1. Introduction

Developments in cartographic observations of clause structure in Generative syntax predict strong formal linguistic universals among the ordering of phrases at the clausal edge. This ordering is assumed to result from a predetermined hierarchy that is defined by Universal Grammar (UG), reflecting an innate biological capacity for language in humans (Rizzi, 1989, p. 66). Ibibio, a Niger-Congo language, features a rich left periphery whose components demonstrate this hierarchical ordering. Through the interaction of left-peripheral phenomena such as Argument Focus, Partial wh- movement, Q markers, and complementizers, this ordering is revealed. If Ibibio’s phrasal ordering differs from Rizzi’s proposed structure in (1), then the universality of Rizzi’s left periphery would be compromised. In addition to the phrases that Rizzi (1997) finds through Italian, Ibibio’s grammar parameterizes the activation of an additional phrase. We will find that the underlying order of Ibibio’s phrases does hold up to the posited hierarchy, supporting Rizzi’s (1997) proposition of the ordering of the left periphery in UG. Here is a comparison of these two peripheral structures:

(1) Rizzi’s (1997) Left Periphery
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(2) Pieces of Ibibio’s Periphery

I will test these theoretical predictions with Ibibio, a Niger-Congo language. Ibibio’s grammar features phenomena that interact with left peripheral phrases, such as overt left-dislocation of argument focus or Q markers. Ibibio’s structural ordering of the phrases that these phenomena activate should align with the ordering in in (1) and if not, then the universality of Rizzi’s (1997) posited UG-ordering would be compromised. This study does not attempt to account for all that comprises Ibibio’s left periphery, only pieces of it that correspond to those that Rizzi (1997) claims are rigidly ordered to one another.

1.1. Language background. Ibibio is a Niger-Congo language estimated to have around 1.5 million L1 speakers (Connell, 2007). It is spoken in the Lower Cross State in southeastern Nigeria and is related to many mutually intelligible languages in the region such as Efik (the region’s standard) and Anaang.

Ibibio is a Nominative-Accusative language with a moderately complex tonal inventory. There are two level tones and two contour tones as well as a derived high tone: the downstepped high tone (Urua, 2000). Languages with complex tonal systems tend to be isolating (Maddieson, 2003) as is the case for Ibibio. However, extensive morphology on the verb and far-reaching agreement demonstrate its synthetic capabilities, even though this degree of synthesis is not common across all lexical categories:

(3) nímá áfo ə-ké-má-há ə-ké-dí
    lady you 2nd.SG-PST-love-REL 3rd.SG-PST-came
    ‘The lady that you loved came.’

This example illustrates how the verbal stems má and dí both may host multiple prefixes. It also demonstrates Ibibio’s word order which is SVO. When this word order is changed, the leftmost word receives a contrastive or focalized interpretation according to our native speaker. It is this property that we will use to investigate the peripheral phenomena.

1.2. Methodology. Most data I use are the result of elicitation sessions with my language consultant unless otherwise noted. The consultant is a native speaker of Ibibio who learned English in adulthood. The elicitation sessions consisted of largely grammaticality-judgment tests and translations of English sentences. Discussions of interpretation and meaning were recorded and considered as well.

This analysis is organized as follows. In Section 2, the basic arguments for an articulated left periphery are reported. Section 2.1 reviews theoretical assumptions that provide a basis for the analysis and 2.2 lists

11st = First Person; 2nd = Second Person; 3rd = Third Person; AA = Anti-agreement marker; ADV = Adverbial; C = Complementizer; DET = Determiner; FOC = Focus marker; FUT = Future tense; IMPF = Imperfect aspect; INF = infinitival tense marker; NEG = Negation; NEUT = neutral tense marker; PL = Plural; PREP = Preposition; PRES = present tense; PST = Past tense; Q = Question particle; SG = singular.
the specific diagnostics employed in it. Section 3 investigates a possible Focus Field in the middle of the CP domain and the various phenomena that interact with it such as focus (3.1) and wh-movement (3.2). Section 4 looks at the Force-Finiteness system, where items that occur very high in the periphery may interact. These include Q markers (4.1), complementizers (4.2), and certain adverbials (4.3). The conclusions drawn from these investigations are summarized in Section 5. Other left peripheral phenomena not included in the study are discussed in the Appendix.

2. The necessity of more than CP

Since the seminal analysis in Rizzi (1997), a huge body of research concerning the left periphery has developed. The following section details the results of these developments and then situates Ibibio in relation to them.

Rizzi (1997), Cinque (1999), and others have demonstrated a need for an expanded left periphery in clausal structure, beyond the traditional singular Complementizer Phrase (CP). This expanded CP domain is broken into an array of functional projections that are assumed to be universally present, when active, in every language’s clauses. Different grammars parameterize which phrases to employ, generating the diversity of human language.

Just as Pollock (1989) found in English and French evidence that the single projection of IP must be broken into several different projections, so does Rizzi (1997) with the CP. Using the order of lexical items and phrases that undergo left dislocation, and their relation to complementizers, he finds the need for such an articulated left periphery as in (1). Consider the following examples below that use the distinction of [+Fin] on C° to suss out this ordering:

(4) a. Credo che [TOP il tuo libro] loro lo apprezzerebbero molto
1st.SG.believe C [+Fin] DET your book they it would.appreciate.much
‘I believe that, your book, they would appreciate very much.’ (Rizzi, 1997, p. 228)

b. * Credo [TOP il tuo libro] che loro lo apprezzerebbero molto
1st.SG.believe DET your book C [+Fin] they it would.appreciate.much
‘I believe, your book, that they would appreciate very much.’ (Rizzi, 1997, p. 228)

(5) a. * Credo di [TOP il tuo libro] apprezzar-lo molto
1st.SG.believe C [-Fin] DET your book to.appreciate-it.much
‘I believe that, your book, it is appreciate very much.’ (Rizzi, 1997, p. 228)

b. Credo [TOP il tuo libro] di apprezzar-lo molto
1st.SG.believe DET your book C [-Fin] to.appreciate-it much
‘I believe of your book, that it is appreciated very much.’ (Rizzi, 1997, p. 228)

In example (4), the C che that selects a finite TP must precede the topicalized constituent il tuo libro or else it is ungrammatical (as in 4b). Example (5) demonstrates just the opposite with the C° di, where the same topicalized constituent moves beyond it. This distribution of topics is the initial proof that Rizzi (1997) uses to demonstrate that there must be multiple phrases in CP that host complementizers, namely ForceP and FinP. Topics, as (4a) and (5b) demonstrate, occur somewhere between the two, necessitating more than just a C° for complementizers.

