COORDINATORS IN SAFALIBA

BY

KENNETH BODUA-MANGO

A thesis submitted to the Department of Language and Communication Studies, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, in partial fulfilment for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy (Mphil).

June 2012

DEDICATION

To God be the glory

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest gratitude first goes to the Almighty God for giving me good health and a sound mind throughout my studies in Norway.

I would like to thank the Norwegian government for funding my study through the Quota Scheme scholarship.

Special thanks go to my supervisor, Prof. Kaja Borthen, for accepting to supervise my work. She has been source of encouragement and help to me throughout my studies especially during the trying time of writing my thesis. Thanks for all the comments and suggestions. I will always be indebted to you.

I would also like to thank all my teachers in the department of linguistics, NTNU, for sharing their knowledge with me. I would like to thank the creators of the online linguistic annotation tool Typecraft. They have made annotation much simpler. Thanks to Prof. Dorothee Beerman Hellan for teaching me how to use TypeCraft for the interlinear glossing of my data.

I would like to acknowledge my colleagues at the department of linguistics NTNU Mercy, Franciane, Miomiao, and Lars. I am particularly grateful to Ganaah John who shared native speaker intuitions with me. Thanks to Eric Tamantey for helping me with the table of content. Special thanks also go to Adda Gerald for being a friend and source of motivation throughout my stay here in Norway. Thanks to all my mates and friends of the Ghanaian community of NTNU especially Tutu, Ababa, Enoch, Safo, and Seth.

I will also like to thank Jonathan Allen Brindle for his advice and encouragement, particularly for making Blass's article on coordination in Sissala which has served as inspiration for this work available to me. I will also like to thank Paul Schaefer, Regina Blass, K.K. Ali, and Adams Bodoma whose work I have referred to extensively. You laid the foundations for my research.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all my informants especially Jacob, Kipo B, Alice and Memuna who helped me with the data. ***"Aní ya tuma".***

Also, thanks to the department of linguistics, University of Ghana for laying the foundation for me. Special thanks go to Dr George Akanlig-Pare and Dr. James Saanchi of the department of linguistics for mentoring me.

I would not be who I am but for my family. I thus would want to thank my family for their prayer and support.

Thank you all.

Abstract

This study examines the Safaliba coordinators ***'ní' / 'aní', 'á', 'ka', 'chɛ'*** and ***'bíí'*** in their naturally occurring environments. Safaliba is a Gur language spoken by some 5000 -7000 people in the north-western part of Ghana.

The main areas of study include the syntactic categories that each coordinator can coordinate, the semantic properties of each of the coordinators and the pragmatic effect that the use of theses coordinators can have. Combinations of the individual coordinators called compound coordinators are also investigated; discussing the syntactic categories that each compound coordinator can coordinate, their semantic contents and the pragmatic effect that the use of each compound coordinator can have. The main source of data is eight (8) selected and transcribed narratives collected during a two month field work carried out between July and August 2010 in Mandari, the largest Safaliba village.

A general background about Safaliba is presented first. Here the language and its people are introduced. Some basic grammatical properties of Safaliba are also presented with the aim of facilitating the reader's understanding of various issues as they pertain in Safaliba. These constitute chapters 1and 2.

Secondly, the syntactic properties of the coordinators are investigated. Here, the syntactic categories that each coordinator can coordinate are illustrated with relevant examples. At the end of the discussion on the syntactic properties of these coordinators, I look at whether the coordinators in the language adhere to Payne's (1985) implicational scale that is assumed to constrain the syntactic properties of coordinators across languages.

Next the semantic and pragmatic properties of the coordinators are tackled. Here the discussion tries to assign specific meanings to the various coordinators by separating the meanings from connotations that are pragmatically inferred from the use of these coordinators. An attempt to account for the source of the pragmatically derived connotations is also made here.

Last to be discussed are compound coordinators. Here the discussion concerns the definition of compound coordinators and how they are formed. The syntactic categories that each compound coordinator can coordinate are illustrated. Also, specific meaning is assigned to these compound coordinators by separating the pragmatically derived connotations they can carry from the bare meaning of the compounds.

TABLE OF CONTENT

List of abbreviations, glosses and some Safaliba words

N	Noun
V	Verb
Det	Determiner
ADJ	Adjectives
LOC	Locative construction
Subj	Subject
Obj	Object
PERF	Perfective
IPFV	Imperfective
REL	Reletivizer
1SG	First person singular
2SG	First person singular
3SG	First person singular
1PL	First person plural
2PL	First person plural
3PL	First person plural
NEG	Negative marker
PN	Pronoun
Np	Proper noun
CONJC	Coordinating conjunction
CONJS	subordinating conjunction
FOC	Focus marker

ADV	Adverb
V1	First verb in a serial verb construction
V2	Second verb in a serial verb construction
V3	Third verb in a serial verb construction
PNrel	Relative pronoun
S	Sentence
VP	Verb phrase
AP	Adjectival Phrase
HAB	Habitual marker
PL	Plural
TZ	A local dish made from millet or maize flour
Fufu	A local dish made from pounded yam
Gari	A grain like food made from cassava
Tapioca	A grain like food made from cassava very similar to gari
Dawadawa	A spice for cooking

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The aim of this work is to look into coordination in Safaliba with focus on the coordinators ***'ní' / 'aní', 'á', 'ka', 'chɛ'*** and ***'bíí'***. I will first account for the syntactic categories that each of these coordinators can coordinate. After the syntax chapter, I will look at the meaning of each coordinator whether semantically encoded or pragmatically derived. This thesis will also look into compound coordinators; investigating both their syntactic and semantic properties. Where applicable the pragmatic connotations that the use of these compound coordinators convey will be discussed with the view of accounting for the source of those connotations.

1.1.1 About the language and people

Naden (1988) classifies Safaliba as a Niger-Congo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, North, Gur, Central, Northern, Oti-Volta, Western, Northwest language. Its closest relatives include Waali, Farefare, and Dagaare. The Safaliba villages are however geographically distant from the towns and villages where it's sister languages are spoken. Sissala; a language that will be referred to in this thesis is a distant relative of Safaliba.

According to (Schaefer, 2009:5), the language is spoken by some 5000 -7000 people in the north-western part of Ghana. Both the language and the speakers are called Safaliba. Safaliba speakers can be found in several towns and villages located near the Black Volta River. The Black Volta also serves as a border with Côte d'Ivoire. The language is not known to have any dialects. The language is used for all domains of life among the Safaliba people.

The Safaliba communities are predominantly agricultural. A vast majority of the people engage in subsistence farming, growing mainly yams, cassava, millet, and maize. In recent time cashew farming has become very popular among the people with many farmers going into small, medium or large scale cultivation of the cash crop. Many of the women engage in sheabutter making. Gari making is also popular among the women. Even though the people are located near the Black Volta River, they are not known for fishing.

Historically the Safaliba people are regarded as indigenes of the land they now occupy. According to Kluge and Hatfield (2002:7) the Safaliba people claim to have come from an area in today's Cote d'Ivoire and first settled in an area around what is now Mandari near Bole in the Northern region of Ghana. However, verification of this from the villagers suggests that

this is not the case. One Aworo, the oldest person from the ***'Naa-weeri'*** clan in Mandari claims that it is actually the Muslim section of the population that came from Cote d'Ivoire. According to him, the Muslims came as settlers and that they have now integrated with the Safaliba people and speak the language. He said that, the Gonja and other tribe migrated to the area after the Safaliba people. Currently, Mandari is the biggest Safaliba village.

