African Research Review: An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia

On Polar Question in Echie and English: A Transformational Approach

Nwala, Michael Alozie
Department of English Studies
University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Port Harcourt
Rivers State, Nigeria
E-mail: Michael.nwala@uniport.edu.ng

Abstract

The formation of polar question also called a Yes-No question, appears to be language-specific, a situation which makes Echie speakers to find it difficult to accommodate the system of the English language, vice versa. This paper, using the qualitative design and the transformation approach, investigated the structural forms of both languages. The analysis showed great structural differences in both languages: while there is a swop in the position of the subject and the auxiliary in English, there is no such in Echie. In Echie, there are two forms of polar question realization: the resumptive pronoun type and the emphatic construction type. The paper noted that, although, the structural and derivational forms parametrically differ, polar questions exist in both languages and also perform the same syntactic and functional communicative roles.

Key Words: Polar, resumptive, inversion, emphatic, transformation

Introduction

Interrogation is a discourse function of language used to elicit different forms of responses. It is basically concerned with the expression of thought but in the form of question. Interrogation is used in grammar classification of verb forms (Emenanjo, 2015) or sentence types which are usually in contrast to declarative or affirmative forms.

There are three classifications of questions in human language, in terms of the answers expected from the respondents. They are:

   a. The Polar or Yes-No Question
   b. The WH-Question, and
   c. The Indirect Question

The Polar or Yes-No Question, which is the focus of this paper, is the type where the expected response is either yes or no that is an affirmation or denial of a statement. Their formations generally involve a transformation of an initial declarative or affirmative statement to an interrogative one

Nwala (2013) observed the above and states that to form a polar question in English, we usually swop the position of the auxiliary of the sentence with that of the subject of the sentence: subject- auxiliary inversion. Similarly, Ndimele (2003) noted that Yes-No questions are those which are used by the questioner to elicit a "yes" or "no" response from the hearer. He identifies two types of Yes-No questions in Echie language: the resumptive pronoun type; and the emphatic question type. In addition, Ndimele (2003) asserted that the resumptive pronoun type in Echie is signalled by a low tone which is marked on a pronominal or subject c1itic element in pre-verbal position. He goes further to say that in this type of question, there is a demand for the truth-value of the whole utterance without an attempt to contradict any part of the question.

The emphatic question type, according to Ndimele is not signalled by a low tone but can optionally be introduced by ò-bu, (is it?). The low tone which signals a Yes-No question in Echie is marked on the personal pronoun, ò and not on the subject pronominal clitic. The syntactic or structural configurations of polar questions in both languages differ considerably, no doubt, but they perform the same communicative function.

 The WH-Question is the type that uses the Wh-words such as: who, when, where; what, which, how, whose, why and whom. In English, the Wh-words are used as adjective, interrogative adjective (e.g. who, which); adverb, interrogative adverb (e.g. why) and as pronoun, interrogative pronoun (e.g. who). The position of the Wh-words is sentence internal in English. The equivalent of the WH-Question words in Echie are onye (who); be-ole (where) kwo ole (how), nni (what), ndii (which, what, where). Apart from ndii these wh-words in Echie can appear sentence internal and final positions.

The indirect questions are either Yes-No or WH-Question which are usually embedded as NP sentential complement or simply subordinate clauses in sentences. The different types of questions and their forms are used to elicit different discourse responses, which may be direct or indirect. The major aim of this paper is to investigate polar question formation in English and Echie languages so as to identify any form of similarity or if there is/are forms of language-specific formation or parametric significance. The implication of this is that the findings of this study will guide linguists and language practitioners in both divide to reach conclusions that will help L2 learners of both languages.

Linguistic Background of the Echie Language

Echie is one of the major languages spoken in Rivers State of Nigeria. There are five discernible dialects or varieties of the Echie language: the Ozuzu, Omuma, central Echie, Omuoye and Obite/Igbodho varieties. But in this article, we draw our data from the central variety popularly considered as the standard variety.