To derive the position of FocP within this framework, Rizzi (1997) uses the difference in recursivity between Topics and Foci to determine that FocP must be embedded between two recursively occurring instances of TopP. Consider the examples below that were adapted from Rizzi (1997, p. 290).

(6) a. [TOP il libro] [TOP a Gianni] [TOP domani] [IP glielo darò]
DET book to Gianni tomorrow him 1st.SG.FUT give
‘The book, to Gianni, tomorrow, I’ll give it to him.’
b. *\{FOC \text{a} \text{Gianni}\} \{FOC \text{il} \text{libro}\} \{TOP \text{domani}\} \{darò\} (\text{non a Piero, l’articolo})

to Gianni DET book tomorrow 1\text{st}.SG.FUT.give

'I’ll give the book\text{FOC} to Gianni\text{FOC} (not to Piero, the article)'

c. \{TOP \text{A} \text{Gianni}\} \{FOC \text{Questo}\} \{TOP \text{domani}\} \{IP \text{gli dovete dire}\}

to Gianni this tomorrow him 2\text{nd}.SG.should say

'To Gianni, tomorrow, you should tell him this\text{FOC}.'

As in English, (6a) demonstrates that Italian also allows many Topics high in the clause. Examples (6b-c) demonstrate that there can only be one focus, and it is able to be enclosed within the recursive Topics. This evidence brings us closer to the proposed left periphery in (1). Ibibio will be compared against (1) since it similarly syntactically marks this by dislocation to the clause’s edge. This patterning of these phrases leads us to Rizzi’s proposed left periphery illustrated in (1).

Refinements to this cartography have been made since this influential analysis. Relevant to Ibibio is IntP which hosts the yes/no operators of polar questions (Aboh, 2004). These questions are marked by a Q particle in Ibibio. This particle’s supposedly universal rigid ordering in relation to focalized constituents and complementizers situates it between the two and serves as an anchoring point of reference in the highest part of a clause.

These are the basic theoretical arguments for positing an articulated left periphery. The following subsection will situate this argument in relation to the Cartographic enterprise in syntax, as well as lay out further mechanics of clause structure that the analysis utilizes.

2.1. Some assumptions of clause structure and cartography. Since a strict cartographic approach maps one feature to one projection, the layout of the clause consists of numerous potential phrases instead of the conventional three: VP, TP, and CP. While these phrases have been broken into numerous pieces, they still represent relevant domains of phrases, or layers. These formerly singular projections are referred to as the Argument layer (VP), Inflectional layer (TP), and the Left Periphery (CP) in that ascending order (Rizzi, 1997). Cartography aims to map out the rich array of functional projections within these domains. Beyond this fundamental goal of the cartographic enterprise, the following are some additional assumptions of clause structure.

The VP layer originates with the verb inside the Verb Phrase. It contains argument and event structure, including thematic information. During numeration, lexical items of particular categories enter the computation at this layer of the clause via a type of external Merge called C-selection (Chomsky, 1995). This process sets up the foundation for the clause and as such is the most internal.

Between this layer and the Inflectional Layer above it, Aspect acts as in interface. AspP expresses grammatical aspect.\(^2\) Cinque (1999) has compiled a hierarchy of 18 different Aspect heads using a variety of TP and VP adverbials, affixes, and other heads that demonstrate the gradual fluidity between the two layers. Above the AspP, tense and modality are expressed. Modals generally appear between AspP and TP, except epistemic modals according to Cinque’s (1999) universal hierarchy of adverbs.

This subject-hosting phrase can be a TP with an EPP feature that acts as a probe, initiating agreement with a similarly valued head in the probe’s domain (Pesetsky, 2000),\(^3\) but does not have to be. For example, this layer can be many different sizes in terms of number of functional projections, and Baker and Willie (2010) demonstrate that in Ibibio the highest head in this layer, be it TP, MoodP, or even as low as AspP as in the subjunctive, bears the EPP feature that acts as a probe to trigger agreement with the subject. Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007) take it a step further and argue that at the very top of the inflectional layer there is a Subject Phrase (SubjP) that acts as an interface between the TP system and the CP domain above. This special SubjP, whose head acts as a probe for a nominal for its specifier position, has a deeply woven relationship with the head above it, the first in the Left Periphery proper, Finite Phrase (FinP).

\(^2\)As opposed to lexical aspect encoded by a verb.

\(^3\)Pesetsky (2000, p.2) follows Chomsky (2000) in defining the probe’s domain as its c-command domain. This assumes that probes always search downward for similarly valued features to establish an Agree relationship with. Baker and Willie (2010) find through the incredibly rich agreement system in Ibibio that probes search upward. They argue this is a specific parameter of the language.
The Left Periphery:
The interface between a propositional content (expressed by the IP) and the superordinate structure (a higher clause or, possibly, the articulation of discourse, if we consider a root clause).

Considering this definition in relation to Ibibio’s phenomena that interact with this domain, the various systems within it and diagnostics to test them must be defined. Let us look into the left periphery in detail, beginning with the largest system.

2.1.1 The Force-Finiteness system. The two heads marking the boundaries of this system host mainly complementizers. These are elements that contain information regarding the clausal mood (Indicative, Subjunctive, etc.), finiteness, and features that end up being inherited by T (Chomsky, 2000). The complementizers exist in the high Force$^*$ or the low Fin$^*$. The rudimentary tense features that a complementizer has (finiteness) is interpreted at Fin$^*$ and the mood feature in Force$^*$, where the complementizer is normally pronounced. While this system envelops almost the entire CP$^4$, it may be nonexistent or reduced in defective clauses such as those with infinitival T heads. Besides these special cases, ForceP and FinP contain the entire left periphery as in (1).

2.1.2 The Focus Field. Also called the Topic-Focus System (Rizzi, 1997), this domain within the Force-Finiteness system contains XPs that are pragmatically highlighted or quantificational.$^5$ These can be Topics, Foci, and $\textit{wh}$-items. Topics do not exclusively appear within this system in Ibibio, and for this reason we will refer to this as the Focus Field. Focus is also a primary function of phenomena interaction with this system as well like quantification.

