Aspects of Simple Connectives in Ikwere

Joshua, Samuel F.

University of Port Harcourt

E-mail: Samuel_joshua@uniport.edu.ng,

Phone: +2348037625560.

Alerechi, Roseline I. C.

Department of Linguistics and Communications

University of Port Harcourt

E-mail: alerechi_ric@yahoo.com

Phone: +2348035429749

………………………………………………………………………………….

Abstract

This work on aspects of simple connectives in Ikwere, an Igboid language spoken in Rivers State was undertaken because the subject matter of connectives in Ikwere has received very little attention. This study was thus carried out to investigate the structure of simple connectives in Ikwere, ascertain the syntactic relevance of connectives in Ikwere and determine the semantic import of these connectives. The work is based on the Ọ̀muanwa dialect of Ikwere Data for the work were obtained through unstructured elicitation interviews with competent language consultants of Ikwere and through participant observation. Data gathered were analyzed using the descriptive method of interlinear morpheme-to-morpheme glossing. Simple connectives in Ikwere were divided into Simple coordinators and Simple Subordinators. Simple coordinators in Ikwere were semantically split into additive, adversative and alternative while simple subordinators were functionally divided into subordinators in noun, relative and adverbial clauses. Our findings revealed that some simple connectives (simple adversatives) in Ikwere are optional as contrastive clauses are better linked without such connectives while some others are homophonous.

Key Words: conjunctions, connectives, coordinators, subordinators.

Introduction

The Ikwere language is spoken in four of the twenty-three Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Rivers State of Nigeria. The four LGAs are Ẹmohua, Ikwerre, Obio/Akpor and part of Port Harcourt Local Government Area. Linguistically, Ikwere is classified as an Igboid language of the West Benue-Congo

family of the Niger-Congo Phylum of languages (Williamson 1988, Williamson & Blench 2000). It is related to Echie, Ẹkpeye, Igbo, Ọgba, among others. The language comprises 24 divergent dialects, which are mutually intelligible. However, this paper identifies and analyzes some aspects of simple connectives based on the Ọmuanwa variety of Ikwere.

The study of connectives offers little evidence in favour of structural parallelism between hierarchical and non-hierarchical connections in syntax and discourse. Rather, it should be assumed that hierarchical as well as non-hierarchical discourse relations may in principle, be encoded by both coordination and subordination in syntax.

In syntax, hierarchical connection of clauses is traditionally called subordination and the non-hierarchical connection of clauses is called coordination. In line with this tradition, the terms coordination and subordination will be used in this paper as the two main types of connection (conjunction) in syntax. The distinction between linguistic coordination and subordination in languages has been investigated during the last decade by many authors within various research paradigms. A lot of works has been done in the area of coordination and subordination in several languages, however, there is no detailed or particular work on connectives in Ikwere. This work examines simple coordinators and subordinators in Ikwere to bridge the gap in knowledge.

Aim & Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate simple coordinators and subordinators in Ikwere. Specifically, the work seeks to investigate:

i. The structure of simple connectives in Ikwere
ii. The syntactic relevance of connectives in Ikwere
iii. The semantic import of coordinators and subordinators in Ikwere.

Methodology

Data for this work was obtained through unstructured elicitation interviews with six (two males and four females within the age range of 35 to 80) competent language consultants (native speakers). Sentences containing connectives were formulated in English and read to some of the lettered language consultants who in turn provided the Ikwere equivalent of those sentences. In addition to this process, the researchers also used the participant observation method to obtain some aspects of the data. The data were analyzed using the descriptive method of interlinear morpheme-to-morpheme glossing. The descriptive method of data analysis is based on the native speakers' intuition of their language and does not subscribe to any form of subjective conjecture. The data is represented orthographically and vowel nasalization is signaled by inserting 'n' between the consonant and vowel of the affected syllable.

Literature Review

1. Connectives

A connective is an uninflected function word that serves to join words, phrases or clauses or even sentences. In the same light, Quirk and Greenbaun (1973) conceived connectives as the most important means used to establish subordinative and coordinative relations in syntax. For Crystal (1997), connectives refer to a term in grammatical classification of words to characterize words or morpheme whose function is that of linking linguistic units at any level (words, phrases, clauses, sentences). The most obvious types of connectives are conjunctions.

Conjunction has been observed as traditionally having the function of joining grammatical structures. In the same vein, Ndimele (1999) described conjunction as a word whose primary function is to connect words, phrases, clauses or sentences. Examples of conjunctions are coordinators and subordinators.

