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Abstract. Negative-polarity items in Büli, a Mabia (Gur) language spoken in Ghana, exhibit a mixed behavior between NCIs and NPIs (or between strong NPIs and weak NPIs). Thus, Büli presents a counterexample to Vallduví’s generalization that negative-polarity items come in two kinds. Adopting and extending the framework of Collins & Postal (2014) and Collins et al. (2017), we will show that the apparently mysterious mixed behavior of negative-polarity items in Büli can be explained by articulating an unary-NEG structure and syntax of reduplication.
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1. Diagnosing for NCIs and NPIs. Vallduví (1994) examined behaviors of negative-polarity items such as n-words and minimizers in Catalan and Spanish and proposed four diagnostic tests (1a)–(1d) to distinguish Negative Concord Items (NCIs) and Negative-Polarity Items (NPIs). Giannakidou (2000) further added clause-boundedness (1e) to the list. For example, any in (1) in English is diagnosed as an NPI (a weak NPI), while n-words in (2) in Spanish are considered to be an NCI (or a strong NPI) (see Ladusaw 1979, Haegeman & Zanuttini 1996, Haegeman 1995, Watanabe 2004, Giannakidou 2006, Giannakidou & Zeijlstra 2017, among others).

(1) English
a. Did you see anyone? (Question)
b. *Anyone did not come. (*Pre-negative subject position)
c. *I didn’t see almost anyone. (*Modification by almost)
d. *Anyone (I didn’t see). (as an answer to (1a)) (*Fragment answer)
e. I didn’t say I saw anyone. (Long-distance licensing)

(2) Spanish (Vallduví 1994, Penka 2011)
a. *¿Quieres nada? 2SG-want nothing ‘Do you want anything?’ (*Question)
b. Nada funciona. nothing 3SG-work ‘Nothing works.’ (Pre-negative subject position)
c. ¿A quien has visto? a who 2SG-PERF see ‘Who’d you see?’
   A (casi) nadie. almost no one
   ‘(Almost) no one.’ (Modification by almost/Fragment answer)
d. *No dije que había nada en el frigorífico.

‘I didn’t say that there was anything in the fridge.’

(*Long-distance licensing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCI</th>
<th>NPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-negative</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-negative</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifiability</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment Answer</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. NCI vs. NPI (Vallduví 1994, Giannakidou 2000)

Contrary to the generalization in Table 1, however, NCIs and NPIs do not always show systematic behaviors cross-linguistically. For example, Korsah & Murphy (2017) show that negative-polarity items in Gà behave like NCIs, but cannot be used as fragment answers (see also Collins et al. 2017 on Ewe and Hiraiwa (2019) on Okinawan).

Negative-polarity items in Bùlì, a Mabia (Gur) language spoken in Ghana, also exhibit a mixed behavior, but their distribution is different from those in Gà and Ewe, as shown in Table 2. They pattern with NCIs in that they can appear in pre-negative subject position, but they pattern with NPIs in that they are allowed in non-negative downward-entailing contexts, cannot be used as fragment answers, and are licensed long-distance (note that Bùlì lacks a straightforward counterpart of almost and hence modifiability of negative-polarity items cannot be tested). Thus, Bùlì presents yet another counterexample to Vallduví’s generalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCI</th>
<th>NPI</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Gà</th>
<th>Bùlì</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-negative</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-negative</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifiability</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment Answer</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Cross-linguistic Variations

Adopting and extending the framework of Collins & Postal (2014) and Collins et al. (2017), we will show that the apparently mysterious mixed behavior of negative-polarity items in Bùlì can be explained by articulating an unary-NEG structure and syntax of reduplication.

2. Negative-sensitive items in Bùlì.

2.1. Morphosyntax of negative-polarity items in Bùlì. Before examining each diagnostic test in Bùlì, let us first detail morphosyntactic properties of negative-polarity items in Bùlì (see Akanlig-Pare 2005, 2014).