Theoretical Framework: Contrastive Analysis

The Contrastive Analysis (henceforth, CA) is a theory of language learning introduced by Robert Lado in 1957. It is a theory of language learning used to contrast and compare the forms and structures of two or more languages in order to identify their similarities and dissimilarities (Lado 1957; Wilkins 1972, Fries 1945). Linguistically, no two languages of

the world are the same in structure. This simply means that at the various levels (i.e. phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics) of language analysis, there are observable differences in languages of the world. These differences can adequately be accounted for, through a CA which is one of the surest and most important ways by which linguistics is applied in second language teaching and learning. In the thinking of Nwala (2015),

> Contrastive analysis concerns two or more languages, a source language and a target language. It is a systematic investigation which places two or more languages side by side with the view to identifying their areas of similarities and dissimilarities (p. 312)

Similarly, Klein (1986) cited in Tamunobelema (2018, p. 38), explained that "contrastive hypothesis claims that the acquisition of an L2 that coincides with corresponding structure of L1 are usually assimilated with great ease as a result of "positive transfer". Nonetheless, contrasting features present considerable difficulties and give rise to errors as a result of negative transfer". In a related opinion, Corder (1973, p. 48) stated that CA is "… the process of comparing different languages mostly two languages to yield an account of the difference between language: predicting learning problem or task the learner will meet in trying to acquire the second language." A CA is an aspect of second language learning whose duty is to contrast synchronically, two language structures in such a way that the similarities and dissimilarities can be revealed. Valsoman (1966, p. 34) cited in Corder (1973) defined contrastive analysis as "a comparison of the two equivalent portions of two languages for the purpose of isolating the problem that speakers of one language will have in acquiring the other" (p. 41). Little wonder, Tamunobelema (2018, p. 39), opined that "contrastive analysis believes that interference can be predicted on the basis of contrastive or differential analysis, and that a CA is an attempt to predict and elucidate the reaction of learners in a given contrast situation". In a similar view, Schacter (1973, p. 210) cited in Tamunobelema (2018, p. 39), held that CA is "the analysis of the similarities and differences between two or more language". He explains that the interference from L1, are the elementary problems of learning a new language at various levels of linguistics study. Relatedly, Gast (2013, p. 61) narrowly defined CA as "the study which investigates the difference between pairs (or small sets) of languages against the background of similarities and with the purpose of providing input to applied discipline such as foreign language teaching and translation studies." In like manner, Falk (1978, p. 9) cited in Corder (1973, p. 48) stated that CA is "the comparison of the linguistic system of the source and the target language". Consequently, Klein (1986, p. 53) postulated that CA is "any investigation in which the sentence of two languages are compared. A contrastive grammar establishes point – by –point relation between their respective system, with the aim of explaining the problematic areas, and thereby helping teachers to remedy errors made by speakers of one in learning the other". In the same vein, James (1980) cited in Tamunobelema (2018, p. 39), postulated that CA is a "linguistic enterprise aimed at producing inverted (i.e. contrasting not comparative) two related typologies". He went on to say that it is for that reason that CA deals with languages in contact, not in isolation. In a related way Gass and Selinker (1994, p. 59) viewed CA as "a way of comparing languages in order to determine potential errors for the ultimate purpose of isolating what needs to be learned and what does not need to be learned in a second language learning situation". Corroborating the above, Kohler (1974, p. 83) cited in Tamunobelema (2018, p. 38), said that "the idea behind it is to find a way of predicting those mistakes in

pronunciation and sentence construction which foreign leaners of a language are likely to make and devise drills to prevent these mistakes from occurring".

In the light of above, CA maybe described as systematic process of comparing or studying two or more human languages with a view to sport-lighting or identifying the dissimilarities and similarities between or among them. It is basically a method of second language study which is believed to be teacher centred. In it, the teacher knows the differences or difficulties that exist between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL), so that he or she can teach better or explain both the structural and linguistic differences to the L2 learner. In CA therefore, the analyst is usually preoccupied with the comparison of two languages (the first language and second language of a language learner) so as to uncover areas of differences and similarities to help the adult learner to acquire the language easily. This can be achieved by means of placing the languages of interest or study, side by side and describing their various features methodically.

Conceptual Review

1. Transformational Grammar

This is a subcomponent of the generative grammar. It is the subcomponent of the generative grammar made up of T- rules - that operate on the D-Structure, which is generated, by the rules of the base to derive the S-Structure. The base of the syntactic component is a system of rules that generate a highly restricted (perhaps finite) set of basic strings. Chomsky (1964) averred that the rules of the base generate restricted sentences called kernel sentences.