Religiously, Safaliba people are generally traditional believers. Islam was brought into the communities by the settlers who came from Cote d'Ivoire. Christianity is also fast growing among the people with many churches springing up. This growth of Christianity has mainly been among the traditional believers with the Muslim population relatively unaffected.

The Safaliba are well integrated and intermarry with several of the other ethnic groups particularly the Vagla, Choruba and Gonja who also live in the area.

Traditional political authority among the Safaliba people is vested in the ***'Safalinaa'*** literally meaning (Safaliba chief). There are also Gonja chiefs in the Safaliba villages but they are largely seen by the people as chiefs of the Gonja people in the villages. The modern political system turns to give more recognition to the Gonja chiefs. They however do not have any control over the land. The land is controlled by the ***'Safalinaa'*** and the clan heads who double as his elders.

1.2 Previous research

According to Naden (1988:12), the Gur languages "have attracted comparatively little study by outsiders" and Safaliba is no exception. Like most of its sister languages, Safaliba remains largely under-studied. In fact, Safaliba seems to be one of the least studied in the language family. In recent times, basic linguistic research has been done by personnel of the Ghana Institute of Linguistics, Literacy and Bible Translation (GILLBT). Notable among them is Paul Schaefer. They have also translated part of the Bible into the language and written some children's story books as well as some basic school text books.

Analysis of some aspects of the linguistic structure of Safaliba has been done by Schaefer and Schaefer (2003, 2004), P. Schaefer (2008a, 2008b and 2008c). More recently, Schaefer's doctoral dissertation, Schaefer (2009), gives a fairly detailed overview of the language. The language however has been subjected to little semantic and pragmatic analysis. This work will thus be seen as breaking the ice on the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the language.

Apart from Schaefer (2009), in which Schaefer talks about coordinators in the language, there is no other published work on coordinators in the language known to me. Dakubu (2005) and Ali (2006) however give a fairly detailed account of coordinators in Dagaare which is a related language. Blass (1990) also works on coordinators in Sissala, which is another related language. Relevant portions of what theses researchers write about each of the various coordinators have been provided in the sections in which they are deemed necessary.

1.3 The research problem

The main focus of this research is to find out under what conditions the coordinators ***'ní'*** / ***'aní', 'a', 'ka', 'chɛ'*** and ***'bíí'*** can be used. This will involve all the following sub questions.

- What grammatical categories can each coordinator coordinate?
- What are the semantic and pragmatic properties of the various coordinators?
- What are the possible combinations of coordinators in Safaliba?
- What grammatical categories can the various compound coordinators coordinate?
- What are the semantic and pragmatic properties of the compound coordinators?

1.4 Method and empirical sources

The findings in this work are based largely on recorded naturally occurring data collected during a two month field work carried out between July and August 2011 in Mandari, the largest Safaliba village. During this period, I recorded several stories and narratives. I also recorded conversations and arguments. Out of this pool of recordings eight were selected to be used as the corpus for this research. All the recordings were done in MP3.wav format. All the selected recordings were transcribed and translated with the aid of three informants: Jacob Aworo (25) Kipo B (35) and Alice Aworo (32).

Since one does not always find all the needed examples in the data, I have in addition to the four short stories and four narrative descriptions, that serve the corpus for this work, made use of some constructed sentences and some translated examples from related works in related languages. To aid in clarifying the meaning of the various coordinators, direct questions on what particular coordinators meant and the possible connotations they may carry were also asked.

Due to the demands of annotations[1], only the selected sections that were used as examples to show various concepts and claims were annotated. The annotation was done using the online annotation tool called Typecraft (http://typecraft.org). All the annotated examples are available on http://typecraft.org/TCEditor/1881.

The annotated examples in this work have four levels; the first tier is the sentence in the object language. The second tier is the free translation. The third tier consists of the meanings of the individual word while the last one consists of the parts of speech.

Annotated examples where applicable, come with reference to particular texts which are available in full at http://typecraft.org/tc2wiki/Category:Safaliba_Corpus. Also where necessary, background information and scenarios have been described to enable easy understanding.

Basic rising (ˊ) and falling (ˋ) tone was also annotated.

Out of the four short stories and four descriptive narratives, the various coordinators had the following number of occurrences.

Table 1 Number of occurrences

Coordinator	Number of occurrences
'ní'	11
'aní'	3
'a' – conjunction	28
'ka' – subordinator	72
'ka' – conjunction	83
'chɛ' – and	9
'chɛ' – but	4
'bíí'	5

The statistics here does not include the occurrences of the various coordinators in the constructed sentences and the translated examples from other related languages, as the aim is to investigate the coordinators in naturally occurring data.

[1] Annotations include transcription, descriptive and analytic notations such as part of speech, tone, free translation, base forms etc applied to raw language data.

The syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic findings of this work are thus based on these numbers. However native speaker intuition is also important.

1.5 Theoretical Framework

This work is descriptively oriented, thus no one theoretical approach was used in the analysis although relevance theory plays a prominent role. The main aim of this work is to describe the phenomenon such that it could be implemented in any framework and not to test if a particular theory can account for the phenomenon.

First of all the grammatical categories used here are based on categories that are well known in generative grammar and are consistent with those mentioned in Andrew Radford (1997). The meaning of the coordinators is influenced by the semantic pragmatic distinction assumed in relevance theory Carston (2002). Other theoretical assumptions necessary for the discussion will be briefly presented in the relevant sections.

1.6 Organization of chapters

This thesis is divided into six chapters. The first chapter is made up of an introduction that consists of some background information about Safaliba; it's classification and also about the people. Chapter one also includes a review of what has been written on the language in general and also what has been written about coordination in the language and related languages. This chapter also outlines the research problem and objectives of the study. The methodology used in the research is described in this chapter. Included in this chapter is information about the data kinds and sources. Information about the annotation software and conventions used in this work is also provided in this chapter.

The second chapter consists of a brief introduction to Safaliba. This includes a discussion of some relevant notions that will help clarify various linguistic issues as they pertain in the language. This will thus facilitate easy understanding of the subsequent chapters. This section will also include some important linguistic theoretical definitions and assumptions.

In the third chapter, I look at the syntactic properties of coordination in Safaliba. Here, I represent with relevant examples the various grammatical categories that each coordinator can coordinate. At the end of the discussion on each coordinator, a table summarizing the syntactic properties of that coordinator is provided. I also look at whether the coordinators in the

language adhere to J. R. Payne's (1985) implicational scale that is assumed to constrain the syntactic properties of coordinators across languages.

In the fourth chapter, I discuss the semantic and pragmatic properties of the coordinators. Here I will attempt to assign specific meanings to each coordinator by separating information that is pragmatically inferred from the bare meaning of each coordinator. Where the coordinators contribute some pragmatic information, I will try to account for the source of these extra connotations.

In the fifth chapter I discuss compound coordinators. Here I discuss what compound coordinators are and how they are formed. I will look at all the possible combinations of single coordinators that can form compound coordinators in Safaliba. In this chapter, the syntactic and semantic properties of the compound coordinators will be discussed. Where applicable the pragmatic connotations that the use of these compound coordinators convey will be discussed.

In the sixth chapter, I give a summary of the whole thesis and highlight the conclusions that arise from the arguments in the thesis.

2 BASIC GRAMMATICAL PROPERTIES OF SAFALIBA

2.1 Sentence structure in Safaliba

According to Schaefer (2009:120 – 121), Safaliba has a subject - verb - object (S-V-O) word order in simple clauses. He adds that more complex patterns occur in complex clauses and various types of serial constructions. Consider the following example from Schaefer (2009:121)

(i) **Ɲmaaŋa nɔŋŋi a daa geni**

"The monkey loves the tree very much"

Ɲmaaŋa	**nɔŋŋi**	**a**	**daa**	**geni**
ŋmaaŋa	nɔŋŋi	a	daa	geni
monkey	*love*	*the*	*tree*	*much*
N	V	DET	N	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this the example, ***'ŋmaaŋa'*** (monkey) is the subject, ***'nɔŋŋi'*** (love) is the verb and ***'daa'*** (tree) is the object. Thus the subject comes before the verb which in turn comes before the object.