Negative-polarity items in Bùlì come in two varieties, a form based on reduplication of a noun class (NC) pronoun wa/di/ka/ku/bu and a suffix -i (e.g. wàa-(i)wàa-i ‘anyone’) (hereafter
reduplicated noun class pronouns: Table 3) and one based on reduplication of an indefinite ordinary noun (e.g. nür nür ‘anyone/any person’) (hereafter reduplicated indefinite nominals: Table 4)\(^1\). In nominal reduplication, just as in all compounds, coda of the preposed stem is deleted and hence partial reduplication results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Wh</th>
<th>Negative-Polarity Items</th>
<th>Universal/FC</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Relativizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa</td>
<td>wà-nà</td>
<td>wāā(-i) wāā-ı</td>
<td>wāā-ı méeñá</td>
<td>wāā-ı</td>
<td>-wāā-ı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di</td>
<td>dì-nà</td>
<td>dīī(-i) dīī-ı</td>
<td>dīī-ı méeñá</td>
<td>dīī-ı</td>
<td>-dīī-ı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>kà-nà</td>
<td>kāā(-i) kāā-ı</td>
<td>kāā-ı méeñá</td>
<td>kāā-ı</td>
<td>-kāā-ı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>kù-nà</td>
<td>kūū(-i) kūū-ı</td>
<td>kūū-ı méeñá</td>
<td>kūū-ı</td>
<td>-kūū-ı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu</td>
<td>bù-nà</td>
<td>būū(-i) būū-ı</td>
<td>būū-ı méeñá</td>
<td>būū-ı</td>
<td>-būū-ı</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Negative-Polarity Items in Bùli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indefinite NP</th>
<th>Negative-Polarity Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>nür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>bík</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hen</td>
<td>kpiāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>yér</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Reduplicated Indefinite Nominals in Bùli

Examples (3) illustrate the use of these expressions with negation.\(^2\)

(3) Bùli

\[\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ Mí àn nyã wãã(-i) wãã-ı ä.} \\
& 1SG NEG see.PERF NC-i NC-i SFP \text{ ‘I did not see anyone.’} \\
b. & \text{ Mí àn nyã nür nür ä.} \\
& 1SG NEG see.PERF person person SFP \text{ ‘I did not see anyone.’}
\end{align*}\]

Each of the morphemes (wa/dì/ka/ku/bu) in Table 3 is a noun class pronoun. This is illustrated in the following example with wa.\(^3\)

\(^1\) We assume that a long vowel is purely phonological, but it could be an independent morpheme with its own function. We also leave open the source of the mid-tones for these items, as independent noun class pronouns have low tones.

\(^2\) The sentence-final particle ŋ (also realized as yã or wã phonetically) appears post-object position in negative and question sentences. But it never appears when the object is followed by an adjunct.

\(^3\) We leave it open whether the pronoun wa itself in (4) is a noun class pronoun or a noun class marker with a null pronoun \([NCP \text{ wa [NP } \emptyset ]]\).

\[\begin{align*}
(i) & \text{ Bùli} \\
& \text{ Mí àn nyã wãã(-i) wãã-ı (*ã) délã (*ã).} \\
& 1SG NEG see NC-i here NC-i here SFP \text{ ‘I did not see anyone here.’}
\end{align*}\]

We assume it is more like a conjunct/disjunct marker and not a negative particle of a bipartite negation structure, unlike Ewe (see Collins et al. 2017). See Section 4.

\[\begin{align*}
(\text{We leave it open whether the pronoun wa itself in (4) is a noun class pronoun or a noun class marker with a null pronoun [NCP \text{ wa [NP } \emptyset ]]\).
\end{align*}\]
Following Hiraiwa et al. (2017), we assume that actual (in)definiteness of noun class pronouns is marked by tone (definiteness with high tone and indefiniteness otherwise) and that the suffix -i is for marking indefiniteness SOME. This makes sense because -i also appears in existential quantifiers and relativizers.

Reduplication is obligatory for negative-polarity items (7a)–(7b). Without reduplication, waa-r functions as an existential quantifier that is not negative-polarity (7c)–(7d).