Coordinators and Subordinators

Coordination and subordination involve the connecting of units; but in coordination, the units are on the same syntactic level while in subordination, one of the units is a constituent of a superordinate unit (Greenbaum & Quirk 2005). Coordination can be syndetic, asyndetic and polysynedic. In this paper, we are more concerned with syndetic coordination because it is the more usual and simple form and involves linking or connecting of unit by a coordinating connective such as and, but, or.

Subordination is a non-symmetrical relation holding between two clauses in such a way that one is a constituent or party the order (Quirk &Greenbaum 1973). This is true because a subordinate clause cannot stand alone as a sentence. It begins with a word (subordinator) that makes it dependent upon some other clauses. The main clauses of the sentence, which the subordinate clause is parasitic can stand alone and still be meaningful. For example:

    a.   Chika sang country side classics while she prepared dinner.

      i. Chika sang country-side classics (Main Clause)

      ii.while she prepared dinner (Subordinate Clause)

Syntactic Features of Coordinators and Subordinators

Quirk &Greenbaum (1973) and Greenbaum & Quirk (2005) discuss the syntactic properties of coordinators. They also showed how each feature applies to subordinators such as subject ellipsis, sequentially fixed clauses, linking of more than two clauses etc.

    (I)   **Subject Ellipsis**

When the subject of a preceding clause refers to the same entity with the clause introduced by a coordinator, the latter can be omitted. This contrasts with the subject of the clause introduced by subordinators. See examples (b) and (c):

    b.   He shot the thief <u>and</u> (he) caught him
    c.   (i)   They call <u>because</u> they need your service
        *(ii) They call because need your services

    (II) Sequentially Fixed Clauses

Clauses that begin with coordinators are sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause as illustrated in (d). This is in contrast to clauses that begin with some subordinators because they are not sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause as shown in (e).

    d. (i) Eze is crying or he is laughing. OR

      *(ii) Eze is crying, he is laughing

    e. (i) She opted to leave <u>because</u> she was not invited

      (ii) <u>Because</u> she was not invited, she opted to leave.

    (III) Linking of More Than Two Clauses

Quirk &Greenbaum (1973) said that *and* and *or* can link more than two clauses, and when this is done, all the final instances of these two conjunctions can be omitted, as shown in (f). On the other hand, subordinators and even the coordinator but cannot link more than two clauses.

    f. (i) She came to my house, deceived me and stole my watch.

This is interpreted as:

(ii)   She came to my house <u>and </u>deceived me <u>and </u>stole my watch.

Review of Related Works

Though the coordinator *nị* was treated in Alerechi & Weje (2013), their work was on numerals and not connectives. There is no work on connectives in Ikwere that we are aware of. We would however, review the work of Joshua (2015). In his work entitled *the syntax of connectives in Gokana and Kana,* Joshua identified two broad categories of connectives in Gokana and Kana. They are simple and derived connectives. The former are primarily connectives while the latter are derived through the process of grammaticalization. He identified three categories of simple connectives which are simple coordinators, simple subordinators and simple conjuncts. Joshua (2015) identified, for example, the connectives nè and vaa 'and' as additive coordinators in Gokana and stated that nè 'and' is used to link two or more noun phrases (NPs) in a construction and also used in the counting system of the language. Consider examples (g) – (h):

g.   nèn   mẽnẽ   nè   nèn   tãã

human rich   CONJ   human poor

'A rich man and a poor man'.

h.   òb   nè   enè

ten   conj.   one

'Eleven'

He opined that váa 'and' the other additive coordinator in Gokana is used to link two clauses of equal status into one compound sentence as shown in example (i):

i. Dumadi   gé   dé nu   váa   Bura   gé   bé-bé

PN   be-PROG   eat thing CONJ PN   be-PROG   fight-fight

'Dumadi is eating and (at the same time) Bura is fighting'

In all, Joshua (2015) identified five (5) simple coordinators, nine (9) simple subordinators and four (4) simple conjuncts in Gokana and they were described and analyzed functionally and semantically.

SIMPLE CONNECTIVES IN IKWERE

Simple connectives are those connectives that underived in nature. They are purely connectives and not derived from some other grammatical category. In Ikwere, simple connectives are divided into simple coordinators and subordinators.

