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APPENDIX - SUMMARY OF RULES

REFERENCES
This thesis is primarily an investigation into Pronominalization in Efik. Pronominalization is treated from a basically Chomskian point of view as a general term for a number of related processes each of which is explicitly formulated as a rule. These are reflexivization, simple pronominalization, possessive pronominalization and relativization by which reflexive, anaphoric personal, possessive and relative pronouns respectively are derived. As rules they all operate on Noun Phrases (NPs) under certain conditions. One such condition is coreference. In general NPs on which a rule of pronominalization has operated may (and in fact in some cases must) be deleted under certain conditions one of which is also coreference. In this way, Pronominalization and NP Deletion are related.
GLOSSES

Translations into English are word for word. In many cases, such English translations are either ungrammatical or obscure. Efforts will be made to explain some cases of obscurity. In some cases where a word, for example a personal name or place name, is obvious, no translation is made, as in the following examples:

Bassey eyọka dọ : 'Bassey will go there'

Ime ọdu ọọ Uyo : 'Ime is at Uyo'
Ikọ Efik okpon mbet,
Etị usuk, eyak usuk.
(E.N. Amaku)

'The Efik language has many rules,
Certain things can be said, and
certain things cannot be said'.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Efik Language, Where It Is Spoken and by Whom:

Efik is spoken by about three million people in the South-Eastern State of Nigeria. The South-Eastern State itself was part of the former Eastern Nigeria before it became an autonomous State on May 27th, 1967, when by Decree the present Military Government headed by General Gowon split the country into twelve autonomous States. Before this date, there were only four States which were then known as 'Regions'. It will be recalled that recently former Eastern Nigeria tried unsuccessfully to break away from the Federation of Nigeria. This led to the Civil War which ended on the 14th of January, 1970. What is now South-Eastern State before the creation of the twelve States consisted of Ogoja, Calabar, Uyo and Anang Provinces, the last three of which were often referred to as 'Old Calabar Province'. Old Calabar Province was in fact one Province in the colonial days before it was split into three Provinces by the Government of the former Eastern Nigeria, after independence in 1960. The Provinces of Uyo, Calabar and Anang correspond to Ibibio, Efik and Anang, respectively. These are the three main dialects of Efik.

Of the three million speakers, about half of a million are non-native speakers mostly people from neighbouring Ogoja Province. Some of the Ogoja or 'Atam', the Efik name for Ogoja, people must have learned Efik through trade contact. However, a majority seem to have learnt it through formal tuition in primary schools. In this Province there are so many small languages that, as my wife, who once lived there, remarked, "almost every village speaks its own language". And a village may be just over several hundred people. It is no surprise /
surprise, then, that Efik spoken in the three neighbouring Provinces of Calabar, Uyo and Anang had to be used and I believe is still being used in primary schools in the 'non-Calabar' Province of Ogoja. It is for the same reason that English is still being used in the country as a whole as the official language, in spite of national pride.

1.2 Dialects

Leaving for the moment the status of Oron, Eket and Ibuno, Efik has three main dialects corresponding to the region or area where they are found. These are Calabar Efik, or the so-called Efik proper, Ibibio and Anang. Of the three, the Calabar dialect is the most prestigious and the one most commonly used in schools, broadcasting, customary courts and churches, in settings where English cannot be used. This dialect is spoken in Calabar Province, Enyiong and parts of Itu in Uyo Province. Its prestige is primarily a consequence of its having been written first by reason of its first contact with early missionaries who landed in Calabar Town, which opens into the sea. Calabar as a seaport has had a long contact with Western Europeans dating as far back as the seventeenth century or even earlier. In fact, according to Hair (1967:71) the name 'Calabar', which is supposedly derived from an Ijaw name 'Culeba/Okolaba', "was first used by Europeans to mean the section of the Delta around Bonny and Degema .... Around the middle of the seventeenth century, the name 'Calabar' was also applied to a second trading area, that on the Cross River". The present city of Calabar of course stands at the mouth of the Cross River. So, contrary to popular belief, the name 'Calabar' is apparently not derived from a Portuguese word meaning 'Calm Bar'. Whatever /
Whatever the origin of 'Calabar', it is certainly not Efik, for as we shall see later on, Efik does not have the sound 'l', nor does 'r' occur in final positions.

Calabar was important not only as a trading centre but also as the Capital of Nigeria before the Capital was moved to the City of Lagos. These factors added immensely to the prestige of Efik proper. Furthermore, the Efiks are by nature a proud and cultivated people, very conscious of their enviable past of wealth, glories and influence. They like good food, good clothes, good music, good poetry and good leisure. Above all, they love the Efik language, because for them it is music and poetry itself.

The Ibibios and the Anangs, on the other hand, handicapped initially by being land-locked were more or less provincial in outlook. However, they too can look back to a proud heritage of adventure, sheer hardiness and enterprise. Thus they are often scornful of the Efiks for what they call 'ikp-inua' (talking big), and living in the past. For them, the Efiks' love of leisure is just laziness. In actual fact, however, the division of traits is not so sharp: there are just as many hardy and enterprising Efiks as there are cultivated and pleasure loving Ibibios and Anangs. In addition, there are many more traits they all have in common, which are beyond the scope of this thesis to go into. After all, they are all 'Okop Usem', a term which I shall explain later on.

The prestige of Ibibio and Anang is on the increase partly because of what may be called the 'educational boom' in Ibibio and Anang lands. Coupled with the characteristic enterprise of the people, they have tended, in recent years, to dominate nearly all fields of endeavour in the /
the new South Eastern State, a situation strongly resented by the Efiks. In addition, a good many Ibibios and Anangs hold responsible and influential positions outside the State in other parts of the country. Naturally, this influence is bound to affect the dialects these people speak, just as the dominant influence of the Efiks in the early days enhanced the prestige of their dialect, Efik proper. This is evident in what has come to be considered the standard language – Efik-Ibibio, a combination of Efik and Ibibio, as the name clearly suggests. In a Languages & Dialects map of Nigeria published by the Federal Ministry of Surveys, Lagos, 1969, it is interesting to note that Efik-Ibibio is shown as the standard language for the Old Calabar Province part of the South-Eastern State. It is worth noting that as far back as in the 1930s, it was recognised that although the Calabar dialect was the standard dialect, other dialects, notably Ibibio, could not be overlooked. Thus in an introduction to the Adams (1939:1) *English-Efik Vocabulary*, H.W. McCowan, the then Director of Education in Nigeria had this to say:

"When Mr. Gaskin retired in 1932, Mr. Adams called a meeting of the leading missionary authorities on the language to discuss the position. Those attending were emphatic on the need for the continuation of the work, and so Mr. Adams, with the help of these gentlemen and many representative Efik and Ibibio born speakers, proceeded with the task of compilation which is now nearing its end.

The basis of the book is the Efik spoken in Calabar, but in view of the widespread use of this dialect in other literary works, it is hoped that the vocabulary will be of great use to all members of /
of the Efik-Ibibio race."

Adams himself in his own introduction said, "a few notes are necessary to make perusal of the vocabulary easier for the native Efik-Ibibio user" and went on in the body of the Dictionary to provide a lot of alternative Ibibio words alongside their Efik equivalents. For example, for cassava, he gave iwa as Efik and nt2r2r as Ibibio, and for clothing he gave df2adem as Efik and mfr2adem as Ibibio. However, I personally do not have mfr2adem in my Ibibio but the Efik form. This is partly due to the fact that we in some parts of Itu speak partly Efik and partly Ibibio.

Welmers (1968) also recognised the existence of Efik-Ibibio as is evident in his remark:

"Efik is the second largest language (after Igbo to the West) in the Eastern Region of Nigeria. It is sometimes referred to by the hyphenated name Efik-Ibibio, combining the names of two of its major dialects. In these and other dialectal forms such as Anang, it is spoken by perhaps two million people" (p.i).

There are, however, some people, mostly outsiders, who claim that Efik, Ibibio and Anang are in fact different languages and not dialects of the same language. In the years before the creation of the twelve States, this was one of the major problems the Efiks, Ibibios and Anangs, who wanted a State of their own on the basis of ethnic affinity, among other things, had to face. For it was argued by those in power to create the State that since Efik, Ibibio and Anang are in fact different languages, rather than dialects, then the speakers of these languages cannot claim to belong to the same ethnic group. Coupled with other arguments whose merits we do not wish /
wish to go into, the legitimate demand of these people was rejected until in 1967.

Unfortunately, Cook (1969:4) has made the same mistake as the politicians, claiming that Efik, Ibibio and Anang are different languages but closely related. In support of his claim, he says:

"In truth speakers of Anang and Oron can converse with Efiks, not because their languages are mutually intelligible (i.e. dialects) but because they have learned to speak Efik as a second language. Ibibio is in fact so similar to Efik that the two are nearly mutually intelligible, but again some of the similarity is due to Efik influence on Ibibio through its long use as a second language".

Cook appears to be saying

(i) Anang and Oron are not dialects of Efik, because though speakers of Anang and Oron understand and can speak Efik, they do so not because Efik, Anang and Oron are mutually intelligible, but because speakers of Anang and Oron speak Efik as a second language. In which case they have to learn Efik to do so.

(ii) Ibibio and Efik are so similar as to be nearly mutually intelligible because of the influence of Efik on Ibibio, since the former is spoken as a second language by speakers of the latter.

Now, let us look at Efik vis-a-vis Anang and Oron. I do not wish to commit myself either way with regard to Oron vis-a-vis Efik, since no analysis of Oron has yet been made. However, if Efik speakers do not understand Oron, it is important to know that neither do /
do Ibibio and Anang speakers. The same is true of Eket and Ibuno. Again since no analyses have been made of these tongues, it is difficult at the moment to say whether or not they are dialects of Efik.

As far as Anang, however, is concerned, there is little doubt that it is a dialect of Efik, since speakers of Efik also understand Anang, without learning it. The problem with Anang vis-à-vis Efik is not that Efiks do not understand Anang but that they think that Anang is inferior Efik. Similarly, Anang speakers understand Efik without learning it. In fact there are only two effective ways in which speakers of Anang could have learnt Efik to use it at the scale they now do: namely by formal tuition in school, or by living in Efikland, or both. However, according to a Federal Ministry of Information document published in 1972, the illiteracy rate in Nigeria is 40% of the population. Yet this 40% of people in Anangland who have never been to school where they could have learnt Efik and who may never have set foot in Efikland understand broadcasts, church sermons and customary court proceedings in Efik.

Moreover, an Anang child who goes to school for the first time receives instructions in Efik the first day he arrives in school. He does not have to learn the language first to understand it. What he does, however, learn is to read and write the language he has already known. In my view the only way to explain the above facts is that Efik and Anang are dialects of the same language. The same facts also apply in the Ibibio case: speakers of Ibibio understand Efik without learning it and speakers of Efik understand Ibibio without /
without learning it.

In the circumstances, Efik must be seen as a cluster of dialects consisting of Calabar Efik, Ibibio and Anang, with Efik as the officially recognised name of the language, though in recent years, Efik-Ibibio is felt to be a more suitable name. The situation is somewhat like Akan, a Ghananian language. According to Brown (1972:1-3) "Akan is now officially recognised name for the language" but "the Akan (Twi-Fante) 'dialect cluster' is said by Westerman and Bryan to consist of four main dialects: Akwapem, Akem..., Asante... and Fante".

In recognition of the fact that Efik, Ibibio and Anang are dialects of the same language, there is a term used by speakers of these dialects to refer to one another, namely okop usem (one who speaks the same language as the speaker and hearer). Although okop usem is not directly translatable as 'dialect', it comes close to that. 'Dialect' refers to the variations in the language itself, whereas okop usem refers to the people who speak varieties of the same language. It is interesting to note that okop usem is never used to include people from other linguistic groups, like the Ibos, for example, even if they speak Efik, or a dialect of it.

It is worth pointing out that the differences among these dialects are purely regional. It is also worth pointing out that Ibibio appears to be closer to Efik than Anang, because it is also physically closer to Efik than Anang is. The Ibibios are separated from the Efiks by the Cross River. Between the Efiks and the Anangs, the Ibibios intervene. So it is not surprising that Ibibio is closer /
closer to Efik than Anang is. Within ibibio itself, there are some areas whose dialects are a mixture of Efik and Ibibio. Some parts of Itu, where I come from, are a fine example. Often speakers in such areas were derided because they were said to speak Ikọ Efik Ikọ (Efik spoken by Ikọ people), which meant adulterated Efik. Ikọ by the way is close to Itu Town, where Efik proper is also spoken. Geographically, Itu stands on the other side of the Cross River. Ikọ is one of the transitional areas between Efik and Ibibio. Today, Ikọ Efik Ikọ is of course Efik-Ibibio, which has now become the official name for Efik 'dialect cluster'. In my view, however, this name still discriminates against Anang.

On page 10 are two rough maps. Fig. (i) shows the location of the South-Eastern State in Nigeria, while Fig. (ii) shows the three main dialects of Efik in the South-Eastern State itself.
1.3 Family:

In one of the earliest books on the Efik language, Goldie (1862) divides the languages of Africa South of the Sahara into two big families, namely the Nilo-Hamitic, which comprises those languages South of the Equator, and the Nigro-Hamitic, comprising those languages North of the Equator. As Nigeria is North of the Equator, Efik falls within the Nigro-Hamitic family in this classification. The languages of Nilo-Hamitic family are said to be much more connected with each other than those of the Nigro-Hamitic, "which, however, have many affinities with each other, especially in all important forms of grammar and idioms". However, the two big families "have so many points of connexion as to form one great family, more closely allied to each other than many of the languages grouped together under the denomination of Indo-European", according to Goldie.

However, languages in Africa are no longer classified in the above fashion. Today, Efik is generally considered to belong to the West Sudan group of the Sudanic languages. But in the latest classification, which is widely accepted, Greenberg (1966:6ff) groups Efik in the Benue-Congo sub-family of the Niger-Congo family. According to him, Niger-Congo includes languages of the West Sudanic Stock, Bantu and those he calls 'Adamawa Eastern'. He prefers the name 'Niger-Congo', because for him it is of a "non-committal geographic nature ... from the two great rivers (Niger and Congo) in whose basins these languages predominate". The Benue-Congo sub-family is said to be very close to another sub-family, the Kwa, to which Igbo, one of the three main languages of Nigeria spoken in the neighbouring /
neighbouring East-Central State, belongs. Ijaw, spoken in another
neighbouring State of Rivers, and Yoruba, the second of the three
main languages of Nigeria, are also said to belong to the Kwa group.
One of the criteria for Efik membership in the Niger-Congo family is
morphological. Greenberg says "the trait of the Niger-Congo morphology
which provides the main material for comparison is the system of noun
classification by pair of affixes, one singular and another for the
plural". This classificational system is fairly typical of Bantu
noun prefixes. Such a system has survived in a very small number of
nouns as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-didem (king)</td>
<td>n-didem (kings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-kparawa (young man)</td>
<td>ṣ-kparawa (young men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ⓞ-bọ́ŋ (chief)</td>
<td>m-bọ́ŋ (chiefs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and in a great many adjectives, which must agree with the nouns they
modify in number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-nyan owo (a tall man)</td>
<td>n-nyan owo (tall men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-bufa eso (a new pot)</td>
<td>m-bufa eso (new pots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-kani eduat (an old sword)</td>
<td>ṣ-kani eduat (old swords)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where the vowel and nasal prefixes alternate indicating singularity
and plurality respectively. There are other criteria including
similarities in lexical items, and adjective and noun concord which
Efik, as shown above clearly manifests.

Efik is often regarded as very closely related to the Bantu
family of languages. Winston (1970) clearly illustrates this. In
this /
13.

This article, Winston shows that there are other similarities, besides resemblances in vocabulary, between Efik and the Bantu languages. These similarities involve what Winston calls 'features of linguistic structure', where structure for him is widely used "to embrace any aspect of the language that is not associated simply with individual items". Some of these features of structure include nominal classification, lexical alternation of prefix of the kind shown above, semantic grouping, verbal extension and copular constructions.

1.4 Linguistic Works on Efik

Not much has yet been done on Efik. Of the Nigerian languages, it is the three main ones - Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo - on which much attention has been focused. However, there is what Cook (1969:x1) calls 'a respectable tradition of Efik language scholarship, now more than a century old'. The first studies of Efik appear to have been inspired not by the search for knowledge as such but by Christian missionary interest. There was need not only to translate the Bible into the language but also for the European missionaries themselves to know the language itself for effective propagation of the Christian faith. This also seems to have been the motivation for much of the early works on other Nigerian languages. In Efik, the first such work was undertaken by the Church of Scotland missionaries in the last century. This resulted in the publication of what is perhaps the first dictionary on Efik by Hope Waddell and Edgerley in 1849. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to get access to this work. This /
This was followed by Goldie's monumental Dictionary of the Efik Language in 1862. Apart from the dictionary proper, it contains an elaborate introduction dealing with family relationship and the grammar of the language. For him, Efik grammar consists of three parts, namely orthography, etymology and syntax. Goldie is said to have published two grammars on Efik, in addition to the Dictionary. Following the dictionary publication, the Bible and other religious works were translated into Efik, using Goldie's orthography. Today, the current orthography is a revised version of Goldie's orthography. In the 1950s R.F.G. Adams published two other dictionaries, using the revised orthography.

Other published books include Ida Ward's Phonetic and Tonal Structure of Efik (1933) which Cook describes as 'the most thorough published linguistic study of Efik'; Cook's own The Pronunciation of Efik for Speakers of English, (1969); Welmers' Efik (1968). These last two are text books primarily for learners of Efik with English as a first language. Another text book A Study of Efik for Schools and Colleges has been published by O.A. Akpanyu for native speakers of Efik.

In addition to the above books, there are articles. These include F.D.D. Winston's 'The "Mid" Tone in Efik' and 'Some Bantu-like Features of Efik Structure' published in African Language Studies 1960 and 1970 respectively; Udo Essien's (to appear) paper on some aspects of Efik phonology; Cook's contribution in Twelve Nigerian Languages edited by Elizabeth Dunstan; and Okon Essien's 'The Reflexive in Efik' (to appear in Journal of African Languages).
1.5 **Phonology and Orthography:**

A detailed description of Efik phonology will not be attempted here. However, we think that some notes on the sounds and sound patterns of Efik are necessary. Let us begin with the phonemes which are given in the following charts

**Consonant Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labio-dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Labio-velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>j̃</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vowel Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consonants:**

/b/ has several allophones. These are positionally determined. In final positions it occurs as an unreleased stop phonetically represented as \([p^-]\), as in the following imperative verbs:

- \([b)p^-\] (build)
- \([d)p^-\] (buy)
- \([kp)p^-\] (teach)

If /
If it is, however, immediately followed by a syllable juncture ( - ) in the middle of a word, it occurs as a released stop phonetically represented as [pʰ], as in these examples:

[lokopʰ-ke] (he hasn't heard)
[ndɔpʰ-ke] (I haven't bought)

Like /b/, /t/ and /k/ are unreleased in final positions. Thus phonetically we have the following:

[bʰtʰ] (wait)
[dɔkʰ] (dig)

/k/ has other allophones. If it is preceded by a high front vowel, it is phonetically [g], as in these examples:

[diɡ] (trample)
[diɡa] (it is not)
[tiga] (shoot, kick)

If, however, it occurs between two mid front vowels, or two low central vowels, it is phonetically [ɣ] or [x], as in the following examples:

[fːxː] (run)
[daɣa] (leave, go away)

Among literate Efiks, [g] is sometimes found in initial positions as in the loan word gari (a staple food). This is no doubt influenced by English, though gari itself is not English. The English /g/ occurs in initial positions and educated Efiks who, of course, speak English must be familiar with the sound in that position. However, among Efiks who do not speak English gari is pronounced either as kari or ɣkari. Till her death, my grandmother used to pronounce it as ɣkari.

/d/ /
/d/ has an allophone [t̠]. It occurs between vowels in free variation with [d], as in the following examples:

\[\text{aian} \quad \text{adan} \quad \text{(oil)}\]
\[\text{oco} \quad \text{odo} \quad \text{(the/that)}\]

where the preceding vowel is itself preceded by a stop or fricative, this vowel is entirely deleted and the word pronounced with appreciable consonant clustering, as in these examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonemic Structure</th>
<th>Phonetic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/tid\o/</td>
<td>[tɪd] (stop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kpid\a/</td>
<td>[kpið] (be small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fida/</td>
<td>[fidi] (forget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sid/</td>
<td>[sið] (be closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fada/</td>
<td>[f ada] (fry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/f\a/</td>
<td>[f\a] (pass)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth pointing out that in Anang, the phonemic and phonetic forms of the above words are the same or at least very similar.

The nasals are homorganic with a following consonant if the consonant itself occurs at the beginning of the following syllable, thus we have the following:

\[\text{mbak} \quad \text{ntan} \quad \text{ms\&n} \quad \text{mdo} \quad \text{\&kp} \quad \text{(part)\quad (sand)\quad (an egg)\quad (blemish)\quad (something)}\]

They are also syllabic, thus we have

\[[m-bak\] \quad [n-tan]/
Cook (1969:99) says "in Efik there is only one phonemic syllabic nasal as its particular pronunciation (allophones) can be predicted from the following consonant". However, the nasals in such positions as those above are to be analysed, the syllabic property is not in doubt.

/ŋ/ has an allophone [ŋʷ] which is a labialized dorso-velar nasal. This sound occurs at the beginning of syllables, as in these examples:

[ŋʷana] (fight)
[ŋʷoŋ] (drink)
[i-ŋʷaŋ] (farm)
[u-ŋʷoŋ] (tobacco)

Observe that [ŋʷ] is followed by a vowel.

Semi-Vowels:

The semi-vowels /w/ and /y/ behave like consonants, as the following show:

/wak/ (tear up)
/awa/ (a green plant)
/yom/ (look for, search)
/ayəŋ/ (broom)

When they are preceded by a consonant, they sound like /u/ and /i/ respectively, as these examples show:

Phonemic /
Vowels:

Vowels in Efik vary phonetically depending on whether they occur between consonants (i.e. in closed syllables) or not. Vowels in closed syllables are shorter and more centralized than those in open syllables. Thus /i/ and /u/ are highly centralized in the following:

- /t:i:k/ (push or press someone to do something)
- /b:J/ (shame)

As /i/ is a front vowel, centralization involves a position further back while in the case of /u/, a back vowel, centralization involves a position further front in the mouth (cf. Cook 1969:74ff).

Syllable Structure

At the phonemic level, an Efik syllable may be structured as follows:

- V as in /u-fJk/ (house)
- CV as in /bÇ/ (receive, take)
- CVC as in /sop/ (be lost)
- C₁C₂V as in /dya/ (eat) (where C₂ is a semi-vowel)
- C₁C₂VC₃ as in /dw-:k/ (throw away) where again C₂ is a semi-vowel.
- N as in /n-do/ (blemish)(where nasal is syllabic).

Phonetically, C₂ may be the alveolar tap [t], which is an allophone of /d/, as in these examples:

- [tít] (stop)       [fít] (forget)

Phonemically /
Phonemically, they are in fact words of two syllables each. In Anang, as already pointed out, both the phonemic and the phonetic forms are very much the same. In other words, they are pronounced as

\[ \text{[ti-d\text{\textacircumflex}]} \quad \text{[fi-d\text{\textacircumflex}]} \]

**Orthography:**

The orthography is of course based on the phonology. As revised in 1929, the following are the letters of the alphabet:

a, b, d, e, f, g, h, i, k, m, n, ny, o, p, kp, r, s, t, u, w, y.

The orthography has no Ç. For this reason both the singular and plural of second and third person verbs are orthographically the same in cases where phonemically the plural prefixes are /e/ and the singular ones /ç/. These are cases where the vowel of the root of the verb is either /i/ or /ç/ itself. For example in the following:

- mbufo etiŋ (your pl are saying)
- mæ̞ etiŋ (they are saying)
- afo etiŋ (you sing are saying)
- enye etiŋ (he/she is saying)

The prefixes are the same in all cases in the orthographic forms. Phonemically, however, the first two prefixes are /e/ while the last two are /ç/. There is, however, no problem where the root vowel is neither /i/ nor /ç/, as in these examples:

- Mbufo eyom (you pl want) mbufo eka (you pl are going)
- mæ̞ eyom (they want) mæ̞ eka (they are going)
- afo oyom (you sing want) afo aka (you sing are going)
- enye oyom (he/she wants) enye aka (he/she is going)

Sometimes the orthographic forms are more like the phonetic forms than /
than the phonemic forms, as these examples show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic</th>
<th>Phonetic</th>
<th>Phonemic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tre</td>
<td>[t:i]</td>
<td>/tid:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bre</td>
<td>[b:i]</td>
<td>/bid:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiop</td>
<td>[fiop:]</td>
<td>/fiob/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duak</td>
<td>[duak:]</td>
<td>/dwak/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All examples are quoted in the orthography.

1.6 Tones:

Efik is a tone language. Its tonal structure is described as 'terraced level' (cf. Welmers ibid:vi). According to Cook (1969b:42), "this means;

(a) whereas after a low tone, there is only the possibility of a high tone or another low tone, .....  
(b) after a high tone there are three possibilities:

(i) a low tone (L)  
(ii) a high tone at the same pitch level (H)  
(iii) a high tone which is lower than the preceding high (i.e. downstep (D) + high)".

In this work, tones will not be marked unless they are essential to the point or argument raised (cf. 5.4.2 for example). Following largely Winston (1970:418), the tones are marked as follows:

/ high tone  
\ high tone preceded by downstep, i.e. a downstepped high  
\ low tone  
\ rising tone  
\ falling tone

Basically Efik has two tones, high and low. These are the most frequently occurring tones. In general a syllable may be said to have one /
one inherent tone, as shown below:

- épó (a goat) — a sequence of two high tones.
- énàj (a cow) — a sequence of a high and a low tone.
- afo (you sing) — a sequence of two low tones.

Within a word, however, a high tone preceded by another high tone may be slightly lower in pitch than the preceding high. Such a lowered high tone may be called a 'down-stepped high' (Welmers 1968). So in addition to the above sequences there is a sequence of high and down-stepped high as in ëbọ́j (chief).

A syllable may, however, appear to have more than one tone, namely, either a combination of high and low (falling pitch) as in imọ (wealth) or low and high (rising pitch) as in ëkà (go). Whether these are sequences of two tones in each case or single ones is a moot point.

1.7 The Dialect:
The dialect used here is Efik-Ibibio (cf. 1.2). Moreover, it is the Efik-Ibibio of an educated Ibibio. In such a dialect, such loans as leta (from English letter) and gari (the origin of this word is as yet unknown) are commonly used in those more or less un-Efik forms. As we have seen in the previous section, the sound /l/ does not occur in the Efik sound system and although the sound [g] does occur, it does so as an allophone of /k/. As an allophone of /k/, [g] does not occur at the beginning of a word. For the illiterate Efik therefore gari is kari, or sometimes ìkari, and leta is deta. Educated Efiks speaking among themselves will normally use leta and gari. They would regard it as unsophisticated if any of their peers used deta and kari respectively. Interestingly, when an educated Efik talks with an uneducated /
uneducated one, he would normally use the so-called unsophisticated forms for fear that the illiterate man would not understand the so-called sophisticated forms. In general, however, although the illiterate man does not use the sophisticated form himself, he does appear to understand it when used by someone else.

Another common practice by the users of this dialect is what Ansre (1971:147) calls "inserting varying 'chunks' of English into their performance of the West African language". The following are examples of such practice:

Ekeme ndi explain igo esie psychologically: 'His behaviour can be explained psychologically'  

Bassey ede a very arrogant man: 'Bassey is a very arrogant man'.

We will avoid this practice because we wish to describe Efik in its own right.
2.1 The Model:

The descriptive model used here is basically Chomsky's Aspects model of grammar (Chomsky:1965). We shall, however, make such modifications as seem necessary. The justification for our choice of this model, which has been unduly attacked by those who favour 'generative semantics', is the fact that there is virtually no description of Efik syntax from the transformational standpoint. As the best tested version of the transformational generative theory, it is probably wise, from a practical point of view, to use the standard theory for describing a language like Efik. Moreover, generative semantics seems even more powerful than the standard theory; yet one of the criticisms against transformations as formulated in Aspects is that they are so powerful that they can often be misused.

Our modification of this model will be rather eclectic, such proposals as seem helpful will be used to enhance our descriptive apparatus. The Aspects model of grammar is a modification of Chomsky's earlier works, notably *Syntactic Structures* published in 1957, and based on findings, criticisms, and suggestions of works like Katz's and Postal's *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*, among others. A very good summary of the Aspects model is given by Lyons (1970:124):

"As described in Aspects, the grammar of a language (and 'grammar' must now be taken in its widest sense) consists of three sets of rules: syntactic, semantic and phonological. The syntactic rules generate the sentences of the language, assigning to each both an underlying phrase marker (which represents the deep structure of the sentence) and a derived phrase marker (which /
(which represents the surface structure). The meaning of the sentence is derived (mainly, if not wholly) from its deep structure by means of the semantic rules of interpretation; and the phonetic realization of the sentence is derived from its surface structure by means of the phonological rules".

In the syntactic component of this model, there are three sets of ordered rules, namely (i) base rules, (ii) lexical insertion rules, and (iii) transformational rules.

2.2 The Base Rules:

The base rules together with the lexicon, which we shall discuss later, make up what is called the base of the grammar, which is a sub-component of the syntactic component. There are two kinds of base rules, namely Phrase Structure (PS) or branching rules and rules forming Complex Symbols (CS) on major lexical items. PS or branching rules are of the form

A ---> XBZ

where X and Z may be null. If X and Z are null, the rules are known as CF (Context Free) rules. If, however, X or Z or both are non-null, the rules are known as CS (Context Sensitive) rules. Most of our PS rules will be of the CF kind.

2.2.1 Rules Forming CS on Major Lexical Categories:

Rules forming CS on major lexical categories - N, VB and ART, though the latter is not a major lexical category as such, in our case - are not ordinary PS rules but 'transformational rules of elementary sort' or 'local transformations' (Chomsky 1965:98-99).

There /
There are two kinds of rules forming CS on major lexical categories. The first set of rules are CF rules that introduce 'inherent' features such as [+Animate], [+Count], etc. The second set of rules are CS rules. These rules are of two sorts, namely strict subcategorization rules and selectional rules. Strict subcategorization rules are of the form

A \rightarrow \text{CS/Z-W}

where A 'stands for any symbol ready for rewriting through strict subcategorization rules, such as N...', CS for any partial matrix in the CS of a lexical entry' (Seuren 1969:41), Z and W complex, perhaps null strings acting as a context restriction, and ZAW for some X category symbol, where furthermore X is the category symbol that appears on the left in the rule X \rightarrow ZAW that introduces A. In practical terms then, if A is a VB, then only the VP, which in this case substitutes for X, determines the strict subcategorization of A. If, however, A is an N, then the strict subcategorization of A is determined by frames dominated by the NP.

Selectional rules, which 'subcategorize a lexical category in terms of syntactic features that appear in specified positions in the sentence', are of the form

\[[+A] \rightarrow \text{CS/\text{\alpha} - \text{\beta}}\]

where \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) are variables ranging over a set of specified features.

Thus if \([+A]\) is \([+V]\) and \(\alpha\) is N and \(\beta\) is also N, 'the rules abbreviated by the above schemata assert, simply, that each feature of the preceding and following Noun is assigned to the Verb and determines an appropriate selectional subclassification of it' (p.97).

Selectional rules have come under criticism in recent years. McCawley (1970) /
(1970), for example, claims that

(i) selectional restrictions have no independent status in linguistics, whereas in Chomsky (1965) they are used as a form of constraints on deep structure, which for McCawley and other generative semanticists is not a clearly defined level as it is in Aspects;

(ii) selectional restrictions are predictable from the meaning of the lexical item in question;

(iii) many of the so-called selectional violations in fact correspond to 'possible messages' in possible worlds.

He therefore concludes that the peculiarity of sentences arising from the so-called selectional violations are in fact a consequence of extra-linguistic factors and that such 'deviant' sentences are possible in appropriate circumstances (McCawley 1970:166-168).

In our grammar, syntactic features are not primarily for selection of the above kind. Rather 'the features I have chosen to regard as syntactic features ... are operated on in certain specifically grammatical processes' (Brown 1972:40). For example, after simple pronominalization, the 'residual' Number and Person features are crucial for determining the forms of the personal pronouns, enye and mm (he/she, it and they), for example. Similarly, when the WH question transformation applies, the formative (in the sense of a transformationally introduced element) anie (who) or nso (what) is introduced /

---

1. For example, the following sentence is perfectly grammatical in the context of witchcraft:

Arit ndita nyu| idem esie : 'Arit has started to eat and drink herself'.
introduced, depending on whether the NP which dominates (see the base rules in 2.6) WH is [+Human] or [-Human], respectively.

2.2.2 The Lexicon:

The lexicon is "a set of lexical entries, each lexical entry being a pair \((D,C)\), where \(D\) is a phonological distinctive feature matrix 'spelling' a certain lexical formative and \(C\) is a collection of specified syntactic features (a complex symbol)". (Chomsky 1965:84).

In addition to phonological and syntactic features, the lexicon will also contain the following information:

(a) features that are peculiar to the formative and which can trigger off a transformation or block it;

(b) relevant features for semantic interpretation.

In our lexicon, however, we will be primarily concerned with syntactic features, i.e. the \(C\) element in the pair \((D,C)\) of the lexical entry.

2.2.3 The Lexical Insertion Rule:

The PS rules will generate strings consisting of grammatical formatives (e.g. Past, \(C\), etc.) and complex symbols called preterminal strings.

To derive a terminal string from a preterminal string, a lexical insertion rule of the following kind is required:

"If \(Q\) is a complex symbol of a preterminal string and \((D,C)\) is a lexical entry, where \(C\) is not distinct from \(Q\), then \(Q\) can be replaced by \(D\)" (p.84)

This rule permits lexical items from the lexicon to be inserted into the preterminal string generated by the PS and subcategorization rules 'if the markers in the lexicon for that item and the markers in the Complex /
Complex Symbol under that particular node do not conflict!

(Grinder and Elgin 1973:129).

As Seuren (1969:38) says, "one notices that this lexical rule is not so much a rule as a rule schema: it is a cover formula for a large number of rules, each of which would apply to a particular complex symbol and a particular lexical item".

The formal abstract structure generated by the base rules plus lexical insertion constitutes the deep structure or deep phrase marker of a sentence which may be represented in the form of a tree diagram.

2.3 Transformational Rules:

Transformational Rules like PS rules are rewrite rules. They however differ from PS rules in a very significant way. While PS rules operate on single symbols, "without being able to take into account any other symbols from which they have been previously rewritten (their derivational history), \(T\)-rules operate on P-markers" (Seuren 1969:30) generated by the rules of the base and lexical insertion, changing these phrase markers into derived phrase markers. A surface phrase marker is generated when no more transformations need apply to a phrase marker.

Stockwell et al (1968) give an interesting description of the organization of transformational rules, part of which is quoted below:

"Transformational (\(T\)) rules change underlying P-markers into derived P-markers. That is, the rules effect restructuring of trees. Each \(T\)-rule consists of

(a) a structure index (SI), (b) a structure change (SC), and sometimes, (c) a set of conditions.

(a) The SI indicates the set of P-markers to which the \(T\) can apply /
apply and hence is stated in terms of PS symbols (e.g. \( t \), NP, ART, etc.), syntactic features (e.g. \( +\text{Def} \), \( +\text{AND} \), etc.), morphemes, and a variable \( X \), which stands for an arbitrary string of symbols...

(b) The SC indicates the restructuring which the T effects" (Stockwell et al 1968:15).

Transformational operations include among other operations such elementary operations as deletion, substitution, adjunction and permutation. A permutation transformation, for example, may be formulated thus:

\[
\text{SI} \quad X \quad A \quad B \quad C \quad Y \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \\
\]

\text{Condition : (specified)}

\text{SC : Permute 2 with 4}

where \( X \) and \( Y \) are variables, possibly null, \( XABCY \) an underlying phrase marker, and the condition, if any, for the application of the rule specified. The 'output' or derived phrase marker will then be \( XCBAY \). Thus a transformation defines a relation between a pair of successive phrase markers by altering the underlying phrase marker in one way or another.

Transformations may be obligatory or optional. Optional transformations may or may not apply but an obligatory transformation must apply once there is a proper analysis and the relevant condition or conditions are met. An obligatory transformation may, however, be blocked where the deep structure is ill-formed or underlies no sentence of the language under description. In this way, transformations may act as a 'filter' to ensure well-formedness (Chomsky 1965:139).
2.4 Deep and Surface Structure Constraints:

It is pertinent at this juncture to add that it has been shown by Perlmutter (1971) that in addition to transformations, other devices can be made to perform the filtering function. He calls them deep structure constraints and surface structure constraints. Deep structure constraints are defined as "well-formedness conditions on generalized phrase markers that apply prior to the application of transformations and 'filter out' certain generalized phrase markers generated by the base as ill-formed" (Perlmutter 1971:i). The need for such constraints according to Perlmutter is to be able to handle certain cases of ill-formed phrase markers generated by the base component, where such ill-formed phrase markers cannot be so characterised by the blocking of obligatory transformations.

We shall need constraints of the above kind in our grammar. For example, the fact that YN and WH questions do not co-occur (cf 2.7.1) can best be accounted for, in our view, by a deep structure constraint, since YN and WH are both deep structure categories in our grammar.

Surface structure constraints are also well-formedness conditions but this time on the output of the transformational sub-component, which together with the base constitute the syntactic component of the grammar as a whole. These constraints act as a filter, like the deep structure constraints, and reject as ungrammatical any string which has a well-formed deep structure but whose deep structure there is no way of 'actualising' as a grammatical sentence. In other words, where there are well-formed deep structures and where all the relevant transformations have applied and yet no grammatical surface sentence results, surface structure constraints are required to reject that sentence as ungrammatical.
ungrammatical.

We shall rarely require surface structure constraints in our grammar.

2.5 phonological and semantic components:

As both the phonological and semantic components of the grammar concern us very little, we do not wish to go beyond the remarks that have been made in the introduction and other sections of this work. Before we turn to the next section, it is, however, worth pointing out that in Aspects, it is the deep structure which wholly determines the semantic interpretation. However, Chomsky (1972) has modified this position and proposed that semantic interpretation be determined by the pair deep structure and surface structure, rather than by the deep structure alone.

2.6 actual rules:

1. \( S \rightarrow (Q) \text{NP} \text{VP (ADJT)} \)

2. \( \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{AUX} \left\{ (\text{VP} \text{NP}) (\text{NP}) \left\{ \left\{ \text{COMP-PHRASE} \right\} \right\} \right\} \text{S} \text{PRED} \)

3. \( \text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{C TENSE/ASPECT (NEG) (EMPH)} \)

Rules (4)-(6), which would expand the TENSE/ASPECT element and introduce certain modal distinctions, are not given here, since the details in this area of the grammar have not been worked out satisfactorily (cf. p. 52).
7 \text{PRED-} \rightarrow (\text{NP} \text{COMP-PHRASE})

8 \text{COMP-PHRASE} \rightarrow \text{COMP} \quad \text{NP} \quad S

9 \text{COMP} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{Prep} \\
\text{QVB}
\end{array} \right.
\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{Quant} \\
\text{Q} \\
\text{Num}
\end{array} \right.
\quad (\text{PART}) \quad \text{N} \quad \text{DET} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{S} \\
\text{EMPH}
\end{array} \right.

10 \text{NP} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{S} \\
ye \text{NP} \quad \text{NP}^*
\end{array} \right.

11 \text{Q} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{YN/\#} \\
\text{WH/} \\
n - \text{N}
\end{array} \right.

12 \text{PART} \rightarrow \text{NP} \quad \text{PT}

13 \text{DET} \rightarrow (\text{NUM}) \quad (\text{NOM}) \quad \text{ART}

14 \text{NOM} \rightarrow \text{NP}

15 \text{EMPH} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{REDUPL} \\
\text{INT}
\end{array} \right.
\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{COMP-PHRASE}
\end{array} \right.
\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{PRE-S} \\
\text{S}
\end{array} \right.

16 \text{ADJT} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{MAN} \\
\text{DEG}
\end{array} \right.

17 \text{N} \rightarrow \text{CS}

18 \text{VB} \rightarrow \text{CS}

19 \text{ART} \rightarrow \text{CS}

20 \left[ \begin{array}{l}
{+N} \\
{+\text{Common}} \\
{+\text{Animate}} \\
{+\text{Count}} \\
{+\text{Pro}}
\end{array} \right.

21 \left[ \begin{array}{l}
{+\text{Animate}} \\
{+\text{Human}}
\end{array} \right.

22 /
Lexicon (Sample)

35a **ebot** (goat): [+N], [+Common], [+Animate], [-Human], +Count], [+Sing], [-Pro], -II

35b **Bassey**: [+N], -Common, [+Animate], +Human, +Count], +Sing], [-Pro], -II

35c **udua** (market): [+N], [+Common], -Animate], +Loc], +Place], [+Count], +Sing], -Pro], -II

35d **mbubreyo** (evening): [+N], +Common], -Animate], +Loc], -Place], +Sing], -Pro], -II

35e **nnvin** (we): [+N], +Common], -Animate], +Human], +Count], [-Sing], +Pro], +I

35f **dep** (buy): [+VB], +V], -Adj], + - NP, + [Human] DET AUX - -Human] DET
2.7.0 Explanations - Introduction:

In the following sections, we will attempt to give some explanations for the base rules in 2.6 above as they apply to categories other than the NP, whose analysis will be considered in the next chapter. The abbreviations and the use of the interlocking brackets \( \Rightarrow \) are explained in footnote 2 below.

2.7.1 /

2(a) Abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJT</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmp</td>
<td>Compulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp-Phrase</td>
<td>Complement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEG</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Intensification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>Partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUPL</td>
<td>Reduplication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2(b) The interlocking brackets \( \Rightarrow \) indicate that at least one category must be chosen. Thus Rule 7 means that NP and Comp-Phrase may be chosen together to generate the string NP Comp-Phrase. If, however, they are not chosen together, then one of them must be chosen.
2.7.1 Questions:

We begin with questions, grammaticalised as Q. As in many languages, there are two kinds of questions, the Yes/No question (i.e. one which requires the answer yes or no; and the non-Yes/No question. The former has been grammaticalised as YN and the latter as WH. It is our thesis that within our system of grammar, YN is a constituent or modifier of the S while WH is that of the NP. Our analysis thus squares with both syntactic and semantic observations which we will present presently. For the moment, however, let us see the form the questions take.

(1)a. (Nunteer) ɨwed ke oyem? : 'Is it a book that you are looking for?'
(1)b. (Nunteer) Ata egi mi? : 'Has Ata come here?'

(2)a. Nso ɨwed ikpon ntere? : 'What book is as big as that?'
(2)b. Ete ekedep ẹwe ẹdut? : 'Which sword did father buy?'
(2)c. Ata akasa ọya anie ọyo? : 'Ata wept with which person (or whom)?'
(2)d. Bassey ẹwe didie? : 'How handsome is Bassey?'
(2)e. Iban oro ẹka ẹnụ? : 'Where have the women gone?'

Neteor, which is used optionally, is the YN question morpheme whereas nso, ewe, anie, didie and ẹnụ are various forms of the WH question morpheme.

Let us now consider the differences between the two kinds of questions. First, if neteor occurs in a sentence, it occurs invariably at the beginning of the sentence and does not appear to show any form of relationship with any constituent of the S. Consider the following examples:

3. Efe and eke can also be found in some dialects instead of ewe or in free variation with it.
examples:

(3)a. Nte ami ke oyom? : 'Are you looking for me?'

(3)b. Nte ini oro ke enye edika? : 'Is it at that time that he will go?'

(3)c. Nte imekpere itie oro? : 'Have we approached the place?'

(3)d. Nte kg Uyo ke Imo okokut fi? : 'Was it at Uyo that Imo saw you?'

(3)e. Nte ediwak owo esobo ete? : 'Have many people met father?'

where nte shows no form of relationship with any other element in the sentence. By contrast, consider the following examples with WH words:

(4)a. Ngo mto ke enye awat? : 'What car does he drive?'

(4)b. Anie akparawa ekesin ntime? : 'Which youth gave trouble?'

(4)c. Mme anie kaiseri enek unek? : ' Which girls are dancing?'

where ngo agrees with inanimate nouns, anie with human but singular nouns, and mme anie with plural human nouns. Thus (5), where this kind of concord is violated, are ungrammatical:

(5)a. *Anie moto ke enye awat? : 'Which car does he drive?'

(5)b. *Ngo akparawa ekesin ntime? : 'Which youth gave trouble?'

(5)c. *Anie m? eyom mi? : 'Which chiefs want me?'

In (5)a, anie, which requires a human noun, is given an inanimate one instead, hence the ungrammaticality. In (5)b, ngo is given a human noun and yet it requires an inanimate noun, hence the ungrammaticality. The ungrammaticality of (5)c arises from the use of anie instead of mme anie. Thus while nte shows no relationship at all with any constituent of the S, ngo and anie clearly show that they are related to the NP.

In addition to the above relation between the WH question morpheme and the nominal head, there is also a co-occurrence restriction between this category /
category and ART, which is also a constituent of the NP. Consider (6):


(6)b. *Anie ọdụ emi akawat moto? : 'Which this man drove a car?'

where nso and anie, which are WH realizations, do not co-occur with oro and emi, which are ART realizations.

Observe that WH question, as an NP constituent, can be attached to an NP not necessarily first in the sentence, subject of course to the above restrictions. Thus we have (7)a:

(7)a. Bassey oyom anie ọwọ? : 'Which person (who) is Bassey looking for?'

It is even possible to have two occurrences of it in the same sentence, as in (7)b:

(7)b. Anie ọwọ oyom nso nke nso? : 'Which person (who) is looking for what thing (what)?'

However, although (2)d and (2)e are regarded as WH question sentences, there appears to be no NP as such to which the question elements didie (how, in what way?) and mmọj (where, at which place?) respectively are adjoined in these examples. Of course (2)d and (2)e are surface sentences and must have undergone some transformations. We claim that these sentences are in fact derived from (8)a and (8)b respectively, since the latter and the former are paraphrases of each other

(8)a. Bassey eye ke nso ụsụ? : 'Bassey is handsome in what way?'

(8)b. Iban oro ọka ebiet ụwọ : 'What place (where) have the women gone?'

If so, there is an optional transformation that can replace ke nso ụsụ and ebiet ụwọ with didie and mmọj in order to derive (2)d and (2)e from (8)a and (8)b respectively.

Further /

4. Ewe occurs with both human and non-human nominals though more frequently with the latter.
Further syntactic evidence for deriving (2)d and (2)e from (8)a and (8)b comes from the fact that just as didie and mm® can be fronted, so can ke ns® usu® and ebiet ewe. Thus we have (9)a and (9)b and (10)a and (10)b, which are paraphrases of each other, respectively:

(9)a. Didie ke Bassey eye? : 'How handsome is Bassey?'
(9)b. mm® ke iban oro eka? : 'Where have the women gone?'
(10)a. ns® usu® ke Bassey eye? : 'In what way is Bassey handsome?'
(10)b. Ebiet ewe ke iban oro eka? : 'Which place have the women gone?'

Finally, as an NP modifier, the WH morpheme is distributionally equivalent to other NP modifiers like the determiner, adjective, quantifier, etc., as the following examples show:

(11)a. Effiong oyom ns® kp®? :'Effiong wants what thing (what)?'
(11)b. Effiong oyom ns® : 'Effiong wants what?'
(12)a. Enye oyom kp® oro : 'He wants that thing (that)'
(12)b. Enye oyom oro : 'He wants that'
(13)a. Bassey oyom akamba kp® : 'Bassey wants a big thing'
(13)b. Bassey oyom akamba : 'Bassey wants a big one'
(14)a. Ata oyom ediyak kp® : 'Ata wants many things'
(14)b. Ata oyom ediyak : 'Ata wants many'

where the Ns are deletable in the context of N + Modifier or modifier + N.

So far we have shown that the main difference between YN and WH is that while the latter is clearly a constituent of the NP, there is no S constituent to which YN shows any form of relationship. It has also been shown that while YN occurs at the beginning of the sentence, the position of WH depends on the NP of which it is a constituent. There is also another difference between YN and WH, as the following surface sentences show:
show:

(15)a. Nte mbufo emekot njparawa? : 'Have you invited youths?'

(15)b. *Mme anie njparawa ke mbufo emekot?: 'Which youths have you invited?'

(15)a, which is a YN question sentence, allows the perfective marker me- (cf. 2.8.3). However, (15)b, which is a WH question sentence does not allow this marker. Thus if the perfective marker me- is removed from the verb emekot in (15)b, (15)c, which is grammatical, results:

(15)c. Mme anie njparawa ke mbufo ekot? : 'Which youths have you invited?'

So far, what appears clear is that WH is a constituent of the NP and that YN and WH must differ in their derivations. However, there is nothing so far to suggest strongly that YN be derived as a constituent of S. We think, however, that there are some pieces of evidence that strongly suggest that it should be.

First, as has been pointed out above, the YN question morpheme nte occurs optionally, thus (16) are paraphrases of (1):

(16)a. njwed ke oyom?: 'Is it a book that you are looking for?'

(16)b. Ata edi mi? : 'Has Ata come here?'

Note that (16) are ambiguous as between statement and question but (1) with the morpheme nte are not. If, however, there is a rising intonation at the end of the sentence in (16), then these sentences will be unambiguously questions as (1). If intonation is a property of the sentence rather than of the individual words, then this provides a very strong support for our derivation of YN as a constituent of S.

Second, observe that nte can only appear at the beginning of the sentence, as has already been pointed out. Thus the following are ungrammatical:

(17)a. *Mmč nte edia udia? : 'Have they eaten?'

(17)b. *Ata anam nte utom? : 'Has Ata worked?'

(17)c. /
Finally, the two questions of course differ semantically, for in the YN question, the hearer is being requested to affirm or deny a proposition that can be extracted from the question. There is an element of doubt or uncertainty in the mind of the speaker, hence the question for confirmation and denial. In the case of WH question, however, the speaker has a certain presupposition. For example in (11)a, the speaker presupposes that Effiong wants something. What the speaker therefore wants is a definite quantification of the thing wanted. It is no wonder then that most of the NPs that are given as answers to WH questions are definite, or otherwise restricted.

In some way, our analysis looks like Katz and Postal's (1964) analysis. For example, we have derived WH questions from NPs just as in Katz and Postal (p.103). However, we do not think that as far as Efik is concerned, there is any basis for deriving YN question as a constituent of what they call Adverb Sentence. On the contrary, as we have shown above, there are very sound reasons for deriving YN as a constituent of S with an intervening Q whose function is to signal question. In the same way, Q signals question in the case of WH. One of the advantages our analysis has is that as Q immediately dominates both YN and WH, we do not need to delete Q at all, unlike in the Katz and Postal analysis.

2.8 The VP:

The VP is probably the most complex of all the major categories in Efik. Not only is there a complicated tense/aspect system accounted for here as expansion of the category of AUX, but also what looks like a VP within a VP, accounted for here under the expansion of the category QVB ('quasi Verbal'). Consequently, we have not attempted to produce rules that will generate 'all /
'all and only Efik vPs but have limited ourselves to the more modest task of attempting to account for some of what we consider to be the important features of this category.

2.8.1 Concord:
First the verb agrees\(^5\) in number and person with the subject nominal, as shown below in (18):

(18)a. Ami \(\_\_\)wet leta : 'I'm writing a letter'
(18)b. Afo ewet leta : 'You (sing) are writing a letter'
(18)c. \(\_\_\_\)nye ewet leta : 'He/she is writing a letter'
(18)d. Nnyin iwet leta : 'We are writing a letter'
(18)e. Mbufo ewet leta : 'You (pl) are writing a letter'
(18)f. Mm\(\_\_\_\) ewet leta : 'They are writing a letter'.

where /

---

5. Some of the auxiliary elements also show this kind of agreement. The past tense morpheme \(-ma-\), which does not get attached to the main verb, is one such element. (cf.2.8.2)
6. We are not concerned with phonological and tonal details. However, here are some notes:

(i) 1st Person Sing prefix is always a nasal, which is homorganic with a following consonant. Thus we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic</th>
<th>Phonetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ñ̈kä</td>
<td>ñ̈kä (I'm going)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ň̂dë</td>
<td>ň̂dë (I'm sleeping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbët</td>
<td>mbët (I'm waiting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This nasal is syllabic and always bears a high tone.

(ii) The first person plural is always /i/ and the tone on it always low.

(iii) The second and third persons singular vowel prefixes vary according to the first vowel of the root or stem of the verb. In other words, there is harmony between the vowels of the root or stem of the verb and these vowel prefixes. Thus we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Person Singular</th>
<th>3rd Person Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anäm utom (you are working)</td>
<td>anäm utom (he/she is working)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oýom (you are looking for)</td>
<td>oýom (he/she is looking for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ewët (you are writing)</td>
<td>ewët (he/she is writing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although in the orthography both the second and third persons singular and plural sometimes have a common vowel, phonemically the vowel is actually /i/ for the singular of these persons, if the root vowel is /i/ or /i/ (Cook 1969:84). The tone on the second person singular prefix is always low while that on third person singular may be high or falling depending on the aspect (cf. 2.8.3).

(iv) The second person plural prefix is /e/ (orthographically and phonemically) and has a low tone.

(v) The third person plural prefix is /e/ (orthographically and phonemically) and the tone may be high or falling (as in the case of the singular) depending on the aspect.