With this in mind, let us examine syntactic distribution of negative-polarity items in Bùli.4

4 There is another form ba baa-r (note the short form ba), which can only be used in plural noun class pronouns and expresses a partitive meaning ‘some of X’.

(i) Bùli

   1SG see.PERF NC-i NC-i NC-i
   ‘I saw some of them.’

b. Mí àn nyá wåa(-î) wåa-î à.
   1SG NEG see.PERF NC-i NC-i SFP
   ‘I didn’t see.PERF anyone.’

   1SG see.PERF someone
   ‘I saw someone.’

d. Mí àn nyá wåa-î à.
   1SG NEG see.PERF someone SFP
   ‘I didn’t see someone/anyone.’
2.2. Are negative-sensitive items in Bùlì NCIs or NPIs? Both reduplicated noun class pronouns and reduplicated indefinite nominals in Bùlì cannot appear in positive declarative clauses. On the other hand, the fact that they can be licensed in questions indicate that they are so-called (weak) NPIs (van der Wouden 1997).

(8) Bùlì
a. Mi *(àn) nyà wāā(-î) wāā-î ā.
1SG NEG see.PERF NC-i NC-i SFP
‘I did not see anyone.’ (*Positive declarative)
b. Fí nyà wāā(-î) wāā-î ā?:
2SG see.PERF NC-i NC-i SFP
‘Did you see anyone?’ (Question)

(9) Bùlì
a. Mi *(àn) nyà nùr nùr ā.
1SG NEG see.PERF person person SFP
‘I did not see anyone.’ (*Positive declarative)
b. Fí nyà nùr nùr ā?:
2SG see.PERF person person SFP
‘Did you see anyone?’ (Question)

As expected, being (weak) NPIs, they cannot appear as fragment answer as shown in (10)–(11), in response to a question like *Who did you see? or Did you see anyone?*⁵

(10) Bùlì
*Wāā(-î) wāā-î (ā).
NC-i NC-i SFP
‘No one.’ (*Fragment answer)

(11) Bùlì
*Nùr nùr (ā).
person person SFP
‘No one.’ (*Fragment answer)

Finally, they can be licensed by a non-clausemate negation.

(12) Bùlì
Mi kàn pōlī/wēēnī [àyîn mí nyà wāā(-î) wāā-î ā].
1SG NEG think/say C 1SG see.PERF NC-i NC-i SFP
‘I don’t think/will not say that I saw anyone.’ (Long-distance licensing)

(13) Bùlì
Mi kàn pōlī/wēēnī [àyîn mí nùr nùr ā].
1SG NEG think/say C 1SG see.PERF person person SFP
‘I don’t think/will not say that I saw any person.’ (Long-distance licensing)

⁵ There are some speakers who allow for such fragment answers in Bùlì (Abdul-Razak Sulemana p.c.). Those speakers may be interpreting the NPIs in (10)–(11) as NCIs (see Section 4). They also tend to require the sentence-final particle ŋ in fragment answers, while the first author and other speakers find fragment answers ungrammatical, irrespective of ŋ, as (10)–(11) show. We leave the issue for future research.
All of these diagnostic tests corroborate evidence that these items are (weak) NPIs. However, they also pattern with NCIs in that they can appear in subject position (followed by sentential negation).

(14) Bûlî
Wââ(-î) wâ-î àn chêng Wiâgâ.
NC-i NC-î NEG go.PERF Wiaga
‘No one went to Wiaga.’

(15) Bûlî
Núr núr àn chêng Wiâgâ.
person person NEG go.PERF Wiaga
‘No one went to Wiaga.’

In the discussion below, we offer a theoretical analysis for the apparently mixed behaviors in the framework of Collins & Postal (2014). We focus on reduplicated noun class pronouns, as basically the same analysis is available for reduplicated indefinite nominals, too.