Focus is a feature of a lexical item that denotes relevant or salient information in a clause. It is a highlighting device that interacts with syntax (displacement), semantics (operator evaluation), phonology (nuclear pitch accents), and pragmatics (information structure). The element bearing a [+FOC] feature is either new information or is contrasted with some other element. When focus is contrastive, it denotes that there exists at least one set that is excluded from the relevant alternative sets that may be the referent (Molnár and Winkler, 2010). This type of focus exhaustively interprets its answer(s).

General strategies of focus include being syntactically marked by overt left dislocation to a phase edge, the creation of a gap (or resumptive pronoun) at its launching site, and/or the realization of an overt Focus marking. In Ibibio, focus induces displacement to a phase edge in two ways. Duncan et al. (2014) argue that verb focus displaces the foci to the left edge of the VP phase in a low FocP as in their example included below. Argument focus displaces foci to the left edge of the CP as we will investigate in detail.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{akùn ǎ-mà ả-dép íngwèt} \\
\hspace{1cm} akùn 3rd.SG-PST 3rd.SG-buy book \\
\hspace{1cm} ‘Akun bought the book.’
\item \textit{akùn ǎ-ke (á-)dèé-dép íngwèt í-ké} \\
\hspace{1cm} akùn 3rd.SG-C 3rd.SG-FOC.buy book 3rd.SG.S \\
\hspace{1cm} ‘Akun bought the book.’ (Duncan et al., 2014, p. 46)
\end{enumerate}

The head of the XP that host the foci contains an operator that probes for [+FOC] deeper within the structure that it attracts, satisfying the requirements of an \textit{Agree} relationship when both objects are in finally in a spec-head configuration. Focus can be identified (and disentangled from Topic) by means of interaction with Weak Crossover Effects (WCOs) due to the operator-variable nature of the construction. As well as focus, $\textit{wh}$-items also display this sensitivity.

2.1.3 Interrogative Phrase. \textit{IntP} is responsible for encoding Interrogative Force (Rizzi, 2001). In Ibibio, this is realized as an overt Q particle. \textit{Wh}-words however do not appear in Spec,\textit{IntP}. Instead, they are realized

$^4$XPs have even been detected above Force$^*$ such as Agr$_{wh}$P in Wolof (Torrence, 2013), MoodP$_{Evidential}$ (Haegeman, 2003), and HighOperatorPhrase (Scott, 2012).

$^5$By ‘quantificational’ I mean that the XPs form some dependency in an operator-variable structure with another element lower in the derivation.
in Spec, FocP. While this may seem counterintuitive, Wh- items have a long history of being associated with focus. Aboh and Pfau (2011) find that wh- expressions are not inherently interrogative (like heads of relative clauses) and therefore the movement of such phrases is not triggered by a need to clause-type for Interrogative Force. Instead, the wh- phrase itself is composed of at least a lexical specification of [+FOC] that is present during numeration. Chomsky (1995, p. 30) proposes that lexical entries are able to be composed of three categories of features: Semantic Features, Phonological Features, and Formal Features. The lexical array of words containing these features would be arranged in the computation then spelled out where the resultant structure interacts with the C-I and A-P interfaces.

This applies to wh- phrases in that [+FOC] is an inherent Formal Feature of their lexical entries in wh-movement languages (as well as the entries of FOC particles like kê). This feature mandates an operator-variable structure due to its quantificational nature whose dependency is shown by Aboh and Pfao (2011, p. 121) to perhaps be ‘required cross-linguistically for the identification of the content of the question’ rather than clause-typing for interrogative force’. Instead, a (potentially null) Q marker in IntP does this, and wh- items specify the content of the desired information. This separation of wh- and interrogativity is in alignment with the cartographic mapping of one feature to one projection as in Rizzi (2004). Furthermore, Ibibio’s marking of wh- expressions with a focus marker, as well as its overt realization of a higher Q marker corroborate this disentanglement.

2.2. Diagnostics. To test the viability of the structure in (1) in relation to Ibibio, as well as the cartographic assumptions of clause structure, the following tests will be used. Argument Focus morphology will lay out basic focalization tactics. The relationship between focused arguments, functional focus markers, and complementizers will establish the basic position of the Focus Field in the Ibibio’s periphery, if at all.

Next, since wh- items supposedly land in Spec,FocP, they should be predicted to be in complementary distribution with focused arguments, suggesting that they compete for the same semantic function and structural position. If so, then their structural relationship with complementizers would also parallel those of argument focus. Furthermore, the morphology of argument focus and wh- movement should be identical.

Moving to IntP, the Q marker nîtê provides an easily detectable head for IntP. To test for the supposed high position of IntP, we may combine it with focalized constituents to verify this position. Adverbials that occur high within the periphery, such as evaluative or evidential ones, will determine the upper limits in which IntP may appear.

Finally, the positions of different complementizers will determine the structure of the Force-Finiteness system. These will be examined by their relationships with subjunctive and infinitival clauses as well as adverbials. The results of these tests will yield the structure in (2).

3. Testing for FocP

Our first test into the left periphery begins with focus. Typologically common for a Niger-Congo language, Ibibio leftwardly displaces foci into the periphery (Aboh, 2007). This activates the Focus Field and makes overt the Foc with the marker kê. This will be our main indicator of the presence of Foc opposed to a C because, as I show below, this can co-occur with a higher complementizer of the same clause.

A secondary indication that focus is present is the morphology on T. Clauses that contain a focused, contrasted, or quantified constituent mark their presence on T with a different, nonneutral paradigm than basic neutral sentences. For example, in a simple past tense clause without contrast or focus, mà is how T is realized but those containing contrastive or quantificational elements make use of the nonneutral tense marker is kê.

3.1. Argument Focus. Ibibio’s strategy for focusing nominals share characteristics with wh- movement such as gapping at launching sites and manifestation of overt kê. The standard method of focusing is demonstrated in (8b) below where arguments of a matrix clause are focalized. Example (8c) highlights the subject/object asymmetry of focus that Duncan et al. (2014) have argued for. The grammatical counterpart to (8c) is illustrated in (8d).
Ibibio’s strategy for focusing nominals share characteristics with *wh*- movement such as gapping at launching sites and manifestation of overt *ké*. The standard method of focusing is demonstrated in (8b) below where arguments of a matrix clause are focalized. Example (8c) highlights the subject/object asymmetry of focus that Duncan et al. (2014) have argued for. The grammatical counterpart to (8c) is illustrated in (8d).