(vi) Where the neutral past marker (cf. 2.8.2) -ma is used, the Person and Number prefixes are attached to this marker as well as the root verb itself. Thus we have

Nnyin ìma iyom enye: 'We looked for him'

The Number and Person prefixes on -ma bear normal tones as described above but the prefixes on the root verb are high irrespective of person. But the tone on the root verb is unaffected except that in monosyllabic roots, a high tone becomes a downstep high.
This is why the pronoun is deletable in such sentences as (18). Such a deletion, however, will not take place until the transformation that copies the salient syntactic features of the subject onto the VP has applied. It can then be claimed that the subject was deleted by identity with these features. In this case all nouns are necessarily third person and although the same concord rule that copies the person and number features of the subject onto the VP applies, we will have to limit allowable deletions to the subjects that are personal pronouns, since these but not noun NPs can be uniquely recovered. In order that the agreement (or concord) rule may apply copying the features of number and person of the subject onto the VP, we have allowed the category C (Concord) in the base so that the concord transformation could apply at the appropriate time.

I would like to mention in passing that in every day speech, however, all subjects, whether they be personal pronoun or noun, are deletable once they have been first mentioned and the participants in the discourse know what the subject of the discourse is. Such deletions are easily recoverable in context. However, since our grammar cannot handle contextual matters of this kind, we have limited our deletions to just those that can be recovered from the grammar itself (cf. Chomsky 1965: 144).

(Note page 52 follows directly as from page 44.)
2.8.2 Tense/Aspect:
No attempt is made to discuss the expansion of this node, since it
does not affect the discussion on pronominalization. The general area
that would need to be covered is that discussed in Ward (1933) pages
61-93.

2.8.3 Emphasis:
Emphasis on the VP is achieved by some reduplication, as in (43):

(43)a. Enye esi\textsubscript{2}de kpykpru us\textsubscript{\textfrac{3}{4}}en-\textsubscript{\textfrac{1}{4}}ub\textsubscript{\textfrac{3}{4}}k: 'He sleeps (rather than do
anything else) every morning'

(43)b. Nnyom ndikpekpe fi: 'I want to pay you (for it), not ex gratis'

Note that \textit{de} (sleep) and \textit{kpe} (pay) are the root forms of \textit{esidede} and
\textit{ndikpekpe}, respectively. Thus \textit{-de-} and \textit{-kpe-} are reduplicated
segments of the roots \textit{de} and \textit{kpe}, respectively. Note that (44) below
are the unemphatic counterparts of (43):

(44)a. Enye eside kpukpru use\textsubscript{\textfrac{3}{4}}n-\textsubscript{\textfrac{1}{4}}ub\textsubscript{\textfrac{3}{4}}k: 'He sleeps every morning'

(44)b. Nnyom ndikpe fi: 'I want to pay you'

We wish to point out that our derivation of emphasis in general as
a category in the base arises from the fact that the unemphatic and
the emphatic parallels are semantically different. There are
certain implications which are obvious to the native speaker, when
there is emphasis, and which are absent in the unemphatic cases.
We think that these implications can be captured or accounted for
by the kind of analysis we have made.

2.8.4 /
2.8.4 Negation:

Negation is indicated on the VP by the use of affix. Consider the following examples:

(45)a. Ami mmaha enye : 'I don't like him'
(45)b. Arit idikaha do mfin : 'Arit will not go there today'
(45)c. Afo ukoṭke mmο : 'You have not invited them'

where the affix -ha/-ke indicates negation, except in the imperative cases where ku is used, as in (46):

(46)a. Kuka : 'Don't go'
(46)b. Ekuka (pl) : 'Don't go'

Observe that the number and person (concord) prefixes often undergo some phonological changes when there is negation. Consider, for example, the positive counterpart of (45)c in (47):

(47) Afo okot mmο : 'You invite them'

where the prefix oo in (47) changes phonologically to u in (45)c.

There are other complications and constructions involving negation that are beyond the scope of this work to go into.

2.9 Adjectives:

What has been said so far about the VP is accounted for by the expansion of the AUX. There is, however, another important part of the VP in our rules, namely the constituent VB (Verbal). In our grammar, the root forms of verbs (cf.2.8.4) are analysed as VB. In this analysis, too, what is traditionally known as adjectives are treated not as segments but /
but as syntactic features of the VB\textsuperscript{9}. We shall come back to these features later.

It is largely agreed by linguists working within the generative transformational theory that verbs and adjectives share many common properties. For example, in English (cf. Lyons 1968:323-325) there are both stative verbs and adjectives as well as both non-stative verbs and adjectives. Consequently, they are assumed to belong to a common class or category which some call Verbal and which we have employed in our analysis. Some linguists like Bach, McCawley, Langendoen, etc., go even further to claim that adjectives, nouns and verbs are indistinguishable in the deep structure. The position taken here is the former, namely that verbs and adjectives belong to a common category. To begin with, most adjectives in Efik have two forms: one which could be described as adjective proper and the other verb. The forms, of course, do not affect the lexical meaning of the item. Consider the following examples:

(48)a. Okon e\textsubscript{1} di\textsubscript{2} any\textsubscript{3} o\textsubscript{4} : 'Okon is a tall man'
(48)b. Okon \(\rightarrow_{\text{V}}\) e\textsubscript{2} (owo) : 'Okon is a tall man'

(49)a. Un\textsubscript{1} em\textsubscript{2} e\textsubscript{3} ak\textsubscript{4} ba un\textsubscript{5} : 'This hen is a big hen'
(49)b. Un\textsubscript{1} em\textsubscript{2} ok\textsubscript{3} pn\textsubscript{4} (un\textsubscript{5}) : 'This hen is a big hen'

(50)a. 

9. Winston (1970) treats adjectives as nouns. Although adjectives show 'a singular-plural alternation' (cf. 3.1) like some nouns (e.g. just as we have \textit{et\textsubscript{1}/et\textsubscript{2}}: king/kings, we also have at\textsubscript{1}/at\textsubscript{2} : good (sing)/good(pl), the 'verbal' (in the sense of 'behaving like a verb) character should not be overlooked. In our view this phenomenon should be regarded as evidence of the concord between adjectives and nouns. But it has been shown (cf. 2.8.1) that subjects and verbs agree in number and person. What appears to be the case with Verbs which are \textit{\#Adj} is that where they are used attributively (after a series of transformations) they bear only the number marker. With the verbal adjectives, however, the 'verbal' character of adjectives is not in doubt: they agree with the subject in number and person, as \textit{t\textsubscript{1}Adj} (tall), \textit{ok\textsubscript{4}pn} (big) and \textit{ey\textsubscript{4}e} (pretty) in (48)b, (49)b and (50)b respectively show.
The verbs in the (a) examples - *anyan, akamba, edive* - have adjective proper forms while those in (b) - *ami, okpon, eye* - have verb forms. We shall call the latter 'verbal' adjectives to distinguish them from the so-called adjectives proper.

Like most verbs, verbal adjectives may be used in the imperative mood, as in the following examples:

(51)a. *Kuni yaba:* 'Don't be tall any more (i.e. stop growing)'
(51)b. *Kpon us, p usp:* 'Grow or be big quickly'
(51)c. *Ye ndien:* 'Be pretty/handsome now'

Perhaps we should mention that the contexts in which such imperatives occur are rather restricted, unlike those of the ordinary verbs. Such imperatives nearly always require some kind of adverbial.

Furthermore, some verbs in Efik are translated as adjectives in English. Consider the following examples with verbs like *yama* (be bright) and *kim* (be dark):

(52)a. *Ukwak oro ayama eti eti:* 'That metal is very bright'
(52)b. *Anwa okim eti eti:* 'The outside is very dark'

This appears to suggest that some verbals have only the 'verb' forms. Observe that like the imperatives of *ami, okpon* and *eye* above, the imperatives of *yama* and *okim* require some kind of adverbials, as the following examples show:

(53)a. *Yama ndien:* 'Be bright now'
(53)b. *Kim usp usp:* 'Get dark quickly'

But

(54)a. /
The above characteristics of adjectives strongly suggest that they be analysed as VB, as we have done. To distinguish 'verbal' adjectives from adjectives proper, we have introduced the feature $^+[+V]$. All verbals are of course $^+[+VB]$. So ordinary verbs like fehe (run), dia (eat), top (throw), etc. are $^+[+VB, +V, -Adj]$. 'Verbal' adjectives like kpon (be big), fum (be good), bire (be black), etc. are $^+[+VB, +V, +Adj]$. And adjectives proper like akamba (big), eti (good), obubit (black), etc. are $^+[+VB, -V, +Adj]$. These features have some syntactic correlates. $^+[+V]$ verbals allow imperatives, though in varying degrees, thus we have the following:

(55)a. Fehe : 'Run'
(55)b. Didj idem : 'Know yourself'
(55)c. Kukpri ntre : 'Don't be as small as that'
(55)d. Nij suj suj : 'Be tall slowly'

$^[-V]$ verbals allow no imperative at all, thus the following are impossible:

(56)a. *Kamba : 'Be big'
(56)b. *Ti : 'Be good'
(56)c. *Subit : 'Be black'

What can be said about $^+[+Adj]$ verbals in general is that unlike $^-[Adj]$ verbals, they do not characteristically allow the imperative. Even the verbal adjectives which do allow, do so in a rather restricted way, as has been shown above.

We have allowed the two forms of adjectives in the base because it would be difficult to derive one from the other transformationally. For one thing /
thing, not all adjectives have the verb forms. For example, although
obukpo (useless) exists, there is no *bukpo (be useless). For this
reason, the attempt to derive the adjective forms from the verb forms
is bound to run into difficulties. Deriving obukpo from a starred and
non-existing form like *bukpo appears unattractive to me. If, however,
one wishes to derive the verb forms from the adjective forms, one is
confronted with the same problem, since, as we have shown above, some
adjectives appear to have no adjective proper forms. Besides, some
constructions obligatorily require the verb forms of adjectives, even
if both forms exist. Consider the following, for example:

(57)a. Bassey okpon onyu anyan owo : 'Bassey is big and tall'

(57)b. Bassey okpon akan Ata : 'Bassey is bigger than Ata'

If the adjective forms akamba and anyan are used in place of the verb
forms, (58), which are ungrammatical, would be generated:

(58)a. *Bassey edi akamba owo onyu anyan owo: 'Bassey is a big and
tall man'

(58)b. *Bassey edi akamba owo akan Ata: 'Bassey is a bigger man than Ata'

The ungrammaticality of (58) can be handled by a deep structure con-
straint. Such a constraint would characterise as ungrammatical any
c-o-ordinate structures involving the co-ordinate conjoining element nyun
in which two or more [\+-V, +Adj] verbals are conjoined, or any phrase
markers in which these sorts of verbals are followed by a QVB (cf.2.10
below). The transformational derivation of attributive adjectives will
be considered in 3.6.

2.10 Quasi-Verbals:
The expansion of the VP also includes a rather curious category called
QVB /
QVh (Quasi-Verbal). This is designed to account for certain verb-like elements in the language. There are a class of elements in Efik which behave syntactically like verbs but functionally like prepositions, conjunctions or adverbs of degree. Consider the following examples:

(59)a. Arit ekpì akaha : 'Arit is too small'
(59)b. Ami mmekpon onkan Ata : 'I am bigger than Ata'
(59)c. Effiong ekere eje Bassey egi eti owo : 'Effiong thinks that Bassey is a good man'
(59)d. Kpa eket wad eba9a enye : 'They have written a book about him/her'
(59)e. Ima ama ake onyu~ okokut ebe esie : 'Ima went and saw her husband'

The elements in question are akaha, onkan, ebe, eba9a and onyu~. They are like verbs in that they have to agree with the subject of the sentence in number and person. However, unlike verbs they are not inflected for aspect, mood and tense (though onyu~ is occasionally for tense and mood). In addition, unlike most ordinary verbs, they may not be used in the imperative alone, thus (60) are impossible:

(60)a. *Kaha : 'Be too'
(60)b. *Kan : 'Be than'
(60)c. *Te : 'Be that'
(60)d. *Ba9a : 'Be about'
(60)e. *Nyu~ : 'Be and'

On the other hand, it is possible to have the imperative with these elements in conjunction with ordinary verbals, as in these examples:

(61)a. Kpri kaha : 'Be too small'
(61)b. Kpon kan : 'Be bigger than'
(61)c. Doh~ ete : 'Say that'
(61)d. Wet ba9a : 'Write about'
(61)e. /
(61)e. Nyunj kut enye: 'See him too'
Although these elements have a lot of syntactic similarities, they also have differences. For example, akaha must not be followed by an NP, as (62)a, for example, shows:

(62)a. *Ata ekpri akaha ọgo: 'Ata is too small man!'

Secondly, nyunj, apart from being inflected for tense and mood, precedes the main verb, unlike the rest. In addition, nyunj appears to occur only in what is traditionally called 'compound sentences', unlike akaha, jkan and ebaọa, which appear to be confined to the simplex. Like nyunj, ete does not occur in a simplex. But unlike nyunj, it occurs in complex structures, particularly of that-S kind. Sometimes the main verb preceding ete may be deleted, if dọhọ (say) is the verb, thus (62)b is synonymous with (62)c:

(62)b. Bassey ọdọhọ ete imọ iyeka: 'Bassey says he will go'

(62)c. Bassey ete imọ iyeka: 'Bassey says he will go'

Both nyunj and ete are sometimes deleted, as the following examples show:

(63)a. Bassey jọdọhọ ete imọ ima ika: 'Bassey said that he went'

(63)b. Bassey jọdọhọ imọ ima ika: 'Bassey said that he went'

(64)a. Mmọ ema etem udia emunj edja: 'They cooked and ate'

(64)b. Mmọ ema etem udia edja: 'They cooked food and ate'

Unlike nyunj and ete, jkan and ebaọa cannot be deleted, nor can the main verbs with which they occur. Thus (65) and (66), where these sorts of deletions have occurred, are ungrammatical:

(65)a. *Ami mmekpon Ata: 'I am bigger Ata'

(65)b. *Ami jkan Ata: 'I'm bigger than Ata'

(66)a. /

10. Only dọhọ (say) appears to allow the deletion of ete.
(66)a. *Mm) ewet wed enye : 'They have written a book about him'
(66)b. *Mm) wed ebata enye : 'They have written a book about him'

Ignoring akaha, which is hardly relevant to pronominalization anyway, it appears that elements like njkan and ebana must be part of the VP. In particular, they are limited to the simplex. On the other hand, ete and nyuna are clearly sentence connectives, the former occurring in complex sentences as a complementizer, and the latter in compound sentences as a co-ordinating conjunction. We call those elements like njkan and ebana QVB (Quasi-Verbal) and derive them as part of the expansion of the VP. Ete and nyuna will be treated as sentence connectives, the former as a complementizer and the latter as co-ordinating conjoining element.

But if nyuna and ete are sentence connectives and njkan and ebana QVBs, what about elements like nn·2 and aka in the following sentences?

(67)a. Mma ndep yed nn·2 eyen mmi : 'I bought a book and gave it to my son'
(67)b. Enye efhe aka ufok wed : 'He has run and gone to school'

We claim that although nn·2 and aka may be translated as prepositions in English, they are verbs proper, and that (67) themselves are in fact compound sentences with a deleted nyuna. The main reason for our claim is that (67) can be paraphrased as (68):

(68)a. Mma ndep yed nn·2 yed nyuna nn·2 eyen mi : 'I bought a book and gave my son'
(68)b. Enye efhe onyuna aka ufok yed : 'He has run and gone to school'

In view of nyuna as a sentence connective, we will use it as a test for compound sentences in cases where this is not obvious, as in (67). So a verb-like element in a sentence will be considered as a QVB if it does not permit nyuna, as nyuna is supposed to precede a true verb when it co-ordinates sentences. It follows from this that a sentence whose paraphrase /
paraphrase includes *mmy* is a compound sentence. By this criterion,
then, *ikan* and *eba~a*, as already shown above, are QVBs and examples such
as (59)b and (59)d simplex sentences, as they cannot be paraphrased as
(69) below:

(69)a. *Ami mme~kan~mny* *ikan* Ata: 'I am bigger and than Ata'

(69)b. *Mm)* *ewet* *wen* *mny* *eba~a* *eny*: 'They have written a book and
about him'

By the same criterion *ito* in (70)a is a QVB and (70)a itself a simplex
but *ekpo* a full verb and (70)b a compound sentence, as (71) show:

(70)a. Ata ib~ja le~ta* *ito* *eny* : 'Ata has*not* got a letter from her'
(70)b. *Iban* oro ema *efehe* *ekpo* *nyin* : 'The women ran away and left us'

(71)a. *Ata ib~ja le~ta* *mny* *ito* *eny* : 'Ata has not received a letter
and not from her'

(71)b. *Iban* oro ema *efehe* *mny* *ekpo* *nyin* : 'The women ran away and left
us'

Observe that QVBs function like prepositions. Consider the following
examples:

(72)a. Effiong an~m ut~m *ye* Okon : 'Effiong is working with Okon'
(72)b. Effiong ~*ja* le~ta* *a*~*to* Okon : 'Effiong has received a letter from
Okon'

(73)a. Bre *mbe* ke *uf~ok* : 'Play at home'
(73)b. *Ti* *mbuk* ba~ja *uf~ok* : 'Tell a st*ory* about home'
(73)c. Dia *udia* *ye* *ikpan* : 'Eat food with a *spoon*'

As (72) and (73) show, prepositions (*ye* and *ke*) are not inflected, unlike
QVBs. Perhaps one might ask, from the point of view of a case grammar,
whether there are any particular functions which require a QVB rather
than a preposition. It is unclear to me at the moment whether there
are any such functions. What is, however, clear are the ones that do not /
not require a QVB. As (72)a, (73)a and (73)o show, the comitative, locative and instrumental cases require prepositions.

It should be obvious from our analysis of sentences like (59)b as simplexes that we do not favour a complex sentence derivation of comparative sentences. While many of the arguments for such an analysis may be valid for English, there are complications if such arguments are applied to Efik. First, while in English (74)a and (74)b are paraphrases, in Efik (75)b, which is supposed to paraphrase (75)a, is highly questionable:

(74)a. Ata is taller than Bassey
(74)b. Ata is taller than Bassey is

(75)a. Ata ɔnjig akan Bassey : 'Ata is taller than Bassey'
(75)b. ??Ata ɔnjig akan nte Bassey ɔnjide: 'Ata is taller than Bassey is'

Secondly, even if (75)b were grammatical, there is the question of semantics. While (75)b implies that Bassey is tall but Ata happens to be taller, this is not necessarily the case in (75)a. There is also a similar implication in (76)b:

(76)a. Ima ɔmuh ə akan Arit : 'Ima is shorter than Arit'
(76)b. ??Ima ɔmuh ə akan nte Arit ɔmuhede: 'Ima is shorter than Arit is short'

Similar to (75)b, (76)b implies that Arit is short but (76)a does not necessarily imply this.

However, as in English, sentences like (77)a are ambiguous, since it could be interpreted either as (77)b or as (77)c:

(77)a. Mmekpono enye əkan Ata : 'I respect him more than Ata'
(77)b. Mmekpono enye əkan nte əkponode Ata : 'I respect him more than I respect Ata'
(77)c. Mmekpono enye əkan nte Ata okponode enye : 'I respect him more than Ata does'

However /
However, observe that kpomo (respect) is $-\text{Adj}$. Perhaps this is yet another syntactic difference between $+\text{Adj}$ verbals and $-\text{Adj}$ verbals (cf. 2.9 above). So while there may be grounds for deriving comparative sentences involving $-\text{Adj}$ verbals from complex sentence sources, there are no such grounds for deriving comparative sentences involving $+\text{Adj}$ verbals in a similar way. On the other hand there are semantic grounds for not doing so, as shown above.

2.11 Nyene and Di (Have and Be):

We have made the VB optional so as to account for sentences of the following sort:

(78)a. Ebot edi unam : 'A goat is an animal'
(78)b. Ata enyene ebot : 'Ata has a goat'

which are analysed as NP AUX Pred and NP AUX NP, respectively. They will then require the Efik equivalents of 'be' and 'have' insertion transformations. I would like to mention in passing that the arguments presented by Bach (1967) in connection with reduced attributive clauses also apply to Efik (cf. 3.6).

With regard to nyene (have), it could be argued that this element may well be a contextual variant of di (be), because of sentences like the following:

(79)a. Ata enyene eti ido : 'Ata has a good character'
(79)b. Ata $\text{Ifon}$ ido : 'Ata is good in character'

(80)a. ime enyene idiek enyin eti eti : 'Ime has very bad eyes (i.e. looks at people in a bad or unusual way)

(80)b. ime idiek enyin eti eti : 'Ime has very bad eyes (i.e. looks at people in a bad or unusual way)

(81)a. Mma oro enyene ediyi ido : 'The lady has a pretty face'
(81)b. /
(81)b. *mma oro eye iso* : 'The lady has a pretty face'

where the (a) examples are synonymous with the (b) examples. Support for our claim comes from comparison of (79) - (81) with (48) - (50) (cf. 2.9). The (a) sentences in (48) - (50) have *di* (be) while the (a) counterparts in (79) - (81) have *nyene* (have). *Di* in (48)a - (50)a cannot substitute for *nyene* in (79)a - (81)a or vice-versa. It seems plausible therefore to assume that *di* and *nyene* may well be contextual variants, especially as what follow *etti, idi2k* and *ediye* in (79)a - (81)a are typically parts of the body and what follow the adjectives in (48)a - (50)a are more or less generic nouns.

2.12 Adjunct:

Finally, the expansion of S includes an optional category ADJT (Adjunct). Instead of adverbs, we prefer adjunct partly because there are several kinds of adverbs (*e.g.* manner, time, etc.) and partly because adjunct as defined by Lyons (1968) is 'extranuclar'. We want precisely a category of this kind for those elements of the sentence that are not essential to the nucleus of the S. Having got this, it is expanded into a number of options, one of which is Pre-S S, to account for sentences of the following kind:

(82)a. *Ata enyene eyen okposuk edii eyen midoh> wan* : 'Ata has a child

(82)b. *Nnyikut Okon man nnd> enye utgm* : 'I will see Okon so that I may send him'

The Pre-S is supposed to dominate such phrases as *okposuk edii* (although) and *man* (so that). If we do not introduce such elements in the base, it would be problematic to do so transformationally, since for one thing these /
these elements have semantic contents, which according to our grammar should be accounted for in the base.

2.13 A Derivation:

Finally in this chapter, let us take a sentence like (83) and see how it can be generated according to our base rules in 2.6 above:

(83) Bassey eyedep ebot ke obio oro 1 2 3 4 5

'Bassey will buy a goat in that village'

S
NP VP ADJT R1
NP AUX VB NP ADJT R2
NP C TENSE VB NP ADJT R3
NP C Fut VB NP ADJT R4
N DET C Fut VB NP ADJT R10
N DET C Fut VB N DET ADJT R10
N ART C Fut VB N DET ADJT R13
N ART C Fut VB N ART ADJT R13
N ART C Fut VB N ART COMP-PHRASE R15
N ART C Fut VB N ART COMP NP R8
N ART C Fut VB N ART Prep NP R9
N ART C Fut VB N ART Prep N DET R10
N ART C Fut VB N ART Prep N ART R13

With the application of the relevant CS forming and lexicalization rules /
rules, the following structure will be generated:
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CHAPTER THREE

THE NP

3.0 Introduction:

As pronominalization operates on the NP, it is considered necessary to examine this category in more detail.

3.1 Characteristics of the NP:

Most Efik nouns begin with a vowel or a syllabic and homorganic nasal, thus we have the following:

(1a) ebua: 'a dog' (1d) ibuot: 'the head' (1g) mboro: 'banana'
(1b) ubom: 'a boat' (1e) obot: 'a hill' (1h) wed: 'a book'
(1c) akparawa: 'a youth' (1f) kp: 'bone' (1i) ntak: 'a reason'

There are, however, a few nouns which begin with non-nasal consonants, such as the following:

(2a) bia: 'Yam'  
(2b) sokoro: 'orange'  
(2c) da: 'pal'

Adjectives also begin with either a vowel or a syllabic and homorganic nasal, thus we have the following examples:

(3a) akamba: 'big'  
(3b) edie: 'pretty'  
(3c) obubit: 'black'

However, as was shown in Chapter Two (cf. 2.9), most adjectives have two forms, one form as adjective proper and the other as a verb. Let us take one example:

(4) afia ebot oro: 'the white goat'  
    ebot oro afia: 'the goat is white'

Clearly /
Clearly the stem of the adjective meaning 'white' is fia and the prefixes are a-/m- and a-/e-. A-/m- indicate only number but a-/e- indicate both number and person. Except for a very small number of nouns, which we will see presently, nouns in general do not have stems and prefixes in this kind of clearly defined way. As Cook (1969:178-9) has pointed out, the vowel and nasal prefixes of nouns "are invariant parts of the noun in almost all cases and no longer have any grammatical significance except to indicate that the word in which they occur is a noun....They are now 'frozen' as part of the noun and no longer actually function as prefixes". So while the noun prefixes (at least in a majority of cases) are 'inherent' part of the noun, at least synchronically, the adjective prefixes are derived as a result of the concord between adjectives and nouns (cf. Footnote 9 in Chapter Two).

Secondly, most nouns may be either singular or plural. Plurality is indicated in several ways (e.g. by the use of numerals iba (two) and above, the use of some quantifiers like ediwak (many), etc.). But the commonest way of showing plurality is by the use of the plural morpheme mme, as in these examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ebot (a goat)</td>
<td>mme ebot (goats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owo (a person)</td>
<td>mme owo (persons, people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in (a thief)</td>
<td>mme in (thieves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okpokoro (a table)</td>
<td>mme okpokoro (tables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntak (a reason)</td>
<td>mme ntak (reasons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kp (a thing)</td>
<td>mme kp (things)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mme is used optionally, since it is quite common to have nouns in the plural without the use of mme. Consider the following sentences, for example:

(6)a. Owo Ọma edi ediyom mbufo : 'People came to see you'

(6)b. /
If the noun has an article, however, the plural morpheme must be used, thus (7) are grammatical but (8) are not:

(7)a. Mme ete oro eyom fi : 'The men are looking for you'

(7)b. Mme_andikpep oro edaha : 'The teachers have left'

(8)a. *Ete oro eyom fi : 'The men are looking for you'

(8)b. *Andikpep oro edaha : 'The teachers have left'

Another way of showing number is what Winston (1970:420) calls 'alternation of prefix for number'. This is less common in modern Efik and applies to only a small number of singular nouns beginning with a vowel, as in these examples:

(9)   Singular               Plural
      m-bọ́ (a chief)               m-bọ́ (chiefs)
      e-didem (a king)            n-didem (kings)
      a-kparawa (a youth)         -kparawa (youths)
      a-bia (an informant)        m-bia (informants)
      a-ta-utop (a hunter)        n-ta-utop (also mme ata-utop)
                                  (hunters)

It is also possible to have mme along with such plural nouns, as in the following examples:

(10) mme mbó (chiefs)
    mme ndidem (kings)
    mme n-kparawa (youths)
    mme mbia (informants)
    mme nta-utop (hunters)

Thirdly, as already shown in 2.7.1, only the NP allows WH question, thus we have the following, for example:

(11)a. anie eyen? : 'which child?'

(11)b. nso leta? : 'what letter'

(11)c. /
However, as was pointed out then, NPs with articles do not allow WH, thus (11)e, for example, is ungrammatical:

(11)e. *Anie owo oro ke oyom? : 'Which the man do you want?'

Fourthly, NPs act as antecedents to relative clauses. Consider the following, for example:

(12)a. *kesaja wye Bassey : 'I went with Bassey'
(12)b. kesaja wye Bassey emi okoduude mi:'I went with the Bassey who lived here'

(13)a. Eyen oro imaha fi : 'The boy doesn't like you'
(13)b. Eyen emi akanyajade imaha fi : 'The boy you helped doesn't like you'

Finally, if the NP has a modifier, the nominal head may be deleted in contexts where both the speaker and hearer know what they are talking about. (cf. discussion in 2.8.1). Consider (14) and (15):

(14)a. Nnyom okpokoro emi : 'I want this table'
(14)b. Ndusuk iban edaha : 'Some women have left'
(14)c. Ekpri ebiot oro okosop : 'It is the small goat which got lost'

(15)a. Nnyom emi : 'I want this'
(15)b. Ndusuk edaha : 'Some have gone'
(15)c. Ekpri oro okosop : 'It is the small one which got lost'

Except in context, there is no way of recovering the deleted Ns in (15) from the grammar.

All these properties taken together go a long way to identify the NP as a category.
3.2 Expansion and Constraints

For convenience, we repeat below the base rules that expand the NP:

10. \( NP \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
    \text{Quant} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{PART} \quad N \quad \text{DET} \quad \{S \quad \text{EMPH}\} \\
    \text{S} \\
    \text{ye NP} \quad \text{NP*} 
\end{cases} \)

11. \( Q \rightarrow \text{WH} \)

12. \( \text{PART} \rightarrow \text{NP} \quad \text{PT} \)

13. \( \text{DET} \rightarrow \text{(NUM)} \quad \text{(NOM)} \quad \text{ART} \)

14. \( \text{NOM} \rightarrow \text{NP} \)

15. \( \text{EMPH} \rightarrow \{ \text{REDUP} \} \\
    \quad \{ \text{INT} \} \)

In the following sections, we will consider the constituents of the NP and see how they relate to one another. At the centre of all of them is the nominal head \( N \), which controls the selection of others. Except for the DET, the \( N \) is the only obligatory element in the base. But as we shall see later, even the DET (or its constituent) must be deleted in some cases to generate well-formed surface sentences.

3.2.1 Quant \( N \):

The following can be analysed as Quant \( N \):

(16)a. Ediwak unam 1 2 'Many animals'

(16)b. Ndušuk iban 1 2 'Some women'

(16)c. Kpukpru ubom : 'All canoes'

Quant does not co-occur with some constituents of the NP. Consider the following examples:

(17)a. *Mme anie ediwak kparawa? : 'Which many youths?'

(17)b. /
(17)b. *Oyom ndusuk owo ndusuk owo: 'Do you want some people some people'  
(17)a shows that both Q and Quant do not co-occur. Rule 10 of the base rules of course indicates this. (17)b shows that quantified NPs cannot be reduplicated; in other words, Quant and RDUPL do not co-occur. As this is not accounted for by the base rules the Reduplication transformation can be so formulated as not to apply if the NP to be reduplicated dominates a Quant.

3.2.2 Q_N:
WH as a constituent of the NP has been mentioned in 2.7.1, 3.1 and 3.2.1. In this section, we wish to consider the co-occurrence restrictions between this category and the other noun modifiers. As (17)a above shows, WH and Quant do not co-occur. In addition, as (11)e above shows, WH and the article do not appear to co-occur. Yet in our base rules, both WH and ART co-occur. However, there is a rule which deletes the ART either optionally or obligatorily. So the ART Deletion rule must apply obligatorily if the NP dominates a WH to generate such well-formed surface sentences as the following:

(18)a. *Anie eyen?: 'Which boy?'
(18)b. Nso okuk?: 'What money?'
Furthermore, like Quant, WH does not co-occur with REDUPL. In other words, WH NPs should not be reduplicated, thus (19), for example, are not well-formed:

(19)a. *Anie Bassey anie Bassey edi eren owo?: 'Which Bassey which Bassey is a man?'
(19)b. *Nnyomke nso okuk nso okuk?: 'I don't want what money what money?'
Without the question markers (19) would be perfectly grammatical, as (20) show:

(20)a. /
(20)a. Bassey Bassey edin erno? : 'Is Bassey the only person?'
(20)b. Nnyomke okuk okuk : 'I don't want only money'

The ungrammaticality of (19) can be handled in much the way as the ungrammaticality of (17)b.

3.2.3 PART N

PART N accounts for partitive constructions such as the following:

(21)a. Ndusuk owo ke otu owo edip oro : 'Some people of the twenty people'
(21)b. Anje akparawa ke otu akparawa oko : 'Which youth of the youths over there?'
(21)c. Unen 1ba ke otu unen ition emi : 'Two hens of these five hens'

As Rule 10 shows, although PART is an optional category, if it occurs, it must be preceded by one of the categories Quant, Q (which must be expanded as WH) or NUM. If none of these categories occur in this position, then the string would be ill-formed, as (22) below show:

(22)a. *Owo ke otu owo edip oro : 'A man out of the twenty people'
(22)b. *Akparawa ke otu akparawa oko : 'A youth out of the youths over there'
(22)c. *Unen ke otu unen ition emi : 'A hen out of these five hens'

Since NUM may occur without PART (though not in a preceding position) and since the expansion of DET also includes a NUM, strings such as the following may be generated by Rules 10 and 13:

(23)a. *Iba ejo ija : 'Two trees three'
(23)b. *Dop unen itjabe : 'Ten hens seven'

Strings such as (23) can be handled by a deep structure constraint that labels as ill-formed any NP structure which dominates two NUMs without an intervening PART.

3.3 /
3.3 N DET:

DET is expanded to include two optional elements NUM and NOM, and an obligatory one ART. Syntactically at the surface level each of these categories can follow N immediately in parallel positions as these examples show:

(24)a. Mmoto iba : 'Two cars'
(24)b. Mmoto Bassey : 'Bassey's car'
(24)c. Mmoto oro : 'The car'

If NUM and NOM occur together, the two could be optionally permuted with each other, as (25) show:

(25)a. Mmoto iba Bassey : 'Bassey's two cars'
(25)b. Mmoto Bassey iba : 'Bassey's two cars'

In the following sections, we will examine NOM and ART in some more detail. As NUM is fairly straightforward, we will say no more about it.

3.3.1 N NOM:

N NOM accounts for possessive cases. The following NPs have NOM as one of the constituents:

(26)a. Itam Bassey : 'Bassey's hat'
(26)b. Okuk eyen oro : 'The boy's money'

Besides NUM and ART, NOM can also occur with other NP modifiers such as WH, Quant, S (relative clause) or EMPH, as the following examples show:

(27)a. Ewe itam Ata? : 'Which hat of Ata's?'
(27)b. Kpukpru ufan ete oro : 'All the man's friends'
(27)c. Okuk Bassey emi osopde : 'Bassey's money which is lost'
(27)d. Eyen Bassey ke idem esie : 'Bassey's son himself'

3.3.2 /
3.3.2 N ART:

The following are analysed as N ART:

(28)a. Itam emi: 'This hat'
(28)b. Itam oro: 'That/the hat'
(28)c. Itam oko: 'Yonder hat'

The articles are the demonstratives emi (this), oro (that near the hearer) and oko (yonder, over there far from both speaker and hearer). Oro is also translatable as the English definite article the.

Articles occur with personal pronouns as well:

(29)a. Ami emi: 'This I'
(29)b. Afo emi: 'This you'
(29)c. Afo oro: 'That you'
(29)d. Enye emi: 'This he/she/it'
(29)e. Enye oro: 'That he/she/it'
(29)f. Enyeoko: 'Yonder he/she/it'

However emi (I) does not occur with oro or oko and oko does not occur with afo, as these examples show:

(30)a. *Ami oro: 'That I'
(30)b. *Ami oko: 'Yonder I'
(30)c. *Afooko: 'Yonder you'

From (29) and (30) it can be said that the first person occurs only with emi, the second person with either emi or oro, and the third person with all three emi, oro and oko. Sooko occurs with only the third person. Like oko, eken (other) occurs with only the third person, as the following examples show:

(31)a. *Ami eken: 'The other I'
(31)b. *Afo eken: 'The other you'
(31)c. /
Although ART is obligatory in the base in our grammar, certain NPs occur without explicit articles in the surface structure as in these examples:

(32)a. Bassey edi : 'Bassey has come'

(32)b. Owo oyom fi : 'Someone is looking for you'

(32)c. Etubom iduhe : 'The headmaster is not in (school)'

Such NPs include proper nouns, indefinite NPs and certain NPs indicating office holders. Such NPs could be handled by the ART Deletion Rule (cf. the summary of Rules in the Appendix for the formulation of this Rule).

In our grammar, emi, oro, oko, etc. do not occur as lexical items in the base. Rather they are introduced during the second lexical pass in accordance with the feature specifications. For example, an ART node marked [+Def, +Dem, +Prox] is realised as emi (this); another marked [+Def, +Dem, -Prox, +There] is realised as oro (that near the hearer); and a third marked [+Def, +Dem, -Prox, -There] is realised as oko. If an ART has no surface realization, then it is obligatorily deleted.

As all +Def ARTs have no surface realizations they are obligatorily deleted. A +Def, -Dem ART may also be deleted if the N is -Common as the following examples show:

(33)a. Bassey oro ididihe : 'Bassey will not come'

(33)b. Bassey ididihe : 'Bassey will not come'

Ordinarily, however, the ART is deleted unless some emphasis is involved. This is also the case if the N is [+Pro] and the ART is [+Def, -Dem]. Thus (34)b is ordinarily preferred to (34)a:

(34)a Mm>: oro ema edi : 'They came'

(34)b Mm>: ema edi : 'They came'

There /
There are problems with the status of article features of this kind just as there are with the syntactic features of nouns. Brown (1972:42-44) discusses these and concludes that "many determiners must ultimately be derived from an orientational component". Whatever may be the ultimate status of these features, they certainly perform syntactic functions. As we have seen above, the surface realizations of these articles and the deletion of the entire node depend on the features on the node itself. The feature \(^{+Dem}\) also appears to play a role in relativization (cf.8.2), as these examples show:

(35)a *Ete oko emi ayarade itam okoyom fi
\[1 2 3 4 5 6 7\]
'Yonder man who has on a hat wanted you'

(35)b *Mma ha okpokoro emi emi egbe ekegepde
\[1 2 3 4 5 6\]
'I don't like this table which he bought'

We do not think \(^{+Dem}\) in this instance is being used for 'selection'. On the other hand, what we are suggesting is that \(^{+Dem}\) performs a blocking function here and blocking a transformation is clearly syntactic.

3.4 N EMPH

N EMPH is designed to account for emphatic NPs. Although there are other kinds of emphases (e.g. topicalization) that affect the NP, for our purposes we limit the expansion of EMPH to INT and REDUPL, because intensification and reduplication appear to perform distinctive semantic functions that should be accounted for in the base. Consider these pairs of sentences, for example:

(36)a. Bassey eyeka do : 'Bassey will go there'

(36)b. Bassey ke idem esie eyeka do : 'Bassey himself (and not his subordinates, for example) will go there'

(37)a. /
(37)a. Enye imaha ywan esie ywan esie : 'He doesn't love his wife only' (implying he does love other people)
where the emphatic and the non-emphatic examples are clearly different in meaning.

Whether (38)b involving topicalization is sufficiently semantically different from (38)a, which does not involve topicalization, is not quite clear to me.

(38)a. Nnyom itam : 'I want a hat'
(38)b. Itam ke nnyom : 'It is a hat that I want'
Incidentally, to a question like (38)c, either (38)a or (38)b could be given as an answer.

(38)c. Oyom nso?: 'What do you want?'

Observe that EMPH does not co-occur with S (which accounts for relative clauses) as our analysis shows. Thus (39) are ungrammatical:

(39)a. *Ata ke idem esie emi ekedide mi : 'Ata himself who came here'
(39)b. *Ata Ata emi mikedihe mi : 'Only Ata who did not come here'

3.5 NP as S
Rule 10 shows that the NP can be expanded as an S. This is designed to account for such surface sentences as the following:

(40)a. Enem enye ndibe udomo : 'It pleases him to pass examinations'
(40)b. Eyeyat enye esit ndikut gi do : 'It will annoy him to see me there'

Clearly sentences such as (40) are derived from sources underlying (41):

(41)a. Ndibe udomo enem enye : 'To pass examinations pleases him'
(41)b. Ndikut mi do eyeyat enye esit : 'For him to see me there will annoy him'
where the subjects are the strings ndibe udomo and ndikut mi do. Both these strings are of course analysable as S's. Since NPs are subjects of /
of sentences, then such sentential subjects as those in (41) must be analysed as NPs dominated immediately by the superordinate S thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

3.6 \text{ye NP NP*}:

The above constituent accounts for conjoined or co-ordinate NPs, which are /

1. Without going into details, we assume that, following Lakoff and Peters (1966:114) ye NP NP* is to be interpreted as an infinite collection of rules such that all the rules are of the form NP — ye NP NP...NP NP where the number of NPs to the right of the arrow is finite and is either equal to or greater than two. These rules then generate the following:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{ye} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

According to Lakoff and Peters "there is a universal principle which converts structures" of the above kind to the one below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\ldots \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{ye} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{ye} \\
\end{array}
\]

Following the English analysis, an obligatory ye-Deletion rule will delete the first ye and another optional rule will delete all but the last ye (cf. the examples in 43)
are also discussed in Chapter Five (5.3.1). The following examples contain conjoined NPs:

(42)a. Bassey ye Ime eka udua: 'Bassey and Ime have gone to the market'

(42)b. Nnyom ego ye usan: 'I want a pot and a plate'

(42)c. Ebye ama odu ke Uyo ye Calabar: 'He lived in Uyo and Calabar'

The conjoined NPs in (42) are Bassey ye Ime, eso ye usan (a pot and a plate) and Uyo and Calabar. The conjoining element is of course ye.

As in English, if more than two NPs are conjoined, all but the last ye may be deleted. Consider (43) for example:

(43)a. Nnyedep ebua ye ebot ye ena ye unen: 'I will buy a dog and a goat and a cow and a hen'

(43)b. Nnyedep ebua, ebot, ena ye unen: 'I will buy a dog, a goat, a cow and a hen'

In general, examples like (43)b are preferred to those like (43)a.

In addition, modifiers of the constituent NPs may be deleted. If the modifiers are pre-nominal modifiers, then it is the modifier of the first constituent which is undeleted. Consider the following examples, which have a quantifier and a WH question respectively. Both the quantifier and WH question are pre-nominal modifiers.

(44)a. Ediwak iben ye ediwak iden-owo ikedihe: 'Many women and many men did not come'

(44)b. Ediwak iban ye iden-owo ikedihe: 'Many women and men did not come'

(45)a. Oyom Ngo mmin ye nso udia?: 'What wine and food do you want?'

(45)b. Oyom Ngo mmin ye udia?: 'What wine and food do you want?'

(44)a and (44)b, and (45)a and (45)b are paraphrases of each other respectively.

If, however, the nominal modifier is a post-modifier, then it is the modifier of the last constituent NP which is not deleted, as these examples /
examples show:

(46)a. Mmekot mma oyo ye ete oro: 'I have invited the lady and the gentleman'

(46)b. Mmekot mma ye ete oro: 'I have invited the lady and gentleman'

(47)a. Nnyom mmoto Bassey ye enaj-ukwak Bassey: 'I want Bassey's car and Bassey's bicycle'

(47)b. Nnyom mmoto ye enaj-ukwak Bassey: 'I want Bassey's car and bicycle'

Not all NP modifiers can be deleted. The numeral, for example, should not be deleted, since such a deletion would result in a semantic difference between the full version and the deleted version. (48)a and (48)b below illustrate this point:

(48)a. Enye eyedep ebya ijon ye a7a ijon: 'He will buy five dogs and five cats'

(48)b. Enye eyedep ebya ye ajwa ijon: 'He will buy a dog and five cats'

Clearly (48)a and (48)b are semantically different.

Where both kinds of modifiers occur in the same NP, the same principle still applies: the first constituent NP retains a pre-nominal modifier while the last NP retains a post-nominal modifier. (49)a and (49)b illustrate this point:

(49)a. Ndusuk iban oro ye ndusuk idep-owo oro ikeyomke enye
   'Some of the women and some of the men did not want him'

(49)b. Ndusuk iban ye iden-owo oro ikeyomke enye:'Some of the women and men did not want him'

However, the first NP may retain both kinds of modifiers, as (50) shows:

(50) Ndusuk iban oro ye iden-owo ikeyomke enye:'Some of the women and men did not want him'

But (49)b is preferred to (50), at least in my dialect. Apparently the last NP is not allowed to retain all the modifiers, as (51) shows:

(51) /
(51) Iban ye ndusuk iden-owo oro ikeyomke enye:

'The women and some of the men did not want him'

Observe that (51) is not synonymous with (50) and (49)b, which are paraphrases of each other.

The above deletions are of course handled by the transformational sub-component of the grammar.

3.7 The NP and Adjective:

In Chapter Two (cf. 2.9) we analysed the adjective as a verbal in much the same way as the ordinary verb is and argued that there should be a double entry in the lexicon for adjectives which have two forms, since a transformational derivation of one form from another has attendant problems. In this section, we wish to consider how adjectives (or more precisely [(+Adj) verbals]) are derived in sentences. In particular, we wish to see how attributive adjectives such as akamba and ediye in the following sentences are derived in the base:

(52)a. Bassey oyoB akamba bia oro: 'Bassey wants the big yam'
(52)b. Ediye mma oro ama fi: 'The beautiful lady loves you'

Like all verbals, adjectives must have an NP subject in the deep structure in our grammar. So we have such sentences as the following:

(53)a. Bia oro edi akamba: 'The yam is big'
(53)b. Bia oro okpon: 'The yam is big'
(54)a. Mma oro edi ediye owo: 'The lady is a pretty person'
(54)b. Mma oro eye: 'The lady is pretty'

where the verbals akamba/okpon and ediye/eye have as their subjects bia oro and mma oro respectively in (53) and (54). If so, it follows that in the deep structure of (52), bia oro and mma oro must be the subjects /
subjects of the verbals *akamba* and *ediye*. In other words, in the deep structures of (52) there must be embedded S's of these sorts:

(55)a. *bía* ART AUX *kamba* : 'I am ART AUX big'

(55)b. *mma* ART AUX *ye* : 'Lady ART AUX beautiful'

As in English such embedded S's must be modifiers of the *NPs* which the adjectives themselves modify attributively in the surface structure.

It seems therefore clear that sentences like (52) are derived from deep structures with relative clauses. For example, a structure such as (56a) underlies (52)a:

---

To derive (52)a from (56a) the following rules are required, among others:

(i) In the embedded S, the concord rule will apply and because the verbal is [−V, +Adj], only the number prefix is attached to the VB to derive *akamba*;

(ii) The Relative Clause Reduction Rule will then apply deleting the subject of the embedded S and the AUX node and then permuting the *akamba* with *bia*, the object of the matrix S (see the Appendix for details /
details of this Rule). These Rules together will generate the following structure:

\[
S
\]

\[
NP \quad VP
\]

\[
AUX \quad VB \quad NP
\]

\[
Bassey \quad Yom \quad VB \quad +VB \quad N \quad DET
\]

\[
- V
\]

\[
+ Adj
\]

\[
akamba \quad bia
\]

(56b)

When the other rules, which are not relevant to the adjectives, apply (52)a will be generated.

Sometimes it is necessary to introduce a di (be) form. Consider (57a), for example, which is derived from (57b):

(57a). Bassey èdi anyan owo : 'Bassey is a tall person'

\[
S
\]

\[
VP
\]

\[
NP
\]

\[
AUX \quad PRED
\]

\[
NP
\]

\[
Bassey \quad N \quad DET \quad S
\]

\[
owo \quad ART
\]

\[
NP \quad VP
\]

\[
N \quad DET \quad AUX \quad VB
\]

\[
owo \quad ART \quad C \quad TENSE
\]

\[
+ VB
\]

\[
- V
\]

\[
+ Adj
\]

\[
nyan
\]

(57b)
After the concord and the relative clause reduction rules as explained above have applied, the following string will be generated:

(57)c. Bassey AUX anyan owo ART : 'Bassey AUX tall person ART'

NP       NP
PRED     PRED

The 'be' insertion rule will apply to a string like (57c) with an immediately following \(-V, +\text{Adj verbal}\) to generate (57a).

In English, it is not only adjectives that are derived from relative clauses. Bach (1970) has shown that like adjectives (and verbs) nouns, especially the common ones, can be derived from relative clauses.

Examples can be cited in Efik to support this kind of analysis for such nouns. For example, \(\text{\`ti\hbox{-}ign\text{\`}\v{o}}\) (a farmer) and \(\text{andik\text{\`}\v{a}}\) (a ruler) could be said to be derived from strings such as (58):

(58)a. Owo emi \(\text{\`ti\hbox{-}ign\text{\`}\v{o}}\) : 'One who plants on the farm'

(58)b. Owo emi a\text{\`}\v{a}r\text{\`}\v{a}de : 'One who rules'

We acknowledge that the Bach analysis could be applied to Efik with some interesting results.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRONOUNS AND PRONOMINALIZATION

4.1 Pronouns:

In this Chapter we will discuss pronouns and pronominalization in broad outlines. Previous analyses (e.g. Goldie, Adams, Winston) have tended to classify pronouns as follows:

Demonstrative Pronouns: emi (this near the speaker); oro (that near the hearer); oke (that away from both speaker and hearer); eken (that other there); efen (another).

Interrogative Pronouns: anja? (who, which?); nso? (which, what?), ewe/efe/ekə? (which, what?)

Relative Pronouns: emi (which, who, that); se (that, what, which);
oro (that, which); eke (who, which).

Personal Pronouns: ami (I); afo/im? (you); enye/im? (he/she/it);
nnyin (we); mbufo/mmim; (you pl); mm?/mmim; (they)

Reflexive Pronouns: idem mmi (myself); idem fo/im? (yourself);

idem esie/im? (himself/herself/itself); idem nnyin (ourselves); idem mbufo/mmim; (yourselves); idem mm?/mmim; (themselves).

Reciprocal Pronoun: kiet eken (each other).

Possessive Pronouns: mmi (my); fo/im? (your); esie/im? (his/her/its);
nnyin (our); mbufo/mmim; (your pl); mm?/mmim; (their)

For our purposes, we will recognise the following as pronouns, for it is actually they which replace or substitute for the NP in the traditional sense of pronouns: relative pronouns, personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, reciprocal pronouns and possessive pronouns. We will also recognise the locatives mi (here) and do (there) as pronominal.

As /
As for demonstratives and interrogatives, they are better analysed as nominal modifiers, as we have already shown in Chapters Two and Three. The fact that there are such paraphrases as (1a) and (1b) and (2a) and (2b)

(1)a. Emi edi itam Okon : 'This is Okon's hat'

(1)b. Itam emi edi itam Okon : 'This hat is Okon's hat'

(2)a. Afo oyom nso? : 'What do you want?'

(2)b. Afo oyom nso n kp? : 'What thing do you want?'

shows that (1a) and (2a) in fact have underlyingNs as part of the subject and object, respectively. Recall that in Chapter Three (cf.3.1) it was shown that if an NP has a modifier, the nominal head (N) may be deleted in situations where both the speaker and the hearer know what they are talking about. Except in sentences like (1a) or NPs with n kp (e.g. 2b) or owo (a person) as the nominal head, recovery of the deleted nominal is situationally determined, as was pointed out in 3.1. We will return to n kp and owo in 4.1.2.

4.1.1 Personal Pronouns:
These pronouns are marked for number and of course for person. As already pointed out (cf.2.8.1), these features of person and number are copied onto the VP by the concord rule, thus making it possible for personal pronouns to be optionally deletable in Efik, once this rule has applied. The distinction between (3) and (4) below is therefore essentially a matter of formality and informality:

(3)a. Ani mmeka do : 'I have gone there'

(3)b. Afo ameka do : 'You have gone there'

(3)c. Enye aka do : 'He/she/it has gone there'

(3)d. /
(3) d. Npyin imeka do: 'We have gone there'
(3) e. Imfo emeka do: 'You (pl) have gone there'
(3) f. Ima eka do: 'They have gone there'

(4) a. Meke do: 'I have gone there'
(4) b. Ameka do: 'You have gone there'
(4) c. Aka do: 'He/she/it has gone there'
(4) d. Imeka do: 'We have gone there'
(4) e. Emeka do: 'You (pl) have gone there'
(4) f. Eka do: 'They have gone there'

In normal everyday speech, (4) are more common.

The first and second persons singular have positionally determined allomorphs, as these examples show:

(5) a. Bassey oyom mi: 'Bassey wants me'
(5) b. Eyen mmi imaha enye: 'My son doesn't like him'

(6) a. Ama oro eygsofo fi: 'The lady will meet you'
(6) b. Ete fo edi andikara obio emi: 'Your father is the boss of this town'

In (5a) mi is in an object position while in (5b) mmi is in a possessive position. Similarly, in (6) fi is in an object position while fo is in a possessive position.

In the Ibibio dialect, the first and second person objects are attached to the verb itself, as in (7):

(7) a. Ata ammia: 'Ata has hit me'
(7) b. Ata umia: 'Ata has hit you'

where the affixes -m- and u- indicate first and second persons singular in /

1. As the root of the verb is mia (hit), it appears the prefix u- (which performs an object function) has replaced the subject prefix a-.
in that dialect. In Efik-Ibibio and Calabar Efik (7) would be rendered as (8):

(8)a. Ata amia mi: 'Ata has hit me'
(8)b. Ata amia fi: 'Ata has hit you'

The first and second persons plural may be 'exclusive' or 'inclusive' (Lyons 1968:277). Thus nnyin may exclude the hearer, in which case it means ami ye enye/nnnyin (I and he/they) or it may include the hearer. The inclusive use of mbufco includes only the speakers present (thus excluding others) while the exclusive use includes the hearers present as well as other person or persons not actually present. As in English, these differences are not formally marked in the language: they are contextually understood.

In our grammar the first and second persons are introduced in the base as Ns with a [+Pro] feature. Thus ami and mbufco will be represented in the lexicon thus (cf. the base rules in 2.6):

(9)a. ami (I): [+N], [+Common], [+Animate], [+Human], [+Count], [+Sing], [+Pro], [+I].
(9)b. mbufco (You): [+N], [+Common], [+Animate], [+Human], [+Count], [-Sing], [+Pro], [-I], [+II].