3. Syntax of pre-negative subject NPIs and (partial) reduplication. Collins & Postal (2014) and Collins et al. (2017) propose that NPIs come in two varieties. One has a unary-NEG structure and the other has a binary-NEG structure.

(16) a. [[NEG1 SOME] NP] (NCIs/strong NPIs)
b. [[NEG1 [NEG2 SOME]] NP] (weak NPIs)

They observe that ke-NPIs in Ewe are NCIs/strong NPIs because they cannot be licensed in questions or at long-distance. However, unlike any-NPIs in English, which are weak NPIs, they can appear in subject position (with sentential negation).

(17) Ewe (Collins et al. 2017)
Ame âdêké mé-vá nyê-afé-me o.
person any NEG1-come 1SG-house-inside NEG2
‘Nobody came to my house.’

(18) English (Collins et al. 2017)
Anybody didn’t come to my house.

They argue that the reason why the English sentence in (18) is ungrammatical, is because it has the derivation in (19). NEG1 raises to sentential negation position out of the NPI, while the remnant NPI raises to subject position.

(19) [DP2 [<NEG1> SOME] body] did NEG1 [VP come <DP2> to my house]

Here, the higher occurrence of NPI (i.e. DP2) c-commands the raised copy of NEG1. Thus, they propose condition (20), which prohibits such a structural relation.

(20) The Remnant Raising Condition (Collins et al. 2017)
If M = [DP [D<NEGx> SOME] NP], then no occurrence of M c-commands an occurrence of NEGx.

In contrast, they propose that ke in Ewe is a copy of the original NEG and argue that the Ewe example in (17) does not violate (20) “since a copy NEG, cNEG1 rather than <NEG1> fills
the original position of NEG1 in DP2. In effect, the copy NEG allows the structure to avoid a violation of (20), just as resumptive pronouns in certain English cases allow a structure to avoid a violation of island constraints.” (Collins et al. 2017). The derivation of (17) is given in (21).

(21) Ewe (Collins et al. 2017)

\[
\text{[Ame ádê-kê] mé-vá } \langle \text{DP2} \rangle \text{ nyê-afé-me o.}
\]

person SOME-cNEG1 NEG1-come 1SG-house-inside NEG2

‘Nobody came to my house.’

(Pre-negative subject position)

But their analysis is challenged by Büli. This is because there is no morphological evidence of a copy NEG, cNEG1 in the original position of NEG1 in DP2, which is necessary in order to avoid a violation of (20).

(22) Büli

\[
\text{Wàá(-Î) wáá-Î àn chëng Wiágà. (=}(14))
\]

NC-i NC-i NEG go.PERF Wiaga

‘No one went to Wiaga.’

(Pre-negative subject position)

Nevertheless, we argue that Collins et al’s analysis, once we articulate substructures that reduplication targets in Büli, provides a principled account for the apparently mysterious behavior. To see this, first recall that NPIs in Büli are necessarily reduplicated.

(23) Büli

\[
\text{Mí èn nyá } \text{ wáá(-Î) wáá-Î àa.}
\]

1SG NEG see.PERF NC-i NC-i SFP

‘I did not see anyone.’

(24) Büli

\[
\text{Mí nyá wáá-Î.}
\]

1SG see.PERF NC-i

‘I saw someone.’

Without reduplication, wáá-Î only has an existential quantifier reading (recall (7c)). Thus, reduplication is clearly the key to understanding the syntax of negative-polarity items in Büli. We follow Travis (2001) and Jackendoff (2008) to propose that certain instances of reduplication is syntactic. In particular, we adopt Travis’s theory of syntactic reduplication in which a reduplicant (RED) appears in the specifier of QP (where Q stands for a head with “quantity feature”, which we assume here that the Neg head in Büli has). This is illustrated in Figure 1.
We assume the structure in Figure 2 for existential quantifiers such as ‘somebody’. Bùlì is head-initial and NCP raises to the specifier of DP (see Hiraiwa et al. 2017 for relevant discussion on DP-internal word order).