Safaliba does not allow for zero-subject in clauses. Therefore in the above example for instance, we cannot remove the subject ***'ŋmaaŋa'*** (monkey) to have ***'nɔŋŋi a daa geni'*** (loves the tree very much) even if the ***'ŋmaaŋa'*** (monkey) is in focus.

2.2 Nominal categories

2.2.1 Nouns

Morphologically, nouns can be distinguished from other Safaliba part-of-speech categories based on the type of inflections they take. Safaliba nouns, unlike for example verbs, can be inflected for number. All nouns (countable nouns) in the language have both singular and plural forms. So Safaliba nouns are made up of a root and an affix that indicates number.

Nouns can be derived from verbs in Safaliba. These derived nouns can be identified by the presence of the noun forming morphemes ***'bʊ', 'ra'*** and ***'lʊŋ'***. This is exemplified below.

- ***'Kɔ'*** (to farm) + ***'ra'*** (noun forming morpheme) = ***'kɔra'*** (farmer)

- ***'Kɔ'*** (to farm) + ***'bʊ'*** (noun forming morpheme) = ***'kɔbʊ'*** (to farm)
- ***'bibille'*** (small child) + ***'lʊŋ'*** (noun forming morpheme) = ***'bibilʊŋ'*** (childishness)

2.2.2 Noun phrase

According to Schaefer (2009:96), a noun phrase in Safaliba "is made up of a head noun and peripheral elements. These elements follow the noun, with the exception of the article ***'a'*** (the) which comes before the noun. The other elements of the noun phrase are the demonstrative ***'ŋaa'*** (this), numerals, quantifiers and certain other modifiers."

2.2.3 Locative constructions

In the words of Radford (1997:515), "a locative expression is one which denotes place". Locative constructions in Safaliba usually consist of two adjacent nouns. The first can be any noun, whereas the second usually belongs to a special group of nouns described in Dakubu, (2005:51) as "locative" nouns. Almost all of the nouns that belong to this group have two meanings. When they occur in non-locative NPs they refer to human body parts. However, when they occur in locative constructions, they indicate direction or location. These locative constructions have a function similar to English prepositions. Examples of these locative nouns include all the following.

- ***'poo'*** – stomach /in
- **'zû'** – head / on top
- ***'praa'*** – bottom /under
- ***'logri'*** – side/ besides

An example of a locative phrase is shown in (ii) below.

(ii) **A tágtáá bé a gádò zû**

"The shirt is on the bed"

a	**tágtáá**	**bé**	**a**	**gádò**	**zû**
a	tágtáá	bé	a	gádò	zû
the	*shirt*	*is*	*the*	*bed*	*head/top*.LOC
DET	N		DET	N	

Generated in TypeCraft.

2.2.4 Pronouns

For every pronoun in Safaliba, there are various variants of it. Each variant is used to encode different semantic information. Below is a table from Schaefer, (2009:12) containing the various pronouns of Safaliba.

Table 2

	Regular		**Emphatic**	**"special"**
	Subj.	**Obj**	**(subj)**	**(subj)**
1st person singular	ŋ	ma	màáŋ	màŋ
1st person plural	tì	tʊ	tʊnʊʊ	tiŋ
2nd person singular	i	i	ina	iŋ
2nd person plural	ya	ya	yana	yaŋ
3rd person singular	ʊ	ʊ	ʊna	ʊŋ
3rd person plural (human)	ba	ba	bana	baŋ
3rd person plural (nonhuman)	a	a	ana	aŋ

2.3 Verbs

In addition to the verb root, regular verbs in Safaliba have two other forms (with affixes) which indicate aspectual distinctions. According to (Schaefer, 2009: 83 - 84) the root form carries the perfective aspect and views the action as a whole. The second form marked by the suffix ***-ya*** is a special perfective intransitive form which indicates a fully completed action, and the third form marked by the suffix ***-ra*** is an imperfective form which indicates an on-going or uncompleted action. For instance, the Safaliba verb '***digi'*** (to take) has the following forms.

- ***'digi'*** – pick perfective (root)
- ***'digiya'*** – pick perfective (completive)
- ***'digira'*** – pick imperfective

This is an example of a regular verb thus it takes **-ya** PERF and **-ra** IPFV suffixes. However, these suffixes are subject to phonological changes thus may have slightly different forms depending on the phonological environment.

There are also irregular verbs which do not take these affixes. Below is an example of an irregular verb which does not follow the regular pattern.

- ***'wà'*** – come perfective (root)
- ***'wàyá'*** – come perfective (completive)
- ***'kènné'*** – come imperfective.

2.3.1 Serial verb construction

The serial verb construction, also known as (verb) serialization, is a syntactic phenomenon common to many African, Asian and New Guinean languages.

According to Sebba, (1987), serial verb construction is a string of verbs or verb phrases within a single clause that express simultaneous or immediately consecutive actions without a connective. They have a single grammatical subject and are understood to have the same grammatical categories such as aspect mode polarity and tense.

According to Bodomo (1998), a serial verb construction is a construction in which two or more different verbs share identical arguments within a single clause and is typically conceptualized as a single event. Bodomo (1997) also talks about serial verb constructions in Dagaare and other languages. In the work, Bodomo among other things outlines five constraints of serialization in Dagaare, namely the following:

- "The subject sameness constraint" (all the verbs must have the same subject)
- "The TAP constraint" (all the verbs must have the same tense aspect and polarity)
- "The connector constraint" (there must be no connector between the verbs)
- "The object sharing constraint" (the verbs must share a common object)
- "The predicate constraint: (finite verbs expressing the same type of event occur together [single event hood]")

These constraints also apply for Safaliba serial verb constructions. It is relevant to add that the use of serial verb constructions is a very productive phenomenon in Safaliba. Below is an example of a serial verb construction in Safaliba.

(iii)**A pɔgɔ úŋ dı kú**

"He gave it to the woman"

a	**pɔgɔ**	**úŋ**	**dı**	**kú**
a	pɔgɔ	úŋ	dı	kú
	wife/woman	2SG	*take*	*give*
DET	N		V1	V2

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, the verbs ***'dı'*** (take) and ***'kú'*** share the same subject, object, and aspect. Thus the construction is a serial verb construction.

2.4 Adjectives

Adjectives in Safaliba are words that are used to qualify nouns. They often but not always, occur adjacent to a noun root to form a compound word as illustrated below.

'bi' - child (root) + ***'bile'*** - (small) = ***'bibile'*** (small child)

This example is a case of the adjective ***'bile'*** (small) combining with the root form of the noun ***'bee'*** (child) to form a compound word ***'bibille'*** (small child). In the example below, the same adjective ***'bile'*** (small) is seen occurring alone.

(iv)**a tágtáá bé bile**

"The shirt is small"

a	**tágtáá**	**bé**	**bile**
a	tágtáá	bé	bile
the	*shirt*	*is*	*small*
DET	N	V	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

Like nouns, adjectives in Safaliba also inflect for number. Consider the following examples.

- ***'bile'*** (small. SG) ***'billi'*** (small. PL)
- ***'pɛ́ɛ́lígá'*** (white.SG**)** ***'pɛ́ɛ́lísí'*** (white.PL)

2.5 Adverbs

According to Bodomo (1997:96), "Adverbs modify the meaning or quality of verbs, adjectives, sentences and other adverbs. As a secondary function they also specify temporal and spatial locations".