The third person refers to the person being talked about. In our grammar this personal pronoun may either be transformationally introduced, or introduced in the base like the first and second persons. The latter analysis accounts for deictic third person pronouns.

As gender is irrelevant in Efik, pronouns, and indeed Ns in general, are not marked for gender features.

Second and third person pronouns have a second form which occurs mainly in reported speech, as in these examples:

(10) Afo ekehere eje iye iya ka do: 'You thought that you would go there'
(11) /
In English (11) would be ambiguous but this is not the case in Efik – there is no question of ambiguity. We will discuss the use of im/mim in detail in Chapter Six. Also reflexive, relative, reciprocal and possessive pronouns will be discussed in their respective Chapters.

4.1.2 Locative Pronouns:
In general the locatives mi (here), do (there) and ko (yonder) occur in the base as adjuncts, as in these examples:

(12)a. Enye ama ediyedie mi : 'He came here'
(12)b. Nnyin iyegim do : 'We will get there'
(12)c. Sian Effiong ko : 'Tell Effiong yonder'

However, mi and do do occur anaphorically as in these examples:

(13)a. Edieke edideke k'ufuk, nnyekut fi do

'If you will be at home, I will see you there'

(13)b. Edieke edide k'oabo nnyin, enyene ndiqam utgmi

'If you are in our town, you must work here'

4.1.3 Owo and rkp:
Indefinite pronouns as such do not exist in Efik. In fact all the items which we have classified as pronouns are definite. However, owo and rkp can be translated as the English indefinite pronouns someone and something respectively, as in these examples:

(14)a. Owo ama ediyom fi : 'Someone came to look for you'
(14)b. Nnyom rkp : 'I am looking for something'

Ordinarily owo, which means a person, a human being or man, and rkp, which /
which means a thing, are used like any common nouns, as in these examples:

(15)a. Ediwak owo eyenyime : 'Many people will agree'
(15)b. Enye ama edep ediwak \textit{\textit{\ajkp}o} : 'He bought many things'
(16)a. Mma \textit{\textit{\ajkut} mme owo oro} : 'I saw the men'
(16)b. Enye ikimaha mme \textit{\textit{\ajkp}oro} : 'He didn't like those things'

A very common use of \textit{\textit{\ajwo}} and \textit{\textit{\ajkp}} is as 'place-holders', as in these examples:

(17)a. Bassey edi anyan owo : 'Bassey is a tall man'
(17)b. Owo emi edi eyen-eka mi : 'This man is my brother'
(18)a. Nso \textit{\textit{\ajkp}ke oyom?} : 'What do you want?'
(18)b. \textit{\textit{\ajkp}} emi edi okuo : 'This thing is yours'

As place-holders, \textit{\textit{\ajwo}} and \textit{\textit{\ajkp}} are often predictable in the environment they occur and can sometimes be deleted and be recovered after the deletion. Thus in (17) and (18) only \textit{\textit{\ajwo}} in (17a) may not be deleted, as (19) show:

(19)a. *Bassey edi anyan : 'Bassey is tall'
(19)b. Emi edi eyen-eka mi : 'This is my brother'
(19)c. Nso ke oyom? : 'What do you want?'
(19)d. Emi edi okuo : 'This is yours'

4.2 Pronominalization and Some Approaches to It:

Our conception of Pronominalization includes the following: simple pronominalization, reflexivization, relativization, possessive pronominalization and reciprocal pronominalization. To define pronominalization, we need to look at some of the approaches to it.

Within the standard theory of transformational generative grammar, there are three well-formulated proposals for pronominalization. First, there is /
is the Chomskian model, which derives pronouns from underlying more fully specified NPs provided such NPs satisfy certain conditions which we will discuss presently. For Chomsky, then, (at least in *Aspects*), the word pronoun is still understood in its etymological sense of standing for or replacing an NP "subject to very rigid grammatical rules", in Lees and Klima's (1963) words. In *Aspects* (p.145) the replacement process is "an erasure operation that uses the term X to delete Y...just in case X and Y are identical". Chomsky, however, explains that Y is in fact not entirely deleted but is so deleted as to leave behind some feature ([+Human] in the case of relativization, for example) which will later assume its phonological shape (who, which, etc., in the relativization case) as a pronoun in the surface structure. As we can see, one of the conditions for pronominalization is identity. For Chomsky, this identity is strict identity, which means the NP to be replaced must be not only lexically but also referentially identical to some other NP in the phrase marker which is a proper analysis for pronominalization. It is for this reason that Chomsky suggests the introduction of referential indices to indicate sameness or difference in the base prior to pronominalization. Pronominalization will apply or fail to apply depending on whether two lexically identical NPs also have identical referential indices. It is worth quoting Chomsky himself here:

"Suppose that certain lexical items are designated 'referential' and that by a general convention, each occurrence of a referential item is assigned a marker, say an integer, as a feature. The reflexivization rule can be formulated as an erasure operation that uses one Noun Phrase to delete another. As in the case of relativization..., the erasure leaves /
leaves a residue, in particular the feature [+human], and it introduces the new phonetic element self. Thus when applied to 'I hurt I', the first Noun Phrase is used to delete the second, finally giving, 'I hurt myself'. But by the recoverability condition on deletion, the reflexivization rule (similarly, the pronominalization rule) will apply only when the integers assigned to the two items are the same. The semantic component will then interpret two referential items as having the same reference just in case they are strictly identical - in particular, in case they are assigned the same integer in the deep structure...

The objections to the requirement that pronominalization should apply to a fully specified NP which must be strictly identical to another NP in the same phrase marker are well-known. Jackendoff (1968:5) and Bach-Peters (1970) in their famous 'Mig' sentences have shown that this would lead to infinite recursion of the deep structures of certain sentences thus making it impossible for such sentences to be generated by Chomsky's approach. We do not intend to enter into a debate on this issue.

Another proposal is the one by Postal (1966) which regards pronouns, personal ones in particular, as definite articles. Just as articles in his analysis are introduced as segments only in the intermediate structures, so are personal pronouns. In Postal's deepest structures these pronouns are present not segmentally but as syntactic features such as [+Animate], [+Human], [+Abstract], etc. For Postal, then, pronominalization in general specifies a noun stem as [+Pro] (reflexivization will specify it as [+Reflexive] in addition) subject to the identity and other relevant conditions. Although identity or coreference is required between the antecedent NP and the NP to be pronominalized /
pronominalized, as in Chomsky, it is not required that this identity be strict in Chomsky's sense. The definiteness of personal pronouns is accounted for by the application of the Definitization rule which then marks pronouns as definite. Explaining how Pronominalization (i.e. simple pronominalization in our terminology), Reflexivization and Definitization apply, Postal says:

"The process of Pronominalization is, I assume, a rule which specifies a noun stem as [+Pro] if it is identical to some other noun in the same sentence, subject to appropriate and not entirely understood conditions. The rule of Reflexivization is one which specifies a noun stem as [+reflexive] and [+Pro] subject to its identity to another noun stem in the same simple sentence structure (at the point of Reflexivization). All nouns start out in the deep structure forms as [-reflexive], i.e. the specification [+reflexive] is only introduced transformationally. However, this is, as we have seen, not true of the feature specification [+Pro] which will be present in some noun bundles in the base, namely, in those underlying such surface NP as someone, he, I, etc., in sentences like:

(20) a. Someone saw Bill.
    b. He is clever.
    c. I don't believe that.

Similarly, Definitization involves specifying a noun stem as [+definite] (and generally, but not always, [-demonstrative] as well) subject to certain conditions including previous transformational specification of [+Pro]. Under these assumptions, the overall process of reflexivization which occur in sentences like:

(21) A boy hurt himself.

and pronominalization which occur in sentences like:

(22) /
(22) A boy said he would help.

are considered to be quite similar. Both involve specification of the repeated noun stem as \([+\text{Pro}, +\text{definite}, -\text{demonstrative}]\). The difference is whether or not the specification \([+\text{reflexive}]\) is also assigned'.

For Postal then the difference between a deictic pronoun such as he in his example (20b) and an anophoric one such as he in (22) is that in the former, the noun stem in the base will bear the feature specification \([+\text{Pro}]\) while in the latter, the rule of Pronominalization will introduce the feature \([+\text{Pro}]\). In both cases, however, the form he is realised after the application of a rule known as Segmentalization.

How does this analysis of English pronouns apply to Efik? Our view is that the behaviour of personal pronouns is so much like that of ordinary non-pronominal nouns that our analysis of the former (cf.4.1.1) just like the latter is justified. Consider the following examples:

(20)a. Efe oro adgha : 'The man has left'

(20)b. Eyhe oro adgha : 'The he has left'

(21)a. Mme ete oro edaha : 'The men have left'

(21)b. Mme mm oro edaha : 'The they have left'

In (20b) enye occurs with the article oro just as the ordinary noun ete while in (21b) the pronoun mm allows the plural morpheme mme just as ete in (21a). Even mmim? (the other form of the second person plural or the third person plural used in reported speech) may be said to be in fact mme + im? (i.e. plural morpheme + im), as these examples show:

(22)a. Afo ekere ete im?imeye : 'You (sing) think you are pretty'

(22)b. mbufo ekere ete mmim?imeye : 'You (pl) think you are pretty'

(23)a. Enye ekere ete im?imeye : 'She thinks that she is pretty'

(23)b. mm?ekere ete mmim?imeye : 'They think that they are pretty'

Pronouns /
Pronouns also allow such monimal modifiers as quantifiers, numerals and relative clauses, just as ordinary nouns, as the following examples show:

(24)a. Ndusuk iban : 'some woman'
(24)b. Ndusuk nnyin : 'some of us'

(25)a. Iban ition ema edi : 'five women came'
(25)b. Nnyin ition ima idi : 'We five came'

(26)a. Akparawa emi nnyomde iduhe : 'The lad I want is not in'
(26)b. Enye emi nnyomde iduhe : 'The he/one that I want is not in'

It is even possible to get attributive adjectives with pronouns, as in these examples:

(27)a. Ḣpripi afo anäm emi? : 'Small you did this?'
(27)b. Ndišime Ṣmọ oro esinam nkpo ntre: 'Stupid they do things like that'

These are all surface structures but of course surface structures are related to deep structures.

However, we will adapt some aspects of Postal's analysis for our purposes. For example as he does, when a pronominalization rule applies, the feature [+PrOj] (as well as other features like [+reflexive], where necessary) will be introduced. The phonological shape of the pronoun will be determined partly by such feature or features and partly by others like those of person and number.

We now turn to the third approach to pronominalization, namely, Jackendoff's (1968) hypothesis which allows pronouns themselves to be generated in the base "as lexical items inserted into the base structure". Then all the properties of these items, according to Jackendoff, are explained in terms of the rules of semantic interpretation. In this approach, which Jackendoff calls 'interpretative theory' NPs will be unmarked for coreference in the base, unlike in Chomsky's and Postal's models, where one /
one of the conditions for the application of the pronominalization rule is that the NP to be pronominalized must be coreferential with another NP in the same phrase marker. It is the rules of semantic interpretation which "establish relations between pairs of noun phrases marking them as coreferential or non-coreferential with each other" (p.5). For example, an interpretative rule for reflexivization is formulated (Jackendoff 1972:112) thus:

"(4.9) (Reflexivization, first approximation)

Enter in the table:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{NP}^2 & \text{in the environment} \\
\text{NP}^1 \sim \text{coref} & \sim \text{reflexive} \\
\end{array}
\]

Such a rule, according to Jackendoff, says "in the proper contexts for reflexivization, \( \text{NP}^2 \) is coreferential with \( \text{NP}^1 \) if and if only it is reflexive".

For Jackendoff, then, pronominalization consists in specifying the relations between two NPs in a phrase marker, in particular marking these NPs coreferential. To enrich his theory, Jackendoff needs some blocking devices to ensure well-formedness. One such device is what he calls 'Consistency Condition'. This condition rejects strings such as the following, which are Jackendoff's own examples:

*The boy shot herself


He also needs "a well-formedness condition on the table of coreference to reject a sentence if it contains a reflexive without an antecedent" (p.114). Such a condition will rule out a sentence like (his example, again):

*himself was sick.
One of the advantages of this analysis, according to Jackendoff, is that the recursion problem mentioned above does not arise. As he puts it, "if the reference of pronouns is determined by a rule of semantic interpretation, the deep structure... contains the pronouns themselves, so there is no recursion" (p.110). Another advantage is that under his analysis what he calls 'pronominal epithets' (which includes such NPs as the bum, the bastard, the poor guy, etc.) can be handled within pronominalization.

In spite of the attractiveness of Jackendoff's analysis and in spite of some problems with Chomsky's approach, we will treat pronominalization from a basically Chomskian point of view for a purely practical reason: for all its attractiveness, Jackendoff's theory is still new and not as tried as Chomsky's.

4.3 What is Pronominalizable?

From a Chomskian point of view then, pronominalization can roughly be defined as the process whereby an NP in a phrase marker is replaced by some pronominal form, provided

(i) such an NP bears a coreferential relation with some other NP in the phrase marker;

(ii) the NP does not violate those constraints (e.g. Langacker's backwards condition) with respect to the application of $T$ in the phrase marker, where $T$ stands for the necessary transformational rule;

(iii) the phrase marker itself is of a certain configuration (e.g. reflexivization applies in a simplex).

In answer to the above question then, we will simply say, an NP that obeys the above conditions is pronominalizable. In what follows now, we /
we will be considering concrete examples of pronominalizable NPs.

Consider the following sentences:

(28)a. Ime okot ywed : 'I/me is reading a book'

(28)b. Ime oyom Ata okot ywed : 'I/me wants Ata to read a book'

(29)a. Ime eyekut Ata edieke enye ebjne : 'I/me will see Ata if he waits'

(29)b. Ime okut ywed esie : 'I/me has seen his book'

(29)c. Ime otyk idem esie : 'I/me has cheated himself'

In (28) none of the NPs - Ime, ywed, Ata - can be pronominalized since there is no proper analysis for pronominalization. There are no co-referential NPs, for example, and that in itself automatically disqualifies (28) as proper analyses for pronominalization, though there may be cases where there are proper analyses but pronominalization need not apply. In that case, pronominalization would be optional.

In (29), however, pronominalization does take place. (29a) requires simple pronominalization (we will define this term in a later Chapter), (29b) possessive pronominalization and (29c) reflexivization. Let us try to derive the three sentences in (29). In doing this we will avoid details which are not relevant to pronominalization. Let us begin with (29a) which is ambiguous. In one interpretation (29a) is derived from the base structure in 30a.

\[
S \\
NP \rightarrow DET \rightarrow VP \rightarrow PRE-S \\
N \rightarrow ART \rightarrow AUX \rightarrow VB \rightarrow NP \\
Ime \rightarrow Kut \rightarrow Ata \rightarrow edieke \rightarrow Ime \\
30a.
\]
If the two occurrences of *Ime* are coreferential, then this would be a simple case of simple pronominalization, which as far as is known, applies in complex phrase markers. The subject of the matrix clause will be used to pronominalize the subject of the embedded or adjunct clause thus generating (29a). In another interpretation of (29a), it would be derived from the base structure in 30b.

![Diagram](image)

Like 30a, 30b is a proper analysis for pronominalization if the two occurrences of *Ata* are coreferential and when this rule applies (29a) is also generated. However, while pronominalization is optional in 30b, this is apparently not the case in 30a, for while (31b) is un-questionably grammatical, (31a) is questionable. In fact, one way of disambiguating (29a) is to substitute *Ata* for *enye*:

(31)a. *?Ime eyekut Ata ekieke Ime ebetde:* 'Ime will see Ata if Ime waits'

(31)b. *Ime eyekut Ata edieke Ata ebetde:* 'Ime will see Ata if Ata waits'

Observe that this is true of other kinds of complex sentences, as the following examples show:

(32)a. *??Okon ama_ebine Ata man Okon anyam enye*

  123 4 5 6 7

  'Okon joined Ata so that Okon might help him'

(32)b. /
(32)b. Okon ama ebine Ata man Ata/\enyे 'Okon joined Ata so that Ata might help him'

(33)a. ?Okposuk ed\ Ata amade Ima, Ata idid\enyе 'Although Ata loves Ima, Ata will not marry her'

(33)b. Okposuk ed\ Ata amade Ima, Ima idid\enyе 'Although Ata loves Ima, Ima will not marry him'

Note that in (31a), (32a) and (33a) where pronominalization appears obligatory, the two coreferential NPs in each case are subjects in their own S's. In (31b), (32b) and (33b), however, the pronominalizable NPs are subjects of their own S's but their antecedents are objects in their own S's. In a later Chapter we will show that the notions of subject and object are relevant to simple pronominalization.

(29b), which involves possessive pronominalization, is derived from the following base structure, 34a.

```
S
   NP
      VP
        AUX
          VB
            NP
              N
                NOM
                  NP
                    Ime
                      Kut
                        wed
                          Ime
```

Possessive pronominalization applies to a structure such as 34a if
(i) there are two coreferent NPs, as the two occurrences of Ime in 34a;
(ii) the NP to be pronominalized is immediately preceded by an N and is dominated by an NP that must not be the subject of the sentence

Condition (ii) in particular would block the generation of such strings as the following:

(34)b. /
(34)b. *Eyen esie ama oyo' Okon: 'His son wanted Okon'

(34)c. *Ufan mmọ imha Okon ve Effiong: 'Their friends don't like Okon and Effiong'

where esie and mmọ refer to Okon and Okon ve Effiong, respectively.

however, sentences such as (35) will be generated:

(35)a. mbubehe Ata edi mbubehe esie: 'Ata's business is his business'
(35)b. Effiong eyet jwed abeəa ete esie: 'Effiong has written a book about his father'

A more detailed discussion on possessive pronominalization will be given in a later Chapter.

(29c) is a straightforward case of reflexivization, where, as the underlying structure in 36 shows, the subject of a simplex is used to reflexivize the object under coreference.

\[
S \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Aux} \quad \text{VB} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{ime} \quad \text{tuk} \quad \text{ime} \\
\]

and thereby generating (29c).

As an example of pronominalization involving relativization, let us consider the following sentence:

(37)a. Ete emi nnyomde adaha: 'The man I am looking for has left'

underlying /
Underlying (37a) is 37b:

```
S
 /    
NP₁ \  VP
   |     
N   DET 
Ete ART S
       
NP₂ \   VP
   |     
AUX VB NP₃ 
   |     
N DET 
ami yom ete ART

37b.
```

Leaving details until we come to the chapter on relativization itself, relativization will apply in 37b, if NP₁ and NP₃ are coreferential, generating (37c).

(37c). Ete ART emi aux yom aux daha: 'Man ART who I AUX look AUX leave'

For details of the operations in relativization, see the Summary of Rules in the Appendix. To generate (37a) from (37c) ART and emi are optionally deleted (ignoring the AUX rules).

So far it appears only NPs are pronominalizable. But consider the locative pronouns mi (here) and do (there) in the following examples:

(38)a. Bassey eyekut utom ke obio emi edieke enye ebeted mi

'Bassey will find a job in this town if he waits here'

(38)b. Bassey eyetie ke Uyo edieke enye okutde utom do

'Bassey will stay at Uyo if he finds a job there'

where mi and do appear to replace ke obio emi and ke Uyo respectively. Even in (39a) do appears to replace ke ebiet oro as (39b) indicates:

(39)a. Edieke Bassey amade ebiet oro, enye eyetie do

'If Bassey likes that place, he will stay there'

(39)b. /
(39)b. Edieke Bassey amade ebiet oro, enye eyetie ke ebiet oro

'If Bassey likes that place, he will stay in that place'

However, as we will show in Chapter Six (6.5), mi and do in fact replace the NP, rather than the entire prepositional phrase.

Finally in this chapter let us consider a case where pronominalization must not apply, even though there is a proper analysis for pronominalization (we have already seen cases where it may not apply):

(40)a. Ebot Otu ata ebige Otu: 'Otu's goat has eaten Otu's yam'

If 40b underlies (40a), as it does indeed, then possessive pronominalization should apply to derive (40c).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
S & & & & & \\
NP & & & & & \\
N & NOM & AUX & VB & NP & \\
NP & N & NOM & \\
Ebot & Otu & ta & ebige & Otu
\end{array}
\]

(40)c. Ebot Otu ata ebige esie: 'Otu's goat has eaten his yam'

But (40a) and (40c) are not semantically equivalent. The fact is (40a) is an idiom and means 'It serves Otu right'. As idioms are problems, we would not like to pursue the matter further. So except for idioms, we would like to say that when there is a proper analysis, pronominalization is either optional or obligatory. As we will see, reflexivization, relativization and possessive pronominalization are obligatory. Simple pronominalization may be either obligatory or optional, as we have already shown above.
4.4 Pronominalization and Definitization:

Postal (1966) assumes that the definite character of pronouns (analysed as definite articles) makes it necessary for the definitization rule to be ordered after pronominalization. He says:

"Similarly, DEFINITIZATION involves specifying a noun stem as \([\text{+Definite}]\) (and generally but not always \([-\text{Demonstrative}]\) as well) subject to certain conditions including previous transformational specification of \([\text{+Pro}]\)."

However, as far as Efik is concerned pronominalization should be ordered after definitization, for the following reasons:

First, as we have already pointed out, pronominalization requires that there be two coreferential NPs, among other conditions. In other words, there has to be an antecedent NP to which the NP to be pronominalized must anaphorically refer. That in itself implies that the anaphoric NP is definite. Therefore, contrary to Postal's claim that the feature \([\text{+Anaphoric}]\) be introduced as a result of pronominalization, the feature should in fact be there as one of the conditions prior to the application of pronominalization. This follows naturally from the fact that only an NP which is coreferential with another NP in the same phrase marker can be pronominalized.

Second, there is concrete evidence to show that at the point of pronominalization, an NP must be definite. Consider (41) and (42):

(41)a. \(\text{kma} \text{\(\text{n} \text{kut} \text{owo} \text{edi} \text{ndi} \text{j} \text{k} \text{ke} \text{me} \text{owo} \text{oro} \text{ama} \text{okut} \text{mi}}\)

'a man but I don't know whether the man saw me'

(41)b. \(\text{kma} \text{\(\text{n} \text{kut} \text{owo} \text{edi} \text{ndi} \text{j} \text{k} \text{ke} \text{me} \text{enye} \text{ama} \text{okut} \text{mi}}\)

'I saw a man but I don't know whether he saw me'

(42)a. \(\text{\(\text{A} \text{\(\text{t} \text{a} \text{ama} \text{o} \text{top} \text{unam} \text{edi} \text{unam} \text{oro} \text{ikekpaha}}\)

'A shot an animal but the animal did not die'

(42)b/
In both (41) and (42), **enye** has replaced a definite NP, **owo oro** in (41) and **unam oro** in (42). Now consider (43):

(43)a. Mma nkut owo edi ndisime oro ikedii ke mi owo okut mi
   'I saw a man but I don't know whether a man saw me'

(43)b. *Ata ama otop unam edi unam ikpaha
   'Ata shot an animal but an animal did not die'

where (43a) corresponds to (41a) and (43b) corresponds to (42a). Now (43b) is ungrammatical because the second occurrence of **unam**, which is supposed to refer to the first one is indefinite - the same NP is definite in (42a) hence the grammaticality of that sentence. However, (43a) appears grammatical because the second occurrence of **owo**, which is indefinite does not refer to the first occurrence of **owo**. In other words, the second instance of **owo** in (43a) must be interpreted as a man rather than the man. If, however, the two instances of **owo** in that sentence are supposed to be coreferential, then (43a) would be ungrammatical. It seems clear therefore that at the point of pronominalization, the NP for pronominalization must be definite. Consider other examples:

(44)a. Mma nkut Okon edi ndisime oro ikedii ke mi

   'I saw Okon but the fool didn't recognise me'

(44)b. Kọt ọtọ okposuk edi ifor oro mididihe

   'Invite ọ, although the lazy one will not come'

Observe that **ndisime oro** and **ifor oro** which refer to **Okon** and **Ata** respectively are definite. Observe also that both **ndisime oro** and **ifor oro** are pronominalizable, or at least can be replaced by pronouns, as (45) indicate:

(45)a. /
(45)a. ınıma ọkụt Okon ede enye ịkedị ọkụke ọzọ
   "I saw Okon but he didn't recognise me"

(45)b. ọkọt Ata okposụt ede enye ịme ịniddịhe
   "Invite Ata although he will not come"

There is some problem with the application of pronominalization in (44) to derive (45), namely there is a difference in meaning between (44) and (45): that affective implication of ndisime ọro and ifu ọro is neutralized, as it were, in enye, as a result of pronominalization. However, this is a different kind of problem and does not affect our claim that pronominalization is preceded by definitization. Another different kind of problem is that under the Chomskian analysis, pronominalization would probably be impossible in (44) since Okon and ndisime ọro are not lexically identical, nor are Ata and ifu ọro. Maybe this is just as well, in view of the semantic differences between (44) and (45). Perhaps it is the case that pronominalization must not take place in (44) (cf. 6.1.4).

In the case of proper NPs, the definitization rule might not be necessary since such NPs are inherently definite. It should be obvious by now that the definite character of pronouns arises not from the application of pronominalization as such but from the requirement that only definite coreferent NPs can be pronominalized by their antecedents.
5.0 Introduction:
To facilitate our investigation into the reflexivization process, we will be examining it in simple sentence, complex sentence and conjoined or co-ordinate sentence structures. Among other things we will attempt to answer such questions as whether reflexivization applies only in a simplex, whether the reflexive forms connected with the so-called picture nouns are in fact reflexive pronouns and whether such forms as ke idem esie in (1). Bassey ke idem esie edika : 'Bassey himself will go' also involve reflexive pronouns.

5.1 Reflexivization in Simple Structures:
A simple structure is a structure with no embedded S node, such as the structure in 2 below:

```
S
  NP
    DET
    ART
    x
  VP
    AUX
    VB
    NP
    N
    DET
    ART
    y
    x
```

where x and y represent lexical items.
We will frequently refer to such a structure as a simple phrase marker or simplex. Such structures could of course be dominated by other S nodes. In that case they may be referred to either as complex structures or conjoined structures, as the case may be. Complex and conjoined structures will be defined in their appropriate sections.
As we have already said, reflexivization is an example of pronominalization. In Efik, reflexivization is the rule involved in the derivation of *idem* + what are traditionally called possessive adjectives in such sentences as (3):

(3)a. Arit ekere idem (esie) : 'Arit is thinking of herself'

(3)b. Iban oro ema idem (mmi) : 'The women are harming themselves'

(3)c. Afo ekere idem (fo) : 'You are thinking of yourself'

(3)d. Meko ekere idem (meko) : 'You are thinking of yourselves'

(3)e. Aqi ngam idem (mmi) : 'I am harming myself'

(3)f. Nnyin inam idem (nnyin) : 'We are harming ourselves'

Observe that the so-called possessive adjectives, which we will henceforth refer to as Possessive Determiner (PD) for convenience, is optional, unlike the situation in a language like English. Like all forms of pronominalization, reflexivization requires coreference between two NPs. But in the case of reflexivization, this coreference must be within a simplex, as was first pointed out by Lees and Klima (1963). In addition, the reflexivized NP must be dominated by the VP as the object (or one of the objects) including NPs which are constituents of Comp-Phrases. 'Domination by the VP' is necessary so as to exclude NPs in the Adjunct from being reflexivized, as in the following examples:

(4)a. *Ata ama ere mbre ke idem esie: 'Ata play play on

(4)b. *Ami mma nde ke idem mmi : 'I past morph. sleep on myself'

However, (5) would appear to be a counter example:

(5) Ami nnyenam utom ke idem mmi : 'I will work on my body' (e.g. massage it)

However, *idem mmi* in (5) is not a reflexive pronoun but a lexical item *idem* (body) + a NOM NP (cf. 3.3.1). Thus it is possible to have (6a) but not /
not (6b):

(6)a. Ami nnyenam utom ke idem mmi emi: 'I will work on this body of mine'

(6)b. *Ami nnyenam idem mmi emi : 'I will harm this myself'

because reflexive pronouns (and anaphoric pronouns in general) do not allow nominal modifiers. That is idem in (6a) occurs in the base as a lexical item but idem in (6b) is transformationally derived (along with mmi) as a result of reflexivization. The analysis of idem in (6a) as a lexical item explains the occurrence of idem in the following sentences:

(7)a. Ata anam utom ke idem mi : 'Ata is working on my body'
(7)b. Ami nnam utom ke idem esie : 'I am working on his body'
(7)c. Ami nnam utom ke idem Ata : 'I am working on Ata's body'

We return to the use of idem as a lexical item in 5.1.2. below.

It has been said above that NPs which are constituents of Comp-Phrases within the VP are reflexivizable. However, it is not all Comp-Phrase NPs within the VP that can be reflexivized. For example, those NPs in the instrumental case are not reflexivizable, since NPs in this case in general require human or at least animate, if non-human subjects, as in the following examples (case here and elsewhere in this Chapter should be understood in the sense in which it is used by Fillmore(1968) )


(8)b. Engi ki et ama amia ata-utop oro ye isim esie

'A cow past.morph hit the hunter with its tail'

As NPs in the instrumental case are characteristically -Animate-, in contrast with the subject NPs, like those in (8), which are characteristically animate at least, then the coreferential condition cannot be satisfied. Consequently, reflexivization cannot take place. However, (9) seems to be a counter example to the claim that instrumental NPs are /
are not reflexivizable.

(9) Eto olo okada 3 ke idem esie : 'The tree fell by itself'

However, as we will argue later, forms like ke idem esie (by itself) are not in fact reflexive pronouns but intensifiers. (9) therefore does not constitute a counter example.

Similarly, it seems that an NP in the comitative case cannot be reflexivized since this kind of NP cannot be coreferential with the subject, which has to be different from the comitative NP, if the sentence is to make sense. Consider (10):

(10) Okon akasa 1a ye Effiong : 'Okon went with Effiong'

Of course (11) makes no sense (except perhaps in some McCawlian (1968) world):

(11) *Okon akasa 1a ye idem esie : 'Okon went with himself'

Since the agent cannot occur in the object position in Efik - there is no passivization for example in the language - the NPs which can then be reflexivized include both NPs dominated by VP (i.e. 'Direct' and 'Indirect' objects) and certain NPs dominated by Comp-phrase within the VP (e.g. (13c) and (16)). But other NPs dominated by Comp-Phrase cannot be reflexivized (e.g. (11)). There is no adequate machinery within the Aspects model to cope with this problem. A solution may be possible within a form of 'case grammar' (cf. fillmore 1968), as has been suggested in the discussion above, and this is a subject for further investigation.

In retrospect, we will say that reflexivization in Efik is defined over configurations /
configurations such as 12a, 12b and 12c

12a.

12b.

12c.

12a, 12b and 12c underlie surface sentences of the following sorts, respectively:

(13)a. Ata ekere idem egie : 'Ata is thinking of himself'

(13)b. /
Given the structures 12a, 12b and 12c reflexivization applies on condition that

(i) $S$ is a simplex;

(ii) The NP immediately dominated by the $S$ node is coreferential with another NP which is either immediately dominated by the VP or by a Comp-phrase which is itself a constituent of the VP;

(iii) None of the coreferent NPs is dominated by $\text{Pred}$.

Condition (ii) will block the reflexivization of Adjunct NPs. However, it is not entirely satisfactory since it does not disallow a string like (11) (cf. the discussion above).

Condition (iii) blocks the reflexivization of Pred NPs, such as $\text{kaiferi}$ in (14) below:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & S & \text{VP} \\
  & \text{NP} & \text{AUX} & \text{Pred} \\
  & N & \text{DET} & \text{NP} \\
  & \text{Arit} & \text{ART} & N & \text{DET} \\
  & & & \text{ART} & \text{kaiferi} \\
\end{array}
\]

14, which underlies a surface sentence like (15):

\[(15) \text{Arit } 1 \text{ kaiferi } 2 : \text{Arit is a girl}\]

only partially fulfils the condition for reflexivization: there is a simplex and two NPs - $\text{Arit}$ and $\text{kaiferi}$ - appear to be coreferential. On the other hand, a sentence like (16) is generated from 17 by reflexivization /
reflexivization, among other rules of course:

(16) \[\text{Ime eyewet .arraycopy idem esie: 'Ime will write a book about himself'}\]

Thus reflexivization provides independent motivation for our analysis in Chapter Two (cf. 2.10) of \(\psi\)Vs (\(\psi\) quasi-Verbals) as part of the \(\text{VP}\). However, by the criterion given in 2.10, (18a) is derived from an underlying conjoined structure since it can be paraphrased as (18b):

(18)a. \[\text{nnyin iyedep ncpy in\(\text{\`i}\) idem nnyin: 'we will buy something for ourselves'}\]
(18)b. \[\text{nnyin iyedep ncpy in\(\text{\`i}\) idem nnyin : 'we will buy something for ourselves'}\]

However, no such paraphrase involving the conjoining element \(\text{\`nyu}\) can be made of (16), as (19) below is ungrammatical:

(19) \*Ime eyewet ncpy on\(\text{\`y}\) \(\text{\`a}\) \(\text{\`a}\) idem esie
IMe will write a book about himself'

Observe that in (18b) reflexivization takes place in a simplex, since \(\text{\`n}\) idem nnyin (give to ourselves) is in fact a simple sentence. (18a) is of course derived from (18b) by the deletion of the conjoining element \(\text{\`nyu}\). We return to the deletion of \(\text{\`nyu}\) in conjoined sentences in 5.3.5.
5.1.1 The Reflexive Rule (first approximation):

We have seen the kinds of phrase markers in which reflexivization applies and the conditions that govern its application in such phrase markers. Let us now consider how the rule actually applies. Let us assume that

\[
X \text{ N ART} \text{ AUX N ART} \left( \text{Prep} \text{QVB} \right) \text{ N ART Y}
\]

is analysable as a simplex. Then the reflexive rule can be formulated as follows:

\[
\text{S.D.} \ \ X \ \ N \ \ \text{ART} \ \ \text{AUX} \ \ \left( \text{N ART} \right) \left( \text{Prep} \text{QVB} \right) \ \text{N ART} \ \ Y
\]

Conditions:

(a) 2 & 3 are coreferential either with 6 & 7 or with 9 & 10;
(b) both 6 & 7 and 9 & 10 are constituents of a VP which does not dominate a Pred;
(c) 1 - 11 is a simplex.

S.C. (a) Operations:

If 6 or 9 is \(-\text{Pro}\), change this feature to \(+\text{Pro}\) and introduce the feature \(+\text{Refi}\) (reflexive). Then copy these features as well as those of Number and Person onto 7 or 10, as the case may be. If there are NP constituents other than N and Art, delete them.

(b) Output:

Either 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

\(+\text{Pro}\) \(+\text{Pro}\)
\(+\text{Refi}\) \(+\text{Refi}\)
\(\text{No}\) \(\text{No}\)
\(\text{Per}\) \(\text{Per}\)

Or 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

\(+\text{Pro}\) \(+\text{Pro}\)
\(+\text{Refi}\) \(+\text{Refi}\)
\(\text{No}\) \(\text{No}\)
\(\text{Per}\) \(\text{Per}\)

Later the N, which is the noun stem, following Postal (1966), is realised as idem and the ART as mi, fo, amie, nnvin, mbufo or mnn, as the case may be /
The above rule will generate sentences of the following kind:

(20)a. Ata ama idem esie: 'Ata loves himself'
(20)b. Mbufo e\textsubscript{y}wana ye idem mbyo: 'You are fighting with yourselves'
(20)c. Ami nnyewet mbyuk m\textsubscript{a}na idem m\textsubscript{m}: 'I will write a story about myself'
(20)d. Ndit\textsubscript{o} oro ek\textsubscript{g}sin idem \textsubscript{\textit{\textsuperscript{m}}} \textsubscript{\textit{\textsuperscript{o}}}: 'Those children put themselves through school'

At the same time strings like the following will not be allowed:

(21)a. *Bassey ama mi nnyaw\textsubscript{a} idem esie: 'Bassey likes me to help himself'
(21)b. *Bassey ed\textsubscript{i} idem esie: 'Bassey is himself'.

It was shown in 5.1 above that the PD of the reflexive pronoun is optional. In that case the PD can be optionally deleted, after the application of the reflexive rule. Thus in (20), if the PDs are deleted, then (22) below will be generated:

(22)a. Ata ama idem: 'Ata loves himself'
(22)b. Mbufo e\textsubscript{y}wana ye idem: 'You are fighting with yourselves'
(22)c. Ami nnyewet mbyuk m\textsubscript{a}na idem: 'I will write a story about myself'
(22)d. Ndit\textsubscript{o} oro ek\textsubscript{g}sin idem \textsubscript{\textit{\textsuperscript{m}}} \textsubscript{\textit{\textsuperscript{o}}}: 'Those children put themselves through school'

Details of the rule that deletes the PD can be found in the Appendix.

5.1.2 \textit{Pseudo Reflexives}:

There are several forms in Efik that look like but are not reflexive pronouns. An element will be regarded as a reflexive pronoun only if it is derived as a result of reflexivization. Such an element, as we have already seen, is of the form \textit{idem} + PD, where the PD is optional. In that case in (23), (23b) is not only grammatical, but also a paraphrase of (23a), just as (20) and (22) above are paraphrases:

(23)a. /
In addition, the PD of the reflexive pronoun must agree in number and person with the subject of the reflexive sentence, hence the sentences in (3) above, for example. Observe that the Reflexive Rule ensures this. We will now consider pseudo-reflexives in the light of the form and behaviour of the true reflexive pronouns. First, consider (24):

(24)a. $\text{mi idem akha : 'It is very difficult for me'}$

(24)b. $\text{Akpa enye idem : 'It is surprising to him'}$

(24)c. $\text{ dik fi idem : 'It is bad for you'}$

Clearly, $\text{mi idem, enye idem, fi idem}$ cannot be regarded as reflexive pronouns. To begin with, the form of the reflexive is $\text{idem + PD}$ and not $\text{NP + idem}$, since as the diagram 27 shows, $\text{mi, fi, enye}$ are in fact NPs. Secondly, unlike the $\text{idem}$ of the reflexive pronoun, $\text{idem}$ in (24) does not allow a PD, as (25) show:

(25)a. $\text{*mi idem mmi : 'It is difficult for myself'}$

(25)b. $\text{*Akpa enye idem esie : 'It is surprising to himself'}$

(25)c. $\text{*dik fi idem fo : 'it is bad for you'}$

It could be argued that $\text{NP + idem}$ in (24) is probably derived from $\text{idem + PD}$ by a transformation. Taking a concrete example, $\text{mi idem}$ in (24a) could be said to be derived from $\text{idem mmi}$ by some kind of permutation rule. However, it is known that the sentences in (24) are in fact derived from those in (26) below:

(26)a. $\text{Akpa oro akha : 'The thing/it is very difficult for me'}$

(26)b. $\text{Akpa oro akpa enye idem : 'The thing/it is surprising to him'}$

(26)c. $\text{Akpa oro dik fi idem : 'The thing/it is bad for you'}$
As the three sentences in (26) are similarly structured, let us take (26b) for consideration. This sentence is structured as 27 below:

\[
S \\
VP \\
  NP \\
  AUX \\
  VB \\
N \quad \text{DET} \\
  \text{ART} \\
  N \quad \text{DET} \\
  \text{ART} \\
\]

\[ \text{kpa enye idem} \]

Although 27 is a simplex, there is no coreference between the subject and any of the NPs dominated by the VP. 27 does not therefore qualify as a proper analysis for reflexivization. \text{Mi idem}, \text{enye idem} and \text{fi idem} cannot therefore be considered as reflexive pronouns or their variants. Observe that (28) are perfectly grammatical:

(28)a. \text{Ata idem akaha} : 'It is very difficult for Ata'
(28)b. \text{Akpa mma oro idem} : 'It is surprising to the lady'
(28)c. \text{di\underline{k} ndit\underline{c} oro idem} : 'It is bad for the children'

So as the phrase marker 27 shows, \text{idem} in (24) or (26) is a lexical item which occurs in the base. In fact \text{kpa - idem}, \text{s\underline{\text{oo}} - idem} and \text{di\underline{k} - idem} are fixed phrases or idioms which require human, or at least animate, NPs between the verbs and \text{idem} as (24), (26) and (28) show. Ordinarily \text{kpa} means \text{die}, \text{s\underline{oo}} be old or strong and \text{di\underline{k} be bad}. \text{idem} of course means body. But a combination of each of these verbs with \text{idem} produces the special meaning we have seen in (24), (26) and (28). We are not concerned with the analysis of these 'psychological' verbs as such but it is quite clear that \text{idem} in the above examples - (24), (26), (28) - is not a reflexive /
reflexive pronoun.

Similarly, *idem* in (29) is not a reflexive pronoun or part of a reflexive pronoun:

(29)a. Etim okpon *idem* eti eti : 'Etim is very big in the body'
(29)b. Arit *eye* idem : 'Arit is pretty in the body'

Clearly *idem* in (29) is not a reflexive pronoun as 30, which underlies (29b), shows:

\[
S \rightarrow NP \quad VP
\]
\[
NP \quad AUX \quad NP
\]
\[
\text{DET} \quad N \quad \text{DET} \quad S \quad \text{VP}
\]
\[
\text{ART} \quad \text{idem} \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{ye}
\]
\[
\text{N} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{V} \quad +\text{Adj}
\]

Justification for deriving (29b) from 30 is that the former can be paraphrased as (31)a:

(31)a. Arit enyene idem emi eyede : 'Arit has a body which is pretty'

Similarly (29a) can be paraphrased as (31b):

(31)b. Etim enyene idem emi okponde eti eti: 'Etim has a body which is big'

As 30 shows, *idem* in (29) is a lexical item and as a lexical item, it means the physical body as a whole or just the trunk of the body, i.e. that part of the body between the arms and the legs. So against *idem* in (29) we could have *ub\(\)k udom (right hand) and *ukot* (leg), for example, as in (32):

(32)a. Etim okpon *ub\(\)k udom eti eti : 'Etim has a very big right hand'
(32)b. Arit *eye* ukot : 'Arit has nice legs'

Like (29), (33) below have no reflexives:

(33)a. /
120.

(33)a. Arit eyet eyen idem : 'Arit has washed the baby's body'
(33)b. Nnyin imeyet mm> idem : 'we have washed their bodies'

because idem is merely a part of the body and occurs in the base, just like iso (face) and ubok (hands), for example, in (34):

(34)a. Arit eyet eyen iso : 'Arit has washed the baby's face'
(34)b. Nnyin imeyet mm> ubok : 'we have washed their hands'

We will return to yet (wash) in 5.1.4 below. Observe that idem in fact belongs to eyen or mm> in (33) and not to the subjects Arit and nnyin. Accordingly, (33) are paraphrasable as (35) below:

(35)a. Arit eyet idem eyen : 'Arit has washed the baby's body'
(35)b. Nnyin imeyet idem mm> : 'we have washed their bodies'

Similarly, idem in (36) must be regarded as a lexical item meaning body:

(36)a. Idem abiak Bassey akaha : 'Bassey is very sick in the body'
(36)b. Idem emem iban oro akaha : 'the women are very weak in the body'

Clearly, idem cannot be construed as a reflexive in (36) since here it acts as the subject of the sentences. Under our analysis, the reflexive pronoun must be the object or otherwise constituent of the VP.

Finally, idem in (37) is not a reflexive pronoun:

(37)a. Enye efehe idem nkaja : 'He is running without anything (i.e. empty handed)
(37)b. mm> ekesaja idem nkaja : 'They were walking without anything' (i.e. empty handed)

because it is not derived transformationally as a result of the reflexive rule. If such a rule were to apply, then (38), which are ungrammatical, would be generated:

(38)a. *Enye efehe idem esie nkaja : 'He is running himself without anything'
(38)b. *mm> ekesaja idem mm> nkaja : 'They were walking themselves without anything'

The /
The ungrammaticality of (38) can be attributed to the fact that *sebe* (run) and *sango* (walk) in the sense in which they are used in (37) must be intransitive. Yet as we have seen above, the reflexive pronoun occurs as the object of the reflexive sentence under one kind of domination by the VP or another. In fact, *idem* in (37) is an optional element in the adverb phrase *idem gkaa*. In other words, (37) can be paraphrased as (39) below:

(39)a. *Enye efehe gkaa*: 'he is running without anything'
(39)b. *Enye ekesaa gkaa*: 'They were walking without anything'

5.1.3 Verbals and Reflexivization:

It should be clear by now that reflexivization is not just a matter between two NPs but that the VP and its constituents are also affected. For example, we have already shown that reflexivizable NPs are dominated by the VP directly or otherwise (as in the case of Comp-Phrase NPs).

In this section, we wish to consider some verbals for which reflexivization is obligatory. That is there exist a number of verbs whose subjects and objects must be coreferential, if the sentences in which they occur are to make sense. For most other verbals, this is not the case: reflexivization is not obligatory just in order that the sentences in which they occur may make sense. Thus with a verbal like *ma* (love), we may have sentences like (40a), which is a reflexive sentence, or others like (40b), which is not a reflexive sentence:

(40)a. *Ata ama idem esie*: 'Ata loves himself'
(40)b. *Ata ama mma ogo*: 'Ata loves the lady'

For verbals like *tan idem* (be arrogant), *buti idem* (believe in something/ someone), *fat idem* (be careful with yourself (e.g. to a girl)), however, only /
only (41) are possible:

(41)a. *Ata *ata \quad \text{idem eti eti} \quad : 'Ata is very arrogant'
(41)b. *Ndít \quad \text{ofo ebu \quad \text{idem}} \quad \text{ndí ofo ye afo} : 'Those children believe in you'
(41)c. *Arit \quad \text{afat idem e} \quad \text{esi eti eti} : 'Arit is very careful with herself'

but not (42):

(42)a. *Ata *ata \quad \text{eyen oro} \quad : 'Ata is very arrogant that boy/girl'
(42)b. *Ndít \quad \text{ofo ebu \quad \text{ibun oro ye afo} : 'Those children believe the women in you'

So for such verbals as \text{ta\_ idem}, \text{bu\_ idem} and \text{fat idem}, reflexivization is obligatory if the sentences in which they occur are to make sense.

Observe that the tone on the root of such verbs is characteristically low.

The analysis of sentences like (41) is a problem. In dealing with sentences of this kind in English, Lees and Klima (1963) suggest that the verbals of such sentences be classified as 'reflexive intransitives' to distinguish them from what they call 'absolute intransitives' like vanish, arrive, etc. Reflexive intransitives, which include such verbals as pride, absent, bestir and perjure, "may not be freely followed by an object nominal". According to Lees and Klima, such verbals "undergo an obligatory transformation which inserts a replica of the subject after the verb, and this obligatory 'object' is then pronominalized in the usual way: being part of the same simplex as its subject which it repeats, and yields the appropriate reflexive pronoun" (p.55).

What Lees and Klima are in effect saying is that the subjects and objects of the so-called reflexive intransitive verbals must be identical and since this happens in a simplex, then reflexivization must occur. In one solution to this problem (cf. Emonds 1970), verbals such as \text{ta\_ idem}, \text{bu\_ idem} and \text{fat idem}, which must take the reflexive to make sense, require /
require to be subcategorised as \( NP_{subj} = NP_{object} \) (where object must be understood as direct object in Efik). In other words the above three verbals have a common property which is peculiar to them, namely, the subject and object of these verbals must be identical. Since there is no way in which this property can be predicted, we suggest that it should be marked as an idiosyncratic feature of the above verbs in the lexicon. According to Chomsky, "in general, all properties of a formative that are essentially idiosyncratic will be specified in the lexicon" (Chomsky: 1965:87). Clearly the above property of \( ta^j \) idem, \( bu^t \) idem and \( fat \) idem qualifies to be handled in the way suggested by Chomsky.

In generating (41) above the lexical rule will be sensitive to the subcategorization of the verbals \( ta^j \) idem, \( bu^t \) idem and \( fat \) idem. If we take a sentence such as (43), 44 will be generated after lexicalization. (43) Mama oro eyefat idem esie :'The lady will be careful with herself'

S

\[
\text{VP} \\
\text{NP}_c \\
\text{N} \quad \text{DET} \\
\text{ART} \\
\text{AUX} \quad \text{VB} \quad \text{NP}_c \\
\text{+NP subj = NP obj} \\
\text{fat} \quad \text{mama} \\
\text{ART} \\
\text{mama}
\]

Reflexivization will then apply to 44 generating (43) via the intermediate structure (45).

(45) Mama ART AUX fat mama ART

\[\text{+NP} \text{ subj = NP obj} \quad \text{+Pro} \text{ subj = NP obj} \quad \text{+Ref} \text{ subj = NP obj} \quad \text{+Ref} \text{ subj = NP obj}\]

The justification for analysing sentences like (43) as well as (41) as we have done is that such an analysis ensures not only that the subject and object /
object in such sentences are coreferential but also no arbitrary insertion on the object node is allowed.

If (41) and (43) are analysed as reflexive sentences because of the nature of the verbals, can (46) be so analysed? We do not think so. We will give reasons presently:

(46)a. Arit ẹsọ idem : 'Arit is quick'
(46)b. Iban oro ema ẹsọ idem : 'The women were quick'

in the first place, whereas *taŋ, *bunt and *fat in (41) are meaningless without idem. ẹsọ (be quick) is perfectly grammatical and meaningful without idem. Thus (46) and (47) below are synonymous but (48) are ungrammatical:

(47)a. Arit ẹsọ : 'Arit is quick'
(47)b. Iban oro ẹsọ : 'The women are quick'

(48)a. *Ata ataŋ eti eti : 'Ata is very arrogant'
(48)b. *Nditɔ oro e büt ye afo : 'Those children believe in you'
(48)c. *Arit afat eti eti : 'Arit is very careful with herself'

Secondly, although the subject range of ẹsọ is narrow, it certainly takes objects that differ from the subjects, as (46) show. Indeed it seems to be the case that the object, which is generally part of the body, must differ from the subject. Consider more examples with ẹsọ:

(49)a. Arit ẹsọ ukot : 'Arit is quick in the legs'
(49)b. Iban oro ema ẹsọ ubk : 'The women were quick in the hands'

Interestingly enough, (46) and (49) could be paraphrases. The difference between (46a) and (49a) is that the latter but not the former specifically describes the thing that Arit did quickly, and that could be walking or running, as can be gathered from ukot (leg). Similarly, (46b) differs from (49b) because the latter but not the former shows that what the women did quickly involved the use of hands (from ubk – hands), and this was probably cooking. However, it is assumed that whether walking or cooking, it /
it is in fact the body which is involved, hence idem (body) may replace the specific body part (\textit{ukot, ubok}, etc.), where this is obvious in the context or discourse. It should be obvious by now that idem in (46) is derived like idem in (29) and (33): namely as a lexical item in the base.

In retrospect, we would say that the element \textit{idem} has two sources. It may be transformationally derived as part of the reflexive pronoun, or it may be generated in the base as a lexical item.

5.1.4 Reflexive Suffixes:

As we have already shown above, when the reflexive rule applies, the object (and from now on we will use the word \textit{object} to include not only direct and indirect objects but also NPs dominated by Comp-Phrase) of the simplex is replaced ultimately by a reflexive pronoun. However, there are some cases where reflexivization does not appear to involve the use of the reflexive pronoun, at least in the surface structure. This does not appear to be unique to Efik. Jespersen (1933:111) observed it in English and Anderson (1968) referring to Jespersen too suggests that his 'active non-ergative' verbs can be interpreted as his 'ergative reflexive'. What is, however, unique in the Efik case is that the verbals (mostly those connected with wearing) in such reflexive sentences have one form for non-reflexive acts and another for reflexive acts,\(^1\) as in the following examples:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(50)a.] Bassey eyesin eyen ikpa-ukot: 'Bassey will put on the baby shoes'
\item[(50)b.] Bassey eyesin ikpa-ukot: 'Bassey will put himself shoes'
\item[(51)a.] Iban oro eyep Arit bokut: 'The women will tie Arit a head-tie'
\item[(51)b.] /
\end{enumerate}

\(^1\) There seems to be no such distinction in pure Efik.
The non-reflexive and the reflexive forms of the verbals are *sin* (put something on someone else) and *b~p* (tie someone else something), and *sine* (put something on yourself) and *b~p* (tie something on yourself), respectively. Notice that there is an additional morpheme of a reflexive nature in *sine* and *b~p* so that whereas *sin* and *b~p* contain one morpheme each, namely the imperative, *sine* and *b~p* contain two each, namely the imperative and the reflexive elements. One might therefore say that *sine* = *sin* + reflexive pronoun and *b~p* = *b~p* + reflexive pronoun. Consider also the following examples:

(52)a. Etim obok mmː ':Etim has gathered them together'

(52)b. Ebọgho : 'They have gathered together'

(53)a. Arit eyet eyen idem : 'Arit has washed the baby body'

(53)b. Arit eyere idem : 'Arit has washed herself body'

Observe that *ebọgho* and *eyere* behave very much like *sine* and *b~p* and *bok* and *yet* like *sin* and *b~p*. Observe also that *idem* in (53) is not in fact a reflexive pronoun, as we have already noted (cf. 5.1.2) but merely a lexical item meaning body. Observe furthermore, for future reference, that the tones on *sin*, *b~p*, *bok* and *yet* are characteristically high.

Now there are some pieces of syntactic and semantic evidence that the suffixes in *sine*, *b~p*, *ebọgho* and *eyere* are reflexive in nature. First, these verbals do not allow reflexive pronouns in sentences that are intuitively felt to be reflexive, thus the following are ungrammatical:

(54)a.*Bassey eyesine idem esie ikpa-ukot:'Bassey will put himself shoes'

(54)b.*Iban oro eyeb Johannesburg mmː bykut:'The women will tie themselves head-ties'

(54)c. *Mmː ebọgho idem mmː : 'They have gathered themselves together'

(54)d. *Arit eyere idem idem : 'Arit has washed herself body'
which correspond to (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b). It appears the ungrammaticality of (54) is due to the fact that in one sense both the verbal suffixes and the reflexive pronouns appear to be performing one function. If so, the deletion of one or the other would save the sentences. If we delete the reflexive pronouns in (54), of course we get (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b), all of which, as we have already seen, are grammatical.