![Figure 2. Existential quantifier 'somebody']()

The underlying structure of negative-polarity items in Bùlì is illustrated in Figure 3. We assume that NEG is located above DP and as it is a null affix, it undergoes affix-hopping to wāā.

![Figure 3. The underlying unary-Neg structure](image)

From the earlier discussions, it follows that reduplicated indefinite noun class pronouns in Bùlì should contain an odd number of NEGs, when they behave as NCIs and co-occur with sentential negation, while they should contain an even number of NEGs when they behave as (weak) NPIs.
Now, suppose reduplication targets NCP before affix-hopping in Figure 3. Note that NEG structurally c-commands SOME. Then we get the partially reduplicated structure in (25).

(25) \([\text{NCP } \text{wáá}] \text{[NegP NEG wáá -í]}\)

If, on the other hand, reduplication targets DP before affix-hopping, then we get the fully reduplicated structure in (26).

(26) \([\text{DP } \text{wáá -í}] \text{[NegP NEG wáá -í]}\)

As a result, both (25) and (26) have an unary-NEG structure, as shown in Figure 4. We argue that this reduplication is syntactic and the reduplicant \(\text{wáá(-í)}\) is located in the specifier of NegP (see Travis 2001 for syntactic reduplication).

![Figure 4. Reduplicated class pronouns with a unary-NEG structure](image)

This makes them an NCI and explains why they can appear in pre-negative subject position in Büli (14)–(15) This is because NEG is deeply embedded within the reduplicated indefinite noun class pronouns, just as such subject NPIs are grammatical in English (the data cited from Boeckx 2000; 362 and Bošković 2002; 179).

(27) a. [Pictures of anyone/*someone] did not seem [\(t\) to be available].
   b. [Pictures of any linguist] seem to no psychologist [\(t\) to be pretty].

On the other hand, suppose that reduplication after affix-hopping of Neg to NC. Then we get partially reduplicated structure (28) or fully reduplicated structure (29), depending on whether NCP or DP is targeted by reduplication.

(28) \([\text{NCP wáá-NEG }] \text{[NegP NEG wáá -í]}\)
(29) \([\text{DP wáá-NEG -í}] \text{[NegP NEG wáá -í]}\)

This time, NEG is “copied” as reduplication targets NCP or DP that contains NEG as shown in 5. As a result, both (28) and (29) have a binary-NEG structure. Assuming that the two NEG s cancel out each other (Collins et al. 2017, Watanabe 2004), they behave as (weak) NPIs. Thus, interaction of reduplication and affix-hopping of NEG correctly explains why
NPIs in Büli can be licensed by questions (8b)–(9b) and non-clause-mate negation (12)–(13), but are unable to occur as fragment answer (10)–(11).

**Figure 5. Reduplicated class pronouns with a binary-NEG structure**

One piece of supporting evidence that reduplicated noun class pronouns have a binary-NEG structure comes from the fact that they can be replaced by an existential quantifier *wa wa*-ı.

(30) Büli
   Fí nyá *wa wa*-ı ą?:
   2SG see.PERF NC-ı SFP
   ‘Did you see anyone?’

(31) Büli
   Mí kán pölî/wēënî àyîn mî nyá *wa wa*-ı wē *(w)*a-ı ā.
   1SG NEG think/say C 1SG see.PERF NC-ı NC-ı SFP
   ‘I don’t think/will not say that I saw anyone.’

(32) Büli
   Wَāa(-ı) wē *(w)*a-ı ąn chēng Wīāgā.
   NC-ı NC-ı NEG go.PERF Wiaga
   ‘No one went to Wiaga.’

Weak NPIs, whose two NEGs cancel each other, have a positive interpretation, just as existential quantifiers do.

The syntactic reduplication proposed above also explains why the forms *wa wa*-ı *wa wa* and *wa wa* *wa wa* are not attested, because reduplication takes place after *wa wa*-ı is built in syntax.