\[
(8) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{ini} \quad \text{á-má} \quad \text{á-jem} \quad \text{ñgwèt} \quad \text{ádò} \\
& \quad \text{Ini} \quad 3rd.SG-PST \quad 3rd.SG-look.for \quad \text{book} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{ Ini looked for the book’ }
\\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{ñgwèt} \quad \text{ádò} \quad \text{*ini} \quad \text{á-ké-jem} \\
& \quad \text{book} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{Ini} \quad 3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for \quad \text{The book FOC, Ini looked for’ }
\\
\text{c.} & \quad *\text{ini} \quad \text{á-ké} \quad \text{á-ké-jem} \quad \text{ñgwèt} \quad \text{ádò} \\
& \quad \text{Ini} \quad 3rd.SG-PST.FOC \quad 3rd.SG-PST-look.for \quad \text{book} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{ IniFOC looked for the book’ }
\\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{ini} \quad \text{á-ké-jén} \quad \text{ñgwèt} \quad \text{ádò} \\
& \quad \text{ini} \quad 3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for \quad \text{book} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{ IniFOC looked for the book’ }
\end{align*}
\]

Example (8b) demonstrates the three characteristics that Ibibio focalization has: left dislocation, realization of *ké*, and the nonneutral morphology of T. From this data, the contents of the left periphery seem to contain a Focus Phrase. However, one could argue that this is an arbitrary designation. Why could it not simply be a CP, especially since the Foc◦*ké* is morphologically identical to the complementizer *ké*? The answer is revealed in argument focus of objects from embedded clauses as in (9a) below.

\[
(9) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{átá} \quad \text{á-ké-ré} \quad \text{á-ké-jem} \quad \text{ñgwèt} \quad \text{ádò} \quad \text{ini} \quad \text{á-ké-yem} \\
& \quad \text{ata} \quad 3rd.SG-think \quad C \quad \text{book} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{Ini} \quad 3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for \quad \text{ ‘Ata thinks that Ini looked for the bookFOC.’ }
\\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{ini} \quad \text{á-ké-ré} \quad \text{ké} \quad \text{átá} \quad \text{á-má} \quad \text{á-diá} \quad \text{adési} \\
& \quad \text{Ini} \quad 3rd.SG-think \quad C \quad \text{Ata} \quad 3rd.SG-PST \quad 3rd.SG-eat \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{ ‘Ini thinks that Ata ate the rice.’ }
\\
\text{c.} & \quad *\text{ini} \quad \text{á-ké-ré} \quad \text{ké} \quad \text{átá} \quad \text{ké} \quad \text{á-ké} \quad \text{á-diá} \quad \text{adési} \\
& \quad \text{Ini} \quad 3rd.SG-think \quad C \quad \text{Ata} \quad \text{FOC} \quad 3rd.SG-PST.FOC \quad 3rd.SG-eat \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{ ‘Ini thinks that AtaFOC ate the rice.’ }
\end{align*}
\]

Now with a complementizer present, partial movement of *ñgwèt ádò* in (9a) allows us to see two things. First, there is indeed a good reason to call the position of the fronted constituent Spec,FocP instead of just Spec,CP although the heads of the two phrases are homophonous. Second, the ordering of the phrases is such that ForceP dominates FocP. This configuration does not hold for subject extraction as (9c) demonstrates though. The subject *átá* is unable to undergo the same treatment. Rizzi & Schlongsky (2006) propose a possible analysis for this subject/object asymmetry.

Rizzi (1997, 2004, 2006) views movement as being driven by a principle of UG: a requirement at the interfaces called Full Interpretation. This states that in order to be properly interpreted at the C-I interface, a phrase that has scope-discourse interpretive properties (such as *wh*-items, foci), must occupy the specifier position of a criterial position, one that possesses a head with those features. The *wh*- criterion is one such example. Rizzi and Schlongsky (2007) take this further by stating that once a criterion is met, the phrase can no longer leave it; it is frozen in place. This relates to Ibibio’s (9c) in that the subject *átá* has reached Spec,SubjP right below FinP, thus is frozen in it’s criterial position because of their proposed Subject Criterion. In this way, *átá* here is frozen in place.
3.2. Wh-Movement. Now we will examine three traits of wh-movement in Ibibio; compatibility with focus, relationship with complementizers, and morphological similarity to focus. Ibibio is a wh-in-situ language whose wh-items may be focalized. Consider the example below demonstrating this:

(10) a. ini á-yém ñsó
    Ini 3rd.SG-write what
    ‘What does Ini write?’

b. ñsó ké ini á-ké á-yém
    what FOC ini 3rd.SG-PST.FOC 3rd.SG-write
    ‘What did Ini write?’

This example demonstrates that focus and wh-movement are linked by similar morphology and syntactic structure. This sets the stage for identifying their competition for Spec,FocP. Let us now continue with the next test, checking how wh-items are realized in terms of Force via partial movement.

(11) a. ini á-kéré ké átá á-ké á-diá ñsó
    Ini 3rd.SG-think FOC ata 3rd.SG-PST.FOC 3rd.SG-eat what
    ‘What does Ini think that Ata ate?’ (in situ)

b. ini á-kéré ké ñsó ké átá á-ké á-diá
    Ini 3rd.SG-think C what FOC ata 3rd.SG-PST.FOC 3rd.SG-eat
    ‘What does Ini think that Ata ate?’ (partial)

c. ñsó ké ini á-kéré ké átá á-ké á-diá
    what FOC ini 3rd.SG-think C ata 3rd.SG-PST.FOC 3rd.SG-eat
    ‘What does Ini think that Ata ate?’ (full)

In example (11) we see that arguments in object position may undergo all wh-movement positions just as focalized objects do. Each overt movement type features Foc◦ ké, as evidenced in particular by (11b) that is dominated by Force◦, and all types trigger nonneutral tense markings on T◦. Partial wh-movement of subjects of embedded clauses are similarly disallowed as the examples in (12) demonstrate:

(12) a. ini á-kéré ké ìnìé í-ké í-diá ádésì
    Ini 3rd.SG-think C who AA-PST.FOC AA-eat rice
    ‘Who does Ini think ate the rice?’ (in situ)

b. *Ini á-kéré ké ìnìé *ké í-ké í-diá ádésì
    Ini 3rd.SG-think C who FOC AA-PST.FOC AA-eat rice
    ‘Who does Ini think that ate the rice?’ (partial)

c. ìnìé ké Ini á-kéré ké á-ké á-diá ádésì
    who FOC Ini 3rd.SG-think C 3rd.SG-PST.FOC 3rd.SG-eat rice
    ‘Who did Ini think that ate the rice?’ (full)

In example (12b), the ungrammaticality results from the focalization of ìnìé. This might be explained via Criterial Freezing (Rizzi and Schlosny, 2007) like in example (9c). The particular criterial position that prevents ìnìé from undergoing focalization in (12b) would then be Spec,SubjP. The Subject Phrase is a landing site for subjects that exists in the inflectional layer above TP but lower than the periphery (Cinque, 1999) that again here would be a criterial position attracting ìnìé. This also neatly corroborates Baker and Willie’s (2010) discovery that in Ibibio, an EPP feature is applied to the highest functional projection of the inflectional layer (e.g. MoodP, AspP), and cannot only be a feature of TP. This could be restated as a SubjP that occurs higher than all the projections in the Inflectional Layer.