If we delete the suffixes from the verbals in (54) we get (55):

(55)a. *Bassey eyesin idem esie ikpa-ukot: 'Bassey will put himself shoes (without help)'

(55)b. Iban oro eyet idem mm> bskut: 'The women will tie themselves headties'

(55)c. mm> ebok idem mm> : 'They have gathered themselves (without compulsion)'

(55)d. Arit eyet idem idem : 'Arit has washed herself (so don't bother to help)'

As (55) have certain implications that (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b) do not have, we would hesitate to regard the former and the latter as paraphrases. But this is immaterial. What is material is that *sine, *ba>, *eboho and yere, which we claim contain reflexive morphemes, do not allow reflexive pronouns. Moreover, there is some syntactic difference between reflexivization that introduces the reflexive pronoun and that which introduces the reflexive suffix. Consider (56), for example:

(56)a. Bassey eyegine obufa 74> esie aka 7 wed : 'Bassey will put on his new clothes and go to school'

(56)b. *Bassey eye gin idem obufa 75> esie aka 7 wed: 'Bassey will put on his new clothes and go to school'

We will not discuss the nature of the constraint here. Secondly, such suffixes appear to be confined to a simplex, just as reflexive pronouns. Consider the following examples:

(57)a. Bassey oyigm A 7 esin im< ikpa-ukot: 'Bassey wants A to put shoes on him'

(57)b. /
(57)b. Bassey oyom Ata esine ikpa-ukot: 'Bassey wants Ata to put shoes on himself'

(58)a. Enye oyom ndi'ok nnyin: 'He wants to gather us together'
(58)b. Enye oyom nnyin iboho: 'He wants us to gather ourselves together'

Notice significantly that (59) are ungrammatical:

(59)a. *Bassey oyom Ata esine imikpa-ukot
    'Bassey wants Ata to put shoes on himself him'
(59)b. *Enye oyom nnyin iboho mm: 'He wants us to gather ourselves them'

where sine and iboho cannot tolerate objects in reflexivizable positions, being reflexive in function themselves.

This leads us to the third consideration. Since sin, bap, bok and yet are transitive and since sine, bap, eboho and vere are used only in cases where the action affects the subject itself, it is plausible to suppose that the suffixes do in fact replace the objects of such verbs when these are identical with the subjects. This has been demonstrated by the fact that the suffixes in such verbs and the reflexive pronouns are mutually exclusive, as the ungrammaticality of (54) shows.

We therefore conclude that the suffixes in sine, bap, eboho and vere are reflexive in nature. Our claim is further strengthened when we compare sin/sine and yet/yere with French habiller/S'habiller, laver/se laver and German anziehen/sich anziehen, waschen/sich waschen, where se and sich correspond to the suffixes in sine and vere.

The next question is the generation of such reflexive sentences as (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b). These are problem sentences. All the same, a solution can be found. In Chapter Two we observed that the simplest form of the verb in Efik is the imperative singular. Attached to this form are various affixes indicating number, person, mood, aspect, tense, etc. In all these cases, the affixes precede the root form and we analysed /
analysed these affixes as elements that are ultimately to be derived from constituents of the AUX, which in itself precedes the main verb VB. In no case did we find a suffix. Even the negative affix which appears as a suffix also affects the prefix, as the following examples show:

(60)a. Bassey ama enye: 'Bassey likes him'

(60)b. Bassey imaha enye: 'Bassey doesn't like him'

(61)a. Mbufo eyom enye: 'You (pl) are looking for him'

(61)b. Mbufo iyomke enye: 'You are not looking for him'

In the base NEG of course precedes the main verb. In short, suffixing as a grammatical function is uncommon, i.e. marked, in Efik, and only a few verbs manifest it for a special function, as we will see. Accordingly, we suggest that the few verbs that manifest suffixing be marked as +Suf (Suffix) to distinguish them from others which do not. So like [+NP subj=NP obj] (cf. 5.1.3), +Suf is an idiosyncratic feature of verbs and verbs like sin, bim, bok and yet which manifest it will be so marked in the lexicon in the manner suggested by Chomsky (1965:87). Given the idiosyncratic feature +Suf on the verb sin, for example, let us try to generate a sentence like (50b), which is structured like 62a

\[
S \\
\overbrace{\text{NP}_c}^{\text{VP}} \\
\text{AUX} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{ART} \\
\text{N}_r > / \quad \text{NP}_c \\
\text{NP}_r \\
\text{Bassey} \\
\text{sin Bassey} \\
\text{ikpa-ukot}
\]

As 62a is a proper analysis for reflexivization, the rule will apply, but because of the presence of the feature +Suf on the verb, instead of attaching /
attaching the feature +Refl to the object, this feature is attracted, as it were, to the verb and thus the verb is marked +Refl. But as we have already observed above, the reflexive suffix and the reflexive pronoun are mutually exclusive. For this reason, we suggest that when the reflexive rule attaches the feature +Refl to the verb, there be an obligatory rule, call it Reflexivizable NP Deletion, that deletes the coreferent object that failed to reflexivize (Bassey + ART in this case). The two rules together generate

(62)b. bassey ART aux sin ikpa-ukot ART
   +Suf
   +Refl

The surface form sine will be realised from sin and (50b) would thus be generated.

But how can examples like (55), which contain the regular reflexive pronouns but which are not paraphrases of (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b), be generated? Since it is the feature specification [+Suf] which allows (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b) to be generated, the absence of this feature should on the other hand allow (55), where the verbs have no suffixes, to be generated. For this reason, we suggest that verbs like sin, bap, bok and yet should be specified as [+Suf] in the lexicon. [+Suf] will allow (50b), (51b), (52b) and (53b) to be generated while [-Suf] will allow (55) to be generated.

5.1.5 Ergative Construction:

The Ergative construction is not our main concern, but deserves a brief mention here. We have just shown above that the suffixes in sine, bɔbɔ, eboho and vere are reflexive in nature. In the same way, can the suffixes in obono, ebede, abiaro and awaha in the following examples be analysed as reflexive suffixes?

(63)a. /
131.

(63)a. ọnye obom abanja: 'He has broken a pot'

(63)b. Abanja obomo: 'The pot is broken'

(64)a. Arịt ebet usoro: 'Arịt has closed the door'

(64)b. Usoro ebede: 'The door is closed'

(65)a. Etim abiaj wed oro: 'Etim has spoiled that book'

(65)b. Wed oro abiaro: 'The book is spoiled'

(66)a. Afa awak itam mi: 'Afa has torn my hat'

(66)b. Itam mi awaha: 'My hat is torn'

It is tempting to do so, but let us examine the following sentences:

(67)a. Sin eye ikpa-ukot: 'Put shoes on him'

(67)b. Sine ikpa-ukot: 'Put (yourself) shoes on'

(68)a. Ebi eye bokut: 'Tie her a head-tie'

(68)b. Biye bokut: 'Tie (yourself) a head-tie'

(69)a. Bok mmendo: 'Gather them together'

(69)b. Ebohon: 'Gather (yourselves) together'

(70)a. Yere eyen idem: 'Wash the baby body'

(70)b. Yere idem: 'Wash yourself body'

But

(71)a. Bom abanja: 'Break a pot'

(71)b. *Bomo: 'Break yourself'

(72)a. Beto usoro: 'Close the door'

(72)b. *Bede: 'Close yourself'

(73)a. Biat wed oro: 'Spoil that book'

(73)b. *Biara: 'Spoil yourself'

(74)a. Wat itam mmi: 'Tear my hat to pieces'

(74)b. *Waha: 'Tear yourself to pieces'

Now observe important syntactic differences between sine, biye, ebohon, yere and bomo, bede, biara, waha in (67-70) and (71-74) respectively.

First /
First, *sine, boby, eboho* and *yere* allow the imperative but *bomo, bede, biara* and *waha* do not. Secondly, the subjects of *obomo, ebede, abiara* and *awaha*, as (63b), (64b), (65b) and (66b) show, are characteristically inanimate, whereas those of *sine, boby, eboho* and *yere* (see 50b, 51b, 52b, 53b) are at least animate, if non-human. Furthermore, observe that the tones on *bom, bet, biat* and *wak* are characteristically low, while those on *sin, bob, bok* and *vet*, as already observed, are characteristically high. One wonders therefore whether these syntactic differences do not in fact correspond to a semantic difference between the two kinds of suffixes. We therefore conclude that the suffixes in *sine, boby, eboho* and *yere* on the one hand, and those on *bomo, bede, biara* and *waha* on the other, though similar in pattern, are not semantically equivalent. In other words, those in *bomo, bede, biara* and *waha* are not reflexive in nature. It seems to me that the suffixes here indicate the relationship between the object of a transitive verb and the subject of the same verb used intransitively in the so-called ergative construction.

Additional support for our claim that the suffixes in *bomo, bede, biara* and *waha* are not reflexive in nature comes from the fact that whereas with *sine, boby, eboho* and *yere*, the reflexive pronoun itself may replace the suffix in certain contexts, as we have already seen, this is not the case with *bomo, bede, biara* and *waha*, as in these examples:

(75)a. *Aba* obomo : 'The pot is broken'
(75)b. *Aba* obom idem esie : 'The pot has broken itself'
(76)a. *Usu* ebede : 'The door is closed'
(76)b. *Usu* ebet idem esie : 'The door has closed itself'
(77)a. *Jwed* oro abiara : 'The book is spoiled'
(77)b. *Jwed* oro abiat idem esie : 'The book has spoiled itself'
(78)a. *Itam* mmi awaha : 'My hat is torn to pieces'
(78)b. /
(78)b. *Itam mmi awak idem esie: 'My hat has torn itself to pieces'

It could be argued that this is a matter of selectional restrictions. Apparently, however, it is reflexivization in the (b) examples above which has created the problem.

It is not clear exactly how these sentences should be handled, or indeed whether they can be satisfactorily handled in terms of an *Aspects* grammar: possibly, however, an operation similar to that suggested for the sentences with 'reflexive' verbs would be appropriate.

5.2 Reflexivization in Complex Structures:

So far we have maintained that reflexivization occurs in a simplex. In this section, we wish to examine various complex sentences with reflexive pronouns to see whether the simplex condition actually holds, at least in all known cases, or whether there is need for some modification. For our purposes, we will define a complex structure as a structure with at least one embedded $S$, as the structure in 79:

```
S
   NP
   N DET VP
   ART AUX VB NP PRE-S S
   x
   y w ART N DET NP VP
   z
```

79.

where $x$, $y$, $w$, $z$, $a$, $b$, $c$, stand for lexical items. An embedded $S$ is defined as an $S$ dominated by an $S$ constituent. Thus in 79 the $S$ dominated by ADJT is an embedded $S$.

The /
The following kinds of sentences are analysable as complex structures as defined above; sentences with Adjunct (or adverbal) clauses as (80a); sentences with the complementizer ete as (80b); and sentences with infinitive clauses as (80c).

(80)a. Ata anm utom man 1, 2 5 4 3 4 3 wam idem esie: 'Ata works so that he might help himself'

(80)b. Ete oro ekere ete imo iyemi idem imo: 'The man thinks he will draw himself'

(80)c. Arit ama nditoro idem esie: 'Arit likes to praise himself'

Because of the complications created by imo in (80b), we will not try to generate that sentence until the problems of imo have been discussed (cf. 6.3.ff). Let us now try to analyse examples (80a) and (80c). Let us begin with (80a), which is structured as 81a below:

81a.

where c indicates coreference between NPs.

As 81a indicates, there is a proper analysis for reflexivization, the following /

2. This indexing convention is used merely as a tool for representation.
following conditions having been satisfied:

(i) there is a $S$ which is a simplex;
(ii) the subject of this $S$ is coreferential with the object (i.e., $NP_3 = NP_4$);
(iii) none of the coreferential NPs is dominated by a Pred.

When the rule applies in the manner explained in 5.1.1, the following changes will be effected:

(a) the feature $\neg\text{Pro}$ on the $N$ of $NP_4$ will become $\text{Pro}$ and feature $\text{Refl}$ will also be introduced on it;
(b) the features in (a) as well as the features of number and person on the $N$ will be copied onto the ART node of this NP (i.e., $NP_4$).

These changes together generate 81b:

With the features $\text{Sing, Pro, Refl, Ill}$, the $N$ will be realised as idem while the ART will be realised as esie. In this way, the reflexive pronoun idem esie is generated. $NP_3$ will become he by simple pronominalization, which we will discuss in Chapter Six, when we move into the next higher /
higher sentence in the next cycle. In this way, (80a) will be generated, after the pronoun enye is deleted (optionally).

Let us now turn to (80c) which is structured as 82a:

82a contains an S in which the subject and the object are coreferential. Since this S is a simplex, reflexivization will apply and omitting the structural details, the following will be generated:

In order to generate (80c) from 82b, two important rules, among others, will be required, namely infinitivization and NP deletion. Let us begin with /
with the former, which must apply before the latter. The infinitivization rule is formulated to apply instead of the concord rule in certain structures like 82b above, and is either optional or obligatory depending on the configuration. When this rule applies, it will have the effect of deleting the AUX of the embedded S and attaching the prefix \textit{ndi-} to the VB thus generating 82c:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    & S & \\
    & NP_{c1} & AUX & VP \\
    N & DET & ART & \\
    Arit & ma & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    & S & \\
    & NP_{c2} & VP \\
    N & DET & VP & NP \\
    Arit & ART & \\
    nditoro & \\
    idem & esie \\
\end{array}
\]

82c.

There are conditions which must be fulfilled before the rule applies.

These are:

(a) The S in which the rule applies must not only be an embedded S but also must be dominated by either the NP or VP; that is such an S must act either as the subject or object of another S (generally the matrix S) in the complex structure;

(b) If the embedded S is the object of the matrix (or next higher) S, then the subject of this embedded S must be coreferential with an NP in the matrix (or next higher) S;

(c) The embedded subject is deletable. In the case of the structure 82a, 82b or 82c, this subject (Arit + ART) must be deleted, as we will see presently.

Since the embedded subject is crucial for the application of the infinitivization rule, this rule must therefore precede any rule that deletes this crucial NP. 82c is therefore an input to the rule that deletes the embedded subject and when this rule applies, (80c) above will be generated.
In English, the deletion of such an NP as \( NP_2 \) in (82c) is performed by the rule of Equi-NP-Deletion. In Efik, however, it seems as if this NP, which is in fact pronominal at the time of deletion (cf. 6.2), is deleted by the Pronoun Deletion Rule (cf. 6.1.2) that deletes anaphoric personal pronouns in general.

So far it seems as if the subject of the embedded S must always be coreferential with that of the matrix in such structures (i.e. those underlying infinitive sentences like (80c)). But this is in fact not the case.

Consider the following examples:

(83)a. \( Ata \) oyom ib\( an \) oro \( ewot \) idem \( mbfo \): 'Ata wants the women to kill themselves'

(83)b. \( Enye \) ekpep \( mbufo \) ndikpeme idem \( mbufo \) He has taught you how to look after yourselves

(83a) and (83b) are derived from 84a and 84b respectively:
To generate (83a) from 84a, NP₂ will reflexivize NP₃ in the latter. Observe that 84a does not meet all the conditions for the application of infinitivization, for although the embedded S is the object of the matrix, the subject of this embedded S is not coreferential with an NP in the matrix. Consequently, infinitivization does not apply in 84a. In 84b, however, after reflexivization, infinitivization will be required, since all the conditions given above for the application of the rule have been met. Observe that it is coreference within a simplex which is crucial. Thus in (85a), where there is no coreference within a simplex, as 85b underlying it shows, there is no reflexivization.

(85a) Enye oyom ndinyanya enye: 'he wants to help him'
Although there is coreference in 85b - NP₁ in the matrix = NP₂ in the embedded S - reflexivization does not take place because the coreferent NPs are dominated by different S's. Thus although the subject of the embedded S is coreferential with the subject of the matrix, this embedded subject is not in turn coreferential with the object in its own clause, namely NP₃. Therefore the SD for reflexivization is not met. Thus (85a) differs from (86) below semantically because in the former two persons are involved but in the latter only one person is involved:

(86) ẹnye oyom ndinyaọ idem esie : 'he wants to help himself'

Incidentally, if the subject of the matrix and the object of the embedded S were the same person and the subject of the embedded S were an entirely different person, 85b would be realised as (87):

(87) ẹnye oyom ẹnye anyaọ imọ: 'he wants him to help him'

We will discuss the use of imọ/imọ (he/she/it/they) in Chapter Six (cf./)
Observe that infinitivization is not contingent on reflexivization, since the former must apply in (85b) in order to derive (85a). Also applicable in (85b) is the Pronoun Deletion Rule referred to above and which we will discuss in full in Chapter Six.

Next, consider the following three sentences in (88). Observe that these factors make a lot of differences:

(a) coreference in a simplex, as in (88a);
(b) coreference outside a simplex, as in (88b);
(c) non-coreference, as in (88c).

(88)a. Bassey oyom Ime anya\(\text{a}\) idem esie: 'Bassey wants Ime to help himself'
(88)b. Bassey oyom Ime anya\(\text{a}\) im\(\text{e}\): 'Bassey wants Ime to help him'
(88)c. Bassey oyom Ime anya\(\text{a}\) enye: 'Bassey wants Ime to help him(someone else)

In (88a) Ime anya\(\text{a}\) idem esie is a simplex, hence the reflexivization. In (88b), Bassey and im\(\text{e}\), which are coreferential, are in different S configurations, hence no reflexivization. (88c) is actually ambiguous. In one interpretation, Bassey and enye are two different people, in which case it is structured as 89a, omitting structural details:

```
NP1  
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   

NP2  
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   

VP    
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   

S     
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   

AUX   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   

VB    
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
|   |   
```

In another interpretation, enye and Bassey would be the same person, just as im\(\text{e}\) and Bassey in (88b), in which case (88)c would be structured as 89b.
89b, again omitting details:

A structure like 89b would provide an SD for simple pronominalization by which *emy* can be derived from NP Bassey. Simple pronominalization will of course be discussed in Chapter Six. We will also discuss the differences between sentences like (88b) and (88c) in the interpretation in which Bassey and *emy* are coreferential.

So far it appears as if reflexivization applies only in an embedded S. But in fact this is not the case as (90) show:

(90)a. Ime ekpep idem esie ndiyat moto: 'I/me taught himself to drive a car'

(90)b. Iban o2o enya idem mmp man mmp enya mbufo

'The women have helped themselves so that they may help you.'

Let us consider the derivation of (90b), which is structured as 91.
As reflexivization is cyclic, we begin with the embedded S. Reflexivization will not apply here because there is no proper analysis for this rule. However, NP<sub>3</sub> is pronominalized by simple pronominalization, since it is coreferential with an NP, in fact with NPs, in the matrix S. So if simple pronominalization applies — it appears to be obligatory in this case — the following string, omitting the details, will be generated:

(92) iban ART AUX nyaαa iban ART man mmS AUX nyaαa mbufo ART

In the matrix cycle itself the conditions for the application of reflexivization are met, so the rule will apply and (90b) will finally be generated. It appears therefore that reflexivization precedes or follows simple pronominalization depending on whether the simplex that satisfies the application of this rule is the embedded or matrix S.

In retrospect, it seems that so far there is no evidence to suggest that reflexivization is not limited to the simplex in Efik.

5.3 Reflexivization in Structures with Co-ordinate NPs and Co-ordinate S's

In this section, we will be concerned with sentences containing the so-called co-ordinate conjunctions. We will accept without further qualification the common definition of a co-ordinate conjunction as one that conjoins categories of the same kind, e.g. S and S, NP and N, etc. In Efik, ve and nyaβ may be regarded as co-ordinate conjunctions, since as we will see below ve co-ordinates NPs while nyaβ co-ordinates sentences.

There are of course other conjunctions such as edι (but) and mme (or) in these examples:

(92)a. Bassey ama okut mι 2 edι ikomke: 'Bassey saw mι but didn't greet me'
(92)b. Nnyomke Okon mme Ata : 'I don't want Okon or Ata'

For the purposes of reflexivization, however, we will not discuss sentences with edι and mme, since for one thing, in the case of the former, reflexivization/
reflexivization would apply in a straightforward manner, as 93b, which underlies (93a), shows:

(93)a. nnyin iṣa iṣian eyen oro ede ẹyẹ ikekpeme idem esie

'we past morph tell the boy but he didn't take care of himself'

Since NP₃ and NP₄ are coreferential and since the S that dominates them is a simplex, reflexivization will apply in that S without any problems.

In the case of mme, many sentences with this morpheme do not allow reflexivization, thus (94), for example, are ungrammatical:

(94)a.*Mmaha idem mmi mme Effiong: 'i don't like myself or Effiong'
(94)b.*Effiong ikekpeme 2 mme idem esie: 'Effiong doesn't take care of you or himself'

Even in cases where reflexivization is permissible, as in (95a), there would be no problem for the rule, since (95a) is derived from (95b), which is structured as 96 omitting details:

(95)a. Nte Bassey ekekpeme 1 mme idem esie?:'Did Bassey protect you or himself?'

(95)b. Nte Bassey ekekpeme 1 mme idem esie?

'Did Bassey protect you or did he protect himself?'
As in 93b, since NP3 and NP4 are coreferential and since the S that dominates them is a simplex, it will be a case of straightforward reflexivization. Perhaps we should add that mme appears to occur only in negative or question sentences such as (92b) and (95) above. Thus (97), for example, is ungrammatical:

(97) *Nnyom Okon mme Ata : 'I want Okon or Ata'

So in retrospect structures such as 93b and 96 with edi and mme respectively are similar to those underlying sentences with nyuŋ as we will see in 5.3.5 below. So reflexivization in structures underlying nyuŋ sentences will be assumed to be similar to reflexivization in sentences with edi and mme.

We now return to ye and nyuŋ, which occur in sentences like (98a) and (98b) respectively:

(98)a. Bassey ye Etim eka : 'Bassey and Etim have gone'
(98)b. Ime ama obi et oky uk onyuŋ ɔbɔ p u ɔ'k

'Ime past morph. borrow money and built a house'

To analyse the sentences in (98) we turn to the analyses of similar sentences in English. Within the transformational generative theory there are /
are three hypotheses and Stockwell et al (1968) outlines them as follows:

1. Both phrasal conjunction and derived conjunction are basic (Smith, Lakoff & Peters, Ross)

2. Only phrasal conjunction is basic (Wierzbicka, McCawley, Dougherty)

3. Only derived conjunction is basic (Gleitman, Hellert, Schane).

By phrasal conjunction is meant that certain sentences with the co-ordinate conjunction are in fact simple sentences with a co-ordination of such S constituents as NPs or VPs. Thus a sentence such as

(99)a. John and Mary are alike

according to Lakoff and Peters (1966) cannot be derived from a sentence embodying a conjunction of two assertions. Thus (99)b is ungrammatical:

(99)b. *John is alike and Mary is alike

So according to Lakoff and Peters, "at least in the case of noun phrases, conjunction must occur in the base component. That is, there must be a rule schema of the form

\[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \land (w^r)^n, \; n \geq 2 \] (p.114).

On the other hand, a sentence like (100a) "embodies a conjunction of two assertions"

(100)a. John and Mary are erudite.

In other words, a sentence like (100a) is derived from a conjunction of two sentences such as (100b). Such a conjunction has been referred to as sentence conjunction or derived conjunction.

(100)b. John is erudite and Mary is erudite.

So in (100a), the conjunction of John and Mary at this surface level is not basic but actually 'derived' after a number of operations.

The three proposals above therefore revolve round these two kinds of conjunction namely conjunction whose source is via the schema above, or conjunction whose source is in sentences in the base.
The question is which of these proposals is best suited for our purpose? As Stockwell and his co-authors have acknowledged, none of the three can adequately handle conjoined structures in English but in their opinion, the three do not fail in the same way and the third, namely all conjoined sentences in English are derived as a conjunction of sentences in the base, is shown to be superior to the other two. For Efik, however, similar sentences can best be handled by the Lakoff and Peters' analysis which allows both phrasal conjunction and sentence conjunction in the base. In the first place, whereas English has one morpheme and which appears to conjoin both S's and S constituents, Efik has two, ve and nywu, each of which conjoins different, though specific, kinds of constituents. We would not therefore necessarily expect to find the same sorts of problems in Efik created by the use of and in English. Not only does Efik discriminate morphologically between phrasal conjunction and sentence conjunction, but also one of the conjoining elements nywu is inflected for number and person, as we have already seen in Chapter Two (cf. 2.10). Moreover, the problems created by the English respectively conjunction and used by Stockwell et al to support their analysis does not arise in Efik, since this kind of conjunction does not exist in Efik. Although there are similarities between English and Efik conjunctions, the nature of the problems are different for both languages. For example, English analysts do not have to contend with a co-ordinate conjunction like nywu which is inflected. Accordingly, we will treat conjunction in Efik in its own right. In the following sections, we will examine conjunction involving ve and nywu in some more detail and see how reflexivization applies in such structures.
5.3.1 Ye Conjuncts:

In Chapter Three (cf. 3.6) we showed among other things that *ye* conjoins NPs and that the modifiers of such NPs under certain conditions may be deleted. It is now known that Comp-Phrases are also conjoinable by *ye*. Thus we have the following examples:

(101a) Enye adia udia ke fọk ye ke ikwa:'He is eating with a fork and knife'

(101b) Bassey ama etiŋ mbuk abaŋa Ata ye Etim

'Bassey told a story about Ata and Etim'

where *ye* conjoins ke fọk and ke ikwa in (101a) and abaŋa Ata and abaŋa Etim in (101b). The second ke in (101a) may be deleted, thus we have (102) which is synonymous with (101a):

(102) Enye adia udia ke fọk ye ikwa :'He is eating with a fork and a knife'

In the case of (101b) the second abaŋa must have been obligatorily deleted, since the Comp-Phrase is structured as 103:

```
Comp-Phrase
  ye
  |
  |
Comp     NP
  |
  QVB

abaŋa Ata

103.
```

That is (104), where the deletion of the second abaŋa has not taken place, is ungrammatical:

(104)*Bassey ama etiŋ mbuk abaŋa Ata ye abaŋa Etim

'Bassey told a story about Ata and about Etim'

Observe that the deletion of a common Prep or QVB in a Comp-Phrase co-ordination is similar to the deletion of a common NP modifier in an NP co-ordination (cf. 3.6).

However, verbs, adjectives, and sentences are not conjoinable by *ye*, as the /
the following are ungrammatical:

(105)a. *Ari T kú júu ẹjú ọkọ ọko: 'I went and saw the ghost'
(105)b. *Ari ẹdi ẹdiye ẹjú ẹnyẹn ọwo: 'Ari is a pretty and tall girl'
(105)c. *Mmọ ema edimọ ẹjú ẹmọ ema eyip inọ: 'They conspired and stole'

It is significant that verbs and adjectives cannot be conjoined by ye since
this provides yet another evidence for the hypothesis that adjectives are
in fact verbals. The fact that verb phrases and sentences cannot be con-
joined by ye strongly supports our analysis of conjuncts of ye as
phrasally generated.

There are, however, some restrictions on the conjuncts of ye. In Chapter
Three (3.6) it was observed that identical modifiers of constituent NPs
may be deleted in accordance with the following principles:

(a) If the modifier is a pre-nominal modifier, then it is the modifier
of the first constituent NP which is undeleted;

(b) If the modifier is, however, a post-nominal one, then it is the
modifier of the last constituent NP which is undeleted.

Thus given the structures such as 106a and 106b, where Quant₁ and Quant₂
are identical and where ART₁ and ART₂ are also identical,

quant₂ may be deleted but not Quant₁ in accordance with principle (a),
and ART₁ may be deleted but not ART₂ in accordance with principle (b).

These principles may be more formally stated as (107):

(107) Given a co-ordination of NPs A, B, C...N and an identical non-
nominal constituent X of A, B, C...N, where X is not EMPH, all
occurrences of X may be deleted except for the first one, if it is
a /
a left branching constituent, or for the last one if it is a right branching constituent.

(107) accounts for the deletions in the (b) examples in 108-113. The (a) and (b) examples are of course paraphrases.

(108)a. Bassey eyedep ebot 1a ye unen iba:’Bassey will buy two goats and two hens’

(108)b. Bassey eyedep ebot ye unen iba:’Bassey will buy two goats and hens’

(109)a. Akparawa oro ye jkaiferi oro edian nd7:’The young man and the girl are married’

(109)b. Akparawa ye jkaiferi oro edian nd7:’The young man and girl are married’

(110)a. Eka ese iye ese esie esiono nd7:’his mother and his father are divorced’

(110)b. Eka ye ese esie esiono nd7:’his mother and father are divorced’

(111)a. Ikpan emi jkedepde ye ikwa emi jkedepde ebigrn:’The spoon bought and the knife which I bought are spoiled’

(111)b. Ikpan ye ikwa emi jkedepde ebigrn:’The spoon and the knife which I bought are spoiled’

(112)a. Anie Okon ye anie Bassey ke oyom?’Which Okon and which Bassey do you want?’

(112)b. Anie Okon ye Bassey ke oyom?’Which Okon and Bassey do you want?’

(113)a. I6a ke otu ebot oro ye ita ke otu unen oro eson:’Three of the goats and three of the hens are lost’

(113)b. Ita ke otu ebot ye unen oro eson:’Three of the goats and hens are lost’

(107) also predicts that (114b) is not derived from (114a):

(114)a. Arit ke idem esie ye etim ke idem esie inemke esit:’Arit herself and etim himself are not happy’

(114)b. Arit ye etim ke idem esie inemke esit:’Arit herself and etim himself are not happy’

In addition to obeying the above principle, conjoined NPs must be in the same case in case analysis, thus (115a), for example, is ungrammatical but (115b) is not.

(115)a. /
(115a) *Mma oro enyene okuk ke ufọk ye bank: 'The lady has money in the house and in the bank'

(115b) Mma oro enyene okuk ke ufọk ye ke bank: 'The lady has money in the house and in the bank'

where **ke ufọk** is locative and **bank** is apparently objective in (115a).

(115a) would be grammatical in an interpretation in which the **ke** preceding **bank** is understood to be deleted, that is **bank** is in fact locative just as **ke ufọk**.

It should be observed that the above observations lend further support to our claim that conjuncts of **ye** be phrasally derived.

It could, however, be argued that the ambiguity of sentences like (116) below requires that conjuncts of **ye** be sometimes sententially derived:

(116) Ata ye Okon edia udia: 'Ata and Okon are eating'

In one interpretation (116) could mean that Ata and Okon are eating together but in another it could mean that Ata and Okon are eating differently or separately. Of course the ambiguity of (116) can be resolved without resort to sentence conjunction, namely by the use of the adjunct **kiet** or **nsio-nsio**, neither of which involves sentential sources, as in these examples:

(117)a. Ata ye Okon edia udia kiet: 'Ata and Okon are eating together'

(117)b. Ata ye Okon edia udia nsio-nsio: 'Ata and Okon are eating separately'

In fact to show that the ambiguity of (116) is resolved by phrasal conjunction on the one hand and sentence conjunction on the other, presumably one would have to derive (117b) from a structure underlying (118) below:

(118) Ata adia udia, Okon onyụ adia udia ọko: 'Ata is eating, Okon is also eating'

Clearly (118) cannot be interpreted as a true paraphrase of (117b) (nor of 117a). In the first place it is as ambiguous as (116). Secondly, it asserts an aspect which neither interpretation of (116) does, namely that **Okon** /
Okon is eating just as Ata does, implying perhaps the former should not be bothered, any more than the latter.

If (116) cannot be interpreted as (118) for a semantic reason, it cannot either be interpreted as (119), for a syntactic reason, namely that ve does not conjoin S's, as we have already pointed out.

(119) *Ata adia udia ye Okon adia udia:'Ata is eating and Okon is eating'

So once again there appears to be no basis for sentential sources of conjuncts of ve.

But if there are apparently no bases for deriving conjuncts of ve from sentences sources, there are still more reasons for deriving them as phrasally conjoined. Consider (120a):

(120)a. Ata adia adia =en= onwu enem 13 idem esit

'Ata and Okon have eaten and are happy'

where both ve and onwu occur in the same sentence. Clearly it is unviable both syntactically and semantically to derive (120a) from the structure underlying (120b):

(120)b. Ata adia udia onyu onwu adia udia onyu onyu

'Ata has eaten and is happy, Okon has also eaten and is happy'

The most plausible thing therefore, in our opinion, is to analyse Ata ve Okon as phrasally conjoined and onyu itself as conjoining sentences in (120a)

Next, the conjunction involving such 'relational' MPs as ndit–eka (brothers) and ufan (friends) in (121) below reinforces the arguments for phrasal derivation of conjuncts of ve.

(121)a. Effiong ye Bassey edi ndit–eka:'Effiong and Bassey are brothers'

(121)b. Ata ye Ime edi ufan : 'Ata and Ime are friends'

If the conjuncts of ve were sententially derived, then (121) would be derived /
derived from structures underlying (122):

(122)a. *Effiong edi eyen-eka, Bassey onyu) edi eyen eka
    'Effiong is a brother, Bassey is also a brother'

(122)b. Ata edi ufan, Ime onyu) edi ufan: 'Ata is a friend and Ime is a friend'
      but (122a) is ungrammatical while (122b) does not paraphrase (122b).

Finally conjoined NPs, as can be seen from the examples given so far, are
a sub-set of plural NPs and they behave very much like single plural NPs.
In English, Dougherty (1970) has shown that conjoined NPs belong to a class
of plural NPs which he calls 'semantic non-singualrs'.

There is, however, a problem with deriving all conjoined NPs phrasally.
Consider (123) for example:

(123)a. Bassey ye Ime et~ye kiet eka:'Bassey and Ime have quarrelled
      with each other'

Now if we derive all conjuncts of ye phrasally, it will be difficult,
apparently, to derive the above sentence since (123b) cannot be said to
underlie (123a):

(123)b. *Bassey ey Ime ey Bassey ey Ime
      'Bassey and Ime have quarrelled with Bassey and Ime'

which in fact underlies (123c):

(123)c. Bassey ye Ime et~ye idem mm:'Bassey and Ime have quarrelled with
      themselves'

Although (123a) and (123c) are in fact paraphrases, this is only in one
interpretation of the latter, for a situation could arise where Bassey
could quarrel with himself and Ime with himself too. In spite of this,
the solution does not lie in sentence sources of (123d) kind below to
generate (123a):

(123)d. Bassey et~ye Ime, Ime onyu) et~ye Bassey eko
      'Bassey has quarrelled with Ime and Ime has quarrelled with Bassey also'

for the same syntactic and semantic objections we have raised before. It
seems /
seems therefore the solution to the reciprocation problem must lie elsewhere. We will discuss this in the section on reflexivization and reciprocation (cf.5.5).

So far, we have been considering what we consider to be conjoined NPs. As we have already pointed out, *ve* conjoins NPs. We want to say, however, that there are cases in which *ve* cannot be regarded as a conjoining element but as showing another kind of relationship with other elements of the sentence. Consider (124) for example:

(124)a. *Agi nyaka ya Bassey* : 'I went with Bassey'
(124)b. *Anye esidia udia ya fok* : 'He eats with a fork'

where *ve* are clearly prepositional in function. In (124a) *ve* indicates the comitative case while in (124b) it indicates the instrumental case.

If so, we should expect (125a) and (125b) to differ semantically:

(125)a. *Ata aka isaI ye Ime* : 'Ata went with Ime on a journey'
(125)b. *Ata ye Ime eka isaI* : 'Ata and Ime went on a journey'

Indeed (125a) and (125b) do differ. In (125a) the speaker is asserting that *Ata* is the principal actor while Ime merely follows him. Thus *ve* functions here not as a conjoining element but as a preposition. In case terms, *Ata* would be the agent while Ime would be in the comitative case.

On the other hand (125b) makes a different assertion about *Ata* and *Ime*. They both are principal actors on the journey together. Both are of course in the same agentive case. These differences in interpretation correspond to differences in the underlying representations of the two sentences in (125) as shown in figures 126a and 126b respectively.
It is now time to consider reflexivization in conjoined structures of the kind we have been discussing. Let us consider this example below:

(127)a. Ata ye Bassey enya a idem mma

'Ata and Bassey have helped themselves'

According to our analysis, (127a) is structured as 127b
The application of reflexivization in a structure like 127b above is a tricky business. However, since conjoined simple structures do differ in some respects from non-conjoined simplex structures, reflexivization applies a little differently in the former, in so far as the essential constraints are not violated. Therefore, we will require the reflexive rule to apply recursively in simplexes with conjoined NPs, so long as each pair of constituent NPs are dominated by superordinate NPs which stand in subject-object relationship and so long as the constituent NP subjects are coreferential with the constituent NP objects, as in 127b.

Let us now see how the rule will apply in 127b. Assuming that all morphologically identical NPs are also coreferential and that by inference conjoined coreferent NPs, such as Ata ye Bassey, are dominated by coreferent superordinate NPs, such as the NPs immediately dominated by S and the VP respectively, then reflexivization will begin /
begin to apply generating 127c

As the rule is recursive and as there are yet another pair of NPs meeting the reflexivization criteria, the rule will reapply generating 127d:

Let us assume that from the features [+Sing], [+Pro], [+III] and [+Refl] on both the noun stems and determiners of the constituent NPs objects, *idem esie* will be realised in each case. In order to derive *idem mm* of (127a), we need a pronoun conjunction rule similar to that formulated /
formulated by Stockwell et al (1968:247), which has the effect of obligatorily deriving the plural form *idem mm* (themselves) from *idem esie ye idem esie* (himself and himself). Before we show how this rule can be formulated in Efik, we wish to say that this rule is in fact empirically motivated, for we have the following:

(i28)a. *Ami ye afo/mbufo* = *nnyn*  
'I and you/you pl = we/us'

(i28)b. *Ami ye enye/mm* = *nnyn*  
'I and he/she/it/they = we/us'

(i29)a. *Afo ye afo/mbufo* = *mbufo*  
'You and you/you pl = you'

(i29)b. *Afo ye enye/mm* = *mbufo*  
'You and he/she/it/they = You'

I should point out that the conjoined pronouns on the left are grammatical strings and that the collapsing of the strings which results in the single pronouns on the right is optional in such cases.

5.3.2 The Pronoun Conjunction Rule:

In Efik, the pronoun conjunction rule can be formulated as follows:

Pronoun Conjunction Rule (partly optional):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Sing</td>
<td>+Def</td>
<td>+Sing</td>
<td>+Def</td>
<td>+Sing</td>
<td>+Def</td>
<td>+Sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Pro</td>
<td>+Sing</td>
<td>+Pro</td>
<td>+Sing</td>
<td>+Pro</td>
<td>+Sing</td>
<td>+Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Refl</td>
<td>+Dem</td>
<td>+Refl</td>
<td>+Dem</td>
<td>+Refl</td>
<td>+Dem</td>
<td>+Refl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditions:
1. Either 2 or 5 is -I.
2. Either both 2 and 5 are +Refl or -Refl.
3. Both 3 and 6 are not +Dem.
4. C.
159.

N.G.

Obligatory if both 2 and 5 are $+\text{refl}$, or if both 2 and 5 are $+\text{III}$ and both 3 and 6 are $-\text{Dem}$ and $-\text{Refl}$.

Otherwise optional.

If either 2 or 5 is $+\text{i}$, then (a); if both are $-\text{i}$ and either is $+\text{II}$, then (b); if both are $+\text{II}$, then (c).

(a) \[ l - 2 - 3 - \rho - \rho - \rho - 7 \]

(b) \[ l - 2 - 3 - \rho - \rho - \rho - 7 \]

(c) \[ l - 2 - 3 - \rho - \rho - \rho - 7 \]

Notes:

(i) If the first condition is not met the result will be the generation of nnyin (we/us) from such ungrammatical strings as *ami ye ami (I and I), *ami ye nnyin (I and we) and *nnyin ye nnyin (we and we). But the condition does not necessarily imply that the above strings are ungrammatical, thus we will probably need another constraint to do this job. *Nnyin ye nnyin (we and we) should not be confused with nnyin nnyin (we and we) which is a reduplication of nnyin.

(ii) Condition 2 prevents the rule from applying to a string like Ata ama mi ve idem esie (Ata likes me and himself) to derive *Ata ama idem nnyin (Ata loves ourselves).

(iii) Condition 3 does not allow the collapsing of enye emi ve enye oko (this one and that one yonder), though *enye ve enye obligatorily becomes mm (they).

(iv) The rule optionally changes ami ve afo to nnyin, afo ve enve to /
to *mbufo* (you pl), for example; and *idem fo ye idem esie* (yourself and himself) to *idem mbufo* (yourselves), for example, obligatorily.

(v) Morphophonemically an *N* which is [-Sing], [+Pro], [+Ref] becomes *idem* (self) and an ART which is [-Sing], [-Dem], [+Ref], [+III] becomes mm (their). If, however, the *N* is [-Sing], [+Pro], [-Ref], [+III], for example, it is realised as mm (they).

We will return to this in the Chapter on pronominalization, when we will discuss in detail what the rule does to the phrase marker on which it operates.

After the pronoun conjunction (or should we say collapsing) rule has applied to *Ata ye Bassey enyanga idem esie ye idem esie* (Ata and Bassey have helped himself and himself) (127a), which I repeat below, will be generated:

(127)a. *Ata ye Bassey enyanga idem mm* : 'Ata and Bassey have helped themselves'

5.3.3 **Conjuncts of *nya***:

As in the case of *ve*, conjuncts of *nya* (i.e. categories - *S*'s in this case - conjoined by *nya*) will not be considered in any detail, since our primary concern is with reflexivization.

In Chapter Two (cf.2.10) we came across elements which are partially verbal in character but which vary in functions. *nya* is one such element. Syntactically it behaves like a verb in that, among other things, it agrees in number and person with the subject of the sentence, as in (130):

(130)a. *Arit okpon onyu* 1 2 3 eye : 'Arit is big and pretty'

(130)b. *Nnyin ima ika inyu* 4 5 4 3 ikektu eyye : 'We went and saw him'

where *onyu* and *onyu* agree with *Arit* and *nya* in (130a) and (130b) respectively. Functionally, as it seems now pretty clear, *nya* conjoins or co-ordinates sentences. Thus in (130) the pairs of sentences *Arit* /
Arit okpon (Arit is big) and Arit eye (Arit is pretty) in (a); and
nnyin ima ike (we went) and nnyin ikekut enye (we saw him) in (b) are
co-ordinated in one S each.

If nnyun co-ordinates only S's, then we should expect the following
sentences to be ill-formed, as indeed they are:

(131)a. *Effiong onyu Bassey eka : 'Effiong and Bassey have gone'
(131)b. *Nnyin iyom Bassey inyu Ata : 'We want Bassey and Ata'

(132)a. *Ada ozo ama odu ke Uyo ogyu Calabar
   'The lad had stayed at Uyo and Calabar'
(132)b. *Nnye adia ka ikpa ogyu ikyaw
   'He is eating with a spoon and knife'

(131) and (132) show that NPs and Comp-phrases cannot be co-ordinated
by nnyun. Indeed, as has been pointed out above, this function is
performed by we.

5.3.4 Constraints on nnyun Co-ordination:

As in the case of we, there are some constraints on co-ordination
involving nnyun. First, the constituent sentences co-ordinated by nnyun
must either be all positive sentences or negative sentences, thus (133)
are ungrammatical but (134) are grammatical:

(133)a. *Enye ama okut mi inyu) ikyomke ko: 'we saw me and did not greet me'
(133)b. *Nnyin ikiyom Okon ikyaw ikytke enye
       'We looked for Okon and did not see him'

(134)a. Enye ikekutke mi ikeyu ikymke mi ko
       'He did not see me and did not greet me'
(134)b. Nnyin ikiyomke Okon ikeyu ikytke enye
       'We did not look for Okon and didn't see him'

Secondly, it appears conjuncts of nnyun must either have a common subject
or /
or a common VP, thus the conjoined sentences in (131) and (134) above have a common subject, and (135) below each has a common VP:

(135)a. Effiong eyekut iban ozo, Okon ko eygnyu okut mpo

'Effiong will see the women and Okon will also see them'

(135)b. Ami mma ha mpo, yan mi ko ipamun imaha mpo

'I don't like them, my wife too doesn't like them'

However, the commonest and most natural use of nyun is in cases where the constituent sentences have a common subject. Conjoined sentences with each conjunct having either a common object or a common VB do not appear to involve the use of nyun, as (136) show:

(136)a. Ami ndia ukon, edi Bassey (adja) bia

'I am eating plantains but Bassey (is eating) yam'

(136)b. Ime ama edep yed, ndien ami edep

'Ime bought a book, then I read it'

where in (a) the conjuncts share a common VB while in (b) the conjuncts there share a common object, which is deleted in the second conjunct.

The above constraints on nyun co-ordination could be stated as deep structure constraints since they centre around the notion of subject in the deep sense, and categories like the VP and NEXG, both of which occur in the base.

5.3.5 Deletions in Nyun Co-ordinations:

It was pointed out in 2.10 that nyun may be deleted. Thus (137b) is derived from (137a) by such deletion:

(137)a. Bassey eyebi okuk opum edep moto: 'Bassey will borrow money and

by a car'

(137)b. /
It is 

\textit{nyuo} deletion of this kind that gives sentences like (137b) the superficial appearance of serial construction. It will be recalled that in 2.10 \textit{nyuo} was used as a test for compound or co-ordinate sentences in cases where a simple sentence appears to have two verbs. Thus a sentence like (138a) is in fact a co-ordination of two sentences because it can be paraphrased as (138b):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item (138)a. Ime \textit{ama} otop itiat \textit{onyo} to mi: 'Ime threw a stone and hit me'
  \item (138)b. Ime \textit{ama} otop itiat \textit{onyo} to mi: 'Ime threw a stone and hit me'
\end{enumerate}

where in Efik both sentences imply that the stone actually hit the speaker.

It is not only \textit{nyuo} that can be deleted in \textit{nyuo} co-ordination. Of particular relevance to pronominalization is the deletion of the subject of the second constituent sentence, as can be seen from (137) and (138). Such a deletion has to take place for these examples (i.e. 137 and 138) to be generated. This means that a sentence such as (139a) is derived from a structure underlying (139b):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item (139)a. Ime \textit{ama} \textit{okut} ete oro \textit{onyo} \textit{okot}: 'Ime saw the man and invited him'
  \item (139)b.*Ime \textit{ama} \textit{okut} ete oro Ime \textit{onyo} \textit{okot}: 'Ime saw the man and Ime invited him'
\end{enumerate}

Let us assume that the structure underlying (139b) can be represented as the following diagram, omitting details:
To generate (139a) from 140, NP\2, the subject of the second constituent S, is deleted obligatorily, while NP\4, the object of this same constituent S, is optionally deleted. In other words (141) below is synonymous with (139a):

(141) Ime ama okut ete oro ony\| okot enye: 'ime saw the man and invited him'

It is pertinent at this juncture to recall a rule formulated by Koutsoudas (1971:347) for deleting identical constituents in a co-ordination. The rule, which is not specific to English, is called Co-ordination Deletion and is informally stated thus:

"Given a co-ordination in which each conjunct includes a constituent which is identical to the corresponding constituent of each other conjunct, all but one of these identical constituents may be deleted, the undeleted constituent being that of the first conjunct, if it is a left branching constituent, and that of the last, if it is a right branching constituent".

Although this rule correctly deletes the subject of the second sentence conjunct in structures underlying (137) and (138), it wrongly predicts that in 140 it is the object of the second conjunct which is undeleted, since it is a right branching constituent. We should point out that 140 is not an isolated case. In general in a structure like that (which also includes structures underlying ed\(i\) (but) and m\(m\)e (or) sentences (cf.5.3)), the object of the second or last conjunct is deleted optionally. The rule also wrongly predicts what could be deleted in the following examples:

(142)a. Ata imaha \(\mathfrak{kaiferi}\) oro, Okon \(\mathfrak{ko}\) iny\(\nu\) imaha enye 'Ata doesn't like the girl and Okon too doesn't like her'

(142)b. *Ata, Okon \(\mathfrak{ko}\) iny\(\nu\) imaha \(\mathfrak{kaiferi}\) oro 'Ata and Okon too don't like the girl'

where an identical (right branching) VP cannot be deleted. However, although none of the identical VPs in (142a) can be deleted, one of the /
the identical objects can be, as (142c) with enye deleted is perfectly grammatical:

(142)c. Ata imaha kaiferi oro, Okon ko inyu imaha
   'Ata doesn't like that girl, Okon too doesn't like her'

Again it is the right branching constituent in the last conjunct which is deleted, in violation of Koutsoudas' rule. The deletion of pronouns such as enye will be discussed in Chapter Six.

5.3.6 Reflexivization in Nyu Conjuncts:

Let us now consider how reflexivization operates in co-ordinate structures involving nyu. Let us consider (143a), for example, which is structured like 143b:

(143)a. mma oro ama etin ik onyu anya a idem esie
   'The lady talked and helped herself'

From 143b, it can be seen that reflexivization in a co-ordination involving nyu is after all not very complicated, though nyu itself is a tricky morpheme. Since the second or right branching S is a proper /
proper analysis for reflexivization, the rule will apply as usual changing the feature *-Pro* on the N of NP\textsubscript{4} to *+Pro* and adding the feature *+Refl*. Then the features *+Pro*, *+III*, *+Sing*, *+Refl* are copied onto the ART of the same NP. Later the entire NP will become idem esie and the intermediate structure (143c) generated:

(143)c. *nma ART AUX tịọ ART nyuọ mma ART nyaọ idem esie

As we will see in Chapter Six (cf.6.4.1) NP\textsubscript{3} will be pronominalized by coreference with NP\textsubscript{1} and then deleted obligatorily by the Pronoun Deletion, which is also discussed in that chapter. When this NP is deleted, then (143a) above will be generated.

Perhaps we should point out that sentences such as (144a) below are derived like (143a), except that nyuọ is optionally deleted in the case of (144a) (cf.5.3.5 above).

(144)a. Arịt edep ụpụ nọ idem esie: "Arit has bought a book and given herself"

As (144a) is derived from (144b) below, it seems fairly straightforward that both (143) and (144) are derived by the same rules, except for the additional deletion of nyuọ in the latter case.

(144)b. Arịt edep ụpụ ndị idem esie

'Arit has bought a book and given herself'

Note that nyuọ in (143a) is also deletable, as (145) below is synonymous with (143a):

(145) Nma oro ama eti ịkọ anyọ na idem esie: 'The lady talked and helped herself'

Once again evidence so far available shows that reflexivization in ọfik is limited to the simplex.

5.4 Reflexivization and Emphasis:

It is commonly recognised that reflexive pronouns such as idem esie (himself) and superficially similar forms such as ke idem esie (himself) in /
in (146a) and (146b) respectively are different elements in spite of their similarity:

(146)a. Bassey imaha idem esie :'Bassey doesn't like himself'
(146)b. Bassey ke idem esie imaha enye: 'Bassey himself doesn't like him'

For instance, Hoyne (1971) has shown that reflexive pronouns and emphatics must have different derivations. We want to say that in Efik there is enough evidence to suggest that reflexive pronouns and emphatics, though similar in forms, are properly derived differently.

For our purposes we will use the term intensifiers instead of emphatics, for instances where the emphatic elements take the form of the reflexive, as in (146b) and reserve the term emphatics for emphasis in general. As emphasis in general is not our concern here, we will not discuss it.

Our main purpose in the following sections is to examine forms which look like reflexive pronouns but which we think are best analysed as intensifiers, or as possessives involving the use of the lexical item idem (body).

5.4.1 Intensifiers:
Within the standard theory, it is assumed that reflexivization is a process that involves the subject and the object of a verb, where object must be understood to include not only direct objects, but also indirect objects as well as Prep or QVB-MPs. That is in sentences like (147) the reflexive pronouns must occupy the object position in a language like Efik with a S V O (Subject, Verb, Object) pattern.

(147)a. Ata ekęp idem esie :'ata put himself through school'
(147)b. Ìditće ero efge idem mpę: 'Those children have forgotten themselves'

Here idem esie and idem mpę are objects of (147a) and (147b) respectively. However, consider the following examples:

(148)a. /
In (148a) *ke idem mmi* must refer to, or be an adjunct of, *ami*. Since *ami* is subject itself, *ke idem mmi* must also be part of that subject.

In (148b) *ke idem esie* refers to *ima* even though it is nearer the object of the sentence *mi* than *ima*, which is the subject. That is (148b) must be derived from (149) below:

(149) *ima ke idem esie ama okut mi*: 'ima herself saw me'

In (148) the intensified NPs are subjects. Now consider (150a), where the intensified NP is object:

(150)a. *Nnyin iyom Okon ke idem esie*: 'We want Okon himself'

Unlike in (148b), or (148a) for that matter, the intensifier *ke idem esie* in (150a) cannot be moved about - in this case to the front - as (150b), where this movement has taken place, is ungrammatical:

(150)b. *Nnyin iyom ke idem esie Okon*: 'We want himself Okon'

However, the entire NP (i.e. *Okon + ke idem esie*) could be moved to the front, as in this example:

(150)c. *Okon ke idem esie ke nnyin iyom*: 'It is Okon himself that we want'

In some cases, the presence of an intensifier may result in ambiguity. Consider this example:

(151)a. *Enye imaha Bassey ke idem esie*: 'He doesn't like Bassey himself'

where *ke idem esie* may either refer to *enye*, the subject of the sentence, or *Bassey*, the object. In other words, (151a) may be interpreted as

(151)b:

(151)b. *Enye ke idem esie imaha Bassey*: 'He himself doesn't like Bassey'

The examples in (148)-(151) show that the intensifier differs from the reflexive pronoun in two significant ways. First, as we have already seen, the reflexive must be the object of the simplex in which it occurs /
occurs but in the case of the intensifier, it must be a part of either the subject or the object; in short, the intensifier is a part of the NP intensified, irrespective of the functional notion of that NP.