(I)   SIMPLE COORDINATORS

Simple coordinators are used to express a variety of semantic notions in Ikwere and are thus subdivided according to their semantic implications. These are:

(a) Additive
(b) Adversative
(c) Alternative

A.   Additive Coordinators

Additive coordinators add something to what has been already stated. In Ikwere, the additive coordinator is represented by *nị* 'and', it is used for the addition of units or numbers. Specifically, *nị* links objects and persons. See examples (1) – (4):

---

1. mé   nị̀   gé
   1SG CONJ 2SG
   'You and I'

2. jí   nị̀   édè →   ji   nè   édè
   Yam CONJ Cocoyam   Yam CONJ Cocoyam
   'Yam and cocoyam'

3. é↓lú nị̀   àlì →   é↓lú   nà   àlì
   up CONJ down   up   CONJ down
   'up and down'

4. Ngozi nị̀   Chituru
   PN   CONJ PN
   'Ngozi and Chituru'

Examples (1) and (4) demonstrate that the vowel of the additive coordinator -ị as in nị̀ 'and' is unaffected by the vowel of the following word if it begins with a consonant. In contrast, it assimilates completely to the vowel of the following word if it begins with a vowel as shown in (2) and (3). Examples (2) and (3) further show that the vowel of the additive coordinator is subject to the expandedness or non-expandedness feature of the vowel of the following word in terms of the size of pharyngeal cavity. Notice that the additive coordinator consistently is marked with a low tone irrespective of the level of the contiguous tone or whether its vowel is modified or not.

The additive coordinator nị̀ 'and' also is used in the numeral system of Ikwere to count complex numerals that involves addition. See examples (5) – (9) taken from Alerechi & Weje (2013, p. 176) :

5) Ǹrí   nị̀   àbǒ →   ǹrí   nà   àbǒ
   ten CONJ two   ten   CONJ two
   'twelve'

6) ọ́↓gnú   nì   ìsně
   twenty CONJ   five
   'twenty five'

7) ọ́↓gnú   ànộ̀   nị̀   ǹrí
   twenty   four CONJ   ten
    20   ×   4   +   10
   'ninety'

8) ọ́↓gnú ìsně nị̀   ǹrí nò   ótù
   twenty five CONJ ten CONJ one
    20   ×5   +   10 +   1
   'hundred and eleven'

9) ǹrí ọ́↓gnú nọ̀   ọ́↓gnú   ìsně

ten   twenty CONJ twenty   five

20 × 10   + 20 × 5

'three hundred'

Examples (5) – (9) show that *nị* acts as a mathematical process of addition to derive a more complex numeral. This is contrary to the process of multiplication, which is not marked with any overt morpheme or word in the language as in (7) – (9).

The additive coordinator *nị* also functions to link constructions larger than the word such as phrases. Consider examples (10) – (13):

10)   Nyé   tíchà   nị   nyé   árnụ́ úbì

person teacher CONJ person work farm

'a teacher and a farmer'.

11)   ọ́↓ró   ùjíjî   nọ̀   ọ́↓ró úhié-ú↓hié

house   black CONJ house red-red

'a black house and a red house'

12)   Ézè   gwè-rè-rè   ḿ↓má ògbède nọ̀   ọ̀zìzà àtọ́

PN   take-ASRT-FACT knife   small   CONJ broom three

'Eze collected/took a small knife and three brooms'.

13)   Úrè   nà   Àdná   jné áhiá

PN   CONJ PN   go market

'Ure and Adna went to the market'.

Observe that the vowel of the additive morpheme is always a copy of the initial vowel of the following word but as a syllable peak, it retains its inherent low tone despite the tone of the following word. Examples (10) and (11) show *nị* functioning as a link between two phrases whereas examples (12) and (13) demonstrate the use of the morpheme in linking independent clauses. While (12) demonstrates the linking of two objects, (13) shows that of two subjects.

  The coordinator *nị* 'and' also can be used to add units or objects to an existing list. This also involves connecting more than two persons as examples (14) and (15) illustrate:

14)   Ò   nyègà-rà   Úrè   èkètè, éhnìgwè, ọ̀zìzà nị   ńkwà

3SG give-FACT PN basket, axe,   broom CONJ drum

'S/He gave Ure the basket, axe , broom and drum

15)   Mé,   gé   nù̀   Úchè

1SG 2SG CONJ PN

 'you, Uche and I'

Observe from the data in (14) and (15) that when the items to be linked are more than two, they are conjoined by a comma until the last item, which is then linked by the coordinator *nị*.