Languages with multiple wh-phrases (like Russian) have been analyzed as parameterizing a ‘High Operator Phrase’ that occurs high in the peripheral structure (Scott, 2012). This is a unique position that hosts items with many different features associated with quantification (negation, wh-) and occurs in the matrix clauses. Scott (2012) uses this phrase to reanalyze the traditional dichotomy that Rudin (1988) outlined of multiple wh-languages. Namely those who adjoin wh-items to CP (based on insensitivity to superiority effects) and those languages that allow for multiple specifier positions within CP. Scott (2012) instead finds superiority effects in languages such as Russian that previously were thought to have none, and the High Operator Phrase is invoked to explain this.
3.3. Preliminary conclusions. Using several lines of evidence such as argument *wh*-items under focus (especially partially moved *wh*-phrases) and focus fronting the Focus Field of Ibibio can be said to minimally contain the following phrases in (13) in this particular order:

(13) Ibibio’s Preliminary Left Periphery:

![Diagram of Ibibio's Preliminary Left Periphery]

4. Force-Finiteness

The largest system within the expanded CP is the Force-Finiteness system. This is the structure of the clause that is responsible for serving as the link between the clause’s “propositional content (expressed by IP)” and the superordinate structure” as defined by Rizzi (1997, p. 283). It contains the great majority of the phrases of the periphery. Its basic functions are to fulfill clausal typing (Cheng, 1997) at Force◦ and supply rudimentary temporal information at Fin◦, namely finiteness. IntP participates in the clause-typing of Interrogative Force thus is relevant for ForceP. At the other end of the system is the Mod(ifier)P that serves to host adverbial ‘adjuncts’ that modify the proposition in TP. This system is usually absent in defective clauses (eliminating the possibility of a Focus Field or Topic System) and truncated in limited clauses such as the subjunctive. Let us begin the examination with the IntP high in the system.

4.1. IntP and polar questions. In Ibibio, there are three ways to signal that a clause is typed with Interrogative Force. The first is pragmatic. There is no surface difference between the clause-typing of Declarative or Interrogative Forces, the context of the utterance makes the speaker’s intentions clear (Essien, 1990). This is the most common form of questioning the proposition of a clause. The second way is to use a rising intonation pattern on the final word of the clause. The final method uses a syntactic marker *nt`e clause-initially. Unlike *wh*-questions, polar questions of this type use the neutral tense marker paradigm (Essien, 1990, p. 155). Consider the following examples below:

(14) a. *nt`e m-m`e-j`a`i`a
   Q 1st.SG-PRES-be.pretty
   ‘Am I pretty?’

b. *nt`e am`ı m-m`e-j`a`i`a
   Q 1st.SG 1st.SG-PRES-be.pretty
   ‘Am I pretty (opposed to another person)’

c. *nt`e am`ı k`e m-m`e-j`a`i`a
   Q 1st.SG FOC 1st.SG-NEUT-be.pretty
   ‘Am I FOC pretty?’

In example (14a), the question marker *nt`e appears to be above TP. This can be seen in adding the pronoun am`ı as in example (14b) where its presence also introduces a contrastive reading according to my consultant. This does not appear to be contrastive focus because the verb bears no such morphology. This pronoun also cannot occupy Spec,FocP as (14c) demonstrates. This may also be due to freezing effects. The Q marker occupies some position high in the clause and looking at embedded clauses reveals just how high. Consider the examples below where *nt`e alone may only appear in the matrix clause.

(15) a. *nt`e ini á-kéré k`e am`ı m-m`e-j`a`i`a
   Q Ini 3rd.SG-think C 1st.SG 1st.SG-NEUT-be.pretty
   ‘Does Ini think that I am pretty?’
From the examples in (15), it seems that *nitè must occupy a phrase high in the matrix clause. Consider the examples in (16) where Speech-act adverbials that occur right next to ForceP in a Topic Phrase are inserted above *nitè. Speech-act adverbials are generated in high in the structure and do not occur without such parenthetical use. We see that in Ibibio this pattern holds as well:

(16) a. *nitè ın akpaniko ini á-kéré kè àmì ńt-mé-jàìjà
    Q in truth Ini 3rd.SG-think C 1st.SG 1st.SG-PST-be.pretty
    ‘Honestly, does Ini think that I am pretty?’

b. *nitè ın akpaniko ini á-kéré kè àmì ńt-mé-jàìjà
    Q in truth Ini 3rd.SG-think C 1st.SG 1st.SG-PST-be.pretty
    ‘Honestly, does Ini think that I am pretty?’

The PP kè akpaniko in (16a) has a parenthetical reading to it, suggesting it exists in the peripheral structure. It cannot occur below the Q marker as in (16b). This reflects the necessary existence of a phrase, perhaps TopP, that must dominate the interrogative Q marker’s phrase. We can call this phrase IntP. Furthermore, example (17) below demonstrates the order of IntP in relation to focalized constituents:

(17) nitè ǹgwèt ádò kè ini á-kè-yem
    Q book DET FOC Ini 3rd.SG-PAST-look.for
    ‘Did Ini look for the book?’

4.1.1 Complementizer *mmê and Q-marker *nitè. While the Q marker cannot occur by itself in an embedded clause as in example (15b), it may appear in an embedded clause in conjunction with a special complementizer: *mmê. Consider the following examples adapted from Major (2014, p. 569) illustrating the basic distribution of *mmê:

(18) a. ekpe á-má á-bíp *mmê afó dìyà á-dí
    ekpe 1st.SG-PAST 1st.SG-ask whether you FUT 2nd.SG-come
    ‘Ekpe asked whether you will come.’

b. *dí-jongo-kè *mmê ekpe á-má á-dí
    1st.SG-know-NEG whether Ekpe 3rd.SG-PAST 3rd.SG-come
    ‘I don’t know whether Ekpe came.’

c. ekpe á-má á-bíp *mmê nsó kè á-kè táém
    ekpe 3rd.SG-PAST 3rd.SG-ask whether what FOC 3rd.SG-PAST-cook
    ‘Ekpe asked what you cooked.’