Radford (1997:491) describes adverbs as "a category of words which typically indicates manner (e.g. wait *patiently*) or degree (e.g. exceedingly *patient*)". They usually answer the questions; how, where, and when?

Like the case of Dagaare, as stated in Bodomo, (1997:96), adverbs in Safaliba can be categorised into: manner, spatial, temporal, emphasis, doubt, negation and quality. Below are examples of the two groups that will play a role in this thesis.

- Spatial: '***zέ'*** (here), ***'zèbéè'*** (there)
- Temporal: ***'zaaníí'*** (yesterday), ***'daarí'*** (two days ago)

Adverbs in Safaliba may be reduplicated to show degree or emphasis. However not all adverbs can be reduplicated.

2.6 Numerals

Cardinal numbers from 1 – 9 in Safaliba are made up of a root and the affixes ***'a'*** **–** or ***'ba'*** **–** depending on whether what is being counted is human or non – human. The language uses ***'a'*** **–** for non-human and ***'ba'*** **–** for human. Below are some examples.

Root	**non – human**	**human**
'yii' *(two)*	*'**ayii'** (two)*	*'**bayii'** (two)*

For ordinal numbers '***bʊ'*** precede the root or '***sùbá'*** comes after the numeral. This is similar to what exits in Dagaare Bodomo (2000:21 – 22).

2.7 Subordinate clause

In general terms, subordination can be said to be a means of indicating that one clause is secondary (or subordinate) to another clause. According to Lobeck (2000:350), a subordinate clause is a "clause that is dependant, or dominated by a phrase that is self-dependant (and thus cannot stand alone)." Subordinate clauses function as subjects, compliments or adjuncts of

other clauses. They are usually introduced by subordinating conjunctions. In English subordinating conjunctions include ‘that’ and ‘who’.

In traditional grammar, a subordinating conjunction is roughly equivalent to a complementizer. “... The italicized word which introduces each clause is known in recent work (since 1970) as a complementizer (but would be known in more traditional work as a particular type of subordinating conjunction)” (Radford, 1997). Unlike coordination where the clauses are seen as parallel and independent of each other, with subordination, the clauses are not structurally parallel and independent of each other. A subordinate clause is inserted in the structure of the main clause.

In Safaliba, subordinate clauses are introduced by the subordinator ***‘Ká’*** which will be discussed latter in the section on the ***‘ka’*** **–** conjunction.

2.8 Relative clauses

A relative clause is a “clausal adjunct in a noun phrase that modifies the head noun. Relative clauses can be restrictive and non-restrictive modifiers.” (Lobeck, 2000:349). Relative clauses are usually introduced by relative pronouns. They may also be introduced by relativizers which are a special class of conjunctions.

According to Schaefer (2009:140), this is the case for Safaliba: Relative clauses occur in Safaliba, but without a marker specific to the construction. However, what occurs is plainly a clause modifying a noun. Often, the noun to be modified and the modifying clause are each followed by the specifier ***‘nii’*** but this appears to be optional. The relative clause, which usually has the preverbal particle ***‘haŋ’*** as one of the verb modifiers, follows immediately after the noun to be modified (or the ***‘nii’*** which follows it) e.g.

(v) **dábá nii haŋ sò baa nii wà zɛ́**

“The man who has the dog came here”

dábá	**nii**	**haŋ**	**sò**	**baa**	**nii**	**wà**	**zɛ́**
dábá	nii	haŋ	sò	baa	nii	wà	zɛ́
man	FOC	REL	*have*	*dog*	FOC	*come*	*here*
N			V	N		V	ADV

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, it is the ***'nii'*** that puts the referent of the noun in focus. It is also the ***'nii'*** that restricts the construction to a particular referent, thus making it a restrictive relative clause.

However, there can be non – restrictive relative clauses where there is no ***'nii'*** to restrict the construction to a particular referent. The referent in such a relative clause is ambiguous. Consider the following examples.

(vi)**Í haŋ ɲɛ ní í haŋ ba ɲɛ**

"If you see and if you don't see"

í	**haŋ**	**ɲɛ**	**ní**	**í**	**haŋ**	**ba**	**ɲɛ**
í	haŋ	ɲɛ	ní	í	haŋ	ba	ɲɛ
2SG	REL	*see*	*and*	2SG	REL	NEG	*see*
PN		V	CONJ	PN			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

(vii) **ína nii haŋ ɲɛ ní ína nii haŋ ba ɲɛ**

"You who have seen and you who have not seen"

ína	**nii**	**haŋ**	**ɲɛ**	**ní**	**ína**	**nii**	**haŋ**	**ba**	**ɲɛ**
ína	nii	haŋ	ɲɛ	ní	ína	nii	haŋ	ba	ɲɛ
2SG	FOC	REL	*see*	*and*	2SG	FOC	REL	NEG	*see*
PN			V	CONJ	PN				V

Generated in TypeCraft.

These two examples are only different because of the presence of the ***'nii'*** and the type of 2SG pronoun used (vi) has the regular subject type while (vii) has an emphatic subject. The difference between these two relative clauses it that (vi) is not restricted to a particular referent but (vii) is restricted to a particular referent. In the interpretation of the two, (vi) could refer to any person and it is more abstract whereas (vii) is specific. Thus the presence of ***'nii'*** marks the construction as a restrictive relative clause whiles its absence means it is a non-restrictive relative clause.

2.9 Summary of chapter

In this chapter some relevant background information about the structure of the language that will aid the understanding of the thesis has been presented. These include: grammatical categories such as nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjective, adverbs and numerals. Serial verb constructions, Locative constructions, relative clauses and subordinate clauses have also been discussed.

3 SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF COORDINATION IN SAFALIBA

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main sections. In the first, part I attempt to establish the various categories that each of the selected Safaliba coordinators can coordinate. In the second part, I test the selected Safaliba coordinators on J. R. Payne's (1985) implicational sequence that is assumed to constrain the syntactic properties of coordinators cross-linguistically.

3.2 Coordination

The term coordination refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements. The units may be words, phrases, subordinate clauses or full sentences Haspelmath (2007:1).

Safaliba has several coordinators with varied functions, some of which overlap. These coordinators include:

- ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** – (conjunctive coordination)
- ***'á'*** – (conjunctive coordination)
- ***'ka'*** – (conjunctive coordination)
- ***'bíí'*** – (disjunctive coordination)
- ***'chɛ'*** – (conjunction)
- ***'chɛ'*** (adversative)

3.3 Syntactic properties of 'ní' and 'aní'

Under this section I try to establish the grammatical categories that ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** can coordinate. In the following examples on ***'ní'***, I show some different uses of ***'ní'***. First, consider examples (1) and (2). Example (1) is an authentic example from my field work whiles example (2) is a constructed example.

1. **búà ní písígú ŋ bè béé**

"There lived a goat and a sheep"

búà	**ní**	**písígú**	**ŋ**	**bè**	**béé**
búà	ní	písígú	ŋ	bè	béé
goat	*and*	*sheep*	FOC	*is*	*there*
N	CONJ	N		V	ADV
Generated in TypeCraft.					

2. **A baa ní a dɔgtɛ́ɛ́ ŋ zábìrá**

"The dog and the cat are fighting"

a	**baa**	**ní**	**a**	**dɔgtɛ́ɛ́**	**ŋ**	**zábìrá**	
a	baa	ní	a	dɔgtɛ́ɛ́	ŋ	zábì	rá
the	*dog*	*and*	*the*	*cat*	FOC	*fight*	IPFV
DET	N	CONJC	DET	N		V	
Generated in TypeCraft.							