B. Adversative Coordinator

The adversative coordinator in Ikwere is expressed with *mà nị* 'but that', which is optional and can thus be ellipted in the surface structure of the sentences where it should occur. Consider examples (16) – (19).

16) Ézè bịa ọ̀rò (mà nọ̀) ọ̀ mâ à-hnú ↓ḿ

PN come house but that 3SG AUX-NEG PT-see 1SG

'Eze came to the house but he did not see me'.

17) Ò jnè à-zú ↓jí (mà nọ̀) ọ̀ mâ à-hnú ↓á

3SG go PT-buy yam but that 3SG AUX-NEG PT-see 3SG

'S/He went to buy yam but s/he did not see it.

18) Ò nyègà-rà m ịwaí (mà nị̀) m̀ mâ m è-gwè-rè ↓á

3SG give-FACT 1SG money but that 1SG AUX-NEG 1SG PT-take-ASRT 3SG

'S/He gave me money but I didn't collect it'.

19) M̀ chọ̀gà m è-zní ányárnà (mà nị̀) yá (nǐm) chọ̀gà è-tné é↓rí

1SG want 1SG PT-sleep sleep but that 3SG(self) want PT-dance dance

'I want to sleep but s/he wants to dance'.

Note that in anticipation of the third person singular pronoun *ọ̀* in (16) and (17), the vowel -*ị* in *nị* completely assimilates to the vowel of the pronoun. Thus, *mà nị ọ̀* 'but that s/he' can be read as *mà nọ̀ ọ̀* in fast speech. From examples (16) – (19), it is observed that the original item for the adversative coordinator is *mà* 'but', but it cannot occur in isolation. The parentheses in the examples indicate that the adversative coordinator is optional. However, if it must be used in a construction, it must co-occur with the complementizer *nị̀*, whose English equivalent, in this context, is 'that'. This is so because the deletion of the complementizer in a finite clause makes such a clause ungrammatical as shown in (20):

20) * Ò jnè à-zú ↓jí (mà) ọ mâ à-hnú ↓á

3SG go PT-buy yam but 3SG AUX-NEG PT-see 3SG

This obligatory presence of the complementizer is peculiar to just constructions exemplifying the use of the adversative coordinator *mà nị̀*. We therefore argue from the foregoing that the simple adversative coordinator in Ikwere is by and large not necessary in presenting contrasting statements or constructions. Thus, contrastive clauses are better linked without the adversative coordinator *mà nị̀* 'but that'.

C. Alternative Coordinator

This kind of coordinator offers a choice between two things or a list of things from where one of the possible alternatives can be made. Ikwere records two alternative coordinators marked with the phrase *mà ọ̀ bụ̀* 'or it be' and *sì ọ̀ bụ̀* 'or it be', whose English equivalent is 'or'. They are used to provide a list from which the choice for a particular command to obey and particular information required, respectively, are made. While *mà ọ̀ bụ̀* is used when the alternative choice to be made requires carrying out a specific command, Alerechi (2009:90) observes that *sì ọ̀ bụ̀* is used when the choice demands to provide specific information for any of the alternative items queried. In

other words, *mà ọ̀ bụ̀* 'or' is used for commands, whereas *sì ọ̀ bụ̀* 'or' is used for alternative questions. Examples are given in (21) – (24).

21) Gwè-ré   ú↓bné   mà ọ̀ bụ̀   ọ̀yìkpà!

    Take-ASRT   pear   but it be   corn

  'Collect pear or corn!'

22) Zù áznù   mọ̀ ọ̀ bụ̀   ánọ̀!

   buy fish   but it be   meat

   'Buy fish or meat!'

23) Mọ̀ ọ̀   dà   á-bíà   mọ̀ ọ̀   dǐ-à,   kpọ̀ à!

   but 3SG AUX/FUT PT-come   but 3SG be-NEG call 3SG

   'Whether s/he will come or not, call him!'

24) Ọ̀   gbà-gà   ásọ́ sì ọ̀ bụ̀ ọ̀   jnè-gà   íjnè?

   3SG run-PROG   race   or 3SG be   3SG go-PROG walk

   'Is s/he running or walking?'

25) Ò   rì   mí↓ní sọ̀ ọ̀   bụ̀   ò   rì   ńrì   sò   ò   rì áznù?