In example (18a), the complementizer occurs exactly where kè would, preceding the embedded clause after the matrix V. Example (18b) demonstrates this is also the case when negation is included. Example (18c) illustrates how it may precede a wh-item focalized to Spec,CP. These ordering facts suggest that the complementizer lies between ForceP and FocP.

Rizzi (1997) positions such complementizers in Spec,ForceP. Van Gelderen (2004) argues that these complementizers originate in Spec,FocP. This occupation of ForceP blocks wh-movement because its specifier position is the escape hatch that wh-items move through to a higher clause. Van Gelderen (2004) then argues that such complementizers then finally move to Rizzi’s (1997) proposed position; Spec,ForceP. This landing site accounts for English’s ordering of *whether > that. This ordering is similarly reflected in Ibibio as example (19a) shows:
(19) a. ini á-ké dí-jongo-ké ınmê itê âtâ á-mâ á-día
Ini 3rd.SG-PAST.FOC PAST.FOC-think-NEG whether Q Ata 3rd.SG-PAST 3rd.SG-eat
adêsi
rice
‘Ini doesn’t know whether or not Ata ate the rice.’
b. m-mê kéré ınmê àngê ikpê ikê wêt ñgwêt
1st.SG-PRES think whether who ikpe AA-PAST.FOC write book
‘I wonder who wrote the book.’ (Qin, 2014, p. 631)

In example (19a), we see an embedded question introduced by the interrogative complementizer. It appears above the Q marker, but below the VP of the matrix clause. In example (19b), the complementizer appears before the wh-word in another embedded question that it introduces. This demonstrates that ınmê behaves similarly to kéré and that it appears high in the CP of the embedded clauses it introduces.

4.2. Defective T systems in truncated clauses. Starting with clauses that have little or no CP domain, we will examine Ibibio’s infinitival and Subjunctive clauses. These types of clauses are thought to have T heads that contain a bundle of incomplete features (Chomsky, 2000). Phi-features (such as number, gender, and person) together form a bundle of features. This is somewhat at odds of a cartographic approach that attempts to map one feature to one head. When one of these phi-bundles is missing a feature, it is said to be defective. This defectivity of Tⁿ in such clauses makes the phrase unsuitable for a SubjP given its truncated nature (Rizzi, 2004). If this is true, then in Ibibio as well there should be no ability for an active Focus Field. Let us test Ibibio’s infinitival clauses against these claims.

4.2.1 Infinitival clauses. Defective T systems involve a TP that is selected by a higher VP, instead of the normal merging of TP with a higher CP. At a very basic level, this can be observed by the absence of a possible complementizer in the embedded, truncated clause. Consider the examples below where the invariant T adì appears in the embedded clause:

(20) a. ini á-kêmê adì bok efere
Ini 3rd-SG-may INF cook soup
‘Ini may cook soup.’
b. ini á-kêmê adì sì-bok efere
Ini 3rd-SG-may INF IMPF-cook soup
‘Ini may be cooking soup.’
c. efere ké ini á-kêmê adì bok
soup FOC Ini 3rd-SG-may INF cook
‘Ini may cook soupFOC.’
d. *ini á-kêmê efere ké adì bok
Ini 3rd-SG-may soup FOC INF cook
‘Ini may cook soupFOC.’

In example (20a), no agreement appears on the Tⁿ adì and the subject has been raised to a clause-initial position. The displacement is verified by the fact that bok is transitive and requires an agent and theme and ini is phonetically realized in a different position than it is interpreted as. Ibibio’s infinitival clauses also contain an AspP as is demonstrated in (20b) where the imperfect aspect is able to be encoded between TP and VP. Example (20c) demonstrates that a long distance dependency between the object of the infinitival clause and the CP domain of the matrix is possible. This means that efere is able to form a dependency through the truncated CP domain of the embedded clause, perhaps directly to the matrix CP. Example (20d) illustrates the inability for an activated Focus Field to appear in this type of clause, confirming the generalizations of Rizzi (1997) regarding these clause types.

In order for such clauses to be clause-typed according to Cheng’s (1997) CTH, there must at least be some remnant of CP in the left periphery since it is the phrase responsible for clause-typing. Rizzi (2004)
argues that in these limited C-systems, FinP will always exist to interact with the lower TP-domain. FinP provides the rudimentary temporal distinction that Chomsky (2000) argues is inherited by T°. Thus as we can see that T° does exist in the infinitival clauses in the form of adì, then FinP above it must have been present in order for T° to receive the nonfinite feature. This would also allow for a very limited structure in the periphery, still allowing for clause-typing to occur.

4.2.2 Subjunctive clauses. A Subjunctive clause is another type of truncated clause in at least Ibibio. In Ibibio, they occur without a possible complementizer to introduce them (Baker and Willie, 2010). This is one sign that there may be no ForceP. Consider the following examples in (45) where the matrix verb yèm selects for these reduced clauses.

(21) a. Ini á-yèm okon á-bok efere
    Ini 3rd.SG-want Okon 3rd.SG-cook soup
    ‘Ini wants that Okon cooks soup.’

b. Ini á-yèm okon á-si-bok efere
    Ini 3rd.SG-want Okon 3rd.SG-IMP-cook soup
    ‘Ini wants that Okon is cooking soup.’

c. * Ini á-yèm ké okon á-si-bok efere
    Ini 3rd.SG-want C Okon 3rd.SG-IMP-cook soup
    ‘Ini wants that Okon is cooking soup.’

In examples (21a) and (21b), the embedded verb displays many features of matrix verbs, namely that it agrees in phi-features with its subject and it also can encode aspect, revealing at least an AspP (21b). There is however a notable absence of an overt T°, even in its infinitival form adì as in (20). Example (21c) shows that the insertion of material in Force° is disallowed. Instead, it forces a negative reading of the embedded proposition as in (22):

(22) Ini á-yèm ké okon á-bok efere
    Ini 3rd.SG-want NEG Okon 3rd.SG-cook soup
    ‘Ini wants that Okon is not cooking soup.’