In these examples ***'ní'*** coordinates noun phrases. In example (1), which is the first sentence of a story, the phrases consist of nouns only; ***'bua'*** (goat) and ***'pisigu'*** (sheep). In example (2), the noun phrases include the definite determiner ***'a'*** as well. In both cases, ***'ní'*** could have been replaced by ***'aní'.***

Next, consider example (3), another example from my field work data.

3. **Ína níi haŋ ɲɛ ní ína níi haŋ ba ɲɛ [...]**

"You who have seen and you who have not seen"

ína	**níi**	**haŋ**	**ɲɛ**	**ní**	**ína**	**níi**	**haŋ**	**ba**	**ɲɛ**
ína	níi	haŋ	ɲɛ	ní	ína	níi	haŋ	ba	ɲɛ
2SG	FOC	REL	*see*	*and*	2SG	FOC	REL	NEG	*see*
PN			V	CONJC	PN				V
Generated in TypeCraft.									

In this example ***'ní'*** is again seen connecting two noun phrases. However, these noun phrases are a bit more complex. This is a case of ***'ní'*** combining two NPs that have relative

clauses modifying the pronouns in them. In the first part of the construction that is before ***'aní',*** the ***[níi haŋ ɲɛ]*** gives more information about the referent of the pronoun ***'ína'*** (2SG). It restricts the referent of the pronoun ***'ína'*** (2SG) to a particular person. The ***[níi haŋ ba ɲɛ]*** in the second part ***"ína [níi haŋ ba ɲɛ]"*** also gives more information about the referent of the pronoun ***'ína'*** (2SG) by restricting the referent of the pronoun ***'ína'*** (2SG) to a particular person. Thus these are clear cases of NPs with relative clauses embedded in them.

In the case of example (4) below, ***'ní'*** coordinates two locative phrases which correspond to PPs in English.

4. **A kɔŋ yáárí naŋ a gádò zû ní a dìí poo záá**

"The water spilled on the bed and in the whole room"

a	**kɔŋ**	**yáárí**	**naŋ**	**a**	**gádò**	**zû**	**ní**	**a**	**dìí**
a	kɔŋ	yáárí	naŋ	a	gádò	zû	ní	a	dìí
the	*hunger*	*spill*	FOC	*the*	*bed*	*head/top*.LOC	*and*	*the*	*room*
DET	N	V		DET	N	N	CONJ	DET	N

poo	**záá**
poo	záá
***inside/stomach*.LOC**	*all*
N	ADJ
Generated in TypeCraft.	

In this example it is important to note the use of the words ***'zû'*** (head) and ***'poo'*** (stomach). Even though they are nouns, they do not act as nouns here. They act as prepositions as they are translated as 'top' and 'inside' respectively. This raises the question as to whether such constructions should be regarded as NP or a different category.

The next example gives a clue to this answer. In this example, ***'ní'*** is seen combining a locative construction and a noun phrase.

5. **tí maale a dìí poo ní a záká záá**

"Go and make the room and the whole house"

tí	**maale**	**a**	**dìí**	**Poo**	**ní**	**a**	**záká**	**záá**
tí	maale	a	dìí	poo	ní	a	záká	záá
go	*make*	*the*	*room*	*inside/stomach*.LOC	*and*	*the*	*house*	*all*
V1	V2	DET	N	N	CONJC	DET	N	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example ***'ní'*** is seen combining the locative construction ***'dìí poo'*** (in the room) and the noun phrase ***'á záká* záá'** (all the house). As stated earlier, coordination involves syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type or category are combined. Thus if the locative construction ***'dìí poo'*** (in the room) and a noun phrase ***'á záká'* záá** (all the house) can be combined, then, they must belong to the same category. It is therefore reasonable to say that locative constructions are nominal. I will therefore assume that any coordinator that can combine nouns can also combine locative constructions since they are both nominal.

With the above in mind, I will only test if other coordinators can coordinate noun phrases. The result will then be extended to cover locative constructions as they belong to the same category. But for theoretical purposes and the fact that locative constructions correlate to PP in English and other languages, locative constructions will be separated from noun phrases in the table of summary where I indicate the possible range of categories that every coordinator can coordinate.

Next consider example (6). This example is a response by an informant to a request to list his siblings. It can be seen from this example that ***'ní'*** can string several noun phrases together.

6. **Samua ní Bakari ní Andama ní Alice aní Amos**

"Samua and Bakari and Andama and Alice and Amos"

Samua	**ní**	**Bakari**	**ní**	**Andama**	**ní**	**Alice**	**aní**	**Amos**
samua	ní	bakari	ní	andama	ní	alice	aní	amos
	and		*and*		*and*		*and*	
Np	CONJC	Np	CONJC	Np	CONJC	Np	CONJC	Np

Generated in TypeCraft.

This list could theoretically go on and on. This example is also a case where ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** occur together. The occurrence of ***'aní'*** before the final conjunct has no syntactic significance but is of pragmatic significance (see chapter 4: semantic and pragmatics properties of the coordinators for details).

'ní' is also used in the counting system of Safaliba; thus for coordinating numerals as shown in example (7) below.

7. **tókó ní ayíí**

"Twenty two"

tókó	**ní**	**ayíí**
tókó	ní	ayíí
twenty	*and*	*Two.*
	CONJC	

Generated in TypeCraft.

Whereas the examples so far have illustrated that ***'ní'*** can coordinate nominal categories and numerals, examples (8) and (9) show that ***'ní'*** can also coordinate adjectives and adverbs.

Example (8) is a translated example from Dagaare in Ali (2006:5) describing the colours of a shirt as ***'sáálígá'*** (black) and ***'pɛ́ɛ́lígá'*** (white.)

8. **A tágtáá ɛ́ naŋ sáálígá ní pɛ́ɛ́lígá**

"The shirt is black and white"

a	**tágtáá**	**ɛ́**	**naŋ**	**sáálígá**	**ní**	**pɛ́ɛ́lígá**
a	tágtáá	ɛ́	naŋ	sáálígá	ní	pɛ́ɛ́lígá
the	*shirt*	*is*	FOC	*black*	*and*	*white*
DET	N	V		ADJ	CONJC	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example ***'ní'*** is used to coordinate the adjectives ***'sáálígá'*** (black) and ***'pɛ́ɛ́lígá'*** (white) to describe the colours of a shirt.

Example (9) is a case of ***'ní'*** connecting the adverbs ***'zɛ́'*** (here) and ***'zɛ̀bɛ́ɛ̀'*** (there).

9. **zɛ́ ní zɛ̀bɛ́ɛ̀ úŋ píílí**

"He tore here and there"

zɛ́	**ní**	**zɛ̀bɛ́ɛ̀**	**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	ní	zɛ̀bɛ́ɛ̀	úŋ	píílí
here	*and*	*there*	2SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	PN	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

All the examples so far show possible environments where ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** can occur. However, there are limitations. Example (10) is a case where the original coordinator ***'á'*** in VP coordination is replaced by ***'ní'.*** This construction is however ill-formed thus indicating that ***'ní'*** is not used to connect VPs.

10. ***í ná dɛ́ɛ́ní à ʧóóné ní tɔà ní dugià chɛ la dɛ́ɛ́níà**

"You will dry the sheanuts and pound them and cook them and pound them again"

í	**ná**	**dɛ́ɛ́níà**		**ʧóóné**		**ní**	**tɔà**		**ní**
í	ná	dɛ́ɛ́ní	à	ʧóón	é	ní	tɔ	à	ní
2SG	*will*	*dry*	3PL	*sheanut*	PL	*and*	*pound*	3PL	*and*
PN		V		N		CONJC	V		CONJC

dugià		**chɛ**	**la**	**dɛ́ɛ́níà**	
dugi	à	chɛ	la	dɛ́ɛ́níà	à
cook	3PL		*again*	*dry*	3PL
V		CONJC	ADV	V	

Generated in TypeCraft.