   3SG eat water   or 3SG be 3SG   eat   food   or 3SG eat   fish

   'Did s/he drink water or did s/he eat food or did s/he eat fish?'

Examples (21) and (24) demonstrate the use of the alternative coordinator phrases *mà ọ̀ bụ̀* 'or' and *sì ọ̀ bụ̀* 'or' in imperative and interrogative sentences, respectively and they can be modified in normal and fast speech. Thus examples (22) and (25) demonstrate that the vowels *-à* and *-ì* in *mà* and *sì*, respectively, can assimilate completely to the vowel of the following third person singular pronoun *ọ̀* 'it' within the phrase in normal speech. Examples (23) further show the deletion of *bụ̀* 'be' in fast speech, while the last alternative coordinator in (25) illustrate a successive deletion of both the pronoun *ọ̀* 'it' and *bụ̀* 'be' and the leftward spread of the expanded feature of the vowel of the verb root to the vowel of the alternative coordinator *sì*. Notice also that the alternative coordinators always are marked with a low tone.

It is observed also that apart from the first clause, the entire constituents of the subsequent clauses of an alternative question can be deleted except the alternative coordinator and the contrastive constituent. This deletion is only possible if the verbs are identical in the two clauses. Consider example (26):

26a) Ò   rì   mí↓ní sọ̀   ọ̀ bụ̀   ńrí   sọ̀ ọ̀   bụ̀ áznù?

   3SG eat water   or 3SG be   food   or 3SG be fish

  'Did s/he drink water or food fish?'

Example (26a) demonstrates the deletion of the subject and verb of the subsequent clauses in (25) as they are repetitions of the subject and verb of the initial clause.

If the verbs are not identical in the two clauses then such deletion as seen in (26a) is not tenable. See example (26b):

26b) Ò   rì   mí↓ní sọ̀   ọ̀   bụ̀   ọ̀   gbà   mí↓ni

3SG eat water   or 3SG be 3SG fetch water

'Did s/he drink water or fetch water?'

(II)   SIMPLE SUBORDINATORS

These are subordinators used to join sentence elements of unequal rank or status. They are simple because we are dealing with the underived form. Simple subordinators in Ikwere are functionally classified into subordinators in noun clauses, relative clauses and adverbial clauses.

(a) Subordinators in Noun Clauses

The subordinator which introduces noun clauses is the complementizer *nị* 'that'. *Nị* functions as a subordinator when it is attached to the verb *sị* 'say' and *↓ká* 'tell' in the main clause. See example (27):

(i) Ógè sị nị ǹ   dà   à-biá   ↓á ọrọ̀ tná

    PN   say that 3SG AUX-FUT   PT-come   3SG house today

    'Oge said that he will come home today'.

The morpheme *nị* is homophonous as it serves a dual function in Ikwere. It is an additive coordinator as already exemplified in 3.1 and in reported speech, it functions as a subordinator which introduces noun clauses when it is preceded by the verb *sị* 'say'.

(b) Subordinators in Relative Clause

The subordinator that introduces relative clauses in Ikwere is *↓ké* 'that'. This subordinator is optional in constructions where it is used. Its omission does not make the construction ungrammatical. It is also possible to find relative clauses in Ikwere with no overt subordinator introducing the relative clause. Consider the examples in (28) – (29) taken from Alerechi (2016) :

(28a) Ǹkítá -   tà É↓mé árnụ̀ bụ̀ kè m

    Dog   RC bite PN   bite be PRT 1SG

    'The dog that bit Eme is my own'.

  (b) Ǹkị́tá ↓ké tà   É↓mé árnụ̂ bụ́ kè m

    Dog that bite   PN   bite be PRT 1SG

   ' The dog that bit Eme is my own'.

(29a) Ò   mè ńhné áí   ché-lê

    3SG do thing 3PL think-NEG
    's/he did a thing that we did not expect'.

  (b) Ò   mè ńhné ké áí   ché-lê
    3SG do thing that 3PL think-NEG

Example (29b) is grammatical but rarely used, indicating that relative clause construction is gradually losing its overt marker in the language. Thus, the parentheses in example (30) demonstrate that it is optional in the language.

30) Ọ̀kwú↓kwú (ké) ọ́lú zụ bì àkwnâ

    Hen   (that) PN   buy lay egg

    'The hen that Ọlu bought laid the egg'.

(c) Subordinators in Adverbial Clauses

Depending on their function, the subordinators introducing adverbial clauses are grouped into five in Ikwere. They introduce adverbial clauses of time, condition, cause and purpose.