Transformation generally is the act of rearranging or reordering strings in other ways. According to Chomsky (1964, p.136), the major function of transformational rule is to convert an abstract D-Structure that expresses the content of a sentence into a fairly concrete S-Structure that indicates its form. The D-Structure is the input of the grammar where the T-rules operate to yield the output, the S-Structure. As the input of the grammar, the D-Structure is called the Structural Description (SD), Structural Analysis (SA), or Structural Index (SI), while the S-Structure is known as the Structural Change (SC). What the T- rules actually do is to relate the D-Structure to the S-Structure, this presupposes that T-rules as it were cannot introduce meaning-bearing elements nor can they delete lexical items unrecoverably (Chomsky, 1964). They are said to be meaning preserving (Anagbogu, Mbah&Emeh, 2001).

There are four basic types of transformational rules. They are:

  i.   Movement rule or permutation

  ii.   Deletion rule

  iii.   Insertion rule or Adjunction

  iv.   Copying rule or Substitution.

(i) Movement rule

This is the T-rule, which involves the re-ordering or the movement of lexical items from one position in the phrase marker to another. The movement of items generally from one position to another in the phrase marker is for both stylistic and semantic reasons. The subject-auxiliary inversion in English and resumptive pronoun situations of the Echie language use for polar question formation, the dative (indirect object) movement, passive formation, affix-

hopping or flip-flop are examples of movement T-rules. For explicitness, the paper shows some instances of transformational constructions:

(a) Passive Formation

This is an optional transformational process, which relates or converts the active sentence to a passive sentence. Passive formation involves agent postposing and patient preposing, thereby changing the focus of emphasis in the sentence:

> 1a. Gloria bought the car (Active)

> 1b. The car was bought by Gloria (Passive)

> 1c. The car was bought (Passive)

The rule for deriving passive sentence can be formalized thus:

> S $\longrightarrow$ NP1- AUX-V - NP2 Active

> S $\longrightarrow$ NP2- AUX- be +en – V – by + NP1

> Passive or

> S $\longrightarrow$ NP2 – AUX - be +en –V Passive

The conversion of an active sentence to a passive one as the example shows necessitates the (optional) insertion of the preposition 'by', the insertion of a 'Be' verb and the aspect tense marker (be + en).

(b) Dative Formation

This is the T-rule that moves an indirect object leftward. It is a preposing of the indirect object to a position, which is before the direct object and the consequence deletion of a stranded preposition. The preposed indirect object follows the verb of the sentence in the linear order. In English, not all the verbs can take two objects. Verbs that take two objects are ditransitive verbs (also called, verbs of exchange of possession). Some examples of ditransitive verbs are sell, buy, loan, borrow, dash, give, show, etc. Each of the verbs of the sentences below has two objects.

> 2a. John gave a car to Juliet

> 3a. Nkechi loaned thousands toNgozi

> 4a. Comfort bought a house for thehusband.

> The sentences after undergoing a dative transformational process will be:

> 2b. John gave **Juliet** a car

> 3b. Nkechi loaned **Ngozi** thousand

> 4b. Comfort bought the **husband** a house.

The objects in the bold faces are the indirect ones. In the (A) part of the sentences, they were at their original positions, while their positions in the 'B' part are as a result of the dative T-rule. Their movements as the (B) part of the sentences necessitated an obligatory deletion of the prepositions **to** and **for**. This T-rule is also language-specific. It does not exist in Echie. The rules for deriving dative, expressions can be presented thus:

SD S $\longrightarrow$ NP1 + AUX + V+ NP$_2$- PP + NP$_3$

SC S $\longrightarrow$ NP1 + AUX + V + NP3 +NP$_2$

(ii) Deletion Transformation

This is the transformational process that elides or deletes certain items of constructions as the constructions are undergoing structural changes. Dative transformation is an example of deletion T-rule. Other types of deletion transformations include, imperative construction, Equi -VP deletion, Equi -NP deletion, deletion under the condition of identity(see Ndimele 1999, Agbedo 2000, Anagbogu et al 2001 &Nwala 2016a). In this paper, the imperative deletion situation and **Equi -NP Deletion** are used to show deletion situations:

(a) Imperative deletion

An imperative sentence is the typethat issues directives, orders and commands. Examples of imperative sentences are:

5. Sweep the house!

6. Go to the school!

7. Do it now!

8. Go there!

The sentences above have no overt subjects. The opinion in the literature is that the sentences underwent transformations, which deleted certain items of the Deep Structure. In the literature, it is argued that the items that were removed in such sentences are the pronoun **you** which is the subject of the sentence and the relevant modal auxiliary. The foregoing means that at the underlying construction the sentences read:

9. You will sweep the house

10. You will go to the school

11. You will do it now

12. You will go there.

The rule for deriving imperative sentences ispresented thus:

SD   S $\longrightarrow$ NP + Aux + VP

         1   2   3

SC   ɵ   ɵ   3

The deletion of the subjects of the sentences and their auxiliaries leave the sentences in an imperative structure (Nwala, 2016a).