Next consider (11) where ***'ní'*** is alternatively used to coordinate clauses.

11. ***Baba ná wà ní tí tì pôʔ**

"Baba will come and we will go to the farm"

Baba	**ná**	**wà**	**ní**	**tí**	**tì**	**pôʔ**
baba	ná	wà	ní	tí	tì	pôʔ
	will	*come*	*and*	1PL	*go*	*farm*
Np		V	CONJC	PN	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

In (11) ***'ní'*** is seen connecting two clauses ***'baba ná wà'*** (baba will come) and ***'tí tì pôʔ'*** (we go to the farm). This is however unacceptable in the language.

Even though ***'ní'*** does not connect clauses in normal speech, it is possible to use it to coordinate clauses in figurative or idiomatic language and proverbs. Thus if the clauses involved have a proverbial meaning associated with them, it will be possible to use ***'ní'*** to coordinate them. Consider example (12) below.

12. **dum ma ní finní ma ubori ŋ beera**

"Pinch me and bite me; which one is painful"

dum	**ma**	**ní**	**finní**	**ma**	**ubori**	**ŋ**	**beera**
dum	ma	ní	finní	ma	ubori	ŋ	beera
bite	1SG	*and*		1SG	*which*	FOC	*painful*
V	PN	CONJC	V	PN	PNrel		ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

The construction in (12) is a rhetorical question and is used as a proverb to mean that tit for tat is not a sin. The ability of ***'ní'*** to connect such constructions could possibly be due to the fact that proverbs and idiomatic expressions have a static form which does not change even if the non- idiomatic language does. If this analysis is correct, it raises the expectation that ***'ní'*** might have had a wider distribution earlier.

To sum up, we have seen that ***'ní'*** can coordinate the following categories: NP, LOC, AP, and ADVP. It can however not connect VPs and clauses except in idiomatic expressions/proverbs. This is summarized in the table below.

Table 3

	S	VP	AP	LOC	ADV	NP
'ní' /'aní'	X	X	√	√	√	√

Note however that the table excludes the exception concerning idiomatic expressions. It is also important to state I did not find many occurrences of these coordinators in the corpus and hence the use of many constructed examples. There were only 11 occurrences of ***'ní'*** and 3 occurrences of ***'aní'.*** The low number of occurrences is probably because of the genre of the data collected.

3.4 The syntactic properties of the 'á' – coordinator

Under this section, I establish the grammatical categories that the coordinator ***'á'*** can coordinate. In the examples on the coordinator ***'á'*** below, I show the various uses of the ***'á'*** coordinator. Firstly, consider example (13), which is taken from a descriptive narrative of how sheabutter is made.

13. **Í ná dɛ́ɛ́ní a ʧóóné á tɔà á dugià á la dɛ́ɛ́níà**

"You will dry the sheanuts and pound them and cook them and pound them again"

í	**ná**	**dɛ́ɛ́ní**	**a**	**ʧóóné**		**á**	**tɔà**		**á**
í	ná	dɛ́ɛ́ní	a	ʧóón	é	á	tɔ	à	á
2SG	*will*		*the*	*sheanut*	PL		*pound*	3PL	
PN		V	DET	N		CONJC	V		CONJC

dugià		**á**	**la**	**dɛ́ɛ́níà**	
dugi	à	á	la	dɛ́ɛ́ní	à
cook	3PL		*again*	*dry*	3PL
V		CONJC	ADV	V	

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, it is important to establish the exact category such constructions belong to. That is whether they are VPs or clauses.

According to Hartmann and Stork (1972: 137) a clause is a grammatical unit that includes at minimum, a predicate and an explicit or implied subject, and expresses a proposition. By this definition it seems that the example in (13) can be classified as coordination of clauses with a phonetically unexpressed subject as illustrated in (14).

14. **[Í ná dɛ́ɛ́ní à ʧóóné] á [Ø tɔà] á [Ø dugià] á [Ø la dɛ́ɛ́níà]**

However this analysis can be a bit problematic. One reason is that Safaliba does not generally allow for zero-subject in clauses as stated on page: 7. Another reason is that when the subjects are provided the construction becomes ungrammatical as in (15) below.

15. ***í ná dɛ́ɛ́ní à ʧóóné á í tɔà á í dugià á í la dɛ́ɛ́níà**

"You will dry the sheanuts and pound them and cook them and pound them again"

í	**ná**	**dɛ́ɛ́ní**	**a**	**ʧóóné**		**á**	**í**	**tɔà**	
í	ná	dɛ́ɛ́ní	a	ʧóón	é	á	í	tɔ	à
2SG	*will*		*the*	*sheanut*	PL		2SG	*pound*	3PL
PN		V	DET	N		CONJC	PN	V	

á	**í**	**dugià**		**á**	**í**	**la**	**dɛ́ɛ́níà**	
á	í	dugi	à	á	í	la	dɛ́ɛ́ní	à
	2SG	*cook*	3PL		2SG	*again*	*dry*	3PL
CONJC	PN	V		CONJC	PN	ADV	V	

Generated in TypeCraft.

It is however possible to make such a statement with all the subjects overtly present if one uses the ***'ka'*** version of the 'and' coordinator as will be shown later in example (28) on page 22 where we are clearly dealing with clausal coordination. In view of these facts, I propose that ***'á'*** is coordinating VPs in example (13).

Another implication of such an analysis is that the coordinator ***'á'*** cannot coordinate clauses as the second part cannot have a subject and still be grammatical. Thus example (16) taken from Schaefer (2009:136) is an example of ***'á'*** connecting two VPs; VP1 ***'kú nɔɔsɪ'*** (kill fowls) and VP2 ***'sɔsɪ Naaŋmɪnɪ'*** (ask God).

16. **ká ba kú nɔɔsɪ á sɔsɪ Naaŋmɪnɪ**

"That they should kill fowls and ask God"

ká	**ba**	**kú**	**nɔɔsɪ**		**á**	**sɔsɪ**	**Naaŋmɪnɪ**
ká	ba	kú	nɔɔ	sɪ	á	sɔsɪ	naaŋmɪnɪ
that	3PL	*kill*	*fowls*	PL		*ask*	*God*
CONJS	PN	V	N		CONJC	V	Np
Generated in TypeCraft.							

Next consider Example (17) below. This is a constructed case of ***'á'*** stringing a series of verbs together.

17. **Samua wà zɛ̀ á wà dì á dì á dì á dì**

"Samua came here and ate and ate and ate and ate"

Samua	**wà**	**zɛ̀**	**á**	**wà**	**dì**	**á**	**dì**	**á**	**dì**	**á**	**dì**
samua	wà	zɛ̀	á	wà	dì	á	dì	á	dì	á	dì
	come	*here*		*come*	*eat*		*eat*		*eat*		*eat*
Np	V	ADV	CONJC	V1	V2	CONJC	V	CONJC	V	CONJC	V
Generated in TypeCraft.											

In this example we see ***'á'*** stringing the same verb ***'dì'*** (eat) repeatedly to indicate degree. That is how much ***'Samua'*** ate. This is a case of multiple verb coordination and this string could theoretically go on and on.