(i)   Adverbial Clause of Time

The subordinator that introduces clauses of time in Ikwere is *hnè* 'before'. *Hnè* introduces adverbial clauses of time in the perfect verb form. The subordinator has the freedom to occur at sentence-initial or sentence-medial positions as given in (31):

(31a) Hnè   mé   kè   è-jì   rúdû   ọ̀   lá-lá   (sentence-initial)

Time-before 1SG that PT-take   reach 3SG go-PERF

'Before I could get there he had gone'.

(b) Ọ̀   lá-lá   hnè   mé   kè   è-jì   rúdû   (sentence-medial)

3SG go-PERF time-before 1SG that PT-take reach

'He had gone before I could get there'.

Example (31a) shows the adverbial subordinator in sentence initial position, while (31b) shows it in medial position. Note that the occurrence of the adverbial either in initial of medial position, does not alter the tonal pattern of the sentence.

(ii)   Adverbial Clauses of Cause

The subordinator that introduces adverbial clauses of cause in Ikwere comprises two lexical items *ní* 'in' and *í↓hní* 'cause' as in *ní í↓hní*, giving the meaning equivalent in English as 'because'. See examples (32) – (33):

(32) Ọ̀   znù ó↓shní ní í↓hní ńrí   ọ̀gnùgnû

    3SG steal steal   in cause food hunger
    'S/he stole because of hunger'.

33) Ọ̀   ghà àghàlàghálá ní í↓hní   ọ́jó

    3SG lie lie   in cause fear

    'S/he lied because of fear'.

When the adverbial clause is moved to sentence-initial position, there is an introduction of the complementizer *kè* 'that' to the main clause as shown in (34) – (35):

(34) Ní í↓hní ńrí ọ̀gnùgnû kè/kò ó   ↓znú óshní

    In cause food hunger   that 3SG   steal steal
    'Because of hunger s/he stole'.

(35) Ní í↓hní ọ́jó kọ̀   ọ́   ghà ọ̀ghà (àghàlàghálá)

    In cause fear that 3SG lie   lie

    'Because of fear, s/he lied.'

Examples (34) and (35) demonstrate that in anticipation of the expandedness or non-expandedness feature of the vowel of the verb root, the third person singular pronoun harmonizes with either *o* or *ọ*, respectively. This assimilation further spreads leftward in such a way that the vowel of the connective *kè* copies the vowel of the pronoun to become either *kò* or *kọ̀* as in (34) (35), respectively. It is

observed also that the low tone of *ò* 's/he' in (32) and (33) changes to a high when the adverbial is moved to sentence initial position as in (34) or (35), respectively.

(iii)   Adverbial Clauses of Condition

The subordinator that introduces the adverbial clauses of condition in Ikwere is *ọ́ búrú hné* 'if it be that' meaning 'if' or 'in case'. It sometimes can be reduced to *hnè* 'if' or be completely omitted from the adverbial clause in the sentence and still be grammatical without any meaning change. Consider examples (34) – (35) :

34a) Chị̀-bnàyá   úwò   ḿ   ọ̀   bụ́-rú   hné élú zwè

bring-enter cloth 1SG 3SG be-ASRT if   rain fall

' Bring in my cloth in case (if) it rains'.

b) ọ̀   bú-rú   hné   élú zwè chị̀-bnàyánị̀   m   úwò   ḿ

3SG be-ASRT if   rain fall bring-enter-for 1SG cloth 1SG

'In case (if) it rains, bring in my cloths.'

35a) ì   dà   à-kwná á↓kwná hnè í   ì   gné-né   ńtnì

2SG AUX-FUT PT-cry   cry   if   2SG NEG listen-NEG ear

'You will cry if you don't listen.'

b) í   ì   gné-né   ńtnì ì   dà   à-kwná á↓kwná

2SG NEG listen-NEG ear 2SG AUX-FUT PT-cry   cry

'If you don't listen, you will cry'.

c)* Hnè í   ì   gné-né   ńtnì ì   dà   à-kwná á↓kwná

If 2SG NEG listen-NEG ear   2SG AUX-FUT PT-cry cry

Examples (34a) and (34b) demonstrate that *ọ́ búrú hné* 'if' or 'in case' can occur both in sentence-medial and initial positions, respectively. When *ọ́ búrú hné* is reduced to *hnè, hne* is read with a low tone instead of a high and only occurs in sentence-medial position as in (35a). Contrary to the full subordinator of adverbial clause of condition, which can occur in sentence-initial position as in (34b), the presence of *hnè* in sentence-initial position renders the construction ungrammatical as in (35c) and also can be omitted completely in the sentence and remain grammatical as in (35b).