4. Parameter. Collins et al. (2017) propose a parameter that allows/disallows binary-NEG (Type 2) nominal NPIs. English allows, but Ewe doesn’t allow, a binary-NEG structure. They also suggest an implicational relation that a language having binary-NEG nominal NPIs will also have unary-NEG nominal NPIs.
Bulu allows an unary-NEG structure underlyingly, and a binary-NEG structure is derived through reduplication by copying NEG. Thus, our analysis provides support for the implication relation in that a binary-NEG structure is structurally based on a unary-NEG structure. We leave it for future research to investigate whether there are other types of NPIs in Bulu. Reduplication is not an unfamiliar strategy for forming negative-polarity items cross-linguistically. It is observed in Vietnamese, Ainu, Yoruba, Malagasy, etc. (Haspelmath 1997). According to (Haspelmath 1997: 179), however, no languages that use partial reduplication were in his sample. Bulu, in this respect, offers a case of NPIs with partial reduplication.

One remaining important question is what reduplication is employed for. Reduplication is typically used to express plurality or iterated events (Moravcsik 1978, Travis 2001, Haspelmath 1997, among others). In Bulu, for one thing, reduplication is required in order to obtain two copies of NEG required for (weak) NPIs. There are also languages that use reduplication for building universal quantifiers/free choice items (Haspelmath 1997, Travis 2001, Cheng 2009). From this viewpoint, it is important to point out that universal quantifiers/free choice items in Bulu do not rely on reduplication (see Table 4). For another thing, Haspelmath (1997) conjectures that reduplication is used to express distributive plurality. We concur with his conjecture.

In Bulu, the form wāā-ī consists of a singular noun class pronoun and an indefiniteness marker. This is necessarily interpreted as singular. But NPIs are often considered to yield distributivity. It is not unnatural to think that reduplication is used (as a means of domain widening (Kadmon & Landman 1993) to yield required distributivity.

To summarize, we have proposed the following ingredients that compose NPIs in Bulu.

(33) Ingredients of NPIs in Bulu
   a. Indefiniteness SOME: -i (with noun class pronouns) or -∅ (with ordinary nouns)
   b. Negation NEG: -∅
   c. Neg-copying: reduplication
   d. Distributivity/Plurality: reduplication

5. Conclusion. Reduplicated indefinite noun class pronouns and reduplicated nominals in Bulu behave as NPIs in that they can appear in non-negative contexts and can be licensed at a long-distance. On the other hand, they behave as if they were NCIs in that they can appear in pre-negative subject position. We have argued that the mixed behavior can be explained if we articulate an unary/binary-NEG structure proposed in Collins & Postal (2014) and Collins et al. (2017) and understand which part of the structure reduplication targets.

There are remaining questions that must be answered in future studies. First, the existential quantifier wāā-ī cannot come in subject position in the absence of sentential negation (cf. (7c)). Instead, it is necessary to nominalize wāā-ī by prefixing a-.

(34) Bulu
   a. Wāā-ī *å(än) chēng Wīāgā.
      NC-i NEG go Wiaga
      ‘Someone didn’t go to Wiaga/No one went to Wiaga.’
   b. Å-wāā-ī chēng Wīāgā.
      Hm-NC-i go Wiaga
      ‘Someone went to Wiaga.’

It is also interesting and puzzling that the sentence-final particle a is missing when the NPI
appears in subject position. We don’t have a good account for these at this moment.

Second, NPIs in Bùli, while they can be licensed in questions, are not licensed in conditionals (see Collins et al. 2017 for a similar observation in Ewe).

(35) Bùli

*Fi dàn nyà wàà(-í) wàà-í, wëëë àtè ñ wòm.  
2SG COND see NC-í NC-í tell C 1SG hear

‘If you see anyone, please let me know ’  
(Conditional)

In contrast, an existential quantifier wàà-í can also appear in conditionals. This discrepancy needs to be explained, too.

(36) Bùli

Fi dàn nyà wàà-í, wëëë àtè ñ wòm.  
2SG COND see NC-í tell C 1SG hear

‘If you see anyone, please let me know ’  
(Conditional)
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