Second, whereas the reflexive cannot be moved from its object position, as the ungrammaticality of (152) shows:

(152) *Ami idem mi mfre: 'I myself forget'
the intensifier may be moved in some cases, as we have just seen above.

Of course the ungrammaticality merely emphasises the fact that the reflexive pronoun is an object NP, since object NPs in general resist movement, except in cases involving topicalization such as in (150), where the entire object Okon + ke idem esie was moved to the front.

Even this kind of movement is apparently not allowed, if the object is a reflexive pronoun, as the ungrammaticality of this sentence shows:

(153) *Idem mmi ke mfre: 'It is myself that I forget'

There are other differences between the reflexive pronoun and the intensifier. Consider the following:

(154)a. Bassey ama anyara idem esie: 'Bassey helped himself'
(154)b. Bassey ama anyara idem: 'Bassey helped himself'
(155)a. Eyen oro ke idem esie akabiat okpokoro oro
'The boy himself destroyed the table'
(155)b. *Eyen oro ke idem akabiat okpokoro oro: 'The boy himself destroyed the table'

The PD of the reflexive pronoun is optionally deletable, as we have already pointed out (cf. 5.1 above) and as (154) show, but the PD of the intensifier is not deletable, as the ungrammaticality of (155b) shows.

Fourth, the reflexive pronoun is more restricted in occurrence than the intensifier. Consider the following examples, keeping in mind that the reflexive pronoun is of the form idem + PD while the intensifier is of /
of the form \( \text{ke + idem + P} \):

(a) \( \text{Ami nnyeka ke idem mmi } \) : "I will go by myself"

(b) \( \text{*Ami nnyeka idem mmi } \) : "I will go myself"

(a) \( \text{Bassey ke idem esie enyime } \) : "Bassey himself has agreed"

(b) \( \text{*Bassey enyime idem esie } \) : "Bassey has agreed himself"

(a) \( \text{Ima ke idem esie } \) : "Ima herself is tall"

(b) \( \text{*Ima enyime idem esie } \) : "Ima tells herself"

where the (a) sentences contain intensifiers and the (b) ones reflexive pronouns. \( 156)-(158) \) are enough to illustrate how far less restricted than the reflexive pronoun is the intensifier in occurrence with verbs. With certain categories of verbs, notably those which are intransitive, the reflexive pronoun is not permissible, naturally, as the (b) examples show.

Fifth, the subject of a reflexive sentence may be deleted, but where the subject of a sentence is intensified, the nominal head of that subject NP cannot be deleted, as the following examples show:

(a) \( \text{Ami ke mkpep idem mmi ndiwat moto} : \) "I am teaching myself to drive a car"

(b) \( \text{Ke mkpep idem mmi ndiwat moto} : \) "I am teaching myself to drive a car"

(a) \( \text{Ami ke idem mmi ke mkpep ndiwat moto} : \) "I myself I am learning to drive"

(b) \( \text{Ke idem mmi ke mkpep ndiwat moto} : \) "Myself learning to drive"

where the ungrammaticality of (160b) arises from the deletion of the nominal head \( \text{ami} \).

Finally, whereas the reflexive pronoun is restricted to the simplex, as has already been demonstrated, the intensifier may transcend the simplex, though at the surface level, as (161) shows:

(a) \( \text{Ami nnygobo Ata edjeke enye edide ke idem mmi } \) : "I will meet Ata if he comes myself"

where /
where *ami*, the nominal head, and *ke idem mmi*, its intensifier, are in different configurations.

In addition to the above massive differences between the two kinds of elements, there is also a semantic difference. The intensifier stresses the fact that a particular person or thing and not some other person or thing is the agent, dative, object, etc., to use case grammar terms, whereas reflexivization indicates that an individual's action affects the individual in one way or another.

From all the above facts, we conclude that though the intensifier is similar in form to the reflexive, it is in fact not a kind of reflexive. As our analysis of the NP shows, the intensifier is in fact a constituent of the NP.

5.4.2 The So-Called Picture Nouns:

In English, sentences such as the following are considered as reflexive sentences:

(162)a. John saw a picture of himself
(162)b. Mary told a story about herself

Some attempts have been made to analyse *himself* and *herself* in the above sentences within the general framework of reflexivization. Thus Jackendoff (1968:14ff and 1972:135) suggests that the *N* analysis of Chomsky (1970) would offer a solution to the derivation of reflexives connected with NPs like *picture*, *story*, which have come to be known as picture nouns.

In Efik, however, we want to say that the forms connected with the so-called picture nouns are not in fact reflexive pronouns derived as a result of reflexivization but lexical items generated in the base.

There are a number of reasons for our analysis. First, although there are /
are sentences like (163), there are also sentences like (164):

(163)a. Ami mmekut ndise idem mmi : 'I have seen a picture of myself'

(163)b. Enye eyeti) mbuk idem esie : 'He will tell the story of himself'

(164)a. Ami mmekut ndise idem fo : 'I have seen a picture of yourself'

(164)b. Enye eyeti) mbuk idem mmi : 'He will tell the story of myself'

where idem fo and ami are not coreferential in (164a) and idem mmi and enye are not coreferential in (164b). Surely the sentences in (164) do not qualify as reflexive sentences in our definition and idem fo and idem mmi in these examples cannot therefore be regarded as reflexive pronouns. If so, we ought to look at similar forms in (163) with suspicion, even though they happen to be coreferential with the subject of the sentence. For if the forms in (163) were truly reflexive pronouns, then (164) ought to be ungrammatical, where these forms and the subjects of the sentences are not coreferential.

Moreover these reflexive-like forms are freely used with non-picture nouns, as in these examples:

(165)a. ñnyom okykyidem mmi : 'I want my personal money'

(165)b. Ata idige eyen idem fo : 'Ata is not your begotten child (i.e. is adopted)

(165)c. ñkip pogo idem esie : 'The thing is his own personal business'

where reflexive interpretations are highly improbable. Clearly idem mmi, idem fo and idem esie in (165) are possessive in form and meaning.

This interpretation of the reflexive-like forms in (164) explains the grammaticality of (164), where these elements are not coreferential with the subjects of the sentences.

Finally, and most importantly, there is tonal evidence to show that idem in (163)-(165) is a kind of possessor nominal much like ebot (goat's) in the phrase isim ebot (a goat's tail). First consider (166) which /
which are straightforward cases of possession:

(166)a. Enye eto : 'A tree's top'
(166)b. Ebe eyen : 'A daughter's husband'
(166)c. Isim ebot : 'A goat's tail'

where the tones on eto, eyen and ebot are high-low. 'Inherent' tones on these items are high-high, as (167) indicate:

(167)a. Nyesibe eto oro : 'I will cut down that tree'
(167)b. Ebot ama ata bi fo : 'A goat ate your yams'
(167)c. Arit edi eyen mi : 'Arit is my daughter'

That is the tones on eto, eyen and ebot are ordinarily high unless affected by some grammatical process or processes.

Now consider the tones on idem in (163)-(165) above. They are exactly like the tones on eto, eyen and ebot in (166), namely high-low. 'Inherent' tones on the lexical item idem (body or self) are high-high, as in these examples:

(168)a. Idem mmi isoke : 'My body/self is not well (i.e. I am not well)'
(168)b. Ada oro edehe idem akaha

'That lad is very dirty in the body' (i.e. the lad is dirty)

Like the inherent tones on ebot, eto and eyen, the inherent tones on idem can be affected by some grammatical processes.

Unlike the tones on idem in (163)-(165), the tones on idem as a stem in a reflexive pronoun is always high-high, as in these examples:

(169)a. Ami ntuk idem mmi : 'I'm cheating myself'
(169)b. Enye otuk idem esie : 'He is cheating himself'
(169)c. Abufo etuk idem mbufo : 'You are cheating yourselves'

It seems pretty clear therefore that the difference in tones on idem in (163)-(165) and idem in reflexive pronouns, such as those in (169) indicates /
indicates the difference in the grammatical function of *idem* in the so-called picture nouns and *idem* in reflexive pronouns. It is right therefore that the two elements be derived differently.

Since *enye* etc., *ebè even* and *isim èbot* in (166) involve possession, the phrases *ndise idem mmi*, *ndise idem èsie* and *ndise idem fo* in (163) and (164) must also involve possession. The only difference is that in the latter cases, there are two possessor NPs, namely *idem* and personal pronouns. Accordingly, *ndise idem mmi*, *ndise idem èsie*, for example, are derived from structures of the following sorts, omitting details:

```
170a.
NP
  | N    N
  |       DëT
  |       NUM
  |     AP
  |   N   DëT
  |   NUM
  | NP
  | NP
  | ndise
  | idem
  | ami

170b.
NP
  | N    N
  |       DëT
  |       NUM
  |     AP
  |   N   DëT
  |   NUM
  | NP
  | NP
  | ndise
  | idem
  | enye
```

In this way, the superficial similarities between reflexive pronouns and forms like *idem mmi*, *idem èsie*, *idem fo*, etc. that follow the so-called picture nouns (and non-picture nouns too) can be explained.

5.5 The Reflexive and the Reciprocal Pronoun:

There is very little published material on reciprocal pronominalization. One of the sources often quoted on the subject is Lees and Klima (1963:156), part of which is quoted below:

"Thus /
"Thus, we see that the object one another is a pronominalization of its subject, and it occurs only when the subject is plural and repeated in the object. We shall say then in addition to the reflexive pronominalization transformation there is an optional rule of the following form:

(C) Reciprocal Rule (optional):

\[
\]

where \( N = N \) and they are within the same simplex, and where \( N \) is a noun, \( Pl \) is the plural morpheme, and \( Recip \) is the reciprocal morpheme ...

So according to Lees and Klima in English, the reciprocal pronoun occurs as the object and is a repetition of the subject, like the reflexive pronoun. But in the case of the reciprocal pronoun, the subject must be plural.

In Efik, there are similarities too between the reflexive pronoun and the reciprocal pronoun. As in English both must occur as objects, thus (171) are grammatical but (172) are not:

(171)a. Iban oro enam idem mm ꙃ': 'The women are harming themselves'

(171)b. Iban oro enam kiet ekən : 'The women are harming each other'

(172)a.*Idem mm ꙃ enam iban oro : 'Themselves are harming the women'

(172)b.*Kiet eken enam iban oro : 'Each other are harming the women'

Second, like the reflexive pronoun, the reciprocal pronoun must refer to the subject of the sentence.

Third, neither the reflexive nor the reciprocal pronoun can act as the antecedent of a relative pronoun in a relative clause (cf.8.2.2) as these examples show:

(173)a.*Iban oro esobọ kiet ekən emi mbụfo mịmaha

\[\frac{1}{2}\ 3\ 4\ \frac{5}{6}\ \frac{7}{8}\ \frac{9}{10}\]

'The women have met each other which you don't like'

(173)b. Ata a\(\frac{1}{2}\) idem esie emi enye amade eti eti

\[\frac{1}{2}\ 3\ 4\ \frac{5}{6}\ \frac{7}{8}\ \frac{9}{10}\]

'Ata is arrogant of himself which he loves very much'

Sometimes /
Sometimes the reciprocal takes the form of the reflexive, as in this example:

\[(174)\text{a. Etim ye Arit ema idem mm\textsuperscript{ɔ} : 'Etim and Arit like each other'}\]

\[(174)\text{a) is ambiguous since it could be interpreted as a reflexive sentence. Of course there is no question of ambiguity if kiet eken is used in place of idem mm\textsuperscript{ɔ}, as in (174)b:}\]

\[(174)\text{b. Etim ye Arit ema kiet eken : 'Etim and Arit like each other'}\]

There are of course differences between the reciprocal pronoun and the reflexive pronoun. First, as in English, the subject of the reciprocal sentence must be plural, whereas that of the reflexive need not be. So (175), for example, are ungrammatical:

\[(175)\text{a. *Enye asua kiet eken : 'He hates each other'}\]

\[(175)\text{b. *Ata a\textsuperscript{wana} ye kiet eken : 'Ata fights with each other'}\]

Secondly, whereas the reflexive pronoun and the subject of the sentence must be in the same simplex, as we have already seen, this is not the case with the reciprocal pronoun, as these examples show:

\[(176)\text{a. kim eyo\textsubscript{m} mi n\textsubscript{t\textsuperscript{a}p} ye kiet eken : 'They each want me to quarrel with the other'}\]

\[(176)\text{b. Arit ye Ima imaha fi \textsuperscript{d\textsubscript{a}} kiet eken : 'Arit and Ima don't each like you to marry the other' (where Arit and Ima are girls and fi a male person)}\]

In (176a) mm\textsuperscript{ɔ} and kiet eken are in different S's. Similarly in (176b) Arit ye Ima and kiet eken are in different S's.

Let us now consider how the reciprocal pronoun may be derived and let us consider (177a), which is structured as 177b, given the fact that the reciprocal pronoun refers to the subject of the sentence:

\[(177)\text{a. \textsuperscript{d\textsubscript{a}t\textsuperscript{ɔ} o\textsubscript{w} a kiet eken : 'The children have helped each other'}}\]
Surely a structure like 177b is a proper analysis for reflexivization as well (cf. 12a and 12b in 5.1) and since reflexivization is not only obligatory but also cyclic, there would be nothing to hold it back from applying in 177b, unless there is some means of distinguishing between coreference that results in reciprocal pronominalization. Until such a means is found, under the Aspectis theory of pronominalization3, a sentence like (177a) cannot be generated.

Similarly a sentence like (178a) with the reciprocal kiet eken cannot be generated, since, as we will see in Chapter Six, a structure like 178b, from which (178a) be derived, is a proper analysis for simple pronominalization.

(178)a. Iban oro eyom mi ntcho ye kiet eken

'The women each want me to quarrel with the other'

3. Under Jackendoff's interpretative theory this problem does not arise since kiet eken would be generated in the base. Jackendoff's (1972: 173) analysis is interesting because it captures the similarities between the reflexive pronoun and the reciprocal pronoun, as he himself says: "thus the environments of each other seem to be virtually identical to those of reflexives, and an analysis which does not capture this fact is missing an important generalization. As we have seen, a phrase-structure theory of each other combined with an interpretative theory of pronominalization can capture this generalization....In the phrase-structure theory, each other is generated within a single constituent. Thus the lexicon can list it as an idiom, with special semantic interpretation, including the feature [+refl]."
In fact 178b is a proper analysis for following sentence:

(178)c. Iban oro eyom mi nt深厚的 ye mmm: 'The women want me to quarrel with them'

(178a) and (178c) are of course not synonymous.

Observe, interestingly, that if a plural NP occurs in place of mi in (178a) the reciprocal pronoun must refer to the subject of the embedded S, as (179) show:

(179)a. Iban oro eyom nnyin いつも ye kiet eken
    'The women want us to quarrel with each other'

(179)b. Iban oro eyom mbufo いつも ye kiet eken
    'The women want you to quarrel with each other'

(179)c. Iban oro eyom ṭkparawa ṭoro いつも ye kiet eken
    'The women want the youths to quarrel with each other'

It should be noted that kiet eken cannot refer to iban oro in these examples. However, the reciprocal pronoun is to be generated, for it to refer to the subject of the matrix in complex sentences such as those in (179), kiet will have to be moved to this NP and then reduplicated, as /
as in the following examples:

(180)a. Iban oro kiet kiet eyom nnyin iteh ye eken
    'The women each want us to quarrel with the other'

(180)b. Iban oro kiet kiet eyom mbufi eteh ye eken
    'The women each want you to quarrel with the other'

(180)c. Iban oro kiet kiet eyom kparawa oro eteh ye eken
    'The women each want the youths to quarrel with the other'.
6.0 Introduction

As we have already indicated in Chapter Four (cf.4.2), pronominalization is a cover term for a number of processes by which one NP is used to change the basic form of another on condition of coreference, among other conditions. The term simple pronominalization is due primarily to Lees and Klima (1963) who first used the term simple pronoun to distinguish primarily what is commonly known as personal pronoun from reflexive pronoun. In general, the term pronominalization is ambiguous in transformational generative literature. On the one hand, it is used as a general term for a number of similar processes, as we do in this work. On the other hand, it is used to describe specifically one of the processes by which the basic form of an NP is changed to a personal pronoun form. Thus for Postal, for example, pronominalization (Postal 1971:16) "is the rule involved in the derivation of the pronominal forms in such examples as:

2. (11)a Harry said he would go.
b Harry understood that Mary didn't like him
c The fact that Mary lost was tragic for her

On the reading where these have coreferent interpretations". In order to avoid the above kind of ambiguity, we have preferred the term 'simple pronominalization' to indicate that the rule we are going to discuss is just an instance of pronominalization as a general linguistic rule. Simply, then, simple pronominalization is defined as the pronominal rule that derives personal pronouns. In Xhosa, however, simple pronominalization should be extended to cover not only the derivation of personal pronouns like enye (he/she/it) and mmx (they) or imi and mim but also such locative pronouns as mi (here), do (there) and ko (yonder). As /
As our grammar allows these pronouns in the base too, we wish to say from the outset that simple pronominalization will be deemed to have occurred only in cases where the pronouns in question are anaphoric, or in Postal's words, where they "have coreferent interpretations". We should also add that simple pronominalization will be considered only within the initial S boundary (i.e. $\#S\#$). Inter-sentential pronouns, even though they may be anaphoric, will not be considered since our grammar cannot handle discourse. Perhaps it is worth pointing out that in Efik while pronouns like enye and mm are either deictic or anaphoric, those like im and mm only have anaphoric interpretations, as we will see later on.

To facilitate our investigation, we will look at simple pronominalization in various complex and co-ordinate structures in the following sections.

6.1 Simple Pronominalization in Complex Structures with Adjunct Clauses: 
In Efik, as in other languages perhaps, simple pronominalization occurs only in complex structures or co-ordinate sentence structures. In other words, simple pronominalization takes place in a phrase marker with more than one S node, other things being equal. Consequently, simple pronominalization cannot occur in the following examples because in our grammar there is only one S node in the structures underlying each of the sentences, as the structures in 2a and 2b show

(1)a. Arit eyekut enye : 'Arit will see him/her'

(1)b. Enye eyekut enye : 'He will see him'
Given coreference in 2a and 2b, it is reflexivization, not simple pronominalization which should have taken place. Since reflexivization did not take place in 2a and 2b, as is clear from the surface sentences in (1), it must be assumed that there was no coreference in 2a and 2b, and indeed there is no indication to that effect. We must therefore consider the pronouns in (1a) and (1b) as deictic.

In this section, we will be examining simple pronominalization in complex sentences analysable as matrix S and Adjunct S, which is of course an embedded S.

It goes without saying that given a phrase marker with more than one S node, coreference is a necessary, though not always a sufficient condition for the application of simple pronominalization in our grammar. Coreference will be indicated in our grammar by identical indices. As has already been pointed out, this is intended merely as a tool for representation, rather than support of, or satisfaction with, the indexing theory. As we wish to keep out of the controversies on the problem of coreference and its representation in linguistic descriptions, we will make no further comments on this matter. For us, then, two NPs will be considered coreferential if, among other things, they have identical number and person as well as identical indices.

Let us now begin to examine some examples of sentences. First, consider the /
the following:

(3a). Okposuk,edi Ata migine, enye eyekpe okuk oro

"Although Ata has not come, he will pay the money"

As usual, we will find out how (3a) is structured in the base. In doing this, we will omit details that are not relevant to our discussion, not only for (3a) but also for other examples. Accordingly, (3a) is structured as 3b.

6.1.1 Application of Simple Pronominalization:

As in English, the rule that preposes the Adjunct S with the matrix (cf. Langacker 1968:168 and Koss 1967:189ff) will have to precede simple pronominalization, as we will see later on. When this preposing rule applies, 3c is generated:
The phrase marker 3c is then an input to simple pronominalization. When this rule applies, it does the following:

(a) changes the feature [−Pro] on the noun stem of the affected NP (NP₁ in this case);

(b) deletes the DET of this NP.

Operating on 3c above, simple pronominalization will generate 3d
Later on the noun stem of the affected NP (i.e. \(NP_1\) in this case) will be realised as \textit{eny\-e} from the features \([+\text{Pro}, +\text{Sing}, +\text{II}]\). If however the number feature were \([-\text{Sing}]\), then \textit{mm} would be realised. What we are saying in effect is that after simple pronominalization, the noun stem with a \([+\text{Pro}]\) feature specification will be realised as the appropriate personal (or simple) pronoun in the second lexical pass.

Justification for replacing the noun stem, rather than the determiner, with the appropriate pronoun comes from such surface phrases as \textit{eny\-e} \textit{oro} (the he/she/it), \textit{eny\-e} \textit{oko} (he/she/it yonder), \textit{mm} \textit{em\-i} (these they), \textit{mm\-o} \textit{oro} (the/those they). This does not appear to be peculiar to Efik.

In Ijaw, a related language, there are similar phrases such as \textit{bei} \textit{ara\-u} (this she), \textit{bei} \textit{eri} (this he), \textit{eni} \textit{om\-e\-ne} (those they), etc., and such sentences as (4):

(4)a. Are \textit{bei} \textit{ara\-u} dou yemi mane \textit{eni} \textit{ara\-u} kpo

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 9 & 7 & 8
\end{array}
\]

'I want this her and that her'

(4)b. Are \textit{bei} \textit{eri} dou yemi mane \textit{eni} \textit{eri} kpo: 'I want this him and that him'

Recall that in Chapter Four (cf.4.2) we showed that the behaviour of personal pronouns "is so much like that of ordinary non-pronominal nouns..." Reflexivization also provides support of this analysis. Recall that (cf.5.1.1) when reflexivization applies, the noun stem is replaced with the formative \textit{idem} and the \(P\) of the resultant reflexive pronoun is deletable. Thus in our view there are more compelling reasons for analysing personal pronouns as noun stems than there are for analysing them as determiners. So it may well be that while in English (and perhaps other Indo-European languages), the third person pronouns (or personal pronouns in general) are determiners, in Efik (and perhaps other related languages) they are noun stems.

Let /
Let us now return to the application of the preposing rule which swaps the matrix $S$ with the adjunct $S$ bringing the latter forward, as we have already seen. In English, Langacker (ibid) has shown that this rule must precede simple pronominalization, otherwise it would be impossible to derive certain English sentences. This is exactly the case in Efik. For if simple pronominalization precedes the preposing rule, we will not be able to generate a sentence like (3a), which is repeated below, because of the impossibility of (5) for a reason we will explain later.

(3a) Okposuk edi Ata midihe, enye eyekpe okuk oro

'Although Ata has not come, he will pay the money'

(5) *Enye eyekpe okuk oro okposuk edi Ata midihe

'he will pay the money although Ata has not come'

If, however, the preposing rule precedes simple pronominalization, as we have said above, then the problem posed by (5) does not arise, since the rules will apply in the order indicated above.

Next, let us consider whether simple pronominalization is obligatory in Efik. Consider, for example, (6), which is a paraphrase of (3a):

(6) ?Okposuk edi Ata midihe, Ata eyekpe okuk oro

'Although Ata has not come, Ata will pay the money'

Since (6) is questionable because simple pronominalization has not applied - the proper analysis notwithstanding - it is reasonable to assume that simple pronominalization is obligatory. However, consider (7) and (8), which are paraphrases of each other:

(7) Okposuk edinnyin ima ikpekpe ime okuk, enye inamke utga oro

'Although we had paid Ime the money, he hasn't done the job yet'

(8) Okposuk edinnyin ima ikpekpe ime okuk, ime inamke utom oro

'Although we had paid Ime the money, Ime hasn't done the job yet'

(7) and (8) are derived from 9a, omitting the features and other details not /
Before simple pronominalization operates on 9a, the preposing rule will first of all do so, generating 9b

The phrase marker in 9b is now ready for the application of simple pronominalization. But observe that at the time of the application of this rule, the antecedent coreferent NP is the object in its own S. On the other hand, when this rule was ready to operate on 3c, the antecedent NP there was the subject of its own S. In that phrase marker, the failure of simple pronominalization to apply would result in (6) which is questionable. In the case of 9b, however, if the rule applies then (7) will be derived. If the rule does not apply, then (8) will be /
be derived and is just as grammatical as the former. In short, simple pronominalization is optional in phrase markers such as 9b. It appears therefore that simple pronominalization is conditionally obligatory.

If the antecedent coreferent NP is subject in its own S, as in 3c, then the rule should preferably apply obligatorily. If, however, this NP is object, as in 9b, then the rule applies optionally. What we are thus saying is that given a phrase marker such as 3c in which the antecedent coreferent NP is subject, the Efik speaker would prefer to apply simple pronominalization, whereas given another phrase marker like 9b, in which the same kind of NP is object, he may or may not apply the rule. Observe that this is the case not only in okposuk edi sentences but also complex sentences with Adjunct embedding in general. Thus while (10) are questionable at best, (11) are well-formed.

(10)a. ?Ediike Ata akode, Ata eyikut mp: 'If Ata goes, Ata will see them'
(10)b. ?Effiong edev edjwak nyed man Effiong emem mi esiq
   'Effiong bought many books in order that Effiong may please me'
(10)c. ?Etie ozo akemam utom kini ete oro ekedide akparawa
   'The man worked when the man was a young man'

(11)a. Ediike n'kutde Ata, Ata eyesian mi: 'If I see Ata, Ata will tell me'
(11)b. mp: ekeyom Effiong man Effiong akpanya mp:
   'They wanted Effiong so that Effiong might help them'
(11)c. Nnyin ike ma ete oro kini ete oro ekedide akparawa
   'We liked the man when the man was a young man'

Observe that in cases where pronominalization is optional - (11) for example - the antecedent NPs are objects while the pronominalizable NPs are subjects in their respective S's. In (10), however, both the antecedent NPs and the pronominalizable ones are subjects in their own respective S's. Now consider (12) where both the antecedent and pronominalizable NPs are objects in their own respective S's:

(12)a. /
(12)a. ?ndieke nkutde Ata, nnyesian Ata: 'if I see Ata, I will tell Ata'
(12)b. ?Nm eyekot Effiong man mm eb Effiong okuk
"They will invite Effiong to get money from Effiong"
(12)c. ?Nnyin ima ima ete oro kini nnyin ikekutde ete oro
"we liked the man when we saw the man"

The questionable status of (10) and (12) on the one hand, and the grammaticality of (11) on the other have added new dimensions to the condition for the obligatory or optional application of simple pronominalization. We will accordingly revise what we have said above and say that simple pronominalization applies obligatorily if both coreferent NPs are either subjects or objects in their own respective S's. If, however, one is subject and the other object, then the rule applies optionally.

Where, however, there is more than one set of coreferent NPs, it is customary to disregard the condition for obligatory application of the simple pronoun rule to avoid ambiguity. Thus (13a), (13b) and (13c) are not only grammatical but paraphrases; but (13d) is questionable.

(13)a. Okposuk edị Arit amade Ata, Arit idid\o enye
'Though Arit loves Ata, Arit won't marry him'
(13)b. Okposuk edị Arit amade Ata, enye idid\o Ata
'Although Arit loves Ata, she won't marry Ata'
(13)c. Okposuk edị Arit amade Ata, enye idid\o enye
'Though Arit loves Ata, she won't marry him'
(13)d. ?Okposuk edị Arit amade Ata, Arit idid\o Ata
'Though Arit loves Ata, Arit won't marry Ata'

To allow (13a) and (13b) to be generated, the condition for the obligatory application of simple pronominalization should be restricted to cases where there are single pairs of coreferent NPs.

To recapitulate what has been said so far, we say that simple pronominalization is defined over complex (or c-ordinate) phrase markers and applies obligatorily in a phrase marker with a single pair of coreferent /
coreferent NPs if these NPs are either both subjects, or both objects in their respective S's, and optionally otherwise. Simple pronominalization must follow the preposing rule that swaps the matrix S with the embedded adjunct S, bringing the latter forward.

6.1.2 Pronoun Deletion:
In Efik, the pronouns derived by simple pronominalization in the manner described above are deletable. Thus (14) is derived from (3a) our example sentence which is repeated below, by the deletion of the pronoun enye.

(3)a. Okposuk edi Ata midihe, enye eyekpe okuk oro
   'Although Ata has not come, he will pay the money'

(14) Okposuk edi Ata midihe, eyekpe okuk oro
   'Although Ata has not come, he will pay the money'

It is important to emphasize that such a deletion takes place by coreference with the antecedent Mr. Although a pronoun subject is deletable, this kind of deletion is limited to a simple structure (cf. Subject Deletion Rule in the Appendix). In a complex structure, however, third person pronouns, even if they are subjects, cannot be deleted unless under coreference. Welmers (1968:114) therefore missed the point when he translated the English sentence 'I don't know why he wants to go there' as *mfyökke ntak eke oyomde ndika do and passed the translation as a good Efik sentence. Since there is no coreference, enye should not have been deleted. In other words, the correct translation should have been mfyökke ntak eke enye oyomde ndika do. Pronoun deletion will be discussed in some more detail later in this Chapter and in Chapter Nine (cf.9.4.2).

6.1.3 Backward Simple Pronominalization:
So far we have dealt with cases of simple pronominalization in which the /
the pronoun follows the antecedent. There are, however, cases where
the pronoun precedes the so-called antecedent in what Lyons (1973:486)
calls 'progressive coreference'. Consider the following examples:
(15)a. Okposuk edi enye amade fi3, Arit idia fi
'Although she loyes ygu, Arit won't marry you'
(15)b. Edieke enye amade m, Okon eyedi m: 'If he likes me, Okon will come
here'
(15)c. Man enye obo okuk, Bassey ana okure utom oro
'For him to get money, Bassey ought to finish the job'
The sentences in (15) are a few examples of sentences which have undergone simple pronominalization in a backward direction. Note that the
pronouns in all cases are in the subordinate clauses and do not therefore violate the constraint on backward pronominalization as formulated by Langacker (1968). This constraint concerns what Langacker calls 'primary relations' of 'commands' and 'precedes'. According to him "NP1 may be used to pronominalize NP unless (1) NP1 precedes NP2; and (2) either (a) NP1 commands NP2, or (b) NP2 and NP1 are elements of separate conjoined structures" (p.168), where NP is "used throughout to indicate a noun phrase that reduces to a pronoun" and NP's its antecedent. The 'precedes' relation is more straightforward. It pertains to the linear ordering of NP's and NP. The 'command' relation is, however, a little complicated. It pertains to 'dominance relations'. According to Langacker (p.167), "a node A 'commands' another node B if (1) neither A nor B dominates the other; and (2) the S-node that most immediately dominates A also dominates B".
So in a tree diagram such as 16 below, NP1 commands both NP2 and
NP3, since the first S-node above NP1 also dominates both of these NP's.
So given coreference between either $NP_1$ and $NP_2$, or $NP_1$ and $NP_3$, neither $NP_2$ nor $NP_3$ can be used to pronominalize $NP_1$, since $NP_1$ both precedes and commands both of these NPs.

Let us now turn to the actual application of backward simple pronominalization by considering (15c), for example, which is structured as 17a.

As usual the preposing rule will apply, generating 17b.
Simple pronominalization, in this case in a backward direction, is now ready to operate on 17b. Although NP₃ in the Adjunct S precedes NP₁ in the matrix S, it is in a subordinate clause and does not therefore command NP₁ which is used to pronominalize it. Backward pronominalization can conveniently apply to 17b to generate (15c) from it. (15c) is repeated below for convenience:

(15c) Man enye ob> okuk, Bassey ana okure utom oro

'For him to get money, Bassey ought to finish the job'

Of course, simple pronominalization can also operate in the usual forward direction on 17b. If so, then (17c) below will be derived:

(17c) Man Bassey ob> okuk, enye ana okure utom oro

'For Bassey to get money, he ought to finish the job'

(15c) and (17c) are of course synonymous.

So backward simple pronominalization is optional, given a phrase marker such as 17b.

Perhaps we should add that as in English, if the constraint on backward pronominalization is violated, ungrammaticality results. Thus (18) is ungrammatical, where the pronoun enye precedes and commands Bassey, if enye and Bassey are coreferential.

(18) /
There are, however, instances where backward pronominalization is apparently not permissible, even though Langacker's backward condition is not violated. As in English (cf. Postal 1971:22), backward pronominalization is not allowed if NP, in Langacker's terms, is indefinite, as (19) show:

(19)a. *Edieke enye edide mi, kpeme owo: 'If he comes here, watch a man'

(19)b. *Man enye nem esit, nnyekpe akparawa okuk

'So that he may be happy, I will pay a young man money'

where owo and akparawa which refer to enye in (19a) and (19b) respectively are indefinite. If these NPs are, however, definite the sentences would be grammatical, as (20) show:

(20)a. Edieke enye edide mi, kpeme owo: 'If he comes here watch that man'

(20)b. Man enye nem esit, nnyekpe akparawa oro okuk

'So that he may be happy, I will pay the young man money'

So definitization of the NP on the right is required in a backward pronominalization. Definitization of course precedes pronominalization.

There is, however, a further constraint on backward simple pronominalization which appears to be peculiar to Efik. Consider (21):

(21)a. ?Okposuk edie nnyin imade enye, nnyin iyomke Basse?

'Although we like him we don't want Bassey'

(21)b. *Edieke ykutde enye, nnyekot Ata: 'If I see him, I will invite Ata'

(21)c. *Kpro nsuade enye, mmaha ndikut Ime

'Because I hate him, I don't like to see Ime'

Observe that in each of the sentences in (21), enye and its coreferent nominal are objects in their respective S's. This is important since (22), where this is not the case, are well-formed.

(22)a. /
(22)a. Okposuk ede enye amade nnyin, nnyin iyomke Bassey mi

'Although he likes us, we don't want Bassey here'

(22)b. Edieke enye okutde mi, Ata eygii: if he sees me, Ata will come

(22)c. Koro enye asuade mi, ime iyomke ndikut mi

'Because he hates me, I'm doesn't want to see me'

So it does seem that in Efik, at least in my dialect, backward pronominalization is not allowed if the two NPs involved are objects in their own S's. Perhaps I should add that even in dialects in which (21) are grammatical, (22) are felt to be superior to them. Thus in Efik, the ungrammaticality of sentences like (23) arises from the violation of the above constraint which for convenience we may call object-object, not from referential identity connected with a copular verb as in English, according to Postal (ibid:23).

(23) *Se inamde enye esit ede ami ndikot Ata

'what pleases him is I have invited Ata'

Our observation is borne out by the grammaticality of (24):

(24) Se mmade enye amm ede Ata ndika do

'what like him to go is Ata to go there'

In (23), *enye and Ata are both objects in their respective S's, hence the ungrammaticality. In (24), however, enye and Ata are both subjects in their own S's, and so the object-object constraint is not violated. This constraint will have to be incorporated in the general constraint on backward pronominalization in Efik.

The application of simple pronominalization in structures with adjunct S can be summarised as follows, indicating some kind of hierarchy:

Given two coreferent NPs, A and Y, in complex structures with Adjunct clauses, where X stands for the pronominalizable NP and Y for the NP used to pronominalize X:

(a) /
(a) If X precedes and commands Y, X cannot be pronominalized;

(b) Even if X precedes Y but does not command Y, if both X and Y are objects in their respective S's, X cannot be pronominalized;

(c) Provided X does not precede and command Y, X is optionally pronominalized, if X is subject and Y object, or vice versa, in their respective S's;

(d) X is, however, obligatorily pronominalized, if both X and Y are either subjects, or objects, and if there are no other pairs of coreferent NPs.

6.1.4 Simple Pronominalization and the Use of Certain Coreferent NPs:

It has been suggested that the use of certain NPs like in (thief), ndisime (fool) and akpara (prostitute) in complex sentences such as

(25) is in fact a kind of pronominalization:

(25)a. Nbeniso Ata ekedi, in’oro ama’edidak okuk
'Before Ata came, the thief/rogue got a lot money'

(25)b. Ebiike okuda Bassey, nnye yat esit ye ndisime oro
'I see Bassey, I will be angry with the fool'

(25)c. Okposu oki Arit okojuide kg ufank, akpra oro ikeyemke ndigut mi
'Although Arit was at home, the prostitute didn’t want to see me'

In English, the use of such NPs is often referred to as quasi pronominalization but Jackendoff (1968:14) calls it 'the use of pronominal epithets'. Jackendoff has shown that the use of pronominal epithets is a kind of pronominalization. For example, the distribution of these epithets is similar to that of personal pronouns. For example, they occur in backward positions, subject to the same constraint as pronouns. For this reason, Jackendoff, rightly, treats the use of pronominal epithets within the general framework of pronominalization.
In Efik, however, there are significant differences between the use of such NPs and simple pronominalization. First, unlike in English, such NPs cannot occur backward, thus (26) are ungrammatical, where they do so.

(26)a. *Okposuk ediri ndisime oro odude mi, nnyomke ndikut Okon
   'Although the fool is here, I don't want to see Okon'

(26)b. *Hbemiso akpara oro onyux, Arit ama aywana eywan
   'Before the prostitute left, Arit had fought'

(26)c. *Edieke in ero odude mi, dọhọ Bassey onyux
   'If the rogue is here, tell Bassey to go'

Second, the antecedent of the pronominal epithet, to use Jackendoff's term, must not be indefinite, whereas this is not the case with the pronoun in forward positions. Thus (27) are ungrammatical but (28) are grammatical:

(27)a. *Okposuk ediri eywan odude mi, njwe akpara oro
   'Although a woman is here, I haven't seen the prostitute'

(27)b. *Edieke owo oyomde mi, dọhọ ndisime oro ebet
   'If a man wants me, ask the fool to wait'

(28)a. Okposuk ediri eywan odude mi, njwe enye
   'Although a woman is here, I haven't seen her'

(28)b. Edieke owo edide mi, dọhọ enye ebet: 'If a man comes here, ask him to wait'

Thirdly, after pronominalization, the pronoun may be deleted without a change in meaning, as we have already seen. However, if a pronominal epithet is deleted, this deletion results in a different interpretation of the sentence. Consider the following, for example:

(29)a. Edieke Arit edide mi, akpara oro eyesin ntime
   'If Arit comes here, the prostitute will give trouble'

(29)b. Edieke Arit edide mi, eyesin ntime
   'If Arit comes here, she will give trouble'

There is information missing in (29b), namely, Arit is akpara. There is no way of retrieving this semantic information from (29b).
Pronominalization is not known to introduce additional information in the way that the use of these epithets does. The above syntactic restrictions coupled with the additional semantic information supplied by the use of the above epithets, in contrast with pronouns, suggests strongly that though these epithets behave like anaphoric pronouns in some respects, they should not be derived like ordinary anaphoric pronouns, such as *ewe* in (3) above. In fact, the use of certain NPs in complex (and conjoined) structures to refer to a preceding one even though both the following NP and the preceding one are totally morphologically different in form and meaning is not restricted to the use of epithets only. "Relational" NPs like *even-eka* (brother/sister) and what may be called "position" NPs like *etubom* (the headmaster) and *be* (the chief) may be used in exactly the same way as the epithets. Consider (30)\(^1\) and (31) for example:

(30)a. **Okposuk edí Arit ekedide mi, eyen-eka mi ikeyomke ndikut mi**

'Although Arit came here, my sister didn't want to see me'

(30)b. **Edíke Ime edide, Bassey eyekut yfan esie**

'If Ime comes, Bassey will see his friend'

(31)a. **Emá ebet Ete Inyang, edí [be] ikeđihe**

'Ete Inyang was waited for but the chief didn't come'

(31)b. **Okposuk edí nnyin ima ikekpe Mr. Emá ubók, etubom ke eyayat esit**

'Although we apologised to Mr. Emá, the headmaster is still angry'

As in the case of epithets, the same constraints must be observed by the use of 'relational' and 'position' NPs to refer to other NPs; namely they must occur in forward positions only and their antecedents must not be /

---

\(^1\) It appears even the English equivalents of (30) are also grammatical.
be indefinites. Thus (32) and (33) are ungrammatical, where those NPs occur in a backward position and where the antecedents are indefinites, respectively:

(32)a. *Edieke ufan esie edide, Basssey eyekut Ime
   'If his friend comes, Bassey will see Ime'

(32)b. *Ema ebet boja, edi Ete Inyang ikedihe
   'The Chief was waited for, but Ete Inyang didn't come'

(33)a. *Okposuk edi wan ekedi, eyen-e ka mi ikeyomke ndikut mi
   'Although a woman came, my sister didn't want to see me'

(33)b. *Okposuk edi nnyin ikekpede og ubo, etubog ke ayayat esit'
   'Although we apologised to a man, the headmaster is still angry'

The question is, how are sentences like (25), (30) and (31b), which we believe are similar in structure, to be generated? The problem is the structures underlying these sentences would be proper analyses for simple pronominalization. But if the rule applies, it will seriously affect the interpretation of the sentences. Thus taking (25b), for example, which is derived from the intermediate structure in 35a:

```
  S
 /\      \       /
 /  \    /     \\
| PRE-S |   | VP |
|       |   |    |
|       |   | NP1 |
|       |   |    |
|       |   | NP2 |
|       |   |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |     |
|       |   |     |
|       |   |     |
```

simple pronominalization will generate (35b) below:

(35)b. Edieke nkutde Bassey, nnyeyat esit ye ndisime
   'If I see Bassey, I will be angry with him'

But (25b) and (35b) are clearly not paraphrases. To generate (25), (30) /
(30) and (31b), we therefore suggest that NPs like *even-eka, ndisime, etubom*, etc., must occur in the base as lexical items, in much the same way that deictic pronouns occur in the base. In addition, we must find some device to block simple pronominalization in the structures underlying these sentences.

Now for the analysis of epithets in English Jackendoff (ibid:14) has suggested that they be marked "as special lexical items which may function as pronouns" and that their lexical meaning be added "to the intended attributes of the person they refer to". According to him, "then the pronominalization rule requires no change at all, since the optional feature [+pro] on the epithets automatically brings them under the domain of the rule". Taking Jackendoff's suggestion, we can mark the NPs in question (*even-eka, ufan, etubom*, etc.) as [+Pro]. Then we will need a constraint of the following kind to block simple pronominalization in structures underlying (25), (30) and (31b):

(36) In a structure which normally allows simple pronominalization, the rule does not apply if the pronominalizable NP is [+Pro] and if the other coreferent NP is [+Def].

If the constraint is invoked at some intermediate level, the following will result:

(a) Structures underlying sentences like (37) with the two coreferent pronouns do not allow simple pronominalization, naturally;

(37) *Ndieke enye edide, nnyekut enye:*'If he comes, I will see him'

(b) Simple pronominalization will not apply in structures underlying (25), (30) and (31).

In this way, our analysis overcomes the semantic problem that the application of simple pronominalization will have created. Moreover, it is compatible with the already known fact that in Efik coreference does /
does not always result in simple pronominalization in complex structures. In the case of (25), (30) and (31) this rule must not apply and (36) ensures that.

6.2 Simple Pronominalization in Structures Underlying Infinitive Sentences:
In Efik, a embedding which acts as an object of the matrix verb is of two kinds, namely the embedding which requires the use of the ete connective or complementizer and the other kind of embedding which does not require this element. We will deal with the former kind of embedding in the next section. In this section, we will be concerned with what may be called 'non-ete' embedding which involves infinitivization, in relation to simple pronominalization. We have come across infinitivization already in Chapter Five. Now we wish to look at it in some more detail and see how simple pronominalization applies, if it does at all in structures underlying infinitive sentences. For this reason, we will be primarily interested in infinitive sentences which involve coreference.

Let us now turn to concrete examples and consider (38), for example:

(38) \( \text{Bassey} \text{ ogyom ndibine ete} : \text{Bassey wants to join father} \)

The above is a typical example of an infinitive sentence in Efik. Underlying it is the phrase marker in 39a, if we omit the features and other details.
As we have already pointed out in Chapter Five (cf. 5.2), a phrase marker such as 39a is a proper analysis for infinitivization, among other rules of course. Given such a phrase marker, then, infinitivization applies on condition that

(a) the matrix subject is coreferential with the embedded subject

(b) the S that dominates the embedded subject is an object of the matrix.

The need for (b) is to block infinitivization in complex sentences with Adjunct S embedding so that strings like the following may not be generated:

(39)b. *Bassey eyebine ete edijeke ndima: 'Bassey will join father if to like'

(39)c. *Bassey eyedi mi man ndikut mi: 'Bassey will come here to see me'

We will re-examine condition (a) later. For the moment, however, let us see how the rule applies. It applies obligatorily deleting the AUX of the embedded VP and attaching the prefix ndi- onto the VB, thus generating 40a:

But 40a is ungrammatical. What we need then is a rule to save it.

Since the matrix subject and the embedded subject are coreferential, simple pronominalization should naturally apply. After all, as we have indicated in 6.1.1 above, simple pronominalization applies obligatorily "in a phrase marker with a single pair of coreferent NPs if these NPs are either both subjects or both objects in their respective S's. So simple /
simple pronominalization is obligatory in 40a. Naturally, the application of such a rule should save 40a. In spite of this, however, (40b), the output of simple pronominalization on 40a, is also ungrammatical:

(40)b. *Bassey oyom enye ndibine ete : 'Bassey wants he to join father'

What is in fact required to save 40a is the deletion of the subject of the embedded S and when this is done (38), which is repeated below, is generated:

(38) Bassey oyom ndibine ete : 'Bassey wants to join father'

The question is, should simple pronominalization be made to apply before the deletion, as Rostal (1970) would like to argue? In other words, should (38) be derived via (40b) rather than directly from 40a? Given a structure such as 40a, it would appear to be unnecessary for simple pronominalization to have applied before the deletion of the embedded subject, since it is the deletion and not simple pronominalization that saves 40a. However, there is evidence that although it is in fact the deletion of the embedded subject, rather than the simple pronominalization of it, that ultimately saves 40a, nevertheless the latter rule does in fact apply before the deletion. Consider the sentences in (41) where infinitivization must apply but where the pronominalization and the deletion of the embedded subject are also possible:

(41)a. Ama ayat ete esit ete ndikut Ata: 'It annoyed father for father to see

(41)b. Ama ayat ete esit enye ndikut Ata: 'It annoyed father for him to see

(41)c. Ama ayat ete esit ndikut Ata: 'It annoyed father to see

(41) are paraphrases of each other and are therefore derived from the same /
Justification for deriving (41) from 42a comes from (42b), where it is quite plain that the embedded sentence is the subject of the matrix.

(42b) ndikut Ata ama ayat ete esit: 'To see Ata annoyed father'

Now let us see how we may go about deriving (41) from 42a, considering only the relevant rules. Nfik grammar requires that infinitivization apply to the embedded VP if the embedded S that contains this VP is dominated by the matrix subject NP.

When this rule applies (43a) is generated:

(43a) ete ndikut Ata AUX yat ete esit

'For father to see Ata annoy father'

There is a rule of subject S raising which is required to raise the embedded S to the subject NP node and erase that NP such that the embedded S is directly dominated by the matrix S. When this rule applies /

2. Coreference is not necessary in this case since infinitivization applies in the following, even though there is no coreference between an NP in the matrix and another in the embedded S:

(a) ḥfαn Ata ndika do : 'it is good for Ata to go there'

(a) is of course derived from (b):

(b) Ata ndika do ḥfαn : 'For Ata to go there is good'
applies 43b, which is represented diagrammatically below, is generated:

\[ S \]

\[ NP \]

\[ VP \]

\[ VB \]

\[ NP \]

\[ yat \]

\[ ete \]

\[ esit \]

\[ ndikut \]

\[ Ata \]

\[ VP \]

\[ AUX \]

\[ VB \]

\[ NP_c \]

\[ yat \]

\[ ete \]

\[ esit \]

\[ ete \]

\[ ndikut \]

\[ Ata \]

There is a preposing rule which optionally brings the matrix \( V_r \) to the front and reassigns the embedded subject \( S \) to the back by swapping one with the other. This rule is the same rule that preposes the embedded Adjunct \( S \) by swapping the \( S \) with the matrix \( S \). Since this preposing rule is required to apply before simple pronominalization for reasons we have already explained in 6.1.1, the rule will apply to 43b, generating 43c below:

\[ S \]

\[ AUX \]

\[ VB \]

\[ NP_c \]

\[ NP \]

\[ NP \]

\[ yat \]

\[ ete \]

\[ esit \]

\[ ete \]

\[ ndikut \]

\[ Ata \]

Simple pronominalization can now apply and since it is optional in this case - one of the coreferent \( NPs \) is subject and the other object in their respective \( S \)'s - if the rule does not apply (41a), which is repeated below, is generated:

(41)a. Ama ayat ete esit ete ndikut Ata

'It annoyed father for father to see Ata'

If, however, simple pronominalization applies, (41b), which is repeated below, is generated:

(41)b. /
(41)b. Ama ayat ete esit enye ndikut Ata
   'It annoyed father for him to see Ata'

Deletion can now take place and enye, the pronoun realised after simple
pronominalization, will be optionally deleted. When the deletion takes
place, (41c), which is also repeated below, is generated:

(41)c. Ama ayat ete esit ndikut Ata: 'It annoyed father to see Ata'

The examples in (41) show clearly that simple pronominalization applies
even in cases where the deletion of a coreferent NP is done by Equi-NP-
Deletion in a language like English (cf. Ross 1967:194) (for example). If
so, we wonder whether there is need for Equi-NP-Deletion in Efik.

Shouldn't the deletion of such NPs be done by the ordinary pronoun
deletion, since these NPs are in fact pronouns at the time they are
deleted? We think the pronoun deletion should apply, for in this way
this rule can be formulated to apply obligatorily in phrase markers
like 40b, which can be represented diagrammatically below:

```
S
   NP
   c
   AUX
   VP
   VB
   yom

Bassey

40b. enye ndibine ete
```

where

(a) the embedded subject is coreferential with the matrix subject
(b) the embedded S itself is an object of the matrix VP.

However, (44a) is not covered by condition (a) and can therefore be
generated, in spite of its ungrammaticality. It is not covered by
condition (a) because the matrix NP is the object, not subject, in this
case, as 44b, from which (44a) is derived, shows:

(44)a. /
In order to ensure that the pronoun *enyeg is obligatorily deleted to generate (44c), which is grammatical:

(44)c. Ami m'mekpem Ime ndiwa4 moto: 'I have taught Ime to drive a car'

The conditions for the obligatory application of pronoun deletion can be restated thus:

(a) the pronoun is an embedded subject and is coreferential with a matrix NP;

(b) the embedded S itself is an object of the matrix verb.

In this way, the pronouns in sentences such as (45) will continue to be optionally deleted, while those in sentences such as (46) will be obligatorily deleted to generate grammatical strings:

(45)a. Edi'ke A'ta edide, (enyeg) eyokut mi: 'If A'ta comes, he will see me'

(45)b. Man kpe Ime okuk, (enyeg) ana okure utom ogo

'For me to pay Ime money, he must finish the job'

(45)c. Enem ndit' ogo esit (mm'go) ndikut fi

'It pleases those children for (them) to see you'

(46)a. /
It should be noted that in general failure to delete an obligatorily deletable pronoun when its coreferent antecedent is subject of the matrix generates far worse strings than when the antecedent is object in the matrix, as (46a) and (46b) show.

To summarise, we have said that in infinitive sentences with coreferent NPs, the deletion of the embedded subject performed by equi-NP-deletion in English should in fact be performed by the Pronoun Deletion rule in Efik. This will allow us to make a generalization of the following kind:

A pronoun is obligatorily deletable if (a) it is the subject of the embedded S in an infinitive sentence and coreferential with a matrix NP, and (b) the embedded S itself is an object of the matrix verb; otherwise it is optionally deletable.

6.3 Simple Pronominalization in Complex Structures with Complement Clauses:

In 6.2 above, we dealt with Simple Pronominalization in infinitive sentences, which are in fact complex structures with complement clauses. For our purposes, complex structures with a sentential object or subject will hereafter be referred to as complex structures with complement clauses. In this section, we wish to examine simple pronominalization in complex structures with the ete complementizer. In particular, we wish to examine the occurrence of the self-referring form, to use Clements' (1973) term, \textit{imj} (plural \textit{mmimj}), which appears to occur in sentences with the ete complementizer. However, it should be noted from the outset that although the natural environment, so to say, of \textit{imj} is in sentences with ete, it does occur in some sentences without ete, as we will see.
As the behaviour of some verbs will be shown to be relevant to the generation of \textit{im\(\pi\)}, we will begin by considering the relationship of matrix verbs to their complement clauses. In general, verbs that take complement clauses are verbs of saying, hearing, thinking, resolving, believing, wishing, wanting, liking, etc. The so-called psychological verbs like \textit{vat esit} (be angry), \textit{nem esit} (be happy), etc., also take complement clauses, though these complement clauses are generally subjects of these verbs as we have already seen in the previous section.