All the examples up to this point show possible environments that ***'á'*** can occur but examples (18) – (22) below are cases where ***'á'*** cannot occur. In example (18), ***'á'*** is seen wrongly coordinating two clauses. This is a case where the original ***'ka'*** which is used for clause coordination has been replaced by ***'á'.***

18. ***yà maŋ dı yà tásàsí á yà tí mɔɔ á yà tí túúsì a ʧóóné**

"You take your basins and you go to the forest and you go and pick the sheanuts"

yà	**maŋ**	**dı**	**yà**	**tásàsí**		**á**	**yà**	**tí**	**mɔɔ**	**á**	**yà**	**tí**	**túúsì**
yà	maŋ	dı	yà	tásà	sí	á	yà	tí	mɔɔ	á	yà	tí	túúsì
2PL	HAB	*take*	2PL	*basin*	PL	*and*	2PL	*go*	*forest*	*and*	2PL	*go*	*pick*
PN		V	PN	N		CONJC	PN	V	N	CONJC	PN	V1	V2

a	**ʧóóné**	
a	ʧóón	é
the	*sheanut*	PL
DET	N	

Generated in TypeCraft.

In (19), we see ***'á'*** coordinating noun phrases but this is not grammatical hence the (*) attached to the example.

19. **A baa á a dɔgtɛ́ɛ́ ŋ zábìrá**

"The dog and the cat are fighting"

a	**baa**	**á**	**a**	**dɔgtɛ́ɛ́**	**ŋ**	**zábìrá**	
a	baa	á	a	dɔgtɛ́ɛ́	ŋ	zábì	rá
the	*dog*	*and*	*the*	*cat*	FOC	*fight*	IPFV
DET	N	CONJC	DET	N		V	

'Á' is also seen connecting adverbs in example (20) below. Again, this is ungrammatical as indicated by (*) before the example.

20. ***zɛ́ á zɛ̀bɛ́è úŋ píílí**

"He tore here and there"

zɛ́	**á**	**zɛ̀bɛ́è**	**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	á	zɛ̀bɛ́è	úŋ	píílí
here		*there*	3SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	PN	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

Next consider example (21)

21. ***sáálígá á pɛ́ɛ́lígá**

"Black and white"

sáálígá	**á**	**pɛ́ɛ́lígá**
sáálígá	á	pɛ́ɛ́lígá
black		*white*
ADJ	CONJC	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, ***'á'*** is used to coordinate two adjectives but this is not acceptable. This example indicates that ***'á'*** cannot combine adjectives. However, the next example which is a response by an informant when asked to describe Goliath, a giant in a Bible story seems to provide evidence to the contrary. In this example, the informant uses the adjectives ***'wákù'*** (tall) and ***'pɔlì'*** (fat) to highlight Goliath's height and size.

22. **Ú bé wákù á pɔlì chɛ bé kpɛ́ɛ́ní**

"He is tall and fat and strong"

Ú	**bé**	**wákù**	**á**	**pɔlì**	**chɛ**	**bé**	**kpɛ́ɛ́ní**
ú	bé	wákù	á	pɔlì	chɛ	bé	kpɛ́ɛ́ní
3SG	*is*	*tall*		*fat*		*is*	*strong*
PN	V	ADJ	CONJC	ADJ	CONJ	V	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this example (***'á'*** can coordinate adjectives) seems to contradict that of (21) (***'á'*** cannot coordinate adjectives) above. There is thus a need to resolve or at least account for the apparent contradiction.

A look at (22) shows the presence of the copular verb ***'bé'*** (be). In the first part of example (22) ***'ú bé wákù'*** (he is tall) before ***'á'***, the copular verb is present but in the second part ***'pɔlì'*** (fat) after ***'á',*** it is not there. This apparent contradiction can be resolved if we assume that the sentence involves ellipsis.[2]

If we assume that the construction in (22) is an elliptical construction where the verb ***'bé'*** (be) is present in the first part but omitted in the second part, then this apparent contradiction will be resolved. By this assumption, the AP in (22) will be regarded as an elliptical version of a VP where the copular verb is just phonetically not visible (ellipsis) in the second part.

By this assumption, (22) will not be a case of AP coordination but a case of VP coordination where the verb is omitted in the second phrase. This assumption will then explain why in other cases like (21) where the AP does not occur as part of a VP construction ***'á'*** is not able to coordinate APs.

From the above, it can be concluded that the ***'á'*** coordinator can coordinate only one category: VP. Thus it cannot coordinate clauses, APs, ADVPs, NPs and locative constrictions. See the table below for a summary.

Table 4

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
'á'	X	√	X	X	X	X

This conclusion is based on 28 occurrences of the conjunction in the corpus. All 28 occurrences were cases of ***'á'*** connecting VPs. There were no cases of ***'á'*** connecting any other category. As a native speaker I was unable to construct any valid examples of ***'á'*** coordinating other categories.

[2] According to Radford (1997:505), "ellipsis is a process by which an expression is omitted in order to avoid repetition". Lobeck (2000:338) also defines ellipsis as a "process by which a word or phrase can be "missing" but interpreted under identity to an antecedent in the preceding discourse". The ellipsis could be a VP-ellipsis where a verb is omitted, an NP-ellipsis where a noun phrase is omitted or N'-ellipsis where a noun is omitted.

3.5 The syntactic properties of the *'ka'* coordinator

In this section, I follow Schaefer's (2009:137) line of argument that one should distinguish the ***'ka'*** – conjunction from two other segmentally identical words. I will thus attempt to distinguish the use of these two from the use of ***'ka'*** conjunction which is the focus of this study. After distinguishing the two other forms from ***'ka'*** conjunction, I propose the grammatical categories that ***'ka'*** conjunction can coordinate.

In the discussion of the ***'ka'*** – conjunction Schaefer (2009:137) distinguishes the ***'ka'*** conjunction 'and' from ***'ka'*** complementizer and ***'ka'*** hypotheticality marker. He states that ***'ka'*** conjunction 'and' is written without a tone diacritic in the orthography. This spelling distinguishes it from two other words which are otherwise segmentally identical".

3.5.1 'ká' – complementizer

'ká' – complementizer can occur in a clause to introduce a complement clause. It can be roughly translated with the complementizer /that/ in English. With ***'ká'*** complementizer, the clauses are not structurally parallel and independent of each other. But the subordinate clause is inserted in the structure of the main clause. Examples (23) and (24) illustrate this claim. Example (24) is a translation of the English example in (23) into Safaliba.

23. He said that I should come early

24. **Ú yé ká ŋ wà málàŋ**

"He said that I should come early"

ú	**yé**	**ká**	**ŋ**	**wà**	**málàŋ**
ú	yé	ká	ŋ	wà	málàŋ
3SG	say		1SG	*come*	*early*
PN	V	CONJS	PN	V	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In the above example, ***'ká'*** complementizer connects the compliment or subordinate clause ***'ŋ wà málàŋ'*** (I should come early) to the main clause ***'ú yé'*** (he/she said). Note that ***'ká'*** complementizer occurs in clause medial position and has the function of introducing a complement clause. Even though ***'ká'*** complementizer has the same syntactic position as ***'ka'***

conjunction, they are different in function. ***'ká'*** complementizer introduces a subordinate clause whiles ***'ka'*** conjunction coordinates two parallel clauses.

3.5.2 'kà' – hypotheticality marker

'kà' – hypotheticality marker occurs in clause initial position and roughly correlates to the English forms 'If' or 'when'. In the following example, ***'kà'*** – hypotheticality marker is seen in clause initial position and signals that the event described is hypothetical.