(b) Equi -NP Deletion

This is an obligatory transformation, which removes a noun, or a noun phrase (especially the subject of an embedded infinitival clause), which is identical with another noun, or noun phrase in the sentence:

13a   Peace prefers - to love herself

14a   Gloria pretended- to hate herself.

Sentences 13a and 14a are surface structures of sentences 13b and 14b respectively:

13b.   Peace prefers Peace to love herself

14b. Gloria pretended Gloria to hate herself.

The second **Peace** and **Gloria** in sentences 13b and 14b were deleted to derive sentences 13a and 14a respectively because of their equivalent identity withthe first **Peace** and **Gloria**. The deletion of the second **Peace** and **Gloria** via T-rule favours the argument that subjects of infinitive clauses are not to be filled by any item with a phonetic shape; secondly, another argument in favour of **Peace** and **Gloria** as the subject of the second clause of sentences 13a and 14a is the usual co-referential relationship which exists between an antecedent and its anaphor.

Anaphors and their antecedents as argued in the literature are usually clausemates; if **Peace** and **Gloria** are not the underlying subjects of the second clauses of 12b and 13b, herself in both second clauses will not have any antecedent that will license itsexistence, hence the sentence is bound to be ill-formed (Ndimele, 1999,1996 ; Nwala 2016a).

(iii) Insertion

This is the transformational process that involves the inclusion of new constituents in a construction. The insertion of new constituents usually helps in deriving sentences, which would have been impossible. Passivization of active sentence involves obligatory insertion of constituents that make the grammar possible.

Another example of insertion transformation process is the Do-support transformation. In any sentence where an auxiliary is absent, it is always difficult to form a polar question from such construction. To overcome such problem, the auxiliary **Do** is usually inserted in the Aux node. The inserted **Do** thereafter inverts position with the subject of the sentence. As it (Do) goes, it drags along the tense affix of the verb, thus, leaving the verb in its base form. This transformational rule is a typical example of the principle of last resort introduced in the Government and Binding grammar of 1980 by Chomsky.

Sentences 15b and 16b are the outputs of the **Do-support insertion**:

15a.   John killed the dog

15b.   Did John kill the dog?

16a.   Jane abandoned James

16 b.   Did Jane abandon James?

(iv)   Substitution Transformation

This is the transformational process that copies the relevant constituent of a construction to form a new one. Substitution or copying transformation is not a movement transformation per se, but that which copies relevant constituents of a sentence.

A good example of substitution transformation is the tag question formation. The formation of tag questions normally involves the pronominal copy of the subject and auxiliary elements of an initial statement:

Sentence 17b - 19b are the outputs of the substitution transformation of sentences 17a-19a:

17a.   She is coming

17b   She is coming, -isn't she?

18a.   They did not come.

18b.   They did not come, did they?

19a.   We are reading

19b   We are reading, aren't we?

The samples of transformations shown above allude to the position of scholars n the literature that transformational rules change constructions to new ones.

Nwala (2016a, p. 144) clearly pointed to the above when he defines transformation as "the act of rearranging or reordering items into other ways". This means that a sentence or construction can be represented or realized from an existing construction using the transformational rules. The major function of the transformational rules is to convert abstract deep structures that express the content of a sentence into a fairly concrete surface structures that indicate their form (see also Chomsky, 1964). This simply means that transformational rule act on initial constructions to convert them into new ones.