Some of these verbs like \textit{d\(\text{\textbar}\)} (say), \textit{kop} (hear), \textit{nim} (believe), \textit{biere} (decide, resolve), \textit{kere} (think), etc. may occur with the \textit{ete} complementizer in one interpretation of the sentence, or with the infinitive \textit{S} complement in another interpretation, as (47) and (48) show:

(47)a. Bassey \(\text{\textbar}\) \(\text{\textbar}\) \textit{ete im\(\pi\)} iyedep moto: 'Bassey said that he would buy a car'

(47)b. Arit \(\text{\textbar}\) \textit{ete im\(\pi\)} iyeka do: 'Arit said that she would go there'

(47)c. Iban \(\text{\textbar}\) \textit{ebiere ete mmimo iyekpe okuk oru}: 'The women resolved that they would pay the money'

(48)a. Arit \(\text{\textbar}\) \textit{eta} ab\(\text{\textbar}\) ndika do: 'Arit has talked about to go there'

(48)b. Iban \(\text{\textbar}\) \textit{ebiere ndikpe okuk oru}: 'The women have resolved to pay the money'

(48)c. Bassey ekere ndinyam\(\text{\textbar}\)udu: 'Bassey thinks to trade' (i.e. thinking of taking up trading as an occupation)

The differences between (47) and (48) lie in the fact that in (47) the contents of the complement clauses reflect the view, opinion or speech of the subject of the matrix, while in (48) this not the case; the view, opinion or speech is that of the speaker himself. This is an important distinction which will have a direct bearing on the derivation of \textit{im\(\pi\)} as will be shown later.

However, some of these verbs like \textit{d\(\text{\textbar}\)} and \textit{nim} totally reject the infinitive complement clause, while others like \textit{tin\(\pi\)} (tell) need a quasi verbal (\textit{QVB})/
(QVB) like \textit{abaga} (about) to allow the infinitive. Thus (49) are ungrammatical:

(49)a. *Bassey \textit{dho} ndidep moto: 'Bassey says to buy a car'
(49)b. *Arit \textit{eti} ndika: 'Arit tells to go'

If there is an intervening QVB between \textit{ti} and the infinitive, as in (48a), then the sentence is grammatical. In the case of \textit{dho} and \textit{nim}, not even such an intervening QVB can save the sentence, as (50) show:

(50)a. *Bassey \textit{ba} \textit{abaga} ndidep moto: 'Bassey says about to buy a car'
(50)b. *Akon enim \textit{abaga} ndidep eti ebe: 'Akon believes about to marry a good husband'

So with verbs like \textit{dho} and \textit{nim} the complement clause always reflects the speech, view, opinion, etc. of the matrix subject, since no form of infinitive at all is allowed. This is not to say that the infinitive complement clause always reflects the speech, view, opinion, etc. of the speaker, any more than the \textit{eti} complement clause always reflects only the speech, opinion, etc. of the subject of the matrix, as will become clear as we go on. What can be said at the moment is that with verbs like \textit{dho} and \textit{nim}, \textit{eti} is obligatorily required to relate the complement clause to the matrix clause and the content of the complement clause must reflect the view, opinion, speech, etc. of the matrix subject.

Unlike verbs like \textit{dho}, \textit{ti}, \textit{kere}, etc. considered above, verbs like \textit{ma} (like) and \textit{yom} (want) do not allow the \textit{eti} complementizer, even if they make the same differences in interpretation pointed out above. Thus (51) are grammatical but (52) are not:

(51)a. \textit{Etubom oyom ndikut fi}: 'The headmaster wants to see you'
(51)b. \textit{Okon aya ndigis in time}: 'Okon likes to give trouble'

(52)a. *Etubom oyom ete imo ikut fi: 'The headmaster wanted that he saw you'
(52)b. *Okon ama ete imo isin time: 'Okon likes that he gives trouble',

Even /
211.

Even in (53), where the content of the complement clause reflects the desire or feeling of the matrix subject, ete does not occur:

(53)a. Bassey oygm i3 4 3 ny i3 4 3 4 'Bassey wants he goes alone'
(53)b. Arit imha f3 4 3 ekpame i3 4 3 'Arit doesn't like you to watch her'

The derivation of ete would appear to present some problem. Its occurrence in complexes to introduce a complement clause does not appear to be governed by syntactic factors. It is selected by some verbs in a rather unpredictable way. It is true verbs like d̄ah (say), tin (tell), kop (hear), which could loosely be called verbs of saying, appear to require ete obligatorily. But verbs like kere (think), nyime (accept) biere (decide), yat esit (be angry), beng (beg), yire (insist), etc., which also require ete, though not obligatorily, hardly form a natural class. Nor do verbs like ma (like), yom (want), bet (wait) and these must not have the ete complementizer. We suggest therefore that each verb be individually marked with respect to the use of the complementizer. Those like d̄ah and nim which obligatorily require it should be marked [+Complementizer]; those like kere, biere, etc., which require ete depending on the relationship between the matrix subject and the content of the complement clause should be marked [+Complementizer]; and those like ma, yom, bet should be marked [-Complementizer], whatever the relationship between the matrix subject and the content of the complement clause.

The important thing to be noted is that although ete occurs in many cases where im occurs, there is no justification to say that it is crucial for the occurrence of im.

6.3.1 im/jimim/: Let us now turn to the use of im/jimim. The use of a morphologically distinct /
distinct pronoun form in indirect or reported speech is not peculiar
to Efik. Clements (1973:2) gives a brief survey of the languages which
do this:

"Several years ago, R.C. Armstrong observed that several of the so-
called 'kwa' group of languages employ morphologically distinct
pronounal forms in reported speech to distinguish reference to the
speaker from reference to other parties. He noted that such con-
trastive forms had been described for S. Idoma, and gave examples
showing that Yoruba made similar distinctions (see Armstrong 1963).
Comparable data have since come to light for Igbo (Carrell 1970)
and Avatime (as Kevin Ford has pointed out to me). However, other
'Kwa' languages, such as the Akan group, seem not to have such
forms, while languages outside this group such as Efik, Eskimo,
Latin, Korean and Japanese have at least partially parallel phenomena."

Clements then goes on to say "Ewe employs a unique form for such 'self-
reporting' or self-reference by a speaker: the pronoun ye with its
regular plural ye-wo. It is used not only to report speech but also
thoughts, desires, goals and so forth under certain narrowly defined
grammatical conditions".

Efik uses a parallel form imp/mmim, which contrasts with the regular
third and second person pronouns enye/mm and afo/mbufo, in the following
ways. First, imp/mmim invariably occurs in complement S's, as in (41)
and (53). The verbs in whose complement clauses imp/mmim occurs are
verbs of saying, thinking, hearing, shouting, resolving, wishing, etc.
Imp/mmim also occurs in the complement clauses of the so-called
'psychological verbs', as in (54):

(54)a. Enem enye esit imp ndibe udmo: 'It please him heart to press exam'
(54)b. Ayat wu a esit imp ndigut ndede he kpo
    'It anger Mother to see dirty things'

It is important to emphasise that imp/mmim occurs only in what could
be regarded as reported or indirect speech. The term 'speech' is
perhaps /
perhaps unfortunate since it implies verbal communication. For our purposes, however, we would wish it to cover such things as feelings, thoughts, desires, intentions, etc., understood but not explicitly expressed perhaps.

Second, as (55) show, \textit{im\textperiodcentered} occurs when the subject of the matrix is co-referential with an NP in the complement clause and when the content of this complement clause reflects the speech or discourse, to use Kuno's term, of the matrix subject, rather than that of the speaker.

\begin{itemize}
\item (55)a. \textit{Ata ekere ete im\textperiodcentered imeye} : 'Ata thinks that he is handsome'
\item (55)b. \textit{Okon enyme ete im\textperiodcentered iyekpe is\textperiodcentered or\textperiodcentered} : 'Okon agreed he would pay the debt'
\end{itemize}

Like the Ewe \textit{ve} the use of \textit{im\textperiodcentered} in sentences such as (55) makes it quite clear that it refers only to the subject of the matrix \textit{Ata} or \textit{Okon} in (55a) and (55b) respectively, and not to any other person. In other words, there is no question of ambiguity in (55). If, however, the regular pronoun \textit{enye} were used in place of \textit{im\textperiodcentered}, as in (56), then ambiguity might result, but in none of the interpretations would (55) be paraphrased:

\begin{itemize}
\item (56)a. \textit{Ata ekere ete enye eye} : 'Ata thinks that he is handsome'
\item (56)b. \textit{Okon enyme ete enye eyekpe is\textperiodcentered or\textperiodcentered} : 'Okon agreed he would pay the debt'
\end{itemize}

In (56a) \textit{enye} may refer to \textit{Ata}, or to someone else. But if \textit{enye} refers to \textit{Ata} in (56a) as does \textit{im\textperiodcentered} in (55a), how do the two sentences differ in interpretation? The difference between (55a) and (56a) is that in the former, the complement clause reflects the thought of \textit{Ata} himself while in the latter, the complement clause embodies what the speaker thinks of \textit{Ata}, not necessarily what \textit{Ata} himself thinks of himself. We will return to this distinction again and again, since as we will see, this distinction will be crucial to the derivation of \textit{im\textperiodcentered}. In (56b), however /
however, *enye* cannot refer to *Okon* otherwise the sentence would be ungrammatical. So like (55b), (56b) is unambiguous but the two are not paraphrases.

If *imọ* occurs only in complement clauses, then we should not expect it to occur in adjunct clauses. Accordingly, (57) are ungrammatical:

(57)a. *Okposuk edị Bassey minyeneke okuk, imọ ima idep moto*

1 2 3 4 5 6

'Although Bassey has no money, he bought a car'

(57)b. *Ata ama aka do man imọ ikekut Okon*

1 2 3 4 5 6

'Ata went there for him to see Okon'

However, in pure Ibibio, (58a), which means the same as (57b), is grammatical:

(58)a. *Ata ama aka do man imọ ikekut Okon*:'Ata went there for him to see Okon' which makes Ibibio look more like Ewe.

Predictably, (58a) is interpreted as expressing Ata's, not the speaker's, point of view. To express this in Efik or Efik-Ibibio, the speaker requires a verb of saying like *dọ*, as in (58b):

(58)b. *Ata dọ ọrọ eter imọ ikekut Okon*

'Ata said he went there for him to see Okon' in which case *imọ ikekut Okon* is a complement S. Perhaps we should add that if the speaker expresses his own, not Ata's, opinion, then (58c) is chosen:

(58)c. *Ata ama aka do man enye ekekut Okon*

'Ata went there for him to see Okon'

Third, as Ewe *ve* but unlike Japanese *zibun*, the antecedent of *imọ* cannot be the first person, thus (59) are ungrammatical:

(59)a. *Ami mma nke ete imọ imebe udomo:*'I heard that I passed exam'

(59)b. *Nnyin ima ikop ite mmimọ imebe udomo:*'We heard that we passed exam'

Fourth, the antecedent of *imọ* is characteristically the subject of the matrix, thus the following are ungrammatical, where this is not the case:

(60)a. /
(60) a. *wuro ema_ebian Okon ete imo iyedc yihan
   'They informed Okon that he went there'
(60) b. *tubufo ema_ebian ata ete Okon oyom imo
   'You informed ata that Okon wanted him'

Moreover, in (61a) imo can only refer to Bassey, the subject of the matrix:

(61) a. Bassey asian Okon ete imo iyedc yihan
   'Bassey has told Okon that he would marry'

If, however, imo refers to Okon, then (61b), which is ungrammatical, results:

(61) b. *Bassey asian Okon ete imo iyedc yihan
   'Bassey informed Okon that he would marry'

However, as zibun in Japanese, imo may have an antecedent that is not the subject of the matrix. Consider the following:

(62) a. If oto ama owut Bassey ete owo imaha imo
   'The word showed Bassey that people don't like him'
(62) b. Utok oto ekpep Arit ete imo inyene ndinyene ime
   'The headmaster showed Arit that she has to have patience'

where the antecedents of imo in (a) and (b) are the objects Bassey and Arit respectively. However, the subjects of such matrixes must be inanimate, thus (63) are ungrammatical, where this is not the case:

(63) a. *Ete owut Bassey ete owo imaha imo
   'Father has shown Bassey that people don't like him'
(63) b. *Etubom ekpep Arit ete imo inyene ndinyene ime
   'The headmaster has taught Arit that she must have patience'

But if imo refers to the subjects, Ete and etubom, then (63) would be perfectly grammatical.

With /
With the so-called 'psychological verbs' too, \textit{im\texttildetilde{}} refers to the object, as (64) show:

(64)a. 
\textit{enem Bassey esit im\texttildetilde{}} ndika \textit{\texttildetilde{wed}}

'It pleases Bassey heart for him to go to school'

where \textit{Bassey} is the 'experiencer'. (64a) is derived from the structure underlying (64b):

(64)b. 
\textit{Im\texttildetilde{}} ndika \textit{\texttildetilde{wed}} enem Bassey esit

'For him to go to school pleases Bassey heart'

Unlike Ewe, as pointed out by Clements, there is never any doubt about who the 'experiencer' is in such sentences, for given other 'psychological verbs' like \textit{yat esit} (be angry), \textit{akpa idem} (surprised), (65) are derived from (66), where as in (64b), it is clear what the object - and therefore the experiencer - is:

(65)a. 
\textit{Ayat At\texttildetilde{a} c esit im\texttildetilde{}} ndidep akani moto

'It angers Ata for him to buy an old car'

(65)b. 
\textit{Ama akpa enye idem im\texttildetilde{}} ndikut mi

'It surprised him for him to see me'

As in (62) the subject of the matrix is inanimate, being the abstract \textit{S}, as (64b) and (66) show:

(66)a. 
\textit{Im\texttildetilde{}} ndidep akani moto ayat At\texttildetilde{a} esit

'For him to buy an old car angered Ata'

(66)b. 
\textit{Im\texttildetilde{}} ndikut mi ama akpa enye idem im\texttildetilde{'}for him to see me surprised him'

sixth, the antecedent of \textit{im\texttildetilde{}} like that of Japanese zibun must be animate (except perhaps in some McCawlian world), thus (67) are ungrammatical:

(67)a. 
\textit{\texttildetilde{wed}} enem esit ndidep im\texttildetilde{'}The book is pleased for it to be bought'

(67)b. 
\textit{Akpa eto oro idem im\texttildetilde{}} ndidep im\texttildetilde{'}It surprises the tree for it to fall'

where \textit{im\texttildetilde{}} refers to \textit{\texttildetilde{wed}} (book) and eto (tree).

sixth, the reflexive pronoun is influenced or controlled by \textit{im\texttildetilde{}} if it is the subject of the simplex in which the reflexive occurs. Consider (68)

(68)a. /
(68)a. \(Et\text{\textsc{im}}\ ama\_ebiere\ ete\ im\_\text{\textsc{m}}\ iyegin\ idem\ im\_\text{\textsc{v}}\ wed\)
\(\_\text{\textsc{im}}\ resolved\ that\ he\ would\ educate\ himself\)
(68)b. \(ib\_\text{\textsc{an}}\ oro\ ew\_t\ ete\ mmim\ im\_\text{\textsc{ppone}\ idem\ mmim}\)
\('The\ women\ have\ shown\ that\ they\ respect\ themselves\')

Of course this must be seen as part of the reflexivization condition in 
\(\text{\textsc{nfik}}\) that the reflexive pronoun must agree with the subject of the sim-
plex in number and person. Also controlled by \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) is the possessive
pronoun, thus we have (69):
(69) \(Et\text{\textsc{ubom}}\ ama\_\text{\textsc{okop}}\ ete\ eyen\ im\_\text{\textsc{m}}\ eyedi\)
\('The\ headmaster\ heard\ that\ his\ son\ would\ come\')

where \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) refers to \(Et\text{\textsc{ubom}}\).

Not only does \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) affect the reflexive and the possessive pronouns, it
also affects the verb, if it is the subject of its own clause, as all
the examples involving \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) and (70) show:
(70)a. \(\text{\textsc{hassey}}\ enyime\ ete\ \text{\textsc{im2}}\ iyenam\ utom\ oro\)
\('\text{\textsc{hassey}}\ has\ agreed\ that\ he\ would\ do\ the\ job\')
(70)b. \(\text{\textsc{nkparawa}}\ oro\ enyime\ ete\ mmim\ iyenam\ utom\ oro\)
\('The\ young\ men\ have\ agreed\ that\ they\ would\ do\ the\ job\')

Of course the control of the verb by \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) when it is the subject of its
own clause should be seen as part of the general rule that the verb must
agree with the subject in number and person, just as the agreement
between \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) as subject and its coreferent reflexive pronoun must be seen
as part of a general condition on reflexivization. In the case of \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\),
however, number is not overtly marked on the verb, since as (70) show,
both \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) and \(\text{\textsc{mmim2}}\) have the same form of the verb, \(\text{\textsc{iyenam}}\).

Finally, \(\text{\textsc{im2}}\) is deletable, just like any other anaphoric pronoun in
\(\text{\textsc{nfik}}\). Thus (71a) and (71b) are paraphrases:
(71)a /
(71)a. Akon ebiere ete imọ iyebe udomo oro  
    "Akon has resolved that she would pass the exam"

(71)b. Akon ebiere ete iyebe udomo oro  
    "Akon has resolved that she would pass the exam"

Now given the following:

(a) that the antecedent of imọ must be animate at least;
(b) that it (i.e. the antecedent) is characteristically the subject
    of the matrix;
(c) that where (b) is not the case, then the subject of the matrix must
    be inanimate;

we hypothesize that where both the subject and the object of the matrix
are animate, then imọ can only refer to the subject.

So far we have shown that imọ occurs when the subject or object of the
matrix is coreferential with another NP in the complement clause. It
is in fact this NP in the complement clause which takes the form of imọ.
However, this does not explain why imọ occurs in (72a) but not in (72b);
even though enye is in a complement clause and refers to Etim, just as
imọ does:

(72)a. Etim oyom ọjọ ekpe imọ okuk oro  
    1_2 3 4 5 6 7  
    'Etim wants you to pay him the money'

(72)b. Etim oyom ọjọ ekpe enye okuk oro  
    1_2 3 4 5 6 7  
    'Etim wants you to pay him the money'

Perhaps we should add that enye in (72b) can refer to someone other
than Etim. In other words, (72b) is ambiguous but (72a) is not, since
the above hypothesis predicts that imọ can only refer to Etim.

6.3.2 Subjective Versus Objective Involvement:

The difference between (72a) and (72b) lies in what we have already
mentioned, namely the nature of the speaker's involvement in the content
of /
of the complement clause. Since, as we have already pointed out, this will be found to be crucial to the occurrence - and therefore derivation - of \textit{im\textcircled{2}}, we would like to talk a little more about this phenomenon which is at the basis of Kuno's (1972) Direct Discourse analysis, which will be found to be very useful in our analysis. It matters in Efik - as well as in Japanese and English - whether the speaker gives his own opinion, view, feeling, desire, wishes, interpretation, etc. and thus subjectively involves himself; or whether he merely reports 'objectively', we might say, what the view, opinion, feeling, desire, wishes, interpretation, etc. of the subject (or object) of the matrix (i.e. the person being talked about) is. When the speaker is involved in a personal way and gives his own version or interpretation of the discourse in the complement clause, we will call this 'subjective' involvement (from the speaker's point of view). When, however, the speaker gives the version or interpretation not from his own point of view but from the standpoint of the person being talked about or referred to, we will call this 'objective'. This corresponds more or less to the 'reportive' and 'non-reportive' style of narration in Japanese. It is the objective paraphrase which gives rise to \textit{im\textcircled{2}/mmim} and which distinguishes (72a) from (72b). It is as if the speaker were saying in (72a), for example, that it is \textit{Etim}, not the speaker himself, who suggested or told him the speaker that the hearer (\textit{fi}) should pay him (\textit{Etim}) the money. On the other hand, the suggestion in (72b) must be seen as reflecting that of the speaker himself, not of the subject of the matrix \textit{Etim}. \textit{Im\textcircled{2}} strongly suggests that at one point in time there was a direct speech by the subject (or object) of the matrix. In the case of (72a) \textit{Etim}'s desire or wish was probably something like "\textit{Enye eyekpe mi okuk oro}" ("me will pay me that money"). The difficulty is with verbs /
verbs like *vom, kere, ma, nem esit*, etc. (want, think, like, be happy) the feeling, desire, wish, etc. of the subject or object of the matrix is not necessarily verbal, so perhaps from the speaker's point of view the actual words are not as important as the impression that what the complement clause embodies is in fact the speech or discourse of the person being talked about. In the case of verbs which involve verbal communication, it is possible to give the direct speech or discourse of the matrix subject (or object). Thus in the case of (73a), Bassey must have said, "Ami meye", as (73b), which paraphrases (73a), shows:

(73)a. Bassey *e del ete imo imeye: 'Bassey said that he is handsome'*

(73)b. Bassey *e ehi , "Ami meye": 'Bassey said, 'I am handsome"'

Whatever the case, what the speaker wishes to show in sentences like (72a) and (73a) is that at a point in time, the subject (or object) of the matrix S was in fact a first person - speaker - too. And it is a fact of Efik that this idea is expressed in a complex structure pattern involving a matrix S and a complement S, as in English. Therefore we believe the first person is the source of *im2* when it (i.e. first person NP) refers to another NP in the matrix under certain conditions. Later on we will formally propose that the source NP of *im2* should be the first person pronoun. It is this first person, we believe, that explains the matrix NP's awareness of the situation in the complement clause.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for this is that sentences like (74) can be paraphrased as (75):

(74)a. Etybom *e 2 3 4 5 6 iyo kpu kpru owo*

'he headmaster said he would see everybody'  

(74)b. Okon *ama ofori ete imo i du ke mfuna*

'Okon shouted that he was in difficulty'  

(75)a. /
interestingly, kuno has shown that in comparable structures in both
Japanese and English, zibun and the third person pronouns respectively,
are derived from an underlying first person pronoun. It is this under-
lying first person pronoun, as his Direct Discourse analysis shows,
which makes it impossible for a 'full-fledged noun-phrase' like john to
occur as subject in certain complement clauses with certain matrix verbs,
thus explaining the grammaticality of sentences like (76a) and (76b)
and the ungrammaticality of (76c), which are kuno's own examples:
(76)a. John expects that he will be elected
(76)b. That he will be elected is expected by John
(76)c. *That John will be elected is expected by him
The Direct Discourse analysis, as suggested by kuno, is based on the
fact that the content of the complement clause of some verbs like
expect, claim, etc., in English represents the direct feeling, desire,
speech, etc. of the matrix subject, while that of other verbs like deny,
forget, etc., does not. In his own words, kuno (1972:163) says:
"One of the differences between verbs such as expect, claim, know,
think, request, on the one hand, and verbs such as deny, forget, be
aware (of), on the other, is that the content of the complement
clause of the former represents 'more or less' the direct discourse
of the matrix subject, while this is not the case for the latter".
Then Kuno goes on to show that in (76a) for example, "the content of
John's expectation...is I will be elected".
In Efik, however, although there are verbs like djb and nim whose
complement clauses always represent the direct discourse, feeling or
awareness of the matrix NP, there are also verbs like vom (want),
Kere /
kere (think), wut (show), etc. whose complement clause may or may not do so. It is actually verbs like the latter which give rise to sentences like (72a) and (72b), which as we explained differ semantically. (72a) must be assigned the interpretation in which the complement clause represents the direct discourse of the subject, Etim, while (72b) must not be so assigned.

Moreover, if a complement clause represents the direct speech or discourse of the matrix NP at a point in time, it is not difficult to see that at that point in time, this matrix NP (subject or object in Efik), was in fact the first person or speaker. So a direct speech or discourse representation of the matrix NP's interpretation of the situation necessarily involves the first person.

This 'first person direct feeling representation' (in Kuno's words) has an interesting consequence for us. We have hypothesized that imc refers to the subject of the matrix, unless this subject is inanimate. Given the fact that the antecedent of imc must be animate, this analysis in fact shows that with such verbs as dhor (say), nim (believe), sian (tell) etc. whose complement clause must represent the direct speech or discourse of a matrix NP, it is impossible for the first person in the complement clause to refer to the matrix object, if there is an animate subject. Consider, for example (78), which underlie (77):

(77)a. Etim asian bassey ete imc imenam utom
   'Etim has told Bassey that he has worked'
(77)b. Afo eyedhoro hma ete imc imai ilgue
   'You will tell Mother that you were wrong'

(78)a. Etim asian Bassey, "Ami nnam utom"
   'Etim has told Bassey, "I am working"
(78)b. Afo eyedhoro hma, "Ami mma ndue": 'You will tell Mother, "I was wrong"

Since the complement clauses are objects any way, it is in fact only the /
the subject of the matrix verb who could have uttered them in each case. In other words, ami (I) of the complement clause can only refer to the subject of the matrix, unless that subject is such that it cannot, in our ordinary workaday life, be responsible for the content of the complement clause. Given (78a), for example, both Bassey and the complement clause (directly represented) are objects of the matrix verb, related to Etim, the subject, by way of sian (tell), the matrix verb. Since the complement S is also a direct discourse, it follows that direct discourse as a co-object of Bassey of the verb sian, so to say, cannot be uttered by this co-object, Bassey. But if the direct discourse in the complement clause in (78a) must be that of the matrix subject, it follows also, in my opinion, that the first person in this complement clause must refer to the subject too. It is this first person which will become im to eventually, by a process we will consider shortly.

It should be emphasised that this is true only in cases where the subject is animate. If, however, the subject is inanimate, as in (79a):

(79)a. Ikəoro owut Ata ete obio imaha imə

'The word has shown Ata that the village doesn't like him' surely in this case, the complement clause can only represent what Ata, the object, has come to be aware of. And if (79b) is a representation that reflects what was actually in Ata's mind:

(79)b. Ikəoro owut Ata, "Obio imaha mi"

'The word has shown Ata, "The villages doesn't like me" ' it is conceivable that the awareness embodied in the complement sentence could be attributed to ikəoro (the word).

6.3.3 Verivation of imə/mmimə

We have shown that the source of imə/mmimə lies in the first person pronoun ami/nnyin (I/we). We now wish to consider how this information may...
may be represented in our grammar and how this first person pronoun
has come to assume the form \( \text{im} / \text{mnim} \) in indirect speech or discourse.
In other words, we wish to relate the direct speech or discourse of a
speaker A at a point in time to the speaker B at the present moment.
In fact, this is what \( \text{im} / \text{mnim} \) is all about.
To do this we have to transform the direct discourse of the matrix sub-
ject or object to an indirect one. Now Kuno \(^3\) has proposed a transform-
:ation called Indirect Discourse Formation to handle this problem in
English and Japanese. If there is need for direct discourse analysis
in Efik, as we have shown above, the transformation that converts this
direct discourse to indirect naturally follows.
To chart a path for the above transformation, Kuno suggests that since
some verbs in English take complement clauses that are direct discourse
of the matrix NP while others take complement clauses whose contents do
not represent the direct discourse of the matrix subject, this information
should be made available to the grammar. Accordingly, verbs that take
complement clauses should be marked in the lexicon "with respect to
whether the complement clause represents a direct discourse of the
matrix subject or someone else's". When the complement clause repre-
:sents the direct discourse of the matrix subject, the first person
pronoun in this clause is deemed to be coreferential with the subject
of the matrix.
As in English, there are verbs in Efik whose complement clauses must
contain only the direct discourse or feeling of the matrix subject. In
general such verbs obligatorily require the complementizer \( \text{ete} \). However, it /

---

3. In an earlier version of this Section we suggested, independently
of Kuno's analysis, that there must be a rule of this kind and
referred to it as Reported Speech Pronoun Shift.
it does not necessarily mean that the function of ete is to introduce complement clauses whose contents represent the direct discourse of the matrix subject. There are cases where ete introduces complement clauses whose contents do not represent the direct discourse of the matrix subject, as in (56a).

There are, however, other verbs like kere (think), mut (show), kop (hear), etc., whose complement clause may or may not represent the direct discourse of the matrix subject. Let us suppose that this property can be represented as a syntactic feature of some verbs and let us call this feature \( [\text{DD}] \) (for direct discourse). We suggest that verbs whose complement clause always represent the direct discourse of the matrix subject (or object) should be marked \( [\text{DD}] \) in the lexicon and those whose complement clause optionally do so, as it were, marked \( [\neg \text{DD}] \).

Thus in (55a) and (56a), repeated below:

(55a) Ata ekere ete imye eye : 'Ata thinks that he is handsome'
(56a) Ata ekere ete ete enye eye : 'Ata thinks that he is handsome'

the verb kere is \( [\text{DD}] \) in (55a) and \( [\neg \text{DD}] \) in (56a).

Given this sort of marking on the verbs that take complement clauses, we will say that the Indirect Discourse Formation rule in Efik is defined over a complex structure with a complement S and applies on condition that the matrix verb is \( [\text{DD}] \). Therefore the feature \( [\text{DD}] \) on the matrix verb triggers off the Indirect Discourse Formation.

To show how a proper analysis for the Indirect Discourse Formation rule looks like, let us consider (80a):

(80a) Bassey \( \text{x-dho} \) ete imo imebe udomo

'Bassey has said that he has passed the exam'

according to the Direct Discourse analysis, (80a) is derived from (80b):

(80b) /
Bassey has said, "I have passed the exam."

(80b) is structured as 81 below, omitting details that are not necessary:

Before we consider how the rule actually applies, let us look at the problem of coreference.

Although Bassey and ami in (81) differ in Person feature – the former is [+III] while the latter is [+I] – yet intuitively we know that ami is in fact the same person as Bassey. The problem arises because we have maintained that coreference between NPs require sameness in features of Number and Person.

However, in Direct Discourse analysis, it has been shown that the complement clause embodies the direct discourse of the matrix subject (or object) as a speaker at a point in time. It has also been shown that the first person in such a direct representation must refer to the matrix subject, if this subject is animate, or the object, if the latter but not the former is animate.

There appears therefore to be a principle of coreference in a Direct Discourse analysis which if properly formulated can relate NPs which we know intuitively to be coreferential, even though they differ in Person.

(82) /
(82) **Coreference Principle in Direct Discourse:**

Given a Direct Discourse Representation, the first person in the complement clause refers to the matrix subject if this NP is [+Animate], or to the matrix object, where the subject is -Animate but the object itself is +Animate.

To show that the above Principle is false, one has to show that there are cases where the speaker is not (or is not seen to be) the first person, for the Direct Discourse hypothesis implies that the subject (or object in the case of Efik) of the matrix was (or will be) at a point in time the first person (speaker) of his own speech, feeling, thought, etc.

Returning now to the application of Indirect Discourse Formation, it is well to remember that this rule is defined over a complex structure with a complement S and applies on condition that the verb is marked [+DD] (i.e. the complement clause represents the direct discourse of an NP in the matrix). When the rule applies, it changes the first person pronoun form ami/nnyin (1/We) to im\(\tilde{m}\)/mmim if the matrix coreferent counterpart (i.e. the antecedent) is [\(-I\)] (i.e. it is not also a first person). This is then how im\(\tilde{m}\)/mmim is derived from an underlying first person pronoun.

However, it does appear that it is not only the first person that is changed with the application of Indirect Discourse Formation. Consider (83):

(83)a. Etim\(\tilde{c}\) asian Arit\(\tilde{c}\) ete enye\(\tilde{e}\) ebine im\(\tilde{c}\)

'Etim\(\tilde{c}\) has told Arit\(\tilde{c}\) that she\(\tilde{e}\) should join him\(\tilde{c}\)'

According to the Direct Discourse hypothesis, (83a) is derived from (83b):

(83)b. Etim asian Arit, "Afo bine mi": 'Etim has told Arit, "You join me"'

As (83) indicate the second person in the complement S is changed to enye (or mm\(\tilde{m}\)) when the direct discourse represented is converted to indirect
indirect one. Observe that the afo (you) in (83b) cannot possibly refer to anyone other than Arit (given a [+DD] marking on the matrix verb) who was in fact Etim's hearer at the time he spoke. So in Efik where the matrix S has two animate MPs as subject and object, the first person in the complement clause must refer to the matrix subject while the second person in the same clause must refer to the matrix object. (84a) is in fact not a paraphrase of (83a), since the ancestor of im, ami can only refer to the subject, as (82) correctly predicts.

(84)a. Etim asian Arit ete im p iyebine enye i

'Etim has told Arit that he will join her'

(84a) is derived from (84b):

(84)b. Etim asian Arit, "Ami nnyebine fi"

'Etim has told Arit, "I will join you"

The difference between (83) and (84) is that in the former the ancestor of im, ami is object in the former, whereas in the latter, it is the subject of the complement S. The second person afo in (83) of course has swapped places with the first person ami in (84). Observe that the changes take place independently of the position of functional role of these first and second person pronouns. We should point out that (84a) can be ambiguous, since enye may refer to someone other than Arit. Of course the someone cannot be Etim, the object, otherwise the sentence would be woefully ungrammatical.

Since the second person in the complement clause in direct discourse analysis must refer to the matrix object given a complex structure with both animate subject and object, (82) needs some revision, namely as (85):

(85) Coreference Principle in Direct Discourse Representation:

In a Direct Discourse Representation, the First Person in the complement clause refers to the matrix subject if it is animate, or to the object if the former is inanimate and the latter animate, while /
while the Second Person refers to the object if both subject and object are animate.

The second part of the above Principle implies that the matrix object is the same person that the matrix subject addressed in the direct discourse. Naturally the addressee was the hearer. We should point out that this is only applicable to verbs like *sian* (tell, inform), *doxo* (say), *fiori* (shout), etc., which can take both human subject and object. They may be referred to as 'verbs of saying'.

So far, we have not shown how the rule that introduces the *ete* complementizer relates to Indirect Discourse Formation. In actual fact, this rule applies independently of Indirect Discourse Formation, since, as we have already shown, the occurrence of *ete* does not necessarily indicate that the complement clause represents the direct discourse of the matrix subject, or object. The use of the complementizer therefore is just another feature of the kind of verbs we have been dealing with and is independent of [+wu] or [-wu]. Ordering wise, it does not appear to matter whether the introduction of the complementizer as a segment precedes or follows Indirect Discourse Formation.

6.3.4 Indirect Discourse Formation and Reflexivisation:

We said earlier on that *im* affects the reflexive pronoun if it is the subject of the clause in which the reflexive is object. Since clearly reflexivization precedes the Indirect Discourse Formation rule - the latter is a kind of simple pronominalization - reflexivization should be allowed to apply as usual. Then the indirect discourse formation rule will follow, changing all the pronouns that are changeable.

Thus taking (86a), which is derived from (86b):

(86a) Bassey x̂, x̄, ete im: *im im idem im:* 'Bassey says he is harming himself'
(86b) Bassey x̂, Ami nnam ami: "Ami nnam ami": 'Bassey says, "I am harming I"'
When the indirect Discourse Formation rule applies, it will change not only ami but also umi, which are of course both first person, to imo in both cases. In this way, (86a) will be generated when the introduction of ete also takes place.

So imo is not derived by the ordinary simple pronominalization rule. It is in this way that we can account for the difference between (87a) and (87b):

(87)a. Ata owut mi ete imo imenam utom

'Ata has shown me that he is working'

(87)b. Ata owut mi ete enye anam utom

'Ata has shown me that he is working'

In (87a), the complement clause represents the direct mind or so of Ata as seen from Ata's own point of view. Therefore wut is [+DD] in (87a). In (87b), however, it is the speaker's subjective interpretation of the situation and the complement clause does not therefore represent the direct discourse of the subject of the matrix Ata. Wut (show) in this case is [-DD]. imo in (87a) is therefore derived via Indirect Discourse Formation while enye in (87b) is derived by ordinary simple pronominalization rule. The deep structure of (87b) therefore is 88, leaving out the details:
The feature -DD therefore blocks Indirect Discourse Formation, since the representation is not a direct discourse representation. That is 88 is not a proper analysis for Indirect Discourse Formation but of simple pronominalization. When this rule and segmentalization of the complementizer apply, (87b) will finally be generated. So it is now clear that the source of imv/mim is the first person. Many of the syntactic characteristics we have listed above strongly suggest that apart from its form, imv/mim cannot be derived like enve/mm with which it contrasts.

6.4 Simple Pronominalization in Structures with Co-ordinate NPs and S's:
We will define a co-ordinate NP as an NP which dominates two or more NPs conjoined by the co-ordinating conjunction ye, and a co-ordinate Sentence as a Sentence which dominates two or more Sentences conjoined by the co-ordinating conjunction nyug. A co-ordinate sentence of this kind will hereafter be referred to as simply a co-ordinate structure. In this section, we will concern ourselves with simple pronominalization in structures underlying such sentences as (89) and (90):

(89a) Han Bassey ye Okon ekure utom oro, mnyin iyeke mço okuk

\[\text{in order for Bassey and Okon to finish the work, we will pay them money}\]

(89b) Ayat akaiferi ye akparawa oro esit mço ndikut m1

\[\text{It has annoyed the girl and the boy to see me}\]

(90a) Effiong ema okut etubom oguy otoro egye

\[\text{Effiong saw the headmaster and thanked him}\]

(90b) Iban oro ema ekut i eyuy oc∞

\[\text{The women saw you and greeted you}\]

We /
We will begin by describing how co-ordinate NPs are pronominalized, given the structures underlying sentences such as (89). In Chapter five (cf. 5.3.1), we showed how reflexivization applies in simplexes with co-ordinate NPs. It was suggested that in such simplexes reflexivization should apply "recursively...so long as each pair of coreferent NPs are dominated by superordinate NPs which stand in subject-object relationship and so long as the constituent NP subjects are coreferential with the constituent NP objects".

Now in complex structures, co-ordinate NPs, given coreference, are pronominalized, as the surface sentences in (89) show. As in the case of reflexivization, simple pronominalization (as in fact suggested by Koutsoudas (1971)) applies recursively with respect to co-ordinate NPs.

Let us consider (89a) which is derived from 91a:

```
S
  NP
    VP
      VB NP
        NP NP
          Nnyin iyeke ye NP
            bassey Okon okuk
          PRE-S S
            man NP ye NP
              Bassey Okon
            VP NP
              ye NP VB
                N DET
                  ekure utom
  91a.
```

As usual in a structure like 91a, the preposing rule will apply bringing the Adjunct S forward and thus generating 92a, which is an input to simple pronominalization:
Simple pronominalization is now ready to operate on (92a). As suggested above, this rule applies recursively in a structure like (92a), where a pair of coreferent co-ordinate NPs dominate identical constituent NPs. After the rule has applied ((92b) is generated:

(92b). the Pronoun Conjunction Rule (cf. 5.3.2) will obligatorily generate mm from enye ye enye and thus (89a) will be generated.

Simple pronominalization can of course apply in a backward direction in (92a). So it does not appear to matter whether the NPs are single or co-ordinate, simple pronominalization applies optionally in a structure like (92a). Thus (93) is not only grammatical, but also a paraphrase of (89a), with the application of simple pronominalization in a backward direction:

(93). It should be observed, as we have already pointed out, that co-ordinate NPs behave very much like single plural NPs. The fact that given a structure such as (92a), backward pronominalization is permissible, irrespective /
irrespective of whether the pronominalizable \( \pi \) is single or co-ordinate, strongly supports our analysis of co-ordinate \( \pi \)'s as phrasally derived. In this way, the backward condition is not violated, since the pronominalizable \( \pi \) is in a subordinate clause.

Next, let us consider another example, this time involving \( \text{mmim}_2 \).

(94)a. Etim ye Akon enim \( e_2 \) \( \text{mmim}_3 \) iye \( u_3 \)kut \( u_4 \)m

'Etim and Akon believe that they will find a job'

According to the Direct Discourse hypothesis discussed in the last section (94a) is derived from (94b):

(94)b. \( \text{etim} \) ye Akon enim, "\( \text{mmim}_2 \) \( \text{nyin} \) iye \( \text{utom} \)"

'Etim and Akon believe, "We will find a job"'

According to this hypothesis, the verb \( \text{nim} \) is \ [+DD \]. Omitting unnecessary details, (94b) is then structured as 95a.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \rightarrow NP \rightarrow ye \rightarrow NP \rightarrow VP \\
& \rightarrow NP \rightarrow enim \rightarrow NP \rightarrow VB \rightarrow NP \\
& \rightarrow S \rightarrow \text{Comp} \rightarrow +DD \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow VB \rightarrow \text{VP} \\
\text{Etim ye Akon enim nyin iye \( \text{utom} \)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Since 95a is a direct discourse representation, the Coreference Principle in such a representation will mark \( \text{mmim}_2 \), the first person pronoun and subject of the complement clause, coreferential with the subject of the matrix \( S \), which is the co-ordinate \( NP \) Etim ye Akon. 95a is of course a proper analysis for Indirect Discourse Formation and when the rule applies, \( \text{mmim}_2 \) is changed to \( \text{mmim}_3 \), since the antecedent of \( \text{mmim}_2 \) is not only \(-[I]\) but also \([+\text{Animate}]\). In this way (94a) is generated. It is a measure of the strength of the direct discourse analysis that even co-ordinate NPs present no problems in the derivation of \( \text{mmim}_3 \).

6.4.1 /
6.4.1 Simple Pronominalization in Co-ordinate Structures:

In 5.3.3, we considered some of the syntactic properties of nuq and showed that it can only co-ordinate sentences (unlike ve which can only co-ordinate NPs). Among other things it was shown that since sentences like (96a) and (96b) are synonymous

(96)a. Effiong ama aka okokut Okon: 'Effiong went and saw Okon'
(96)b. Effiong ama aka onyu\n okokut Okon: 'Effiong went and saw Okon'

then (96a) is derived from (96b) by the deletion of the conjoining element nuq. For this reason, we reject a serial construction analysis, for sentences like (96a) since as (96b) shows clearly (96a) is in fact a compound sentence involving two co-ordinate sentences (cf. 2.10 and 5.3.5). It happens to be a fact of Efik that the conjoining element is not only deletable but must also agree in number and person with the subject of one of the conjuncts.

One important thing to note in this section is that conjunction does not allow backward simple pronominalization, thus (97) are grammatical:

(97)a. *Bassey ama okut \mm\ o  eteme iban oro usu\n  'Bassey saw them and showed the women way'
(97)b. *Bassey ama okut \mm\ o  eteme iban oro usu\n  'Bassey saw them and showed the women way'

Let us now try to see how simple pronominalization operates in co-ordinate structures involving nuq. Now consider (98) which is structured as

(98) Bassey okut Ata onyu\n asian enye: 'Bassey has seen Ata and told him'
98a has two pairs of coreferent NPs. Clearly $NP_2$ can be used to pronominalize $NP_4$, thus generating (98b):

(98)b. *Bassey okut Ata onyu) Bassey asian enye
    'Bassey has seen Ata and Bassey has told him'

The question is should $NP_1$ be used to pronominalize $NP_3$ and thus generate (98c)?

(98)c. *Bassey okut Ata onyu) enye asian enye
    'Bassey has seen Ata and he has told him'

and then have *enye the subject of the second conjunct obligatorily deleted to generate (98), as we did with similar NPs in complex structures (cf. 6.2)?

Yes, there is evidence that the subject of the second or following conjunct such as $NP_3$ in 98a is in fact pronominalized. Consider (99):

(99). Ime akayak $1\backslash 2\backslash 3\backslash 4\backslash 5\backslash 6\backslash 7$ kpa enye okonyyu akasian etugom
    'Ime tore the book, he also told the headmaster' (about the tearing of the book)

where the presence of emphasis (as indicated by the emphatic word kpa) demands that the subject of the second conjunct be not deleted. Surely *enye in (99) must be derived from an underlying NP Ime by simple pronominalization. (99) is therefore a clear indication that the subject of the second (or following conjuncts in general) is pronominalized, provided of course it has an antecedent.

Consider /
Consider also (100): 

(100). Bassey aka go enye ikokwe etubom  

'Bassey past morph. go there but he didn't see the headmaster'

Again enye in (100) must be derived from an underlying N bassey by simple pronominalization. It could be argued that edi (but) is a different kind of conjoining element. It is nonetheless a conjoining element. Moreover, it conjoins sentences, just as nyu does, the only difference is that while nyu conjoins positive or affirmative sentences, edi conjoins sentences which contrast (usually one positive, the other negative).

It seems plausible from these two pieces of evidence to claim that subjects of second conjuncts (or following conjuncts in general) are pronominalized. Such subjects are not to be deleted, if they are emphatic. If, however, they are not emphatic, they are obligatorily deleted. This is meant to apply to nyu co-ordination only. Of course in the case of edi conjunction, the subject of the second conjunct is optionally deleted, thus (101) below is derived from (100) by the deletion of enye.

(101). Bassey ama aka do edi ikekwe etubom  

'Bassey went there but he did not see the headmaster'

Returning to 98a, we can now say that in a structure like that, simple pronominalization applies recursively. When NP is used to pronominalize NP, then (98b) is generated, as already shown above. When the rule applies again, then NP will be used to pronominalize NP and thus generating (98c), again as shown above. Then when the subject of the second conjunct is deleted by coreference with the subject of the first conjunct, (98) is finally generated.

(98)Bassey okut Ata onyu asian enye:'Bassey has seen Ata and told him'  
We should point out that enye, the object of the second conjunct is optionally /
optionally deletable in (98), as (102) is not only grammatical but also synonymous with (98):

(102) Bassey okut Ata onyu\~ asian: 'Bassey has seen Ata and told him'

The deletion of this object \( \text{NP} \), a right branch, as the figure in 98a shows, calls into question once again Koutsoudas' claim stated below:

"In all languages where objects can be reduced, the reductions obey the Directionality Constraint".

The Directionality Constraint attributed to Ross is stated as follows:

"The order in which Gapping operates depends on the order of elements at the time the rule applies, if the identical elements are left branches, Gapping operates forward, if they are right branches, it operates backward".

Returning to Figure 98a above, according to Koutsoudas, it is \( \text{NP}_2 \), the object of the first conjunct which should be deleted or reduced and not \( \text{NP}_4 \), the object of the second conjunct. However, if this object is deleted in obedience to the Directionality Constraint, ungrammaticality results, as (103) shows:

(103)* Bassey okut onyu\~ asian Ata: 'Bassey has seen and told Ata'

It is for this reason that we think Koutsoudas' Co-ordination Deletion rule, which is supposed to collapse both Gapping and Conjunction Reduction rules, cannot adequately handle deletion in \( \text{nvun} \) co-ordination, at least, in Efik, as we have already pointed out in 5.3.5.

So pronoun deletion in co-ordinate structures is similar to pronoun deletion in complex structures. Recall that in 6.2 we proposed a hypothesis concerning the deletion of pronouns in complex sentences with infinitive embedding. We restate the hypothesis here:

A pronoun is obligatorily deletable if (a) it is the subject of the embedded \( S \) in an infinitive sentence and coreferential with a matrix \( \text{NP} \), and (b) the embedded \( S \) itself is an object of the matrix verb; otherwise it is optionally deletable.
The similarities between the deletion of subject and object MPs in complex structures with infinitive clauses and in co-ordinate structures involving ṉywa can be captured by restating the above hypothesis thus:

Given Coreference, a pronoun is obligatorily deleted if it is the subject of an infinitive object clause, or an unemphatic subject of a right branching conjunct of ṉywa, otherwise it is optionally deletable.

This statement of course also accounts for pronoun deletion in complex sentences with adjunct clauses where the pronouns are optionally deleted (cf.6.1.2).

6.5 Simple Pronominalization and Locative Pronouns:

The following are locative pronouns:

mi (here); do (there, near you); ko (yonder, away from both speaker and hearer)

The deictic functions of these pronouns are pretty obvious from the above glosses. They correspond to the first, second and third persons respectively. Thus the combinations in (104) are possible:

(104)a. ami mi : 'I here'
(104)b. Afo do : 'You there'
(104)c. Enye ko : 'He/she/it yonder'

But also possible are the following combinations:

(105)a. Afo mi : 'You here'
(105)b. Enye mi : 'He/she/it here'
(105)c. Enye do : 'He/she/it there'

However, the following combinations are not permissible:

(106)a. *ami do : 'I there'
(106)b. *Ami ko : 'I yonder'
(106)c. *Afo ko : 'You yonder'

The following picture, therefore, appears to emerge:

Mi (here, near the speaker) combines with all three persons, thus we have /
have (104a), (105a) and (105b) above;

Do (near the hearer but away from the speaker) combines with two persons, second and third, thus we have (104b) and (105c);

Ko (yonder, away from both speaker and hearer) combines only with one person, namely the third person, thus we have (104c) but not (106b) and (106c).

This is interesting, since according to Lyons (1968:275) "the typical situation of utterance is egocentric...the speaker is always at the centre, as it were, of the situation of utterance".

Not only do locative pronouns co-occur with personal pronouns, they also co-occur with demonstratives, thus the following combinations are possible and quite usual:

(107)a. Ami emi mi : 'I this here'
(107)b. Afo oro do : 'You that there'
(107)c. Ènye oko ko : 'He/she/it yonder yonder'

However, our main concern is with the anaphoric use of these locative pronouns. Consider the following examples with anaphoric mi and do:

(108)a. Edijeke edidude ke obio emi, enyene ndipam utom mi

If you are in this town, you have to work here'

(108)b. Edijeke edidude ke ufok, nnyekut fi do

If you will be at home, I will see you there'

Before we consider the derivation of anaphoric locative pronouns like mi and do above, let us consider what these pronouns actually replace when they are used anaphorically. In examples like those in (108) they appear to replace prepositional phrases, namely ke obio emi and ke ufok.

However, consider the following:

(109) Nnyeka Uyo edijeke Bassey akade do

'I will go to Uyo, if Bassey goes there'

where do replaces a locative NP Uyo, since (109) is derived from (110):
Nnyeka Uyo, edieke Bassey akade Uyo
'I will go to Uyo if Bassey goes to Uyo'

Observe that (111) is impossible:

*Nnyeka ke Uyo, edieke Bassey akade ke Uyo
'I will go in Uyo if Bassey goes in Uyo'

In fact, in Efik movement to or away from a place does not usually require a preposition, as (109) and (110) above, and (112) below show:

Nnykp: Uyo: 'I will leave Uyo'

That being the case, it will be difficult to maintain the position that locative pronouns replace the entire prepositional phrase like ke obio emi (in this town) and ke uf: (at home). But if they do not replace the entire prep-phrase in examples like (108a) and (108b), how can we explain the ungrammaticality of (113)?

Edieke edidude ke uf:, nnyekut fi ke do
'If you will be at home, I will see you at there'

*Edieke odude ke obio emi, enyene ndinam utom ke mi
'If you are in this town, you have to work in here'

The most plausible explanation of this matter, in our view, is that the preposition is obligatorily deleted after simple pronominalization on condition that the pronominalized NP is [+Place] and the entire prepositional phrase dominated by an Adjunct. Strong support for this analysis is the fact that there are instances where pronominalization of an NP in a prepositional phrase affects only the NP and not the entire phrase, as (114) indicate:

Edieke Bassey amade, nnyesara ye enye:'If Bassey likes, I will go with him'

Kini Ata okodude ke Uyo, ykenam utom ye enye
'When Ata was at Uyo, I worked with him'

if enye is anaphoric, surely it refers to Bassey and Ata respectively. It follows therefore that pronominalization must have taken place on NPs /
rather than on the prepositional phrases in (114), since the preposition *ye* is intact in each case even after this rule. Observe that in these cases, *Bassey* and *ata* are "Place" and are not dominated by an Adjunct. It seems clear therefore that where a locative NP, mostly in cases involving no movement, is preceded by a preposition, such a preposition is obligatorily deleted, after simple pronominalization. Such a deletion is not ad hoc. Recall that in Chapter Five (cf. 5.3.1) it was shown that the preposition *ke* is deletable in a co-ordination involving locative phrases. Thus (115b) is derived from (115a) by such deletion:

(115)a. *Bassey ama anam utom ke* Uyo ye ke Calabar

'Bassey worked in Uyo and in Calabar'

(115)b. *Bassey ama anam utom ke* Uyo ye Calabar:'Bassey worked in Uyo and Calabar'

The difference is just that in structures underlying sentences like (108) the deletion is obligatory while in structures underlying sentences like (115a), the deletion is optional.

Let us now consider how an anaphoric locative pronoun may be derived by considering the following example:

(116)a. *Edike enye eti戈de ke ufok, ami nnyakut enye d*8

'If he stays at home, I will see him there'

Let us suppose that a matrix S may have more than one adjunct. If so, (116a) would be structured as (116b), omitting details that are not relevant to the pronominalization of the locative NP:
Since the two occurrences of ufjk are coreferential, simple pronominalization will apply as usual after the rule which preposes the embedded clause. The form the pronoun takes is determined by several factors, namely, domination by adjunct, the feature \(+\text{Place}\) and evidence of proximity or non-proximity. The first two are necessary for all locative pronouns to distinguish them from other pronouns like personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, etc. The last one is for the difference between \(\text{mi}\) (here) and \(\text{do}\) (there). The selection of \(\text{mi}\) and \(\text{do}\) is usually contextually determined unless the NPs involved have demonstrative determiners such as \(\text{emi}\) (this) and \(\text{oro}\) (that), in which case the selection of \(\text{mi}\) or \(\text{do}\) can be grammatically determined, as in (117):

(117)a. Edieke Bassey odude ke ufjk emi, nnyekut enye mi 'if bassey is in this house, I will see him here'

(117)b. /
In general do occurs anaphorically more frequently than mi. We should point out that ko (yonder) is never used anaphorically, thus the following are ungrammatical:

(118)a. *Edieke nnyin idude ke Uyo, nnyin iyenam utom ko

'If we are at Uyo, we will work yonder'

(118)b. *Edieke aka 2 de ebiet oko, tie ko:'If you go yonder place, stay yonder'

Finally, observe that backward pronominalization of locative NPs is allowed subject to the same 'command and precedes' constraint, as (119) shows:

(119)a. Edieke enye edide do, nnyin iyekut enye ke uf\’k

'If he comes there, we will see him at home'

(119)b. *Nnyin iyekut enye go edieke enye edide uf\’k

'We will see him there if he comes home'

The fact that the pronominalization of locative pronouns is subject to the same constraint as the pronominalization of ordinary NPs strongly supports our derivation of locative pronouns by simple pronominalization.
7.0 Introduction:

By Possessive Pronominalization we mean the pronominalization process by which the pronominal forms mmi (my), fo (your), esie (his/her/its), nnyin (our), mbufo (your pl), mm (their) are derived in cases where they have coreferent interpretations, as in (1):

(1)a. Ami nnyom udeme mmi: 'I want my share'
(1)b. Afo oyom udeme fo: 'You want your share'
(1)c. Enye oyom udeme esie: 'He/she wants his/her share'
(1)d. Nnyin iyom udeme nnyin: 'We want our share(s)'
(1)e. Mbufo oyom udeme mbufo: 'You (pl) want your share(s)'
(1)f. Mm > eyom udeme mm: 'They want their share(s)'

It should be noted that except in the singular, where there are minor differences in form, the personal and possessive pronouns are the same in form.