The instance of ké here is not the focus marker or complementizer, but is used to mark negation in specific situations. In most nonnegated sentences, negation is marked by a suffix composed of a homorganic consonant followed by a vowel that undergoes vowel harmony. Duncan et al. (2014) argue that this suffix is the result of V raising-to-NEG in nonhortative and noncontrastive matrix clauses. In instances where V does not merge with NEG, it appears before the verb as the invariant morpheme ké as in the examples below. Just to demonstrate negation, the following examples are provided:

(23) n-ýíp-pé
    1st.SG-steal-NEG
    ‘I have not stolen.’

Without a T°, it can be predicted that there would be no CP domain either for this clause. Example (24) below confirms this, even when omitting the problematic complementizer ké from the example in (21c).

(24) a. * Ini á-yèm (ke) efere ké okon á-si-bok
    Ini 3rd.SG-want C soup FOC Okon 3rd.SG-IMP-cook
    ‘Ini wants that Okon is cooking soupFOC.’

b. efere ké Ini á-yèm okon á-si-bok
    soup Foc Ini 3rd.SG-want Okon 3rd.SG-IMP-cook
    ‘Ini wants that Okon is cooking soupFOC.’
These facts together suggest that the subjunctive clauses in Ibibio may maximally contain an AspP and NegP. The specifier position of AspP phrase may host the subject, if it is the case that the highest phrase of a TP domain contains the EPP feature that attracts a nominal to it (Baker and Willie, 2010). This however would not account for the example in (22) where NegP appears because negation occurs within the embedded CP and before the subject of the clause thus cannot be hosting it in Spec,NegP. The reason for this is unclear. Finally, (24b) shows normal focalization of a constituent within a subjunctive clause. These ordering patterns of truncated clauses support Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) generalizations that defective clauses that lack complete Force-Finiteness system also lack the substructures (such as the Focus Field) within them, although the presence of T° in infinitival clauses suggest that there is at least some piece in the periphery, FinP, responsible for the inheritance of temporal information to T°.

4.3. Adverbials. Adverbial phrases are another instance of structure high in the clause. Cinque’s (1999) massive cross-linguistic survey explores how different classes of adverbials are found to be each assigned a particular functional projection in a specific order. This ordering, like Rizzi’s Left Periphery, is posited to be a language universal. With similarly strong theoretical predictions as Rizzi’s, Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy of adverbials can be tested using Ibibio.

At the top of this hierarchy high in the CP domain, Cinque (1999) finds adverbials related to the speaker’s judgments of the speech act, or mood. These adverbs fall into three classes that are found to be ordered in the periphery in the following way:

(25) Speech-Act > Evaluative > Evidential

In Ibibio, examples of Speech-Act and Evaluative adverbial phrases are ké akpaniko (‘honestly’) and ké ndj:kiso (‘unfortunately’) respectively. Cinque (1999) proposes that this hierarchy is universally rigid thus we should find that the order of these two adverbial phrases is too. Consider the data below:

(26) ké akpaniko ñgwèt ádò ké ini á-ké-yem
    in truth book DET FOC Ini 3rd.SG-PAST-look.for
    ‘Honestly, Ini looked for the book.’

(27) ké ndj:kiso ñgwèt ádò ké ini á-ké-yem
    in bad.luck book DET FOC Ini 3rd.SG-PAST-look.for
    ‘Unfortunately, Ini looked for the book.’

The sentences in (26) and (27) demonstrate that the phrase they occupy dominates FocP. The two phrases are able to occur in the same sentence as well, however we were unable to compose them using FocP. Instead, consider the following examples below where the two adverbials are identified as peripheral elements by their relation to the polar question marker ñtë:

(28) ké ndj:kiso ké akpaniko ñtë ini á-ké-yem
    PREP bad.luck PREP truth Q Ini 3rd.SG-PAST-look.for book DET
    ‘Unfortunately, did Ini honestly look for the book?’

(29) *ké akpaniko ké ndj:kiso ñtë ini á-ké-yem
    PREP truth PREP bad.luck Q Ini 3rd.SG-PAST-look.for book DET
    ‘Honestly, did Ini unfortunately look for the book?’

In example (28), both PPs occur above the Q marker, however when their position is reversed as in (29), an ungrammaticality arises. This suggests that the two phrases occupy two different dedicated phrases in the periphery. Furthermore, the ké marker on the verb appears. This nonneutral tense marker on V tells us that sometime within the sentence is contrastive, quantified, or negated, perhaps the subject ini. All in all, this suggests that Cinque’s (1991) hierarchy of adverbials in the periphery holds for Ibibio as well.
4.4. ModP. The lowest phrase in the Force-Finiteness systems is a special phrase that Rizzi (2004, p. 241) identifies as one that hosts adverbials that modify the propositional content of the IP below it. This phrase is the natural position for peripheral adverbials (i.e., those that are not highlighted by Topic or Focus). Cinque's (1999) universal hierarchy of adverbs places epistemic adverbs, such as 'possibly', in the periphery. In Ibibio, the epistemic adverb akpena, denotes the speaker's judgments about both their certainty about it and has a deontic flavor in that it also encodes how the speaker thinks the world ought to be. Consider the examples below which feature this adverb in a variety of positions:

(30) a. akpena ini a-di bok efere
   perhaps Ini 3rd.SG-FUT cook soup
   ‘Ini should probably be able to cook the soup.’

b. ini a-kérè ké akpena nte átá a-díá ădësì
   Ini 3rd.SG-think C perhaps ADV Ata 3rd.SG-eat rice
   ‘Ini thinks that Ata should probably eat rice.’

c. ini a-kérè ké ătá, akpena nịte a-díá ădësì
   Ini 3rd.SG-think C Ata perhaps ADV 3rd.SG-eat rice
   ‘Ini thinks that Ata, should probably eat rice.’

In example (30a), the adverb is placed in a matrix clause in its normally used position. In (30b), the adverb is given structural prominence by appearing in the the periphery. When it appears in this peripheral position, it must be accompanied by the adverbial nîtë (not to be confused with the overt Inter nîtë). This adverbial particle was identified by my native speaker as an adverb, as well as by a dictionary entry in Urua et al. (2004, p. 94). It has no meaning on its own, it is functional, and it must occur with adverbs placed high in the clause. This position would correspond to Rizzi's (2004) ModP, from which they may undergo further focalization or topicalization. The particle nîtë may be an overt realization of Mod° that attracts adverbials like akpena to their specifier position when highlighted by structural prominence in the periphery. Furthermore, they may be preceded by a topicalized constituent as (30c) shows. This at least demonstrates that it exists in the periphery, but future investigation into its relation to the other structures will confirm its exact position as well as investigating the interaction of other adverbials in relation to nîtë.