Mbah (2006) in his own opinion explained that transformational rules relate the changes at the surface structure to those of the deep structure and reduce same to a minimum of rules. In addition, Mbah noted that transformational grammar refers to a syntactic model, a level, which contains all the phonological materials used in actual speech. The second level is the deep structure. The deep structure according to Nwala (2016a), p. 141) is "an organization in which all the elements determining structural interpretations are represented". This means that the idea of surface structure is embedded in the deep structure. Put differently, the surface structure is the outward representation of the deep structure. That is, through the deep structure, other sentences can be generated or derived.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that T-rules act on structures already generated by the rules of the base to convert them into new structures. The usefulness of the transformational grammar has always been its supports to the dynamic nature of language, as it brings to open the stylistic and pragmatic beauty of language. Again it is argued in the literature that transformational grammar was propounded by Noam Chomsky in 1957 in a thesis entitled "Syntactic Structures" to remedy the short comings of the phrase structure grammar (PSG), (a type of generative grammar also called, a rewritten rule grammar) used to specify or show components of the sentence. The PSG according to Nwala (2016b) for example could not be used to analyse mirror sentences; it could not explain that two sentences that are structurally different may have the same underlying form; PSG could not be used to analyse ambiguous sentences, that is, sentences that have more than one meaning among others. So, in transformational grammar, both the observational and explanatory adequacies of language are pursued, as the grammar tries to recognize two levels of linguistic analysis - the deep structure and the surface structure.

Methodology

Research methodology is the science of methods and procedures used in any given analysis or activity. It is a set of related principles, which are adopted to specify how to reach a particular conclusion or achieve a given objective. This paper adopts the descriptive research design to analyse the data got purposively from English texts and those of the Echie language supplied by the author who is a competent speaker of Echie language.

Data Analysis

1   Polar Question

In this type of question, it is expected that the respondent says either yes or no. In English, it is observed in the literature (Nwala 2016a, Nwala 2016b, Mbah 2006, Ndimele 1999, Ore 1997), that polar questions are formed by swopping the position of the auxiliary of the sentence with the subject of the sentence, hence, subject-auxiliary inversion. For example:

20a. They are singing

20b. Are they singing?

Polar questions in English are realized from underlying sentences which are usually in declarative forms or statements through the action of transformation. The subject of the sentence as noted above takes the position of the auxiliary verb while the auxiliary verb takes the position of the subject. The following sentences give further clarification:

Underlying sentenceDerived polar questions

21. She is sweeping	Is she sweeping?
22. They are coming	Are they coming?
23. He is jumping	Is he jumping?
24. Princewill is going	Is Princewill going?
27. They were here	Were they here?
28. They have gone	Have they gone?

To convert the underlying sentences above that are in the declarative forms or statements, the subjects of the sentences swop positions with those of the auxiliaries. In sentence 20a for example, the subject swops position with the auxiliary, hence, the polar question in 20b. A similar thing is noticed in sentences 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 where the subjects *she, they, he, Princewill,* also swop position with the auxiliaries *is, are, were*, and *have* respectively.

But in Echie, there are two forms of polar question realizations. The emergence of a pronoun popularly called a resumptive pronoun which occurs because of the backward movement of the subject of the sentence to the position of COMP (a place agreed in the literature to be outside the sentence boundary) and the emphatic yes or no question which is optionally introduced by the use of the question trigger ò-bu (is it?). In what follows, we present both types. We start with the resumptive pronoun type.

2.   Resumptive Pronoun Type

	Underlying	**Derived polar question**
29a.	Kelechi jhèrèáhià [Kelechi go-FT market]	29b.Kelechii òijhèrèáhià [Kelechi resum.p. go-FT to market]
	Kelechi went to market	Did Kelechi go to market
30a.	Nwaforjhèrèúlò [Nwafor go-FT house]	30b. Nwaforiòijhèrèúlò Nwaforresum.p. go-FT house]
	Nwafor went to the home	Did Nwafor go to the house

31a.   Chinedu nà Kelechi whnùrùòko   31b.Chinedu naKelechiiòiwhùrùwèòke?

[Chinedu conj. Kelechi see-FT rat]   [Chinedu conj. Kelechi resum.p.
                                         see-FT num. indc. rat]

Chinedu and Kelechi saw a rat   Did Chinedu and Kelechi see a rat?

The derived constructions above clearly show that the emergence of the pronoun ò is as a result of the dislocation of the subjects of the sentences. The moved subjects and the resumptive pronouns are co-indexed showing that they are co-referential, a situation where the moved item is the binder, while the resumptive pronoun is the bindee.