7.1 Analysis of Possessive NPs:

In this Chapter, we wish to consider how the possessive pronouns such as those in (1) may be derived in Efik. Within the standard transformational-generative theory, an English sentence such as (2a) is derived from a structure underlying (2b) which contains an embedded relative S:

(2a) /...

1. Strictly speaking, it is only third person possessive pronouns (esie and mm) which may be transformationally derived in the manner described in 7.3. First and second person possessive pronouns (e.g. mmi and fo) are derived from first and second personal pronouns (e.g. ami and afo), which occur in the base, by morphophonemic rules. Thus ami in the following structure becomes mmi by a morphophonemic rule:

```
N
 / \  
NP  DET
   / \  
   nom  NP
  /  
item   ami
(hat)  (l)
```
We shall refer to this analysis as the 'complex sentence' analysis. In Efik, however, there are strong reasons against the 'complex sentence' analysis of possessive NPs such as udeme esie, udeme mmi, etc., as we shall see presently. Since the grammatical function of possessive pronouns such as esie, mmi, etc. is similar to that of determiner, our derivation of possessive NPs will have to take this into account. For our purposes, we will call NPs such as udeme esie, qwed ata (Ata's book) possessive NPs. In Efik, the possessor, for example, esie, Ata, follows the thing possessed, such as udeme, qwed in the phrases udeme esie and qwed Ata.

We will present facts and arguments against the 'complex sentence' analysis of possessive NPs. Consider the following examples:

(3)a. eyip qwed Ata: 'A thief has stolen Ata's book'

(3)b. eyip qwed emi Ata enyenede: 'A thief has stolen the book which Ata has'

(4)a. Bassey imaha ndi esie: 'Bassey doesn't like his children'

(4)b. Bassey imaha ndi emi enye enyenede

'Bassey doesn't like the children which he has'

(5)a. Ekpat nnyin oro ed emi: 'That bag of ours is this'

(5)b. Ekpat oro emi nnyin inyenede edi emi: 'The bag which we have is this'

First there is the problem of the grammatical status of (3b) and (5b), which are questionable and ungrammatical respectively. The fact that the complex sentence paraphrases of the possessive sentences of (3)-(5) kind vary in grammaticality is a strong case against deriving such possessive sentences from such complex sentences. Secondly, even in cases where the complex sentences are grammatical, there is a semantic problem, for (4a) and (4b), for example, are not paraphrases as such, as /
as those who favour this kind of analysis would wish. For while (4a) merely states the fact that Bassey does not love his children, (4b) carries the implication that he does love other children, even if he does not love his own children. Similarly, even if (5b) were grammatical, I am not at all sure whether it is semantically equivalent to (3a).

Next, consider the following examples, which pose semantic problems of different sorts:

(6a). Ke mbi p ufok mmi: 'I am building my house'
(6b). Ke mbi p ufok emi nyenede: 'I am building a house which I have'
(7a). Ata oyom ndidep moto esie: 'Ata wants to buy his car'
(7b). Ata oyom ndidep moto emi enye enyenede: 'Ata wants to buy the car he has'
(8a). Mm. ikwe ubok utom mm. : 'They haven't found their occupations'
(8b). Mm. ikwe ubok utom emi mm. enyenede: 'They haven't found the occupations they have'

Although (6b), (7b) and (8b) are syntactically well-formed, they are semantically anomalous, for ufok (house), moto and ubok utom (occupation) are 'owned' even though they do not in fact exist. (8b) is particularly problematic because of the apparent contradiction there – they have not yet found occupations and yet they 'have' them. However, these are problems for those who favour the 'complex sentence' derivation of possessive NPs.

Syntactically, there are also convincing reasons against the complex sentence analysis. Consider personal names for example, as in (9):
(9a). Arit Inyang
(9b). Ime Akpan

which in fact mean the following respectively: Inyang's Arit and Akpan's Ime. Support for this claim comes from such questions and answers as those in (10):
(10a)
Note similar structure with personal names, thus (11):

(11)b. Ime anie? (whose Ime?) : ans. Akpan

Observe that the order of these personal names is the same as for the ordinary possessive NPs; the possessor follows the possessed. If personal names of the kind in (9) could be regarded as possessive NPs of some sort, it would be simply ludicrous to derive them from such strings as (12):

(12)a. *Arit emi Inyang enyenede: 'Arit which Inyang has'
(12)b. *Ime emi Akpan enyenede: 'Ime which Akpan has'

Perhaps the strongest cases against the derivation of possessive NPs from complex sentences with an embedded relative S with nyene (have) can be seen from the following examples. First consider (13):

(13)a. Effiong enyene moto: 'Effiong has a car'
(13)b. Effiong enyene moto esie: 'Effiong has his own car'

where both nyene, which according to the 'complex sentence' analysis is supposed to be the source of possession, and a possessive pronoun occur together. If nyene is the source of possession, then (13b) should be paraphrasable as (14):

(14)*Effiong enyene moto emi enye enyenede: 'Effiong has a car which he has'

(14) shows that although nyene may be a source of possession, it is certainly not the case that all possessive cases are derived from the nyene source.

Second, consider the following:

(15)a. Bassey okut Okun enyn fo: 'Bassey has seen your sgn's wife'

If the 'Complex sentence' analysis is correct, then (15a) should be paraphrasable as (15b) and derived from it:

(15)b. /
Not only is (15b) very ungrammatical but it is also semantically anomalous, since it means both the son and father have the same wife.

Third, the ungrammaticality of (16a) is very significant:

(16)a. *eka Ime ama oyom enye : 'Ime's mother wanted him'

The ungrammaticality of the above sentence is easily accounted for by the fact that as a simplex the structure underlying it does not qualify as a proper analysis for simple pronominalization, which as we saw in Chapter Six occurs only in complex and conjoined structures. If the structure underlying (16a) is a simple structure, then it cannot also be a complex structure. In other words, eka Ime (Ime's mother) is not in fact derived from a sentential source. Incidentally, the way to save (16a) is not to pronominalize the object of the sentence which is Ime in the deep structure, as the grammaticality of (16b) shows:

(16)b. Eka Ime ama oyom Ime : 'Ime's mother wanted Ime'

Finally, from a general linguistic point of view, Lyons (1968:391-395) has argued that an analysis which derives possessive phrases such as John's book from an underlying source in which the possessor noun like John's is the deep subject and the verb have is a deep structure verb is incorrect:

"In most of the transformational accounts of English syntax so far published, it has been assumed that phrases like John's book are to be derived from an underlying structure in which the 'possessive' noun is the subject of the verb 'have': in other words, it is assumed that have is a deep structure verb (like read, etc.), which differs, however, from the majority of transitive verbs in that (in possessive sentences) it cannot undergo the passive transformation (*A book is had by John). There are many reasons for /
for believing that this account of the relationship between 'have sentences' and possessive phrases is incorrect" (p.391).

In our analysis have or nyene in Efik is not in fact a deep structure verb but is transformationally introduced (cf.2.11).

Interestingly Lyons has shown, in support of his position, that expressions such as John's above is a kind of adjective. But an adjective is a noun modifier. Although in Efik, expressions such as Ime in the phrase ska Ime (Ime's mother) is not adjectival in function and syntax, it certainly acts as a noun modifier, as we will show presently.

Enough has been given to show that there are very grave problems if one wishes to derive possessive sentences from complex sentences containing embedded relative clauses with nyene. The question then is, how best can they be derived? As already hinted above, we now propose that possessive NPs be derived in the base with the possessor NP as a constituent of the determiner system by the following expansion rule of the base

(i) NP → N Det
(ii) Det → NOM ART
(iii) NOM → NP

The possessor NP will be dominated by the NOM of the Det. Given a possessive NP like ebe esie (her husband), the structure would look like 16c

```
  NP
   /  
  N   Det
   /    
  NOM  ART
   /    
  NP'  
     /  
    ebe enye
```

The /
251.

The analysis of possessive NPs as part of the determiner is justified on both syntactic and semantic grounds. There are two kinds of noun modifiers in Efik, namely pre-modifiers like quantifiers and wh-question words, and post modifiers like demonstratives, the definite article and numerals, which together constitute the determiner system. Since the possessor NP is a post-nominal modifier it seems appropriate that it should also be part of the determiner system. Observe, for example, that (17a) parallels (17b):

(17)  

(17a)  

\[
\text{\textit{John's book}}
\]

(17b)  

\[
\text{\textit{Bassey's book}}
\]

It is not only in Efik that possessor NPs behave like nominal modifiers. In English, as shown above, Lyons has shown that NPs like John's is adjectival in function in the phrase John's book. On the other hand, Postal (1966) has argued that elements such as my, our, him in myself, ourselves and himself respectively "are of course articles, definite articles, in fact genitive type definite articles".

Semantically, the possessor NP, like the demonstrative or article, appears to definitize the NP in which it occurs. Thus, in (18), for example, where only definite NPs can occur in the subject position, a possessive NP occurs as a subject:

(18)a.  

\[
\text{\textit{Okon's son likes to be very arrogant}}
\]

(18)b.  

\[
\text{\textit{That child likes to be very arrogant}}
\]

(18)c.  

\[
\text{\textit{Ata likes to be very arrogant}}
\]

(18)d.  

\[
\text{\textit{A child likes to be very arrogant}}
\]
7.2 Compound Nominals:

As we have seen above, a possessive NP is a complex N\(_r\), by which I mean an N\(_r\) dominating another N\(_r\) (or other N\(_Ps\)). There are some nominals which look like possessive N\(_Ps\) and we wish to examine whether they do in fact qualify as possessive cases. Consider the following examples:

(19)a. eto \(\gamma\)\(_w\) : 'A stick for writing' (i.e. a pen)
(19)b. Okpokoro udia : 'A table for eating'
(19)c. Ufok \(\beta\)k : 'A house for medicine'

Syntactically, the N\(_Ps\) in (19) look like possessive N\(_Ps\); there is a preceding and a following nominal in each case, just as in the possessive case. However, as even the English glosses show, there is no basis for a possessive interpretation of these N\(_Ps\), from a semantic point of view. These N\(_Ps\) characteristically involve instrumentality or purpose; thus eto \(\gamma\)\(_w\) is a stick used for writing, or a stick for the purpose of writing. A possessive gloss like a book's stick for eto \(\gamma\)\(_w\) is clearly unacceptable. Similarly, an instrumental gloss for a possessive NP like even Bassey (Bassey's child) would be clearly unacceptable. Thus a child used for Bassey is clearly not a gloss for even Bassey.

There are also syntactic differences between the N\(_Ps\) in (19) and possessive N\(_Ps\). While the N\(_Ps\) in (19) may allow the plural morpheme mme, some possessive N\(_Ps\) do not, as (20) and (21) respectively show:

(20)a. Mme eto \(\gamma\)\(_w\) : 'Pens'
(20)b. Mme okpokoro udia : 'Dining tables'
(20)c. Mme ufok \(\beta\)k : 'Hospitals'

(21)a. *Mme \(\gamma\)\(_w\) Odok : 'Okon's books'
(21)b. *Mme ekpa\(\prime\)\(_e\)\(_n\) oro : 'The boy's bag'
(21)c. *Mme bia nnyin : 'Our yams'

However, mme ete ndi\(_t\)\(_o\) oro (the fathers of those children) and mme ebe iban oro (those women's husbands) are grammatical, where both N\(_Ps\) are [+Human]/
It should be noted that in (21), although the possessors are human, the things possessed are inanimate.

Secondly, while a possessive NP like *ekpat Bassey emi* is structurally ambiguous, as the phrase markers in (22) show, an NP such as *eto qwed emi* (this pen) is not:

22a underlies the interpretation *This bag of Bassey*, while 22b underlies the interpretation *A bag of this Bassey*.

Therefore, such NPs as *eto qwed*, *uf-k ib-k*, *okpokoro udia* are not possessive, though they look like such NPs in form. Rather one may regard them as such English compounds as *night show*, *play group*, *baby sitter*, etc. We suggest therefore they be analysed as compounds. We shall not attempt the analysis of compounds. Langacker (1972:77) suggests that for such compounds as *armchair*, *rattlesnake*, etc. this rule will work:

"The meaning $N_1$ with $N_2$ can be expressed by a compound of the form $N_2\,N_1$." 

In Efik, however, the meaning $N_1$ for $N_2$ can be expressed by a compound of the form $N_1\,N_2$. For example, *qwed ikwọ* (a book for songs) and *mbre* (a thing for play).

Finally /
Finally, on the differences between possessive NPs and compounds, observe that the former are a 'conjunction' of NPs, if I may be permitted to use this expression in a rather special sense, whereas the latter are a 'conjunction' of Ns. This follows from our observation that whereas NPs like *ekpat Bassey emi* are structurally ambiguous, Ns like *ufok wed emi* (this school) are not.

7.3 Formulation of Possessive Pronominalization:
We shall now turn to the central concern of this Chapter, namely the formulation of possessive pronominalization, which we shall sometimes refer to as the possessive rule. Let us begin with a simple sentence and see how this rule operates. Consider (23), for example:

(23) *Ime eyenyam wed esie: 'Ime will sell his book'*

(23) is structured as 24a, omitting details:

```
   S   
     /   
   VP  
     /   
   VB  
     /   
 NP  
     /   
   N   
     /   
  DEN 
    /   
wed 
```

The possessive rule will apply to a configuration like 24a provided:

(i) $NP_1$ and $NP_3$ are coreferential,
(ii) $NP_3$ is immediately preceded by an N,
(iii) The N that immediately precedes $NP_3$ must be the head noun of the Det that dominates $NP_3$.

Let us suppose for the moment that the above conditions are not only necessary but also sufficient for the application of the possessive rule.
rule. But do these conditions guarantee that in a phrase marker like 24a above, it is possessive pronominalization and not reflexivization that applies, since 24a is a simplex?

We will answer this question by comparing a proper analysis for reflexivization such as the phrase marker in 24b with 24a:

As we have already seen, reflexivization will apply to 24b if NP₁ and NP₂, which are subject and object respectively in a simplex, are coreferential.

Doubtless, 24a and 24b are similar. But they also differ, in fact in a non-trivial way. Observe that in 24b NP₂, which is identical with NP₁, is the object of the simplex (being immediately dominated by the VP), whereas in 24a NP₃, which is identical with NP₁, is not object as such. It is only part of the object NP₁, NP₂ (which is immediately dominated by the VP). Clearly 24a is not a proper analysis for reflexivization and the conditions for the application of the possessive rule seem to recognize this. So given the phrase marker such as 24a and the conditions for the application of possessive pronominalization as spelled out above, reflexivization on such a phrase marker is ruled out. Observe that the conditions for possessive pronominalization make no mention of the simplex condition and although coreference is one of the conditions, it is not required that this must hold between the subject and object in a phrase marker such as 24a. However, possessive pronominalization is/
is blocked if the NP for this rule is part of the subject, as (25) show:

(25)a. *Ukuk esie akabiat bassey ibuot: 'His money made Bassey arrogant' 
(25)b. *Eyen esie ma2ebine ete oro: 'His son joined the man'

Apparently the constraint on backward pronominalization is violated here (cf.6.1.3).

However, it does seem as if this constraint does not affect (26) below:

(26)a. Okuk esie ke Bassey abiat: 'it is his money that Bassey has wasted'
(26)b. Eyen esie ke ete oro ekebine: 'It is his son that the man joined'

However (26) are derived from (27):

(27)a. Bassey akabiat okuk esie: 'Bassey wasted his money'  
(27)b. Ete oro ekebine eyen esie: 'The man joined his son'

where the pronoun follows the antecedent, in obedience to the constraint.

Since (26) and (27) are paraphrases and since Efik is a SVO (Subject Verb Object) language, okuk esie and even esie in (26) must have been moved to the front (from their object positions) by a transformation which we would like to refer to as Topicalization.

In Efik it seems, therefore, the constraint that does not permit a pronoun to precede the nominal expression to which it refers in a simplex is operative at the time the possessive rule is ready to apply. There is evidence too that this is also true of reflexivization, since (28a) is grammatical, and yet the reflexive pronoun clearly precedes the nominal expression Bassey to which it refers.

(28)a. Idem esie ke Bassey otuk: 'It is himself that Bassey has cheated' 
As in (26), the reflexive pronoun idem esie must have been moved to the front from its object position (at which time it obeyed the constraint) by the topicalization transformation, as seems clear from (28b), from which (28a) is derived:

(28)b. /
If the constraint on examples such as (26), where the following NP in each case is \([-\text{Pro}]\), is operative at the time possessive pronominalization is ready to apply, it is not operative at all if the following NP is itself a Pronoun, as (29) are perfectly grammatical:

(29)a. Efe mi oygem mi : 'My father wants me'
(29)b. \(\text{ye} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{fi} \) : 'Your wife loves you'
(29)c. Eyen esie okot enye : 'His son has called him'

Let us now return to the application of possessive transformation, having seen the sort of configuration on which it operates and the conditions for its operation. Given the phrase marker 24a and the fulfilment of the conditions for possessive pronominalization, the rule will apply marking the feature \([+\text{Pro}]\) and \([+\text{Pos}]\) (Possessive) on the NP which is dominated by Det. If this NP is already \([-\text{Pro}]\), the rule will simply mark \([+\text{Pos}]\). In the case of 24a, the NP will later be realised as esie. In this way (23) will be generated.

Next, let us take an example which involves both possessive pronominalization and reflexivization. Let us consider (30):

(30). \(\text{Ata \ ekpep idem esie, } \text{yed ye okuk esie}
\)

'Ata put himself through school with his money'

Underlying (30) is 31a:
31a is a proper analysis for both reflexivization and possessive pronominalization. The question is, which of these two precedes the other? Since reflexivization is limited to the simplex and possessive pronominalization is not, as we will see presently, we will assume that reflexivization precedes possessive pronominalization. Since NP₁ and NP₂ are coreferential and the former is subject while the latter is object, and since they are both within a simplex, reflexivization will operate on NP₂ to generate (31b):

(31)b. Ata ekpep idem esie ṣwed ye okuk Ata
    'Ata has put himself through school with Ata's money'

When the possessive rule applies - all the conditions for application having been fulfilled - NP₅ will be realised as esie and (30) thus generated.

So far we have been looking at possessive pronominalization in a simplex. Now consider (32), which is a complex sentence:

(32) Arit oyom nnyin ikpeme eyen esie: 'Arit wants you to mind her baby'

underlying (32) is 33a:

```
S
  /\  
NP₁/V
  |   |
 VB S
  |   |
 NP₂/V
  |   |
 VB S
  |   |
 N  NP₃
    |   |
    N  DCT
    |   |
    N  NOM

Arit oyom nnyin ikpeme eyen NP₄/V
33a. Arit
```

33a fulfils all the conditions for the application of the possessive rule:

(1) /
(1) there are two coreferent Ns (N₁ and NP₄);
(2) one of the coreferent Ns, NP₄, is immediately preceded by an N and dominated by a Det;
(3) the N that immediately precedes NP₄ is a left sister of the Det that dominates the same NP.

33a is therefore a proper analysis for possessive pronominalization and when the rule applies (32) is generated. So possessive pronominalization applies in both simplexes and complexes, provided the conditions are met.

Backward possessive pronominalization is not permissible even in environments where backward simple pronominalization is allowed. Thus (34a) is ungrammatical:

(34)a. *dieke eyen esie edide, nnyesian Bassey₁
    ₁   ₂
    'if his son comes, 1 will tell Bassey'

where esie refers to Bassey. Of course (34b) is grammatical, where possessive pronominalization must have taken place in a forward direction:

(34)b. nnyesian Bassey dieke eyen esie edide
    ₁
    ₂
    '1 will tell Bassey, if his son comes'

In fact, it seems to be the case that backward possessive pronominalization is not allowed whether in a simplex or complex. Recall that even in (26), at the time the rule applied, it applied in a forward direction. It was a later rule, Topicalization, which moved the objects, of which the possessive pronouns happen to be a part, forward. It is only in (29), where the following coreferent NP is itself a pronoun that possessive pronominalization is apparently seen to have taken place in a backward direction.

7.4 Possessive Pronominalization and Im:

As we pointed out in Chapter Six, Im contrasts not only with personal pronouns /
pronouns (second and third persons) but also with possessive pronouns. Consider (35), for example:

(35)a. Effiong 2-ete in> eyip 'wed im>
   'Effiong said that a thief has stolen his book'

(35)b. Mbufo 2>ete in> eyip 'wed mmim>
   'You said that a thief has stolen your books'

Let us take (35a) for example. According to the Direct Discourse analysis the source of \textit{im2} is the first person and (35a) is structured as 36a below:

\[
\text{S} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Effiong} \quad \text{doh} > \quad \text{in} > \quad \text{eyip} \quad \text{wed} \quad \text{im2} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{S} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{ami}
\]

According to the Coreference Principle in Direct Discourse, \textit{ami} will be marked coreferential with \textit{Effiong}, since \textit{ami} is first person and \textit{Effiong} is not only subject in a matrix clause but also \textit{< Human}. The Indirect Discourse Formation transformation can now operate on 36a and after this operation \textit{ami} is realised as \textit{im2}. When finally the complementizer rule applies, (35a) will be generated. So like the non-possessive \textit{im2}, which is not derived by ordinary simple pronominalization possessive \textit{im2} is not derived by the ordinary possessive rule.

7.5 Possessive Pronominalization and Intensification: Sometimes it becomes necessary to assert or 'intensify' possession or ownership /
ownership. Consider, for example, the following sentences:

(36)a. Bassey oyom ebua esie \(\_1\) 'Bassey wants his own dog'(not anyone else's)
(36)b. Nnyom redio okim \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) 'I want my own radio'(not anyone else's)
(36)c. Emekpe okuk okjo \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) ?:'Have you paid your own money?'

Observe that with intensification, the first and second person possessives \(\_1\) and \(\_1\) respectively change in form. Thus (37) are ungrammatical:

(37)a. \(*\_1\) Nnyom radio \(\_1\) mmi \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) ':I want my own radio'
(37)b. \(*\_1\) Emekpe okuk fo \(\_1\) mmi \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) ?:'Have you paid your own money?'

There are other restrictions on the use of the intensifier \(\_1\). First it does not occur with plural possessives, as (38) show:

(38)a. \(*\_1\) Mm\(\_1\) eyom redio \(\_1\) \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) ':'They want their own radios'
(38)b. \(*\_1\) Nnyin iyom ebua \(\_1\) mmi \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) ':'We want our own dogs'
(38)c. \(*\_1\) Mbufo eyom \(\_1\) [wed \(\_1\) mbufo \(\_1\) mm\(\_1\) ]:'You want your own books'

Second, \(\_1\) does not occur with \(\_1\). Thus (39) is ungrammatical:

(39)*Ata \(\_1\) \(\_1\) \(\_1\) ete ebua \(\_1\) \(\_1\) \(\_1\) mmi \(\_1\) osop:'Ata says his own dog is lost'

When sentences such as (36) come to be generated, as we will do presently, the ungrammaticality of (38) can be accounted for presumably by a condition that allows only singular possessive NPs to be intensified.

However (39) is a problem, for if (40) is a paraphrase of this example:

(40) Ata \(\_1\) \(\_1\), \(\_1\) \(\_1\) 'ebua okim \(\_1\) mmi \(\_1\) osop:'Ata says, 'my own dog is lost' it is difficult to understand the ungrammaticality of (39).

Now, how do we generate sentences like (36)? Since they involve emphasis, we suggest that \(\_1\) should be expanded to include an obligatory \(\_1\) and an optional EMPH thus:

\[\text{NOM} \rightarrow \text{NP (EMPH)}\]

The structure for \(\text{radio okim mmi}\) for example, would look like (41)
In order to prevent the intensification of plural possessor NPs such as mm\text{l}, nnyin and mbufo, we will require not a condition for intensification as such, but a well-formedness condition for the phrase marker which is to be input to the intensification of a possessor NP. Thus given 41, the well-formedness condition, or constraint will have to say that it is a proper analysis for the intensification of the possessor NP just in case the possessor NP itself is [+Singular]. In this way the strings in (38) become automatically ungrammatical, because there are no well-formed phrase markers underlying them, the possessor NPs being plural.

The string in (39) cannot, however, be handled in this way. For (40) underlying it is well-formed and grammatical, as we have already pointed out. It seems to us in this instance, we need a surface structure constraint that will characterise as ungrammatical any string in which int and the intensifier occur together.

Let us now try to derive a sentence involving possessive pronominalization and the intensification of the possessor NP. Let us take (36a) for example, which is structured like 42a below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP}_1 c \\
\text{+Sing} \\
\text{Vb} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{DET} \\
\text{NUM} \\
\text{NP}_3 \text{[+Sing]} \\
\text{INT} \\
\text{Bassey oyom ebu} \\
\text{42a. Bassey}
\end{array}
\]

Let us begin with intensification. As the possessor NP \(-\text{NP}_2 \)- is singular, 42a is a proper analysis for the intensification of this NP. When this rule applies \text{mm}\text{l} will be introduced, since the EMPH that dominates /
dominates \( IN' \) is itself dominated by \( w0m \), not by an \( \bar{w} \) (as in the case of the intensifier \( ke \text{idem esie} \), for example). The application of the intensification rule generates (42b) below:

(42b) *Bassey oyom ebua Bassey mm\(\dot{m}n\) : 'Bassey wants Bassey's own dog'

Since (42a) is also a proper analysis for possessive pronominalization, the rule will apply and (36a), repeated below, will be generated:

(36a) Bassey oyom ebua esie mm\(\dot{m}n\) : 'Bassey wants his own dog'

We should perhaps add that in a phrase marker such as (42a), if \( NP_3 \) were \([+I]\) or \([+II]\), then the possessive form would be realised not as the regular forms mm\(\dot{m}i\) and fo respectively, but as okim and okuo respectively, because of the presence of the intensifier mm\(\dot{m}n\). Recall that we pointed out above that mm\(\dot{m}n\) does not co-occur with either mm\(\dot{m}i\) or fo, hence the ungrammaticality of (37). The fact that the form of the possessive pronoun of the first and second persons (singular) is determined by the presence of the intensifier mm\(\dot{m}n\) indicates that the intensification rule that introduces mm\(\dot{m}n\) should precede possessive pronominalization.

7.6 N Replacement in a Possessive NP:

It would be inappropriate to call the rule we wish to talk about a kind of pronominalization. Pronominalization in all its ramifications operates on NPs, not Ns. On the other hand, the phenomenon we are going to talk about replaces not NPs but Ns in a complex NP, as our analysis will show later. Such a replacement as far as is known takes place in sentences with conjoined NPs and equative sentences. Consider the following for example:

(43a) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textoldstylenum{4}}} \text{\textoldstylenum{5}}} \) \text{\textoldstylenum{1} Effiong yj eke Bassey enm utom} \\
    'Effiong's wife and that of Bassey are working'

(43b) \( \text{\textoldstylenum{1} \text{\textoldstylenum{2} \text{\textoldstylenum{3}}} \text{\textoldstylenum{4}}} \text{\textoldstylenum{5}} \text{\textoldstylenum{1} ebua emi ejji eke Ata} : 'This dog is that of Ata'

(43a) /
(43a) and (43b) are paraphrases of (44a) and (44b), from which they are derived:

(44)a. \( \text{\textswab{wan Effiong ye \textswab{wan Bassey enam utom} 'Effiong's wife and Bassey's wife are working} \)

(44)b. \( \text{\textswab{bua emi edi abua Ata} 'This dog is Ata's dog} \)

To understand how (43) is derived from (44) let us see how (44) themselves are structured in the base. Omitting details that are not relevant (44) are structured as 45:

First let us look at 45a and see how N Deletion works in that phrase marker, where a co-ordinate NP (NP\(_1\)) dominates two possessive NPs.

Although the two possessive NPs dominate two identical Ns (in form though), the two Ns are not coreferential. The condition for the application /
application of N Deletion in a co-ordinate NP like $N_1$ then seems to be that the two Ns must each be a sister adjunct of a Det that dominates another NP (i.e. the two NPs must each be the things possessed). If this condition is fulfilled, as in 45a, then the N on the right is replaced by the morpheme eke. In this way (43a) is generated.

No backward replacement of such an N is allowed, as (46) is ungrammatical, where there is a backward replacement of N:

(46) $\text{Name Effiong ye } f\text{wan Bassey enam utom}$

'That of Effiong and Bassey's wife are working'

Let us now turn to the phrase marker in 45b. Here the two NPs containing the identical Ns are themselves coreferential; ebua emi and ebua Ata are one and the same thing. However, although ebua Ata is possessive, ebua emi is not. So in a structure like 45b, the N replacement rule requires that the NPs that dominate each identical N be themselves coreferential. In addition, the coreferent NP on the right must be possessive. When the rule applies, again the N on the right is replaced by eke to generate (43b). Observe that if the NP on the right is not possessive ungrammaticality results, were the rule to apply, as (47a) shows:

(47a) *$\text{Name Okon ede eke emi : ' Okon's book is that of this'}$

underlying (47a) of course is (47b):

(47b) $\text{Name Okon ede Name emi : ' Okon's book is this book'}$

It seems clear from all these that whether in a structure like 45a or 45b, the NP whose N is replaced by eke is the possessive NP. Now that we have seen that the N of a possessive NP may be replaced by the morpheme eke, is it the case that okim and okup which we saw above are in fact derived from eke mmi (that of me) and eke fo (that of you) respectively? It is tempting to think so. But consider the facts.
First, as we have seen above, eke replaces the N only in certain structures, namely, those like 45a with co-ordinate Ns with identical Ns, or those like 45b which underlie 'equative' sentences. Again the existence of identical Ns is necessary. But the occurrences of okim and okuo are not limited to such structures only. Consider the following, for example:

(48)a. Enye oyom okuk okim : 'He wants my own money'

(48)b. Enye oyom okuk okuo : 'He wants your own money'

Note that eke mmi and eke fo cannot replace okim and okuo respectively in (48) as (49) are ungrammatical:

(49)a. *Enye oyom okuk eke mmi : 'He wants money that of me'

(49)b. *Enye oyom okuk eke fo : 'He wants money that of you'

In fact the function of eke is precisely to replace an N. So it is not surprising that it does not co-occur with the very N it is supposed to replace. Clearly okim and okuo must be regarded as variants of mmi and fo, as has been explained above.

Secondly, okim and okuo are not synonymous with eke mmi and eke fo. Okim and okuo whose occurrences are determined by the presence of INT in the base as shown above mean my own and your own respectively, whereas eke mmi and eke fo mean that of me and that of you. Thus we have (50a) and (50b), for example:

(50)a. Nnyom moto okim : 'I want my own car'

(50)b. Nnyom moto fo ye eke mmi : 'I want your car and that of me'

Note that (48) above are synonymous with (51) below:

(51)a. Enye oyom okuk okim mmm : 'He wants my own money'

(51)b. Enye oyom okuk okuo mmm : 'He wants your own money'

To summarise, we have presented a number of facts and arguments to show why the 'complex sentence' derivation of possessive NPs must be rejected.
In addition, we have shown that

(a) possessive pronominalization applies both in a simplex and a complex, given the relevant conditions;

(b) like non-possessive im[^2], the source of possessive im[^3] is the first person;

(c) the intensification of a possessor NP is limited to singular possessor N[^s];

(d) subject to certain conditions, the N of a possessive NP may be replaced by the morpheme eke.
8.0 Introduction:

Like simple pronominalization, relativization in Efik relates one NP to another outside its own clause. Relativization, like simple pronominalization, therefore, takes place only in a complex structure. However, while a personal, or simple, pronoun in a surface sentence may or may not be anaphoric, a relative pronoun is always anaphoric. Thus like a reflexive pronoun, the NP to which a relative pronoun refers is never in doubt in Efik, as will become apparent as we go on.

As we have done in other pronominalization processes, we will attempt to explore and explain the facts of relativization. It will be shown that some of those facts can be better explained by the Noun Phrase Accessibility hypothesis proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1972).

8.1 Relative Pronouns:

As we have already seen in Chapter Four, the following are, or can be used as, relative pronouns: emi, eke and se as in (1):

(1)a. Oyo emi Arit amade iyhe: 'The man Arit loves is not handsome'

(1)b. Ndite eke mi ghaha ntre ekpo: 'Children who don't like it so should leave'

(1)c. Okuk se Ate b'ge ike ike enye

'The money that Ate receives isn't enough for him'

We have said above "can be used as relative pronouns", because emi may be used, or is primarily used as, a demonstrative, while eke may be used as a Wh-question marker.

The commonest or most often used of these pronouns is emi, thus eke and se in (1b) and (1c) respectively may be replaced by emi as (2) show:

(2)a /
In fact, at least in my own dialect, (2) are preferred to (1b) and (1c) though the latter are undoubtedly grammatical.

The selection of eke and se depends to some extent on the nature of the antecedent. In general, an antecedent that is indefinite as well as non-specific may select eke as a relative pronoun in the relative clause, thus we have (3):

(3)a. òwo ẹke abiatde mbet emi eyeduk ntìme
'Anybody who breaks this regulation will get into trouble'

(3)b. Sìan Bassey ete enye edep ọwed eke enye amade
'Tell Bassey to buy any book that he likes'

As seems clear from these examples, neither òwo nor ọwed refers to a specific person or book. For example, in (3a), there is no specific person who will get into trouble; it is anybody who breaks the regulation. Similarly, in (3b), Bassey is supposed to buy any book at all, provided he likes it. As can be seen animacy or inanimacy is irrelevant here. Eke is of course replaceable by emi in (3), as (4) are synonymous with (3):

(4)a. òwo emi abiatde mbet emi eyeduk ntìme
'Anybody who breaks this regulation will get into trouble'

(4)b. Sìan Bassey ete enye edep ọwed emi enye amade
'Tell Bassey to buy any book that he likes'

The selection of se is, however, less straightforward. In general, the antecedent is inanimate but occasionally animate NPs do also occur as antecedents of se, as (5c) shows:

(5)a. Mmaha ọkpọ se Ime amade: 'I don't like the thing that Ime has done'

(5)b. Sìan Bassey ete enye edep ọwed se enye amade
'Tell Bassey to buy the/any book that he likes'

(5)c.
It could be said that in general the antecedent of se is the kind of N that which accepts the morpheme uta (kind) as (5) are paraphrasable as (6):

(6a) mamaha uta nkpo se Ime anamde: 'I don't like the kind of thing Ime has done'
(6b) Sian Bassey ete enye edep uta jwed se enye amade
    'Tell Bassey to buy the kind of book that he likes'
(6c) Mbufo eyekut uta ebe se enye edidide
    'You will see the kind of husband she will marry'

Even so, se in both (5) and (6) are replaceable by emi, as (7) and (8) show:

(7a) mamaha nkpo emi Ime anamde: 'I don't like the thing that Ime has done'
(7b) Sian Bassey ete enye edep jwed emi enye amade
    'Tell Bassey to buy the book that he likes'
(7c) Mbufo eyekut ebe emi enye edidide
    'You will see the husband that she will marry'
(8a) mamaha uta nkpo emi Ime anamde: 'I don't like the kind of thing Ime has done'
(8b) Sian Bassey ete enye edep uta jwed emi enye amade
    'Tell Bassey to buy the kind of book that he likes'
(8c) Mbufo eyekut uta ebe emi enye edidide
    'You will see the kind of husband that she will marry'

So in actual fact, there is no environment in which either se or eke occurs and from which emi is excluded.

In English a relative pronoun which is the direct object of its relative clause is deletable. In Efik all relative pronouns are deletable, irrespective of function. Thus (9a) and (9b) in which the relative pronoun is subject and object respectively, are synonymous with (10a) and (10b) respectively:

(9a) Nnyin imekut akparawa emi ekefede
    'We have seen the young man who escaped'
(9b) /
In certain contexts instead of the relative pronoun, it is the antecedent which is deleted. Thus we have (11a) and (11b):

(11)a. Nyin emi afo anamde ke idem fo: 'I want the one you made yourself'
(11)b. Efe miko pe item eyeduk ntime

'Who doesn't listen to advice will get into trouble'

where the antecedents ekpo and owo respectively have been deleted as the paraphrases (12a) and (12b) respectively show:

(12)a. Nyom ekpo emi afo anamde ke idem fo
    'I want the thing/one you made yourself'
(12)b. Owo eko miko pe item eyeduk ntime

'A person who doesn't listen to advice will get into trouble'

As it often happens in Efik (cf. the discussion in 2.8.1), antecedents other than the 'place-holders' ekpo and owo may be deleted in contexts where both the speaker and the hearer know precisely what they are talking about.

Since there are no clear grammatical environments for se and eko and since emi occurs in all environments in which they (i.e. se and eko) occur, we will overlook se and eko for our purposes.

8.2.0 Antecedents:

In the following sections, we will consider the kinds of NPs which may or may not act as antecedents of relative pronouns. Except for a few exceptions which will be considered later a great many NPs can act as the antecedent of a relative pronoun.

8.2.1 /
8.2.1 **Grammatical functions:**

The antecedent of a relative pronoun may be the subject or object in its own clause, as in (13a) and (13b) respectively:

(13)a. Effiong emi anamde utom mi edip edifu

\[ \text{The Effiong who works here is lazy} \]

(13)b. Enye imaha utom emi enye anamde

\[ \text{He does not like the work he is doing} \]

The antecedent may also be in the comitative, instrumental or locative case, as in the following examples respectively:

(13)c. \( \text{ime anam utom ye akparawa emi enye amade} \)

\[ \text{ime is working with a young man that he likes} \]

(13)d. \( \text{Wet le\'ta ye pen emi ekedpe} \)

\[ \text{write a letter with the pen that you bought} \]

(13)e. \( \text{Nnyin idu kp\'a ke uyo emi mbufo edyde} \)

\[ \text{We are at the very Uyo where you are} \]

8.2.2 **Features:**

From the standpoint of syntactic features even [Common] (i.e. proper nouns) and [Pro] NPs can act as antecedents, as (13a) above and (13f) below respectively indicate:

(13)f. \( \text{em\'i ekekade Calabar ekerehe: 'Those who went to Calabar escaped} \)

\[ \text{It should be noted that in (13a), the existence of other Effiongs is presupposed (cf. Vendler 1967:39ff).} \]

However the antecedent of a relative pronoun may not be a reflexive pronoun /
pronoun or a demonstrative NP\(^1\), as the ungrammaticality of the following examples show:

(14)a. *Ata anam idem esie emi ekpide

'Ata is harming himself which is small'

(14)b. *Nnyin iyom mm\(\rangle\) enya\(\rangle\) a idem emi mm\(\rangle\) eyomde

'We want them to help themselves which they want'

(15)a. *mmaha akparawa emi emi ayarade itam

'I don't like this young man who wears a hat'

(15)b. *assey oyom eyen oko emi adede ekpere eto

'Bassey wants younger boy who is standing near a tree'

8.2.3 Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses:

There are no non-restrictive clauses in Efik. Thus (13a), as we have already pointed out, implies the existence of other Efiongs and Uyo\(\langle\rangle\) (13c) parallels England in the English sentence "This cannot be the England that I know and love" (Chomsky 1965:217).

Moreover, certain NPs change meaning and become non-unique when they occur as antecedents of relative pronouns. Consider (16) and (17):

(16)a. Mma aka udua: 'Mother has gone to the market'

(16)b. Efe ogu ke Uyo: 'Father is at Uyo'

(17)a. Mma emi nnyomde aka udua: 'The lady that I want has gone to the market'

(17)b. Bassey ikye ete emi odude ke Uyo

'Bassey hasn't seen the man who is at Uyo'

Interpretations /

1. However, the following sentences are grammatical:

(i) Ami emi emi ndude mi \(\langle\rangle\) ndude \(\rangle\) ete oro: 'This I who am here wouldn't marry that man'

(ii) Afo oro emi etide ete ukpenyimeke: 'you there who are there wouldn't agree'

The grammaticality of the above sentences depends on the existence of a locative NP like mi or do and a 'sedentary' verb like ndude (am) and etide (sit), etc., in the embedded clauses.
Interpretations of (17) in which mma and ete still retain their original lexical meanings of mother and father respectively as in (16) are not possible. This is because there is no non-restrictive relative clause in Efik. Thus (18), for example, implies that there are other headmasters, besides the one wanting to see everybody:

(18) Etbom emi oyomde kpu kru o o o du ke Uyo

'The headmaster who wants everybody is at Uyo'

An interpretation in which there is one and only one headmaster is not possible.

However, (19a) appears to indicate that with certain NPs and the verb to be di (be), non-restrictive relative clause formation is possible:

(19)a. Gen. Gowon emi edide andikara Nigeria ama ede mi

'Gen. Gowon who is the Nigerian Head of State came here'

But in fact (19a) is not quite Efik from a stylistic point of view. It is one of the influences of English on Efik and is more likely to be used, if at all, by educated Efiks who speak English than by illiterate Efiks, who do not speak English. Even so, it is not clear to me whether (19a) does not imply the existence of other Gen. Gowons. Moreover, the relative clause in (19a) behaves syntactically like any other restrictive relative clause. For example, it is paraphrasable as (19b):

(19)b. Gen. Gowon edide andikara Nigeria ama ede mi

'Gen. Gowon, who is the Nigerian Head of State came here'

in English, where a clear distinction has been drawn between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses, such a distinction can be expressed in syntactic terms. For instance while the relative pronoun of a restrictive clause may be deleted in some cases, the relative pronoun of a non-restrictive clause is not deletable. In Efik, the relative pronoun in (19a) is deletable, as (19b) shows. Second, in English "non-restrictive /
"non-restrictive relative clauses are not felt to be subordinate to the nouns they occur with, but rather co-ordinate" (Langendoen 1969:93). In Efik, however, there is no way of paraphrasing the relative clause in such sentences as (19a) to show that they are in fact not subordinate clauses but co-ordinate clauses, as can be done in English. Thus (19c) is ungrammatical:

(19)c. *Gen. Gowon ama ede mi, enye onyere ede andikara Nigeria'
   'Gen. Gowon came here, and he is the Nigerian Head of State'

in fact, the subordination of the verb to be di to derive edide, as we will show later, shows that the relative clause is in fact a subordinate clause and not a co-ordinate one, as in English. So we think that examples like (19a) do not provide tangible, if it does provide any evidence at all, to show that Efik allows non-restrictive relative clause formation. 2

Let us return to examples (17) and (18), where a problem appears to arise from relativization. As we noted above, the relativization of mma (mother) and ete (father) changes the meanings of these lexical items, while the relativization of etubom (the headmaster) implies that there are more than one such position in the school. It seems to us that this is a performance problem, since it is only in rather restricted contexts that mma/ete and etubom occur. Ete or mma without any possessive pronouns in general is used by children of the same father or /

2. Smith (1964:248-249) has also shown that the determiners of the antecedents, or what she calls 'containing noun phrases' determine what kind of relative clause may follow. If the antecedent has what she calls an 'Unspecified' determinant, e.g. any, all, etc., then non-restrictive relative clause formation is not allowed. On the other hand, if the NP is 'Unique', i.e. definite without a determiner, only non-restrictive relative clause formation is allowed. Such NPs include proper names. This kind of classification is of course irrelevant to Efik, since as we have seen above, proper names allow restrictive relative clauses just like any ordinary NPs.
or mother, in which case the need for a modifier relative clause does not arise, from the point of view of the participants in the speech act. This is also true of etubom. From the point of view of the teachers and pupils of the school, there is one and only one headmaster, who everybody knows. From their point of view, then, there is no need for a limiting relative clause and once one introduces such a clause, then one also introduces the possibility of the existence of other headmasters in the same school. This is the case with similar NPs like Jb> où (the chief), edidem (the king), etc.

8.3 Restrictions on Relative Pronouns:

In the above section, we considered the restrictions on the NPs that act as antecedents to relative pronouns. In this section, we wish to consider restrictions on relative pronouns as can be determined from surface sentences. Although in Efik relative pronouns occur as subject, object (direct or indirect), prepositional or quasi-verbal NP, and possessor NP, there are some restrictions in some of these positions. Relative pronouns can occur as subject, direct object, indirect object, quasi-verbal NP in their own clauses easily, as (20) show:

\[(20)\text{a. Eyen emi anamde utom mi edí ẹtì owo}\\
\text{ 'The boy who works here is a good person'}\\
\text{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8}\\
\text{b. Akparawa emí nnuyomde idúhe mi: 'The young man that I want is not here'}\\
\text{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8}\\
\text{c. Gkaiferi emí ājà ekeyetde ọlọta ibràke ẹpọye}\\
\text{ 'The girl to whom ājà has written a letter hasn't answered him'}\\
\text{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8}\\
\text{d. Mmikut owo emí Bassey okpónde akan}\\
\text{ 'I have seen a man Bassey is bigger than'}\\
\text{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8}\\
\text{In (20a) emí is the subject of the clause emí anamde utom mi (who works here). In (20b) emí is the direct object of the clause emí nnuyomde (that /}
(that I want). In (20c) \textit{emi} is the indirect object of the clause \textit{emi Ata ekewetde lete} (to whom Ata has written a letter). In (20d) \textit{emi} is the quasi-verbal (QVB) NP of the clause \textit{emi Bassey okponde akan} (that Bassey is bigger than). In all cases, the relative pronoun is at the beginning of its relative clause, irrespective of function. In the case of direct object, indirect object and QVB NP, it will be shown later that these NPs have actually been moved to the front position as part of the relativization process.

However, a relative pronoun does not appear to occur as a comitative NP with a preceding preposition. Thus although we have (21a) there is no (21b):

(21a). \textit{Nkessa\_a ye 2 Okon \_\_ka Uyo : 'I went with Okon to Uyo'}

(21b). \textit{*Okon ye emi \_\_kessa\_ade \_\_ka Uyo okut utom do}

'Okon with whom I went to Uyo has found a job there'

Interestingly enough, although (21b) is ungrammatical (21c) is not:

(21c). \textit{Okon emi \_\_kessa\_ade k\_\_t \_\_ka Uyo okut utom}

'Okon with whom I went to Uyo has found a job'

We will explain the significance of this alternative and all other such alternatives that we will see presently, later.

Next, a locative relative pronoun with a preceding preposition is not allowed. Thus although we have (22a) there is no (22b). But as in the case of (21), (22c) is grammatical:

(22a). \textit{\_\_wed odu \_\_ke okpokoro : 'the book is on the table'}

(22b). \textit{*I\_\_e oyom okpokoro ke emi \_\_wed odude}

'Ime wants the table on which there is a book'

(22c). \textit{I\_\_e oyom okpokoro emi \_\_wed odude: 'I me wants a table on which there is a book'}

Furthermore, an instrumental relative pronoun with a preceding preposition is not allowed. Thus we have (23a) and (23c) but not (23b):

(23a). /
(23)a. Okon adia udia ye ikpa\~n}: 'Okon is eating food with a spoon'

(23)b. *Ikpa\~n ye emi Okon adia de udia ifonke
       'The spoon with which Okon is eating food is not good'

(23)c. Ikpa\~n. emi Okon adia udia ifonke
       'The spoon with which Okon is eating food is not good'

Equally grammatical, and in fact preferable to (23c), is (23d):

(23)d. Ikpa\~n emi Okon adade adia udia ifonke
       'The spoon Okon is using to eat food is not good'

So in Efik, a relative pronoun must not be preceded by a preposition, or any other nominal particle (e.g. a QVB) for that matter. Observe that in (20d), the QVB is left behind while the relative pronoun is moved to the front of the clause. In this aspect, Efik is very much like English.

Finally, let us consider a relative pronoun which is possessive, or shall we say which replaces a possessor NP, as we will see later on. At first sight it looks as if a possessor NP cannot be relativized. Consider the following example:

(24) Akpa\~nawa emi \~wan esie amande eyen okt f\~n
     'The young man who his wife has had a baby has invited you'

where the possessor pronoun esie occurs along with a relative pronoun. Since a relative pronoun in Efik appears to replace the NP which is relativized, then esie could not have been relativized, otherwise it would have been replaced. Clearly, however, emi in the clause emi \~wan esie amande eyen (who his wife has had a baby) is neither subject nor object of this clause. Nor can it be comitative since the verb man (give birth to) does not allow this kind of NP (cf.*\~wan oro aman eyen ye Arit: 'The woman has had a baby with Arit'). Emi as a locative in this example must also be ruled out since in our grammar locatives are dominated by the Adjunct. So it must then be possessive, since possession is /
is involved after all. What has happened in this case, as we will demonstrate in detail later, is that unlike other cases, in relativizing a possessor NP, the NP is retained, nonetheless in the possessive form. As in other cases, the relative pronoun itself is moved to the front of the relative clause closest to the antecedent NP.

8.4 Keenan and Comrie's Accessibility Hierarchy (AH)

In order to explain the facts in 8.3 above, it is necessary to turn to Keenan and Comrie's (1972) Noun Phrase Accessibility to relativization, which is repeated below:

"(i) Subj \rightarrow DO \rightarrow IO \rightarrow O\text{Prep} \rightarrow \text{Poss-NP} \rightarrow O\text{-Comp-Particle}

(ii) if X \not\geq Y and Y dominates Z then X \not\geq Z"

Thus the first part of (i) tells us that subject NPs are easier to relativize than any of the other major constituents of a sentence. In fact in all the languages studied, it was possible to relativize on subjects. We shall call a particular RCF strategy in a given language major if it is used to relativize subject NP. We hypothesize that all languages have at least one major strategy and we note that many languages have more than one major strategy as well as strategies that are not major.

According to the above hypothesis, at least in the forty languages which were studied, if it is possible to relativize into say the O-Comp-Particle position, then it is possible to relativize into all positions left of O-Comp-Particle. In addition, it is part of the Accessibility hypothesis that some languages use various devices or strategies to make accessible to relativization an otherwise inaccessible NP. Although this hypothesis offers an interesting explanation of the facts in section 8.3, it will be necessary to re-order the Accessibility Hierarchy for Efik /
Efik, as seems clear from the examples in section 8.3.

In Efik, as we have shown in the above section, relativization takes place in all the positions along the Aθ. According to the hypothesis, the major strategy, by which the subject in the embedded clause is relativized, deletes the NP_rel position, puts the subordinate relative clause post nominally and introduces the marker or pronoun emi. In addition, what may be referred to as 'subordination marker' is introduced as a suffix of the VB of the subordinate clause. If the tense of this verb is either past or future, then the 'non-neutral' forms of these tenses must be used (cf.2.8.2). This strategy works for the subject, direct object, indirect object, QVB NP (i.e. Keenan & Comrie's O-Comp-Particle), although the direct object, indirect object, and the QVB NP requires an additional movement to the front of the relative clause to immediately follow the antecedent NP. Efik prefers that the relative pronoun immediately follow its antecedent. Where this is not the case at the time of relativization, then the relative NP is moved to the preferred position. Since a relativizable subject NP is at the beginning of the relative clause (Efik is a SVO language) and contiguous with the antecedent NP at the time of relativization, the movement of the relativized NP in this case is unnecessary.

However, Prep-Objects (to use Keenan & Comrie's term), which include locative, instrumental and comitative NPs, and the possessor NP, require, in addition to these 'basic' operations, other operations. Let us begin with the possessor NP, whose relativization is very much like that of the direct object, indirect object and QVB NP. However, there is a difference, namely that the relativizable NP may or may not be deleted even though a relative pronoun is introduced. Thus we have (25a) and (25b) which are synonymous:

(25)a. /
(25)a. Ete emi afo ekpèpde eyen eyen oyom fi

'The man who his son you teach wants you'

(25)b. Ete emi afo ekpèpde eyen oyom fi

'The man who the son you teach wants you'

We will return to this when we consider the actual relativization process. In actual fact, the relativization of a possessor NP does not require an additional operation as such. What happens is that one of the basic operations may or may not be carried out, namely the replacement of the relativized NP with a relative pronoun.

With locative, instrumental and comitative NPs, however, there are additional operations. In all cases, the preposition preceding these NPs are obligatorily deleted. In the comitative case, the morpheme kiet is put in place of the deleted preposition, as we saw in (21c), which is repeated below:

(21)c. Okon emi yesa afo kiet oka uyo okut utom

'Okon with whom I went to Uyo has found a job'

Finally, in the instrumental case there is something similar to the strategy observed for the Bantu language, Luganda. In a preferred alternative to the major strategy, instrumental NPs are moved to the direct object position and the verbal dat (use) is introduced, as we saw in (23d), which we repeat below:

(23)d. ikpa emi Okon adade adia udia ifonke

'The spoon which Okon uses to eat food is not good'

But for this, in Efik the major strategy operates in all the positions with only a few additional operations on NPs with a preceding preposition.

The Major Branch of the A.H. in Efik, then, would look like this

\[
\text{Subj} \Rightarrow \text{DO} \Rightarrow \text{IO} \Rightarrow \text{QVB-NP} \Rightarrow \text{POS-NP} \Rightarrow \text{Prep-NP}
\]

We place the POS-NP lower in the Hierarchy because the relativizable NP may /
may be retained. In the major strategy, which DO, IO and QVB-NP seem to follow, such an NP is obligatorily deleted. However, apart from this, no additional operations are required, unlike the Prep-NP cases, and this is why we place the latter lowest in the Hierarchy.

