Aina said that our teacher was bright.'
  - c. *Sọ fún wọn wípé I'm ready.*  
tell to them that I'm ready  
'Tell them that I'm ready.'

Since the Complementizers are in Yorùbá, the switch direction is Yorùbá-English.

### 5.2.2 Inflection/ Verb Phrase switch

Inflection elements include tense, aspect, modal and negative markers. They are all functional elements. Again, they often occur in their Yorùbá forms principally because Yorùbá is the host language of the CS grammar. Verbs are lexical heads and therefore can occur as English or Yorùbá words without making the structure unacceptable. Here are some examples.

- 50
- a. *Armed robbers maa n disturb wọn.*  
armed robbers FUT CONT disturb them  
'Armed robbers disturb them.'
  - b. *Maid mi ti boil omi.*  
maid my ASP boil water  
'My maid has boiled the water.'
  - c. *Kò travel.*  
NEG travel  
'S/he did not travel.'

- c. *Máà try è.*  
 NEG try 3sg  
 ‘Don’t try it.’

In all these examples, the inflection elements precede the lexical verbs, which are in English. Hence, the switch direction is Yorùbá-English.

### 5.3 Bidirectional Switch Pattern

Conversely, there are some structures which permit switches in both ways. Whichever way the switch goes, the sentence will be grammatical. These include Inflection Phrase/Emphasis switch, and Verb /DP switch.

#### 5.3.1 Inflection Phrase/Emphasis Switch

The Inflection phrase is a simple sentence or a main clause. In many cases, a sentence is modified by emphasis markers, which originate from Yorùbá. Hence, a sentence may be modified by an emphasis marker which occurs at the beginning, middle or end of the sentence.

The switch pattern changes according to the position of the emphasis marker. Consider (51)

51. a. *Àní man yí like è.*  
 EMPH man this like you  
 ‘(I insist that) this man likes you.’
- b. *Şebí few things lo need*  
 EMPH few things that:you need  
 ‘You need few things really.’
- c. *Boy yẹn perfect sẹ.*  
 boy that perfect EMPH  
 ‘That boy is really perfect.’
- d. *We’ll still add water o.*  
 ‘We’ll still add water, mind you’
- e. *Woman yẹ’n sáà explain fún è.*  
 woman that EMPH explain to you  
 ‘After all, that woman explained to you.’
- f. *Kerosene kúkú wà.*  
 kerosene EMPH exist  
 ‘Of course, there is kerosene.’

In (51a&b), the emphasis marker occurs before an English word; and the switch direction is Yorùbá –English. In (51c&d), the emphasis marker occurs after an English word, so the direction is English–Yorùbá. Finally, the emphasis marker occurs before the English verb and after the English noun respectively in (51e&f). Thus the direction can be either way.

### 5.3.2 Verb/ Determiner Phrase

This section contains a lexical verb governing its complement. Recall that verbs can occur as English or Yorùbá words. In the case of the DP, there are both lexical and functional components. The functional items (such as determiners) are usually in Yorùbá; but the lexical item (i.e. nouns) may or may not be in English. The switch pattern in this section occurs when the lexical noun does not have a determiner as head, such that the lexical verb is adjacent to it. In that wise, both items may take different shapes regarding their occurrences in English or Yorùbá. Hence the switch direction can go either way as in the following examples

- 52     a.     Ojo ra *paper*  
              Ojo buy paper  
              ‘Ojo bought a newspaper.’
- b.     Biola *hurt* mi.  
              Biola hurt me  
              ‘Biola hurt me.’
- c.     Sade *ń prepare dinner*.  
              Sade CONT prepare dinner  
              ‘Sade is preparing dinner.’

Thus, while (52a) follows English-Yorùbá switch pattern, (52b) follows Yorùbá-English pattern; but (52c) does not follow either.

In these different switch types, the order stipulated in each section is usually strictly followed. Generally, as noted by Lamidi (2004), all these forms are dictated by the heads to ensure the grammaticality of code-switched structures of Yorùbá and English.



### 5.3.3 Conclusions

Having looked at switch junctions in Yorùbá-English CS vis-à-vis other existing CS grammars, we realize that there are universal features as well as some peculiarities of the Yorùbá-English variety. The first universal feature is switching. Switching is universal to CS varieties, as it is the major form of distinguishing them from monolingual grammars. In addition, switch junctions are also universal to the CS varieties. It is the feature that makes switching possible. Generally, word, phrase, and clausal boundaries are possible switch junctions, though switches need not occur in them at all times. Word internal switches may, however, be problematic to universal grammar: while Yorùbá-English and Arabic-French CS permit it, Spanish-English CS and possibly some others do not.