5. Conclusions

The locations journeyed through in this paper represent only a small fraction of the whole landscape of Ibibio’s Left Periphery. Consider again (2) restated below.

(2) Pieces of Ibibio’s Left Periphery
This structure in (2) represents at least five categories that must be present in Ibibio’s Left Periphery. The exact ordering of these phrases, especially ModP, must be investigated further, however this should represent the general layout of these functional projections in relation to one another, especially under assumptions of UG. I was unable to elicit any projections above ForceP, however many investigations into the CP domain of other closely-related languages reveal such projections (cf. Torrence 2013) thus it is conceptually possible for a language to do so. Furthermore, this configuration in relation to Topicalization has been left aside for future research (see Appendix). Assuming a cartographic view of the periphery, Ibibio’s possible projections in this domain are surely more numerous than those in (2), perhaps even hundreds exist. No language will have all these projections active in every clause, but rather parameterization activating the use of these dedicated functional heads builds the grammar, and by extension, the diversity of human language. The results of this study confirm the peripheral ordering Rizzi (1997) first explored, reflecting an underlying universal hierarchy. The findings support the idea of UG which reflects and posits an innate biological capacity for language in humans.
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My data on topicalization was insufficient to determine its structural configuration in the periphery, however was able to collect a few pieces of information that may be a part of the answer. Topics are disjoint constituents that are not quantificational (Rooth, 1992), define the aboutness or familiarity of the topicalized constituent (Kiss, 1998), do not convey new information like focus, and do not create scope (Lipták, 2010). Like focus however, they are able to be contrastive or noncontrastive, the latter being the most typical types of topic (Molnár and Winkler, 2010). They may occur in numerous positions throughout the periphery in Ibibio. Rizzi (2001) proposes an insertion of a TopP between every phrasal projection in the periphery. Stricter analyses define a Topic Field that only occurs above the Focus Field (Benincà and Poletto, 2004).

In the dialect of Ibibio of my language consultant, it seemed that a translation of ‘as for x, . . . ’ would accompany a noticeable pause between the argument and the remainder of the sentence, suggesting topicalization. The following examples demonstrate this where | indicates this pause:

(31)  

(a) Ini | ké idém ámò á-ké-yem  
Ini  
ké  
3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for  
DET  
‘As for Ini himself (opposed to someone else), he looked for the book’

(b) Iní  
3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for  
DET  
ké  
Prep  
self  
his  
‘Ini looked for the book by himself.’

(c) Iní  
3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for  
DET  
FOC  
Ini  
Prep  
self  
his  
‘As for Ini himself (not someone else), a bookFOC is what he was looking for.’ (Not: ‘A bookFOC is what Ini by himself was looking for.’)

A contrastive reading of the emphatic reflexive (ER) ké idém ámò in examples (31a) and (31c) is the only one available according to my language consultant. This means the denotation of the nominal element that the ER modifies is excluding at least one set of relevant alternatives that it is contrasting with. In (31a) the DP ini as well as the ER, have a parenthetical reading, indicating it may be structurally disjoint from the rest of the sentence. This is lost for ini in (31b) suggesting that it here occupies a regular subject position within the TP-domain. This example also has a different interpretation when the ER is closer to the verb,
one that does not exclude a set of alternatives in a contrastive way, but rather provides emphasis about how Ini performed the action alone.

Another interesting feature is that the verb bears the nonneutral tense marker ke- when there is no other obvious trigger for it (i.e. wh- movement, focalization, negation, quantifiers). This morphology is required for these structures, and this is not expected for a typical topicalization strategy. This indicates that the ER must account for this morphology. This constituent operates in contrastive or emphatic way, aligning with the purpose of the morphology on the verb. Example (31c) demonstrates that it can co-occur with a focalized constituent thus does not occupy Spec, FocP. Here again there is a parenthetical prosodic pausing that is necessary before the VP. My consultant also translated ini ké idém ámò preceded by as for and interpreted it as having a special emphatic quality. Perhaps it occupies a TopP. Consider the following examples:

(32) a. ke ídém ámò ké ini a-ké á-ké-yem ŋwèt ádò
   PREP self his FOC Ini 3rd.SG-PST.FOC 3rd.SG-PAST.FOC-look.for book DET
   ‘By himself, Ini looked for the book.’

b. *ini a-ké-yem ŋwèt ádò ke idém ámò
   Ini 3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for book DET PREP self his
   ‘Ini himself (opposed to someone else) looked for the book.’

c. ke akpaniko ŋwèt ádò ké ini ké idém ámò | akpena itè
   in truth book DET FOC Ini PREP self his probably ADV
   á-ké-yem
   3rd.SG-PST-look.for
   ‘Honestly, as for Ini himself, he should look for the bookFoc.’

In (32a), the ER may occupy Spec,FocP and the subject, ini, loses its parenthetical pause as just as it did in (30b). Another change when the ER is in this position comes with the translation. My native speaker said that when the ER is fronted like this, it is not contrastive with another entity as in (32b) and (32c). This suggests that the ER moves from a TP-internal position where it, along with the DP ini, are modifying the verb by their close proximity as in (31b).

Example (32c) demonstrates a number of items fronted to the periphery. What is important is that this demonstrates that there might indeed be TopP between the FocP with ŋwèt ádò in Spec,FocP and the epistemic adverb akpena that occupies the lowest position in the periphery. The examples in (33) below demonstrate some of these different possible topics occurring in embedded clauses:

(33) a. atá a-kéré ké ini ké idém ámò ké á-ké-yem ŋwèt ádò
   ata 3rd.SG-think C Ini PREP self his FOC 3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for book DET
   ‘Ata thinks that it was Ini, himself (opposed to someone else), looked for the book.’

b. *átá a-kéré ini ké idém ámò ké á-ké-yem ŋwèt ádò
   ata 3rd.SG-think Ini PREP self his C 3rd.SG-PST.FOC-look.for book DET
   ‘Ata thinks that it was Ini, himself (opposed to someone else), looked for the book.’

This data is inconclusive as to where exactly the TopPs exist in the configuration in (1). Topicalization in Ibibio seems to be free for the most part, and if it is the case that ERs are topics as Ahn (2010) suggests, then it too could be occupying some peripheral position. The one clear topic position I was able to detect can be seen in example (31a) where the subject was prosodically disjoint from the remainder of the clause and my consultant actually translated it using ‘as for’ which indicates topics in English. However, the rest of the structural positions are inconclusive.