3.   The Emphatic Type

Unlike the resumptive pronoun type which is as a result of backward dislocation of the subject of the sentence to the position of COMP, the emphatic type is optionally introduced by ò-bu (is it?) known as the question trigger. It is a kind of polar question which has to do with the truth or falsehood of an utterance. For example:

	Underlying sentences	**Derived (Emphatic polar question)**
32a.	Chidubemrìrìirnì	32b. ò-buChidubemrìrìirnì?
	Chidubem eat-FT food]	[QT- Chidubem eat-FT food]
	Chidubem ate the food	Was it Chidubem that ate the food?
33a.	Gi naNwaforrìrìjì	33b. ò -buginàNwaforrìrìjì?
	[You conjNwafor eat-FT yam	[QT- you conjNwafor eat-FT yam]
	You and Nwafor ate the yam	Was it you and Nwafor that ate the
yam?		
34a.	Chika biàrà	34b. ò -bu Chika biàrà?
	[Chika come-FT]	[QT- Chika come-FT]
	Chika came	Was it Chika that came?

The question trigger ò-bu (is it?) behaves like the resumptive pronoun ò since the question it entails makes the respondent to answer either yes or no. But unlike the resumptive pronoun type, the emphatic type puts the respondent almost in an instructive position — where he/she is bound to say something. The question trigger, ò-bu [is it?] has some form of communicative force which is absent in the ordinary Yes-No question type of the resumptive pronoun.

Findings

Polar questions are realized from an underlying declarative sentence through the action of the transformational rules. To realize this in English as the data above show, the subject of the sentence takes or swops position with the auxiliary of the sentence.

But in Echie, there are two structural realizations: one, with the use of the resumptive pronoun, ò which must obligatorily take a low tone; two, with the use of ò-bu, [is it], which makes the question emphatic.

The resumptive pronoun as shown in the analysis is co-indexed with the moved subject and agreed in all grammatical features with it. The moved subject goes into the Comp position [one which is outside the sentence boundary]. The sentence remains grammatical because the subject moved into the new position with its grammatical features and is also co-indexed with the resumtive pronoun. The resumptive pronoun ò have morpho-variant allomorphs which agree in number and person with the antecedents. The question trigger, ò-bu makes the construction to have some compelling force on the addressee, making it mandatory for him/her to respond. What mentioning is the use of what we laballed "number indicator", **we,** which also adds strong responsive or mandatory pressure on the addressee in example 31b, which was not observed in others. The use of the indicator shows the plurality of the subject

Conclusion

Thus far, we have examined the differences and similarities between polar question formation in Echie and English respectively. Our description showed great structural syntactic contrast in both languages. The English language forms her polar question through the parameter of subject-auxiliary inversion but the Echie language realizes her polar question via the emergence of a resumptive pronoun and the insertion of a question trigger ò-bu (is it?).

Moreso, the status of the resumptive pronoun ò as a product of movement was analysed. The paper noted that the resumptive pronoun ò have morpho-variants, called allomorphs which agree in number and person with the antecedents. The antecedents in the parlance of the Government and Binding grammar governs and C-commands the anaphors. The left dislocation of subject to the SPEC-C or TOP position, as noted by the paper is basically for grammatical prominence

References

Anugbogu, P. N., Mbah, M. B. &Eme, C. A. (2001). *Introduction to linguistics*. Awka: J. F. C. Limited.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures.* Mouton: The Hague.

Chomsky, N. (1964). *Aspect of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press

Corder, S. P. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Emenanjo, E. N. 2015). *A grammar of contemporary Igbo: Constituents, features and processes*. Port Harcourt: M&J grand orbit Communications Ltd

Fries, C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Harbour: University of Michigan Press

Gass, S. &Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale, N. J: Lawrence Eribuam

Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures.* Ann Harbour: University of Michigan Press

Mbah, B. M. (2006). *GB syntax: Theory and application to Igbo*. Enugu: Association of Nigerian Authors.

Ndimele, O. M. (1992). *The parameters of universal grammar: A government and binding approach*. Owerri: African Educational service.

Ndimele, O. M. (2003). *A concise grammar and lexicon of Echie.* Aba: National institute for Nigeria language:

Nwala, M. A. (2016a). *Introduction to syntax: The student's guide* (rev.ed.) Abakaliki: Wisdom Publishers.

Nwala, M. A. (2016b). *Introduction to linguistics: A first course* (Rev.ed.)Port Harcourt: Obisco Nig. Enterprises

Isaac, T. (2018). *Applied linguistics: Teaching English as a language*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers International Ltd

Scott, S. &Permutter, D. (1979). *Syntactic argumentation and the structure of English.* Berkeley: University of California Press

Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. Mass: M. I.T. Press.