(iv)   Adverbial Clauses Of Purpose

Certain subordinator is used to express the reason certain action occurred. Thus, the connective that introduces the adverbial clauses of purpose in Ikwere is *kè hné* 'so as to' or 'so that'.

36a) Ézè   ghà   ọ̀ghà kè hné wé   dè   è-nyè-hnásị̀   ↓á íwaí

PN   lie   lie   so that 3PL AUX-FUT PT-give-more   3SG money

'Eze lied so as to be given more money'

(b) kè hné wé   dè   e-nye-hnasi   a   iwai kè Ézè   ghà   ọ̀ghà

so that 3pl AUX-FUT PT-give-more 3sg money that   PN   lie   lie

'So as to be given more money, Eze lied'.

Observe the introduction of *kè* to the main clause when the subordinator *kè hnè* occurs sentence-initially. This is also the case when the subordinator occurs sentence-initially in adverbial clauses of cause as shown in 3.2.3.2. As has been observed earlier, the vowel of the additive morpheme is always a copy of the initial vowel of the following word but as a syllable peak, it retains its inherent low tone despite the tone of the following word.

Conclusion

This paper analyzed simple connectives in Ikwere. Simple coordinators in Ikwere were semantically split into additive, adversative and alternative while simple subordinators were functionally divided into subordinators in noun, relative and adverbial clauses. Our findings reveal that the simple adversative coordinator *mà nì* in Ikwere is by and large not necessary in presenting contrasting statements and constructions. Thus, contrastive clauses are better linked without the adversative coordinator. This kind of optionality is also observed in the subordinator that introduces relative clauses marker *ké* in Ikwere. In this light, relative clause constructions are gradually losing their overt markers in the language. Our analysis also revealed that assimilation and vowel harmony are notable features that affect the form of some connectives in Ikwere. We also found out that *nì* is a homophonous item as it represents both an additive coordinator and also serves as a subordinator that introduces noun clauses in Ikwere. Another item *hnè* was also treated as a homophone introducing adverbial clauses of time and condition. It becomes obvious from this study that some simple connectives in Ikwere are optional while some are homophonous in nature. The study then recommended that further investigation be carried out to examine some connectives that are not simple but could be termed as being complex or derived.

References

Alerechi, R.I.C. (2009). Question formation in Ikwere. *JOLAN*, No. 12, pp. 87-98.

Alerechi, R. I. C. (2016). Nominal modifiers in Ikwere. A paper presented at the ACAL 47 held from March 23 – 26 at the University of Berkley, Berkley, California (USA)

Alerechi, R.I.C. & A.U. Weje. (2013). The counting system in Ikwere. In O.-M. Ndimele & E.S.L. Chan (eds.) *The numeral systems of Nigerian languages: LAN occasional publications,* No.2, 175-187

Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Fourth Edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Greenbaum S., & Quirk R. (2005). *A student's grammar of the English language*, Second Indian Reprint. Singapore: Pearson.

Joshua, S. F. (2015). *The syntax of connectives in Gokana and Kana.* Unpublished M.A. thesis University of Port Harcourt.

Ndimele, O-M. (1999). *An advanced English grammar and usage*. Aba: National Institute for Nigerian Languages.

Quirk, R., & S. Greenbaum. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Williamson, K. (1988). Linguistic evidence for prehistory of the Niger-Delta.In E. Alagoa, F. N. Anozie and N. Nzewunwa (eds.), *The early history of the Niger-Delta,* 65-119. Hamburg: Burske.

Williamson, K. & Blench, R. (2000). Niger-Congo. In Heine, B. & Nurse, D. (eds.) *African languages: an introduction*, 11-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Abbreviations

ASRT = Assertive,	AUX = Auxiliary verb,	CONJ = Conjunction,
1SG = First person singular	2SG = Second person singular	3SG= Third person singular
2PL = Second person plural	3PL =Third person plural	FACT = Factative
FUT = Future	NEG=Negation	PERF = Perfective
PN =Personal name	PRT = Particularizer	PT = Participal
PREP = preposition	PROG = progressive	RC = Relative Clause, ↓ = down step