8.5 Analysis of Relative Sentences:
Let us now turn to the analysis of relative sentences. There are several proposals for the analysis of relative sentences in English. Thompson (1971), for example, has suggested that "the appropriate underlying representation for a relative sentence is a conjunction rather than a sentence embedded into a noun phrase". Recently Schacter (1973) has suggested that relativization, like focus-construction involves the process of promotion and that this is preferable to what he calls 'matching analysis', which is the Aspects type of analysis of relative sentences. We do not intend to take issue with these suggestions and we acknowledge that there are merits in these suggestions. Given the Accessibility hypothesis, however, which we have found to offer a lot of insight into relativization in Efik, it seems to us that the 'matching analysis' naturally offers itself. Since, as we have seen above, there are slight variations in the operation of relativization depending on the functions of the NPs, we wish to consider the application of this rule in accordance with the Am for Efik presented above. Let us begin with the subject position. Consider (26a) which is derived from (26b):

(26)a. ñkajeri epi okoyoande Bassey etem udia

'The girl who was looking for Bassey is cooking food'
For relativization to operate on 26b, the following conditions will have to be fulfilled:

(1) An NP in the matrix S must be coreferential with an NP in the embedded S;

(2) The coreferent NPs are not $\text{+Dem}$.

Since the two conditions are fulfilled, the relativization rule will operate:

(a) marking the features $\text{+Pro}$ and $\text{+Rel}$ on the relativizable NP;

(b) introducing the subordinate marker $\text{de}$ on the subordinate verb;

(c) optionally deleting the Det of the matrix NP, if it is $\text{+Def}$ but obligatorily if $\text{-Def}$.

Later the NP with the transformationally introduced features $\text{+Pro}$ and $\text{+Rel}$ will be realised as $\text{emi}$. In the case of 26b if the Det is not deleted - it is $\text{+Def}$ - (26c) is generated:

(26)c. ọkaiferi oro emi okoyomde Bassey etem udia

'The girl who wanted Bassey is cooking food'

However, the performance preference is to have the Det of the matrix NP deleted. When this is done (26a) is then generated:

(26)a. ọkaiferi emi okoyomde Bassey etem udia

'The girl who wanted Bassey is cooking food'
Next let us consider an example in which the relative pronoun is the direct object, as in (27a):

(27)a. Ndítu emi mbufo emade eyom mbufo

'The children you like are looking for you'

which is structured as 27b:

The application of relativization to an object NP is very much like the application of this rule to a subject NP, except for one thing, namely when the rule applies to an object NP, which is of course separated from its antecedent, as 27b shows, then the rule additionally moves this NP to the front of the relative clause. This movement operation is necessary to prevent the relative clause and its antecedent from being separated at the surface level. Efik demands that the relative pronoun and its antecedent be not separated. Thus (27c) is ungrammatical:

(27)c. *Ndítu oro mbufo emade emi eyom mbufo

'The children you like whom want you'

The movement of emi to the front of the relative clause generates (27d):

(27)d. Ndítu oro emi mbufo emade eyom mbufo

'The children you like are looking for you'

The optional deletion of oro will then generate (27a), which is repeated here /
here for convenience:

(27)a. Ndit٣ emi mbufo emade eyom mbufo

'The children you like are looking for you'

The operation of relativization on indirect object is the same as that on direct object, so we will consider relativization on a QVB NP, which is just lower than the indirect object in the AH. Consider (28a), which is derived from 28b:

(28)a. Ami mmekut oyo emi Arit ekpri de akan

'I have seen someone Arit is smaller than'

There is virtually no difference between the application of relativization on the direct object and the application of the same rule on a QVB NP. As in the case of the direct (and indirect) object, the relativized NP is moved to the front of the relative clause just immediately following the antecedent NP. However, the movement of this NP does not affect the QVB itself, which still remains in its original position. As the Det of the antecedent NP is [-Def], it is obligatorily deleted and (28a) above is then generated.

However /
However, other NPs with a preceding particle do not retain the particle if it is a preposition. Locative NPs with the preposition ke have this deleted and that is the only difference between the relativization of a locative NP and that of the direct or indirect object. However, comitative and instrumental NPs involve additional operations and for this reason we would like to generate them. First, let us consider (29a), which has a comitative NP:

\[
(29)a. \text{Mma emi Etim anagme utom kiet ama egye}
\]

'The lady with whom Etim is working loves him'

(29a) is structured as 29b:

As 29b shows, the NP from which emi in (29a) is derived is preceded by a preposition. When relativization applies in 29b, the rule not only brings the relativized NP to the front of the relative clause itself, but it deletes the Prep and in its place substitutes the morpheme kiet.

The output of these operations would look like 29c:
Next, simple pronominalization will operate on NP₂ by coreference with NP₃ thereby deriving enye from the former. In this way (29a) is generated:

(29)a. ḳma emi Etim anamde utom kiet ama enye

'The lady with whom Etim works loves him'

The operation of relativization on an instrumental NP is very much like that on a locative NP. Since instrumental NPs are preceded by the preposition ve (with) (or ke occasionally), all that relativization does in such cases is to delete the preposition. However, there is another strategy which, as we have mentioned earlier, generates a preferred alternative. Consider (30):

(30)a. ḳma eyom ikaŋ emi Okon okọjopde unam

'They want the gun with which Okon shot the animal'

(30)b. ḳma eyom ikaŋ emi Okon akọjede otop unam

'They want the gun that Okon used to shoot the animal'

Since (30a) and (30b) are paraphrases, we derive them from the same source /
source, namely 3la:

To generate (30a) from (31a) relativization will perform the following operations:

1. Add the features [+Pro] and [+Rel] to NP_5;
2. Delete the Prep ve and move NP_5 to the front of its own clause;
3. Introduce the subordination marker -de on the verb of the relative subordinate clause;
4. Optionally delete the Det of the antecedent NP (i.e. NP_2).

However to generate (30b) from 31a operations (1) and (2) will be performed. But in the case of (3) instead of merely introducing the subordination marker on the verb of the subordinate clause, this simple verb is converted to 'instrumental' form. This operation is not peculiar to Efiko. According to Keenan and Comrie, Luganda uses this strategy to make instrumental NPs accessible to relativization. According to them, "if we convert the simple verb to an 'instrumental' form, it then takes the former instrumental constituent as a direct object—- that is, it moves the instrumental constituent up the AH—and direct objects are accessible to the major strategy in Luganda". Similarly in Efik, after the /
the conversion of the simple verb to an 'instrumental' form, the relative pronoun appears to be the direct object of the 'lexically instrumental' verbal *adade* (used). This similarity between Luganda, a Bantu language, and Efik is striking when one considers Winston's (1970) interesting observations of 'Bantu-like features of Efik Structure'.

Finally let us consider the operation of relativization on a possessor NP. Although it is considered last, the possessor NP is in fact higher on the AH than Prep NPs, as shown above. Let us consider example (24), which is repeated below for easy reference. In our view (24) is structured as 32a:

(24) Akparawa emi esie amande eyen okot fi

'The young man who his wife has had a baby has invited you'

![Diagram](image)

In 32a there are only two occurrences of the NP *akparawa Det*. However, in the surface sentence *emi* and *esie* both refer to *akparawa* and according to our grammar too, anaphoric pronouns such as *emi* and *esie* should each be derived from two full-fledged NPs. Does it then mean that /
that 32a is not correct as an underlying representation of (24)? We think there is nothing to suppose that 32a is an ill-formed source of (24). The fact is NP₅ is in a position in which it can undergo both possessive pronominalization and relativization. This therefore explains why 32a has two coreferent NPs, instead of three, as the surface counterpart in (24) might lead one to suppose. Let us then consider some of the rules required to generate (24) from 32a. Let us assume that possessive pronominalization applies first, since unlike relativization the former can also operate on a simplex. Possessive pronominalization will generate (32b) below:

(32)b. Akparawa wan esie aman eyen okut fi

"The young man his wife has had a baby invites you"

Relativization can now operate on (32b). As we have already pointed out (cf. 8.4), when this rule applies the relativizable NP esie is not obligatorily deleted, unlike in all the cases considered above. It is retained in its original position but the relative pronoun emi is introduced all the same, as in all the other cases. What makes the retention of the relativized NP possible is the feature [\text{Pros}], which is introduced with the application of possessive pronominalization. However, the retention of the relativized possessor NP is optional, since (32c) is not only grammatical, but also an exact paraphrase of (24):

(32)c. Akparawa emi wan amande eyen okot fi

"The young man who his wife has had a baby invites you"

In other words, when relativization operates on a possessor NP, this NP is optionally replaced by the relative pronoun. Thus the difference between the relativization of a possessor NP and the other NPs we have considered is that while the latter are obligatorily replaced by the relative pronoun, the former is optionally replaced.

To recapitulate, relativization in Efik involves a number of operations depending /
depending on the position of the relativizable NP at the time of relativization. In all cases, it is required that the relative pronoun be placed at the beginning of its clause immediately following the antecedent in the matrix clause. Where at the time of relativization this is not the case, the relative pronoun is moved to this position. With locative, instrumental and comitative NPs minor additional operations are necessary. In all three cases the obligatory deletion of the preceding \textit{rep} is required. In the comitative case, however, the preposition is actually replaced by the morpheme \textit{kiet} (which shows togetherness or company). In the instrumental case, there is a preferred performance alternative in which the simple verb of the relative clause is converted to what Keenan and Comrie call 'instrumental' form. The relativization of a possessor NP differs in one respect from the relativization of all the other NPs in that the relativized NP may be retained because of the feature [\textit{+Pos}], introduced by a prior application of possessive pronominalization. Finally, in terms of rule ordering, possessive pronominalization, relativization and simple pronominalization seem to apply in that order. Naturally, reflexivization precedes all of them.
CHAPTER NINE

NP DELETION

9.0 Introduction:
NP deletion has been mentioned at several points in this work, but our
treatment of this operation has been haphazard and unsatisfactory. As
both NP deletion and pronominalization are related, a unified account
of the former is desirable.

9.1 Relationship between Pronominalization and NP Deletion:
One obvious way in which pronominalization and NP deletion are related,
or alike, is that they both operate on NPs. More fundamental, however,
is the fact that at the time some NPs are deleted, fully or partially,
they are in fact pronominal, as we have already seen in the preceding
Chapters. Sometimes, however, an S may be deleted. In that case,
deletion takes place instead of pronominalization, as can be seen from (1):

(1a) keyom Ata ewet fi ede enye imaha ndiwet fi
   "I wanted Ata to write you but he didn't like to write you"

(1b) keyom Ata ewet fi ede enye imaha
   "I wanted Ata to write you but he didn't like it"

(1c) keyom Ata ewet fi ede enye imaha enye
   "I wanted Ata to write you but he didn't like it"

We will return to examples like (1) later.

9.2 General Principle on Deletion:
The general principle on deletion is that the deleted element be recover-
able. Chomsky's (1965:182) 'general principle' for 'erasure operations'
deletions) is therefore designed to ensure recoverability. This prin-
ciple states that

"A term X of the proper analysis can be used to erase a term Y of
the proper analysis just in case the inherent part of the formative X is not distinct from the inherent part of the formative Y".

But this kind of principle is said to be adequate only for deletions which 'have a characteristic identity condition', according to Grinder (1971:184) and will not guarantee recoverability in the case of what he calls a 'Free Deletion Transformation'.

For our purposes, we will be concerned with deletions that leave null elements after the operation. Deletions that leave non-null elements are in fact pronominalization operations, as we have shown in the preceding chapters.

NP deletion may be divided into two broad categories, namely 'free' deletion and deletion by coreference. The former is 'free' in the sense that the operation is not governed by coreference, which is generally recognised as a sure means of recoverability. Nonetheless as we will see presently, there are some restrictions on so-called free deletion. These restrictions, as we will see, help to ensure recoverability.

9.3.1 Free Deletions:

In general free deletions are optional, but deletions by coreference may be optional or obligatory, as we will see when we discuss this kind of deletion. The following may be regarded as free deletions: Place-Holder NP Deletion and Subject Deletion.

9.3.2 Place-Holder NP Deletion:

In Chapter Four (cf.4.1.3) we discussed the nominals Ɂ and owo and showed that very commonly these nominals serve as 'place-holders'. We also showed that as place holders owo and Ɂ are often predictable in the environment where they occur and can sometimes be deleted. Another place-holder nominal is unam (animal). Together these nominals seem to indicate /
294.

indicate a kind of nominal classification. All inanimate things are \$k\$; all animate but non-human things are unam; and all human things are owo. In learning the language therefore the Efik speaker learns this system of nominal classification. We call these NPs 'place-holders' because they can and do substitute for more precise NPs in some contexts. Given these environments, then, place-holders can be deleted and recovery will be no problem at all to the Efik speaker, even though there may be no other coreferent NP to appeal to. However, the deletion of these NPs is not haphazard. Consider the following examples:

(2)a. Nso ke oyom? : 'What do you want?'
(2)b. Nso \$k\$ ke oyom? : 'What thing do you want?'
(3)a. Bassey okoyom anie? : 'Who did Bassey want?'
(3)b. Bassey okoyom anie owo? : 'Who person did Bassey want?'
(4)a. Mmaha se afo anamde : 'I don't like what you do'
(4)b. Mmaha \$k\$ se afo anamde : 'I don't like the thing you do'
(5)a. Eke mimaha ntre \$k\$ : 'Who doesn't like it so let him leave'
(5)b. Owo eke mimaha ntre \$k\$: 'Who doesn't like it so let him leave'
(6)a. Ata okpon : 'Ata is big'
(6)b. Ata okpon owo : 'Ata is a big person'
(7)a. Ebua emi ekpri eti eti : 'This dog is very small'
(7)b. Ebua emi ekpri unam eti eti : 'This dog is very small'

Let us now examine the environments in which \$k\$, unam and owo may be deleted. In (2) and (3) questioned \$k\$ and owo may be deleted. In other words, when these nominals are preceded by the WH question morpheme, they are optionally deleted.

Since the speaker knows that nso occurs with non-human nominals and anie with human ones, the recovery of \$k\$ and owo respectively is never in doubt. However in (8a) below, unam cannot be recovered; the recovery depends on the knowledge of the context in which the utterance is made.

(8)a. Nso unam ke ama? : 'What animal do you like?'
Given (8b) at random, the speaker will intuitively supply \( \text{kp2} \) and not \( \text{unam} \) as the deleted element:

(8)b. Nso ke ama? : 'What do you like?'

Since \( \text{unam} \) is not uniquely recoverable, if deleted, in the environment \( \text{WH N} \), we want to restrict the deletion of Place-Holder NPs to only \( \text{kp2} \) and \( \text{owo} \) in this case. Similarly in (4), the speaker may delete the antecedent of the relative pronoun \( \text{se} \), if this antecedent is \( \text{kp2} \). In (5) the antecedent of \( \text{se} \) is deletable if it is \( \text{owo} \). So in this case, it is the relative pronoun which makes the recovery of \( \text{kp2} \) and \( \text{owo} \) possible.

In (6) and (7) co-occurrence relationships between the place-holder and the subject of the sentence makes the recovery of \( \text{owo} \) and \( \text{unam} \) possible in those examples. In (6b) and (7b) \( \text{owo} \) and \( \text{unam} \) refer to \( \text{Ata} \) and \( \text{ebua} \) respectively. Since \( \text{Ata} \) is human and \( \text{ebua} \) is non-human but animate, the speaker knows intuitively that \( \text{owo} \) and \( \text{unam} \) were deleted in (6a) and (7a) respectively. If the subject is inanimate in this case, then \( \text{kp2} \) will be recognised as the deleted element. In this case, however, it is obligatorily deleted as (9) show:

(9)a. ??Eto emi okpon \( \text{kp2} \) : 'This tree is a big thing'
(9)b. Eto emi okpon : 'This tree is big'

There are other instances in which \( \text{kp2} \) or \( \text{owo} \) may be deleted but there is no way of uniquely determining what was actually deleted out of the context in which the utterance was made. Thus in the following examples, either \( \text{kp2} \) or \( \text{owo} \) could have been the deleted element:

(10)a. Bassey ama akamba : 'Bassey likes a big one'
(10)b. Nnyin iyom emi : 'We want this'
(10)c. Mm\( \text{kp2} \) eyom kpukpru : 'They want all'

(11)a. Bassey ama akamba \( \text{owo/kp2} \) : 'Bassey likes a big person/thing'
(11)b. Nnyin iyom \( \text{owo/kp2} \) emi : 'We want this person/thing'
(11)c. Mm\( \text{kp2} \) eyom kpukpru \( \text{owo/kp2} \) : 'They want everybody/everything'

Contextual /
Contextual deletions (by which we mean deletions whose recovery are possible only in actual contexts in which the utterances are made) are a common feature of Efik. Thus with nominal modifiers - adjectives, quantifiers and demonstratives - the nominal is deletable once the participants in the discourse know what they are talking about. We will return to this again when we talk about Subject Deletion.

What we have been saying so far is that the nature of jkp2, owo and unam is such that they may be deleted in some environments. In some cases these elements are recoverable from the grammar while in other cases there is no way of doing so except with knowledge of the context in which the utterance was made. Regarding the cases in which recovery is possible from the grammar, it is possible to propose a single rule which can account for such deletions. Let us call the rule Place-Holder NP Deletion and state it below:

**Place-Holder NP Deletion**

Given the place-holder NPs jkp2, unam and owo, jkp2 and owo may be deleted if they are antecedents of se and eke, or if they are preceded by a WH morpheme which requires an inanimate or human nominal respectively, or by a verbal which is both +V and +Adj, but unam is deletable only given such a verbal.

As jkp2 is obligatorily deleted if preceded by a verbal which is +V and +Adj, the rule can be constrained to apply obligatorily in this case. The above rule allows only recoverable Place-Holder NPs to be deleted.

9.3.3 Subject Deletion:

In Chapter 1110 (cf. 2.8.1) we showed that the VP bears the number and person features of the subject nominal, as can be seen from the following examples:

(12)a. /
(12)a. Ami ọnyọm ọkpokoro oko : 'I want yonder table'
(12)b. Afo oyom ọkpokoro oko : 'You want yonder table'
(12)c. Enye oyom ọkpokoro oko : 'He/she/it wants yonder table'
(12)d. Nnyin iyom ọkpokoro oko : 'We want yonder table'
(12)e. Nbufo oyom ọkpokoro oko : 'You (pl) want yonder table'
(12)f. Nnyom oyom ọkpokoro oko : 'They want yonder table'

where n, o, o, i, e, e, which are prefixes, indicate the number and person features of the subject, subject of course to tone operation. With such prefixes, then, the personal pronoun subjects in (12) are deletable and (13) can then be generated:

(13)a. Nnyom ọkpokoro oko : 'I want yonder table'
(13)b. Oyom ọkpokoro oko : 'You want yonder table'
(13)c. Oyom ọkpokoro oko : 'He/she/it wants yonder table'
(13)d. Iyom ọkpokoro oko : 'We want yonder table'
(13)e. Iyom ọkpokoro oko : 'You (pl) want yonder table'
(13)f. Iyom ọkpokoro oko : 'They want yonder table'

Subject deletion is not haphazard. We said in Chapter Two:

"Such a deletion (i.e. subject), however, will not take place until the transformation that copies the salient syntactic features of the subject (namely features of person and number) onto the VP has applied. It can then be claimed that the subject was deleted by identity with these features. In this case all nouns are necessarily third person and although the same concord rule that copies the person and number features of the subject onto the VP applies, we will have to limit allowable deletion to subjects that are personal pronouns, since these but not noun NPs can be uniquely recovered".

However, as we mentioned in that Chapter, in everyday speech, all subjects, whether they be personal pronoun or noun, are deletable once they have been first mentioned. Such deletions are easily recoverable in context. But because our grammar cannot handle contextual matters of this kind, we limit our subject deletion to just those instances where the subjects are recoverable from the grammar itself. However /
However, in complex structures, it appears that the third person pronouns require coreference in addition, for them to be deleted. Thus although ami and afọ, for example, in (14) may be deleted, enye in (16a) for example, may not, as the ungrammaticality of (16b) seems to indicate:

(14)a. Edieke ami ndepde raket oro, etubom eyema
   'If I buy the racket, the headmaster will like it'
(14)b. Edieke afo edepde raket oro, etubom eyema
   'If you buy the racket, the headmaster will like it'

(15)a. Edieke ndepde raket oro, etubom eyema
   'If I buy the racket, the headmaster will like it'
(15)b. Edieke edepde raket oro, etubom eyema
   'If you buy the racket, the headmaster will like it'

(16)a. Edieke enye edepde raket oro, etubom eyema
   'If he buys the racket, the headmaster will like it'
(16)b.*Edieke edepde raket oro, etubom eyema
   'If he buys the racket, the headmaster will like it'

From the above examples, then, on Subject Deletion, the rule can be informally stated thus:

Subject Deletion:

Except for the third person pronoun in complex sentences, personal pronoun subjects may be deleted.

The condition for the application of the above rule will be a prior application of the Concord Rule that copies the features of Number and Person of the subject to be deleted onto the VP, as we have already pointed out.

9.3.4 Unspecified Agent Deletion:

This deletion rule allows the human Place-Holder NP owo to be deleted under certain conditions that will be stated presently. Consider the following examples:

(17)a. /
(17)a. Ọwo atabi min emi: 'Someone has tasted this wine'
(17)b. Ọwo ama ana ke bed emi: 'Someone had slept in this bed'

(18)a. Etabi min emi: 'Someone has tasted this wine'
(18)b. Ema ena ke bed: 'Someone has slept in this bed'

As (17) and (18) are paraphrases, it must be assumed that the latter are derived from the former by the deletion of the unspecified agent ọwo in each case. However, observe that it is not just enough to delete the unspecified agent in (17). To do this only would generate (19) which are ungrammatical:

(19)a. *Atabi min emi: 'Someone has tasted this wine'
(19)b. *Ama ana ke bed: 'Someone had slept in this bed'

The difference between (18) and (19) is that in the former the verbs are plural whereas in (19) the same verbs are singular. So it appears that the deletion of Unspecified Agent requires that the verb be obligatorily pluralized, if it was singular at the time the rule applies. When this is done, then (18) is generated.

There are conditions for the application of this rule. First, the Np must be subject. Second, it must be the human place-holder ọwo. And third, the verb itself must not be [+Adj]. This last condition is necessary to block such strings as (20):

(20)a. *Ekpon: 'Someone is big'
(20)b. *Eye: 'Someone is pretty'

Perhaps we should add in passing that sentences like (18) are a rather neutral and non-committal way of saying something. Thus they can be glossed in the following way in English.

(18)a. Etabi min emi: 'This wine has been tasted'
(18)b. Ema ena ke bed emi: 'This bed has been slept in'

9.4.1 /
9.4.1 Deletion by Coreference:

Deletion by Coreference involves a relationship between two NPs, just as pronominalization does. In this kind of deletion, one NP is used to delete another. It is the undeleted coreferent NP that will enable the deleted one to be recovered other things being equal. As we have already seen, there are some cases of the so-called free deletions that involve some kind of coreference appeal: subject deletion, for example. In Efik, deletions by coreference include the following: Pronoun Deletion in complex or conjoined structures, the Partial Deletion of Reflexive Pronoun and S Deletion.

9.4.2 Pronoun Deletion in Complex or Conjoined Structures:

In our definition, complex structures include the following sentence types: structures with embedded complement clauses as (21); structures with embedded adjunct or adverbial clauses as (22); and structures with relative clauses as (23):

(21)a. Bassey oyu n'dikpeme eyen : 'Bassey wants to look after the baby'
(21)b. Iban ozo ekere ets m'mim: imgeye

'Those women think that they are beautiful'

(22)a. Edieke Okon edide mi, nyesian enye: 'If Okon comes here, I will tell him'
(22)b. Okposuk ede Ata amede mi, enye inyake mi

'Although Ata likes me, he doesn't help me'

(23) Ets eni nnyin iyomde odu ke utum idagaemi

'The man that we want is at work now'

Conjoined (or Co-ordinate) structures in our definition are structures underlying sentences of the following sort:

(24)a. /
As we have already pointed out in Chapter Six, (24a) involves an obligatory deletion of the subject of the complement clause, since without such a deletion (25a) would have been generated:

(25a) *Bassey oyom enye ndikpeme eyen:'bassey wants him to look after the baby'.

In (21b) mmimq is optionally deletable, thus (25b) is synonymous with it:

(25b) Iban oro ekere ete imeye:'those women think that they are beautiful'

However, if the pronoun is object of the complement clause, deletion is apparently not allowed. Thus (26b), for example, is ungrammatical:

(26a) Iban oro ekere ete nnyin ibet mmimq
   'those women think that we are waiting for them'

(26b) *Iban oro ekere ete nnyin ibet
   'those women think that we are waiting for them'

The same kind of ungrammaticality results where the complement clause is the subject of the matrix clause, as the following examples show:

(27a) Ama akpa ime idem nnyin ndikpe enye okuk
      'it surprised ime for us to pay him money'

(27b) *Ama akpa ime idem nnyin ndikpe okuk
      'it surprised ime for us to pay him money'

It should be recalled that sentences like (27a) are derived from a source underlying (27c):

(27c) Nnyin ndikpe Ime okuk ama akpa ime idem
      'for us to pay ime money surprised Ime'

in (22) the pronoun enye is optionally deletable, thus (28) are synonymous with (22):

(28a) /
As can be seen from (22a), the pronoun is deletable, even if it is an object in its own clause.

The deletion of the relative pronoun in (23) generates (29) below:

(29) Ete nnyin iyomde odu ke utom idahaemi: The man we want is at work now

In (24) the subjects of the following (or right branching) co-ordinate sentences have been deleted obligatorily, otherwise (30) would have been generated:

(30)a.* Arit ama aka udua enye onyụ ekedep bia
 'Arit went to market and she bought yams'

(30)b.* Iban oro ema enam utom mmụ enyụ ebi ediwak okuk
 'The women worked and got a lot of money'

In Chapter Six we proposed a general statement or principle governing the deletion of NPs in complex and conjoined structures, which we repeat below:

"Given coreference, a pronoun is obligatorily deleted if it is the subject of an infinitive object clause, or an unemphatic subject of a right branching conjunct of nnyi, otherwise it is optionally deletable".

Now that it is known that objects of complement clauses are not to be deleted even under coreference, the above statement needs revision, as given below:

Pronoun Deletion in Complex and Co-ordinate Structures:

Given Coreference in a Complex or Co-ordinate Structure, a pronoun (a) must not be deleted if it is the object of a complement clause, the emphatic subject of a right branching conjunct of nnyi, or a reflexive pronoun;
(b) must be deleted if it is the subject of infinitive object clause, or an unemphatic subject of a right branching conjunct of nnyi;
(c) /
(c) may be deleted in other environments, unless barred by other deletion rules.

If the above principle is taken as a Pronoun Deletion Rule in those structures informally stated, then the rule applies obligatorily if the pronoun is the subject of a complement clause in which the infinitivization rule has applied, or it is an unemphatic subject of a right branching conjunct of nnyin. Thus (21a) is derived from (25a) and (24) are derived from (30) in this way. If, however, the pronoun is object of a complement clause, an emphatic subject of a right branching conjunct of nnyin or a reflexive pronoun, then the rule is blocked. In this way (26b) and (27b) above, and (31b) below, are not generated:

(31)a. Edieke nnyin iposé Ata okuk, enye eyesin idem esje øwed
   'If we give Ata money, he will put himself through school'

(31)b. Edieke nnyin iposé Ata okuk, enye eyesin øwed
   'If we give Ata money, he will put himself through school'

In contrast with (31b) however, (32b) is grammatical, where the deleted pronoun is not reflexive:

(32)a. Edieke Ata iposé nnyin okuk oro, nnyin iyesin enye øwed
   'If Ata gives us the money, we will put him through school'

(32)b. Edieke Ata iposé nnyin okuk oro, nnyin iyesin øwed
   'If Ata gives us that money, we will put him through school'

If, however, the conditions in (a) and (b) do not hold, then the rule applies optionally. The condition in (c) then accounts for the deletion of relative pronouns, im/nm/nm as subject, and personal pronouns in complex sentences with Adjunct or Adverbial clauses.

9.4.3 **Possessive Pronoun Deletion:**

A possessive pronoun may be deleted on certain conditions. Consider (34), which are derived from (33); and (35) which cannot be said to underlie /
underlie (36):

(33)a. Bassey okut ete esie : 'Bassey has seen his father'
(33)b. Edieke Bassey akade Uyo, eyesobo ọwan esie do
   'If Bassey goes to Uyo, he will meet his wife there'

(34)a. Bassey okut ete : 'Bassey has seen his father'
(34)b. Edieke Bassey akade Uyo eyesobo ọwan
   'If Bassey goes to Uyo, he will meet his wife'

(35)a. Bassey okut moto esie : 'Bassey has seen his car'
(35)b. Edieke Bassey edide Uyo nnyewut enye ọwed esie
   'If Bassey comes to Uyo, I will show him his book'

(36)a. Bassey okut moto : 'Bassey has seen a car'
(36)b. Edieke Bassey edide Uyo, nnyewut enye ọwed
   'If Bassey comes to Uyo, I will show him a book'

The fact that (36) differ from (35) in interpretations because of the deletion of the pronoun esie shows that the possessive pronoun is not to be deleted in such examples, in spite of the coreference. Why is the possessive pronoun deletable in (33) but not in (35)? We think that the answer lies in the fact that in (33) the objects possessed — ete (father) and ọwan (wife) — are 'inalienable' to the possessor while in (35) the objects are 'alienable' to the possessor. However, it is not as simple as that. Consider the following examples:

(37)a. Bassey oyom ọwan esie : 'Bassey wants his wife'
(37)b. Bassey oyom eyen-eka esie : 'Bassey wants his brother/sister'

(38)a. Bassey oyom ọwan : 'Bassey wants his wife'
(38)b. Bassey oyom eyen-eka : 'Bassey wants his brother/sister'

(39)a. Ami nnyom ọwan mmi : 'I want my wife'
(39)b. Ami nnyom eyen-eka mmi : 'I want my brother/sister'
(39)c. Afo oyom ọwan fo : 'You want your wife'
(39)d. Afo oyom eyen-eka fo : 'You want your brother/sister'

(40)a. Ami nnyom ọwan : 'I want a wife'
(40)b. Afo oyom eyen-eka : 'You want a brother/sister'(who is not yet born)
In (37) the possessive pronoun can be deleted without a difference in meaning, as these examples are synonymous with (38). In (39), however, the deletion of the possessive pronouns ~mi (my) and ~fo (your) results in differences in interpretations. These differences are similar to the differences we saw in (36) above, where the possessed objects are 'alienable' to the possessor. (39) and (40) show that for the possessive pronoun to be deleted, it is not just enough that the possessed object be 'inalienable' to the possessor but that the possessive pronoun itself must be third person. So the Possessive Pronoun Deletion Rule then applies optionally just in case

(a) it is coreferential with another NP in the phrase marker (simplex or complex),
(b) it is third person,
(c) the thing possessed is 'inalienable', more or less.

These conditions, then, will permit the deletion of ~sia in (33), disallows the deletion of ~sia in (35) and the deletion of ~mi and ~fo in (39). However (41) are still problems, for while (41a) violates condition (b), (41b) still creates a semantic problem, even though the conditions for deletion of the possessive pronoun are satisfied.

(41)a. Ami nnyom ete mi : 'I want my father'
(41)b. Mm~ ekut iban mm~ : 'They have seen their wives'

(42)a. Ami nnyom ete : 'I want my father'
(42)b. Mm~ ekut iban : 'They have seen women'

In formulating the Pronoun Deletion Rule in Complex and Conjoined Structures, above, we indicated in condition (c) that this rule does not apply if a pronoun is barred from deletion by other rules. One such rule is the Possessive Pronoun Deletion Rule just formulated above. It has been shown that this rule does not allow a possessive pronoun to be deleted /
deleted if, among other things, the possessed object is 'alienable' to the possessor. In this way, *esie* (his) in (43a) is protected, as it were, from deletion by the Pronoun Deletion Rule in Complex and Conjoined Structures, by the Possessive Pronoun Deletion Rule.

(43)a. Edieke ọkụtde Bassey, nnyebọ enye ọwed esie

'If I see Bassey, I will get his book'

If *esie* were to be deleted, then (43b), which is not necessarily synonymous with (43a), would be generated:

(43)b. Edieke ọkụtde Bassey nnyebọ enye ọwed

'If I see Bassey, I will get a book'

9.4.4 Partial Deletion of Reflexive Pronoun

In Chapter Five (cf. 5.1.4), we showed that there are what we refer to as 'Reflexive Suffixes'. The presence of these suffixes, we demonstrated then, prevents a reflexivizable NP from actually undergoing reflexivization and in consequence is obligatorily deleted. In this section, we do not wish to reconsider this kind of deletion, since the matter was exhaustively dealt with in that Chapter. But in formulating the Pronoun Deletion Rule in Complex and Conjoined Structures, we indicated that among other conditions the rule does not apply if the pronoun is reflexive. We should point out that since the deletion of a reflexivizable NP which failed to be reflexivized applies well before the above Pronoun Deletion Rule, there is no problem at all. Besides, at the time that this NP is deleted, it is not in fact a pronoun.

However, although a reflexive pronoun must not be fully deleted, as predicted by the Complex and Conjoined Structures Pronoun Deletion Rule, it may be partially deleted. Consider (45), which are derived from (44), by /
by the deletion of the possessive determiner (PD):

(44)a. Ami nyeny~a idem mmi : 'I will help myself'
(44)b. Afo eyeny~a idem fo : 'You will help yourself'
(44)c. Enye eyeny~a idem esie : 'He/she will help himself/herself'
(44)d. Nnyin iyeny~a idem nnyin : 'We will help ourselves'
(44)e. Mbufo eyeny~a idem mbufo : 'You will help yourselves'
(44)f. Mm~ eyeny~a idem mm~ : 'They will help themselves'

As we have already pointed out, one of the conditions for the application of the reflexive rule is that subject and object be identical in a simplex. In particular, the identity of Number and Person is required. Recall that it is also these very features that are crucial for the deletion of subjects. If we regard mmi, fo, esie, etc. as number and person markers on the reflexive pronouns, then these markers are optionally deletable, if they are identical with the subjects of the sentences, as (44) and (45) indicate. The subjects are still deletable after the deletion of these markers. Thus (45a) and (45b), for example, are synonymous with (46a) and (46b) respectively:

(45)a. Ami nyeny~a idem : 'I will help myself'
(45)b. Afo eyeny~a idem : 'You will help yourself'
(45)c. Enye eyeny~a idem : 'He/she will help himself/herself'
(45)d. Nnyin iyeny~a idem : 'We will help ourselves'
(45)e. Mbufo eyeny~a idem : 'You will help yourselves'
(45)f. Mm~ eyeny~a idem : 'They will help themselves'

9.4.5 Sentential Object Deletion:

Finally, let us return to the examples in (1), which we repeat below:

(1)a. Ḧkeyom atɔ ewet fi ed i enye imaha ndiwet fi
   'I wanted Ata to write you but he didn't like to write you'
(1)b. /
(1)b. keyom Ata ewet fi edi enye imaha
   'I wanted Ata to write you but he didn't like it'
(1)c. keyom Ata ewet fi edi enye imaha enye
   'I wanted Ata to write you but he didn't like it'

The question is since (1a) and (1b) are paraphrases, is (b) derived from (1a) via (1c), or by merely deleting the sentential object ndiwet fi? That is we are asking whether the sentential object is pronominalized and then obligatorily deleted, as we have seen in the case of the deletion of the subjects of such clauses. However, in the case of the deletion of such NPs, we were able to show surface evidence (cf.6.2) that pronominalization had indeed applied prior to deletion. At the moment, no such evidence is available in the case of the sentential object. Until evidence shows up, I am afraid we will assume that such sentential deletion takes place without a prior pronominalization of the sentence itself, in so far as there is another sentence or clause like it to which it refers. (1a) and (1b), for example, are derived from the structure underlying (47):

(47) keyom - Ata ewet fi - edi Ata imaha - Ata ewet fi
   'I wanted - Ata wrote you - but Ata didn't like - Ata wrote you'
where there are clearly two copies of the same clause.

So as we indicated at the beginning, it seems as if deletion applies instead of pronominalization in the case of the sentential object. It should be noted that in our analysis such sentential objects are not in fact NPs.

The above, then, are the major NP deletion rules in Efik. As we have seen, the language has various devices or strategies to ensure that the deleted elements are recoverable, even in the so-called free deletions.
APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF RULES

Before we give a summary of the rules, let us look at the work in general. There have been some problems which our model of grammar has either not been able to handle or has done so in a way which is not entirely elegant. For example, as was pointed out in Chapter Five (cf. 5.5) sentences with reciprocal pronouns cannot be generated and the derivation of reflexive suffixes (cf. 5.1.4) has not been entirely elegant.

However, interesting facts which strongly support some hypotheses have come to light. For instance, the occurrence of imi/imi (cf. 6.3.1-4) strongly enhances Kuno's Direct and Indirect Discourse hypothesis, and some aspects of relativization confirm some of the predictions of Keenan and Comrie's Accessibility Hierarchy hypothesis.

Interesting in themselves are the analyses of the so-called picture nouns (cf. 5.4.2), the deletion of nominal modifiers in NP co-ordination (cf. 3.6), the 'hierarchy' of the application of simple pronominalization, the role of tones in certain syntactic phenomena (cf. 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5, 5.4.2), and the fact that reflexivization consistently applies in a simplex.

The Base

1. S → (Q) NP VP (ADJT)

2. VP → AUX \[\begin{cases} V \mathbf{B} (N P) (N P) & S \text{ (COMP-PHRASE)} \\ \text{PRED} & \text{ (S)} \end{cases}\]

3. AUX → C TENSE / ASPEC T (NEG)
Rules (4)-(6), which would expand the TENSE/ASPECT element and introduce certain modal distinctions, are not given, since (as already pointed out on p.32) the details in this area of the grammar have not been worked out satisfactorily (cf. p.52).

7. PRED, (NP, COMP-PHRASE)

8. COMP-PHRASE

9. COMP \rightarrow \{Prep, Qvb\}

10. NP \rightarrow S ye NP NP*

11. Q \rightarrow \{YN/#, WH/ - N\}

12. Det \rightarrow (NUM) (NOM) ART

13. NOM \rightarrow NP

14. EMPH \rightarrow \{REDUPL, INT\}

15. ADJT \rightarrow \{COMP-PHRASE\}

16. N \rightarrow CS

17. VB \rightarrow CS

18. ART \rightarrow CS

19. [+N] \rightarrow [+Common], [+Animate], [+Count], [+Pro]

20. [+Animate] \rightarrow [+Human]

21. [-Animate] \rightarrow [+Loc]

22. [+Loc] \rightarrow [+Place]

23. /
Transformations:

Below are a summary of the major transformations we have discussed in the text. They do not necessarily apply in the order in which they are presented. In a full grammar it may be convenient or necessary to re-order them.

34.a. Reflexivization (Obligatory):

S.D.  
\[ S \rightarrow [N \text{ART}] \text{AUX} \text{VB} ([N \text{ART}] \text{Prep} \text{QVB} [N \text{ART}] \text{Y}] \]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Conditions
(a) 2 & 3 are coreferential either with 6 & 7, or with 9 & 10,
(b) both 6 & 7 and 9 & 10 are VP constituents,
(c) 1 - 11 is a simplex,

S.C. (a) Operations
If 6 or 9 is [Pro], change this feature to [Pro] and introduce the feature [Ref]. Then copy these features as well as those of Number and Person onto 7 or 10, as the case may be.
If there are NP constituents other than N and ART, delete them.

Output /
Later the N, which is the noun stem, is realised as idem and ART as mi, fo, esie, nnyin, mbufo and mm), as the case may be.

The rule generates the following:

(i) Ata anya idem esie: 'Ata has helped himself'
(ii) Ata anwa ye idem esie: 'Ata is fighting with himself'
(iii) Ata ewet abar a idem esie: 'Ata has written a book about himself'

Condition (a) disallows (iv) as idem here is a base item and disallows (v):

(iv) *Ata okpon idem esie: 'Ata bigs himself'
(v) *Ata ama mi nny a a idem esie: 'Ata likes me to help himself'

If, however, the VB is additionally marked [+Suf], as in the following structure:

S.D. X NP AUX VB NP NP Y

where 2 = 5

then when the rule applies, the feature [+Ref] is attracted, as it were, to the VB, instead of the NP 5, by the feature [+Suf]. The output is the following structure:

X NP AUX VB NP NP Y

A structure like the above is then an input to a related rule called Reflexivizable NP Deletion. This rule obligatorily deletes 5, which is a reflexivizable /
reflexivizable NP which failed to reflexivize.

34.b. Partial Deletion of Reflexive Pronoun: (Optional):

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
S.D. & X & \text{N} & \text{ART} & \text{AUX} & \text{VB} & \text{N} & \text{ART} & \text{Y} \\
& +\text{Pro} & +\text{Pro} & +\text{Refl} & +\text{Refl} & -\text{No} & -\text{No} & +\text{Per} & +\text{Per} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

Conditions: Both 6 and 7 are identical in the features [+Pro], [+Refl], as well as features of number and person.

\[
\text{S.C.} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \emptyset \quad 8
\]

35. Concord Rule:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
S.D. & X & \text{NP} & \underline{-} & \text{C} & \underline{-} & \text{VB} & \text{NP} & \text{Y} \\
& \text{AUX} & \text{AUX} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

Conditions: 2 is immediately dominated by the S node and C by the AUX

\[
\text{S.C. (a) Operations: Copy features of Number and Person of 2 onto 3 and then attach 3 to 4.}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
(b) \text{ Output:} \\
1 & 2 & \emptyset & 3 + 4 & 5 & 6 \\
& -\text{No} & -\text{No} & +\text{Per} & +\text{Per} \\
\end{array}
\]

Later 3 is realised as a prefix of the VB.

36. ART Deletion (Obligatory)

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
S.D. & X & \text{(W) N (Z)} & \text{ART} & \text{Y} \\
& +\text{Def} & +\text{Dem} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

where W is a QUANT or a WH and Z a NOM or NUM

\[
\text{S.C. (a) Operations: Delete 5 if it is [-Def], or if it is [+Def -Dem] and 3 is [+Pro] or [-Common].}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
(b) \text{ Output:} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & \emptyset & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

Problems: NPs such as etubom and edidem (the headmaster and the king respectively) still present a problem since like etubom oro (the headmaster) and edidem oro (the king), these NPs are Definite, even though they have no explicit articles at the surface /
surface level, unlike most definite common NPs. Note that etubom and edidem, and etubom oro and edidem oro are not semantically equivalent. Under our analysis, we can conveniently generate etubom oro and edidem oro but not etubom and edidem as definite NPs. However, as indefinite NPs they can be generated in our grammar.

37.a Possessive Pronominalization:

S.D. $X$ NP AUX VB N NP $\gamma$

$1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7$

**Conditions:**
(1) 2 and 6 are coreferential;
(2) 6 is immediately preceded by an N which must be $[-\text{Pro}]$;
(3) The N that immediately precedes 6 must be the head noun of the Det that dominates 6.

**S.C.** (a) **Operations:** Add $[+\text{Pro}]$ to 6 (if it is not a pronoun itself) as well as $[+\text{Pos}]$.

(b) **Output:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 $[+\text{Pro}]$ $[+\text{Pos}]$

Later 6 will be realised as esie, mm, etc. depending on the number and person of 6 itself.

37.b. Possessive Intensification:

S.D. X [N [NP [INT] Y

NP DET NOM DET NP

1 2 3 4 5

**Conditions:**
(a) Both 3 and 4 are immediately dominated by DET
(b) 3 is $[+\text{Pos}]$ as well as $[+\text{Sing}]$.

**S.C. Operation:** Introduce mm as a constituent of 4

**Output:** 1 2 3 4 5 mm

37.c. Possessive Pronoun Deletion (Optional):

S.D. $X$ NP AUX VB N [NP $\gamma$

NOM NOM DET DET

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Conditions:**
(1) 2 and 6 are $[+\text{II}]$ and coreferential
(2)/
(2) 5 is 'inalienable' to 6
(3) 6 is not followed by INT as a constituent that is dominated by the same NOM that dominates 6 itself.

S.C. 1 2 3 4 5 \(\emptyset\) 7

37.d. N Replacement in a possessive NP

**S.D. (a)**

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{X} & \text{N} & \text{N} & \text{N} & \text{N} & \text{Y} \\
\text{NP} & \text{DET} & \text{NP} & \text{DET} & \text{NP} & \text{DET} & \text{NP} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{S} & \text{PREP} & \text{NP} & \text{PRED} & \text{S} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7
\end{array}
\]

**Conditions**

(a)(1) 1 - 6 must be a conjoined NP;
(2) 2 and 5 must be identical but not coreferential;
(3) 3 and 6 must each be dominated by a DET that is a sister of 2 and 5 respectively.

(b)(1) 1 - 7 must be an S;
(2) 2 and 5 are coreferential;
(3) 6 is dominated by a DET that is a sister of 5.

S.C. (a) **Operation**: Replace 5 with eke
**Output**: 1 2 3 4 eke 6 7

(b) **Operation**: Replace 5 with eke
**Output**: 1 2 3 4 eke 6 7

38.a. Relativization:

**S.D.**

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{X} & \text{N} & \text{ART} & \text{ART} & \text{AUX} & \text{VB} & \text{NP} & \text{AUX} & \text{VB} & \text{(NP)} & \text{Y} \\
\text{NP} & \text{+Dem} & \text{-Dem} & \text{+Def} & \text{-Def} & \text{S} & \text{S} & \text{NP} \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12
\end{array}
\]

**Conditions:**

(1) 2 - 8 is an NP and 4 - 5 is also an NP and they both refer to each other
other;
(2) 3 and 5 are \([-\text{Vem}]\).

S.V. (a) \textbf{Operations:} (1) Mark 4 \([+\text{Pro}]\) as well as \([+\text{ Kel}]\);  
(2) introduce the subordination marker \(-\text{de}\) on the subordinate VB, i.e. 7;  
(3) Delete 3 optionally, if it is \([+\text{Def}]\) and obligatorily if \([-\text{Def}]\);  
(4) if 4 is not at the beginning of the embedded S at the time the rule applies, move it to that position (this applies to non-subject NPs which are relativized).

(b) \textbf{Possible Output:}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & \textbf{\ø} & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cc}
\text{[+Pro]} & \\
\text{[+Kel]} & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{A Problem}

Although condition (2) correctly disallows the sentences in (i), it also disallows those in Footnote 1 of Chapter 8, which are repeated here as (ii):

(i)a. \*\text{Mmpto emi emi afo akanygmde }\nu \; \text{mi abigra}  
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{---}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\text{'this car which you sold me is spoiled'}
\end{center}

(i)b. \*\text{Akparawa oko emi okoygmde fi eji ndigime}  
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{---}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\text{'younger youth who looked for you is a fool'}
\end{center}

(ii)a. \text{Api emi emi ndyde }\nu \; \text{akp\text{e}h} \; \text{ete ogo}  
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{---}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\text{'this 1 who am here wouldn't marry the man'}
\end{center}

(ii)b. \text{Afo oro emi etiede do ukpenyimeke}  
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & \text{---}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\text{'you there who are there wouldn't agree'}
\end{center}

38.b. Relative Clause Reduction (Obligatory if the embedded clause VB is \([-\text{V} \; +\text{Adj}]\) )

\begin{center}
\text{S.D.} \text{ X NP AUX} \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \text{ [NP AUX VB]} \text{ Y} \\
\text{ S} \text{ [\text{[+V Adj]}]} \\
\text{ PRE D} \text{ S} \text{ PRE D}
\end{array}
\end{center}

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Conditions /
Conditions:
(1) 4 - 7 is dominated by a Pred;
(2) 4 and 5 are coreferential;
(3) 7, or the embedded clause VB, is [Adj].

S.C. (a) Operations: (1) Delete 5 and 6 and then permute 4 with 7.
(2) If 7 is [+V], optionally delete 4.

(b) Output: Either 1 2 3 φ φ 7 4 , or 1 2 3 φ φ 7 φ

The rule derives sentences like (1) from (2):
(1)a. Ata edi ediy owo : 'Ata is a handsome man'
(1)b. Ata eye (owo) : 'Ata is a handsome man'

(2)a. Ata edi owo emi eyede : 'Ata is a man who is handsome'
(2)b.*Ata edi owo emi edide ediy : 'Ata is a man who is handsome'

The Relative Clause Reduction Rule should precede the Relativization Rule itself, so that if the former does not apply, the latter will apply obligatorily.

39. S Preposing Rule (Optional):

S.D. Either (a) X NP VP \left( S \right) \ ADJT ADJT Y

1 2 3 4 5

Or (b) X \left( S \right) VP Y

NP NP
1 2 3 4

where X and Y are null elements.

Conditions:
In (a) the S must be dominated by ADJT, while in (b) the S must be dominated by an NP which is itself dominated immediately by the matrix S on the left (i.e. the S in (b) must be dominated by a Subject NP).

S.C. (a) 1 4 2 3 5
(b) 1 3 2 4

Examples:
With (a) kind of structure the rule generates (1b) from (1a) and with (b) kind of structure it generates (2b) from (2a):

(1)a. Nnyekut Bassey edieke enye edide: 'I will see Bassey if he comes'
(1)b. /
(1)b. Edieke enye edide nnyekut Bassey: 'If he comes, I will see Bassey'

(2)a. Ndikut mi enem Bassey esit: 'To see me pleases Bassey'
(2)b. Enem Bassey esit ndikut mi: 'It pleases Bassey to see me'

40. Simple Pronominalization (Obligatory if only single pairs of Subject-Subject or Object-Object NPs are coreferential)

S.D. $X N$ ART AUX VB $(N$ ART) $Y$

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 \\
\text{ART} & \text{AUX} & \text{VB} & \text{N} & \text{ART} & \text{Y} & \text{ART} & \text{AUX} & \text{VB} & \text{N} & \text{ART} & \text{Y} & \text{ART} & \text{AUX} & \text{VB} & \text{N} & \text{ART} & \text{Y} \\
\end{array}
\]

where $X$ and $Y$ are null elements and where 8 - 13 are an S and are dominated either by ADJT or VP in the matrix S.

Conditions:
(1) $N$ ART is an NP
(2) an NP in the matrix S is coreferential with another NP in the embedded S
(3) if the NP to be pronominalized precedes the other coreferent NP, the former must be in the embedded clause and both NPs must not be objects in their respective S's.

S.C. Operations: Let us assume that 2 & 3 and 8 & 9, which are NPs respectively, are coreferential, then
(1) change the feature $\text{[-Pro]}$ to $\text{[+Pro]}$ on 8 and delete 9.

Output: $1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ \emptyset \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13 \ 14 \ \text{[+Pro]}$

41. Indirect Discourse Formation (Obligatory):

S.D. $X N$ [AUX VB $S$] [$N$ ART AUX VB $S$] $Y$

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
\text{NP} & \text{VP} & \text{S} & \text{S} & \text{VP} & \text{S} & \text{S} & \text{S} & \text{S} & \text{S} \\
\end{array}
\]

Conditions:
(1) 4, the matrix VB, is $\text{[+DD]}$ (Direct Discourse);
(2) 2, the subject of the matrix, is $\text{[+Animate]}$, or if it is $\text{[-Animate]}$, 5, the matrix object, must be $\text{[+Animate]}$;
(3) 6 - 10, the embedded S, is a complement clause (generally object complement but could be subject too).

S.C. /
S.C. Operations: (1) By the Principle of Coreference in Direct Discourse, the First Person in the complement clause is obligatorily marked coreferential with either the matrix subject or object, given condition (2).

(2) amī/nnyin is changed to imi/mim as the case may be. The Rule affects any first person in any form, in so far as there is a proper analysis, thus idem mmi (myself) and moto mmi (my car) in (1) are changed to idem imi and moto imi in (2):

(1)a. Aṭa ḏēh, "Nnyan idem mmi": 'Aṭa has said, "I'm helping myself"
(1)b. Aṭa ḏēh, "Nyat moto mmi": 'Aṭa has said, "I'm driving my car"

(2)a. Aṭa ḏēh ेtē imi inya idem imi: 'Aṭa has said that he is helping himself'
(2)b. Aṭa ḏēh ेtē imi iwat moto imi: 'Aṭa has said that he is driving his car'

42. Deletion Rules

Optional deletion rules on the whole appear to apply quite late in the grammar.

Place-Holder NP Deletion and Pronoun Deletion in Complex and Conjoined Structures:

These two rules are each more or less a rule schema, since they each collapse into one a number of rules which apply in different configurations but essentially requiring the same kinds of operations and the same, or similar, kinds of conditions. Thus for example although the pronouns may be different kinds of pronouns, they all require the same coreference condition. On the other hand, in the cases of Place-Holder NPs, although they require different linguistic environments for deletion, these NPs are essentially alike in function. The alternative would be to consider the various rules as separate and independent rules and derive them as such. In that case, the S.D.s on which these rules operate will depend on the particular configuration. In our view this approach would miss some generalizations.
43. Subject Deletion (Optional):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
& X & N_P & C & V_B & N_P & Y \\
\hline
S & \#_No & \#_No & S \\
+Pro & \#_Per & \#_Per & \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5
\end{array}
\]

where [+Pro] should be interpreted to mean 'Personal Pronoun'.

Conditions:
(1) 2 is [+Pro] and is immediately dominated by the S node on the left;
(2) the Concord Rule (Rule 35) has already applied attaching C onto the VB as a prefix.
(3) if 2 is [+III], then S must be a simplex.

S.C. 1 3 4 5
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