Another universal feature is the constraint against functional elements such as tense, modal, aspect, negators, pronouns and determiners. These elements are not switched to English, except where they occur in the context of English-only phrases. Furthermore, the direction of switches in CS varieties is another universal trait. In Yorùbá-English and Arabic-French CS varieties, speech direction affects grammaticality. Possibly, a look at the other CS varieties may reveal similar traits.

Switching in Yorùbá-English CS is peculiar in some ways. First, there are switches in serial verb and phrasal verb constructions. Switches in these areas have not been reported in other varieties. While serial verbs can be switched from Yorùbá to English, phrasal verbs cannot be switched into Yorùbá. Nevertheless, both types permit switches along word boundaries.

Again, while Spanish-English CS does not allow internal switching between adjective + noun combination in a noun phrase, Yorùbá-English CS allows some switching, though in some cases it may not. Thus, despite differences that are peculiar to each CS grammars, there are

similarities in their features. Nevertheless, more studies will be required to confirm whether indeed, CS grammars have universal traits.

## References

- Abney, S.A. (1987) *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect* Ph.D Dissertation MIT Cambridge.
- Awobuluyi, O. (1978) *Essentials of Yorùbá Grammar* Ibadan: OUP.
- Banjo, Ayo (1983) 'Aspects of Yoruba/English Language, Mixing' *Journal of Nigerian Languages.*, 1: 17-26.
- Bentahila, Abdelali and Davies, Eirlys E. (1983) 'The Syntax of Arabic-French Code-Switching' *Lingua*, 59, 4: 302-330.
- Chomsky, Noam (1976) *Reflections on Language* London: Temple Smith.
- Chomsky Noam (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding: the Pisa Lectures* Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Collins, Chris (1997) 'Argument Sharing in Serial Verb Construction' *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol 28, 3,461-497.
- Cook, Vivian .J. and Newson, Mark (1996) *Chomsky's Universal Grammar: An Introduction.* Blackwell: Oxford.
- Di Sciullo, A. M., Muysken, P. and Singh, R. (1986) 'Government and Code-Mixing' *Journal of Linguistics*, 22, 1-24.
- Freeborn, Dennis 1995. *A Course Book in English Grammar* London: Macmillan.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1976) The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-Switching. In: J.Cook-Gumperz, J.J. Gumperz (eds.), *Papers on Language and Context*. Working Paper No. 46, Berkeley: University of California Language Behaviour Research Laboratory.
- Kachru, B. B. (1977) Code-Switching as a communicative Strategy in India. In: M. Saville-Troike (ed.) *Linguistics and Anthropology*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Kachru, B. B (1978) 'Toward Structuring Code-Mixing an Indian Perspective' *IJSL* Vol. 16, 27-46.
- Kachru, Braj B. (1992) 'Multilingualism and Multiculturalism' in William Bright (ed) Vol. 1, 182-186 Oxford: OUP.
- Kuiper, Koenraad and Allan, W. Scot (1996) *An Introduction to English Language* London: Macmillan.

- Lamidi, M. T. (2003). *The Head Parameter and Grammaticality in Yoruba-English Code-Switching among Undergraduates in Selected Universities* PhD Thesis, University of Ibadan.
- Lamidi, M. T. (2004) 'The Scopal Authority of Heads in Yoruba-English Code-Mixing' *Nordic Journal of African Studies* [www.njas.helsinki.fi](http://www.njas.helsinki.fi)
- Lamidi, M. T. and Ajongolo, T. O. (2001) 'The Head Parameter iun Yorulish Morphology' *Ihafa: Journal of African Studies*.
- Lawal, Adenike, S. (1989) 'The Classification of Yoruba Serial Verb Construction' *Journal of West African Languages*, XIX, 3 – 14.
- Lipski, J.M. (1977) Code-Switching and the Problem of Bilingual Competence. In: M. Paradis (ed.) *The Fourth Lacus Forum*. Columbia SC: Hornbeam Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993) *Duelling Languages Grammatical Structure in Code Mixing* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pfaff, Carol W. (1979) 'Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code-Switching and Borrowing' in Spanish/English, *Language*, 155, 2, 291-318.
- Poplack, Shana (1980) 'Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching' *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Radford, Andrew (1997) *Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Sankoff, David and Poplack, Shana (1981) 'A Formal Grammar for Code-Switching' *Paper in Linguistics*, 14, 1, 3-35.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. (1982) *The Syntax of Words* Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.
- Timm, L. (1975) Spanish-English Code-switching: el porque y how-not-to. *Romance Philology* 28, 473-482.
- Woolford, E. (1983) 'Bilingual Code-Switching and Syntactic Theory' *Linguistic Inquiry*, 14, 520-36.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1996) 'On the Relevance of Tense for Sentential Negation' in Belletti and Rizzi (eds) *Parameters and Functional Heads Essays in Comparative Syntax* Oxford, N.Y: OUP, 181-208.