25. **kà Baba wá wà tì nà tí pôʔ**

"If/when Baba comes we will go to the farm"

ká	**Baba**	**wá**	**wà**	**tì**	**nà**	**tí**	**pôʔ**
ká	baba	wá	wà	tì	nà	tí	pôʔ
		FUT	*come*	1PL	*will*	*go*	*farm*
CONJS	PN	V1	V2	PN		V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

The above example can be divided into two parts. ***'kà Baba wá wà'*** (if Baba comes), which is an adjunct and ***'tì nà tí pôʔ'*** (we will go to the farm), the main clause. In this example, the second part ***'nà tí pôʔ'*** (we will go to the farm) will only happen if the first part ***'Baba wá wà'*** (Baba comes) happens. Thus the ***'kà'*** is used to indicate that the action of going to the farm is just hypothetical. Given the above, it will also be appropriate to describe the ***'kà'*** – hypotheticality marker as a **conditionality marker**. The reason behind this claim that, ***kà'*** – hypotheticality marker can be described as a conditionality marker is that *going to the farm* in example (25) will only happen on the condition that *Baba comes*. Hence I will from now on refer to the ***'kà'*** – hypotheticality marker as ***'kà'*** – conditionality marker.

From examples (24) and (25) exemplifying the ***'ká'***– complementizer and ***'kà'*** – conditionality marker respectively, an argument can be advanced that both are cases of subordination. For instance in example (24), the compliment can be said to be a subordinate clause that is inserted into the structure of the main clause. A similar argument can be made for example (25) which illustrate the use of the conditionality marker. As indicated above, this example can be divided into two clauses '***kà Baba wá wà'*** (if Baba comes) and ***'tì nà tí pôʔ'*** (we will go to the farm). ***'tì nà tí pôʔ'*** (we will go to the farm) can be described as the main clause while ***'ka Baba wá wà'*** (if Baba comes) can be described as the subordinate clause that

is inserted into the structure of the main clause. Thus even though the ***'kà'*** is in clause initial position it is used to indicate subordination.

We can therefore conclude that any clause preceded by either ***'kà'*** – complementizer or ***'kà'*** – conditionality marker is a subordinate clause. Thus since ***'kà'*** – complementizer and ***kà*** – conditionality marker are items that introduce subordinate clauses, they should not be separated but put together as ***'kà'*** – subordinator and state that when ***'kà'*** – subordinator appears in a clause initial position, it behaves as a conditionality marker and when it occurs in a clause medial position it behaves as a complementizer.

Going by this argument there will be only two types of ***'ka': 'ka'*** – conjunction and ***'kà'*** – subordinator. This is similar to the case of Dagaare as illustrated in Dakubu (2005:22 – 26)

This claim that ***'ká'***– complementizer and ***'kà'*** – conditionality marker are cases of subordination implies that the conditionality interpretation that is associated with ***'kà'*** – conditionality does not come from ***'kà'*** but from some other source. There is therefore the need to account for the source of the conditionality interpretation.

A good starting point will be to look at the word order. Coordination which involves the use of a coordinator in Safaliba generally takes the pattern **A co B** where **A** and **B** are the coordinands and **co** the conjunction. But constructions which have the conditionality interpretation are of the **co A B** form. This word order may be what leads to the conditionality interpretation. Since this is not the focus of this work, I will leave it at that.

For the purpose of this work, I will mark ***'ká'*** subordinator with the high (H) tone and leave ***'ka'*** conjunction unmarked for tone.

3.5.3 'ka' – conjunction

This conjunction occurs between clauses to connect them. The coordinator is one of the varieties of the 'and' conjunction in Safaliba. It is used to coordinate independent clauses. Thus with this conjunction, the constituents that are coordinated are parallel.

First consider example (26) below. This is a constructed example of ***'ka'*** coordinating two independent clauses.

26. **ba ná wà ka tì dì a kábílá**

"They will come and we will eat the fufu"

ba	**ná**	**wà**	**ka**	**tì**	**dì**	**a**	**kábílá**
ba	ná	wà	ka	tì	dì	a	kábílá
3PL	*will*	*come*	*and*	1PL	*eat*	*the*	*fufu*
PN		V	CONJC	PN	V	DET	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, ***'ka'*** is seen conjoining two clauses; ***'ba ná wà'*** (they will come) and ***'tì dì a kábílá'*** (we eat the fufu). In this example the two constituent clauses are structurally parallel or independent of each other and they can each stand on their own and still be meaningful.

One notable difference between ***'ka'*** conjunction and ***'ká'*** subordinator is that, the conjuncts coordinated by ***'ka'*** conjunction can stand as independent clauses but the clauses introduced by ***'ká'*** subordinator cannot stand on their own.

To summarize, this section has shown that ***'kà'*** hypotheticality marker can also be called a conditionality marker and that we can reduce ***'ka'*** from three as stated in Schaefer (2009:137) to two by merging ***'kà'*** – conditionality marker and ***'ká'***– complementizer in to one as ***'ká'*** – subordinator. Thus we now have:

'ka' – conjunction

'ká' – subordinator

3.5.4 The uses of the 'ka' – conjunction

In this section, I discuss the various uses of the ***'ka'*** – conjunction**.** The following examples illustrate the environments where the ***'ka'*** – conjunction in Safaliba can occur.

First consider example (27) taken from a descriptive narrative from my corpus on how sheabutter is made. This is a case of ***'ka'*** connecting clauses with the same subject referent. All the subjects refer to the same entity and this is indicated by the indices **($_i$)**

27. **yà$_j$ maŋ dı yà$_j$ tásàsí ka yà$_j$ tí mɔɔ ka yà$_j$ tí túúsì a ʧóóné**

"You take your basins and you go to the forest and you go and pick the sheanuts"

yà	**maŋ**	**dı**	**yà**	**tásàsí**		**ka**	**yà**	**tí**	**mɔɔ**	**ka**	**yà**	**tí**	**túúsì**
yà	maŋ	dı	yà	tásà	sí	ka	yà	tí	mɔɔ	ka	yà	tí	túúsì
2PL	HAB	*take*	2PL	*basin*	PL	*and*	2PL	*go*	*forest*	*and*	2PL	*go*	*pick*
PN		V	PN	N		CONJC	PN	V	N	CONJC	PN	V1	V2

a	**ʧóóné**	
a	ʧóón	é
	sheanut	PL
DET	N	

Generated in TypeCraft.

Next, consider example (28) below. This is a constructed example of ***'ka'*** connecting clauses that have different subject referents.

28. **Baba ná wà ka tí tì pôʔ**

"Baba will come and we will go to the farm"

Baba	**ná**	**wà**	**ka**	**tì**	**tí**	**pôʔ**
baba	ná	wà	ka	tì	tí	pôʔ
	will	*come*	*and*	1PL	*go*	*farm*
Np		V	CONJC	PN	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

It is important to note that irrespective of whether ***'ka'*** connects same subject or different subject clauses, both subjects must be present. This can be seen in both examples (27) and (28) above, which represent same subject and different subjects respectively. As can be seen from these examples, both cases have the subjects of the constituent clauses present. In fact, it is the presence of the subjects that make the constructions clauses thus enabling ***'ka'*** to coordinate them.

All the examples discussed so far represent what is possible with ***'ka'.*** Next I discuss the impossibilities. The following examples illustrate categories that ***'ka'*** conjunction cannot coordinate.

Firstly consider example (29).

29. ***búà ka písígú ŋ bè béé**

"There lived a goat and a sheep"

búà	**ka**	**písígú**	**ŋ**	**bè**	**béé**
búà	ka	písígú	ŋ	bè	béé
goat	*and*	*sheep*	FOC	*is*	*there*
N	CONJC	N		V	ADV
Generated in TypeCraft.					

This is a constructed example of ***'ka'*** connecting NPs. This example is however ungrammatical thus the (*) attached to the example. In this example, ***'ka'*** is used to combine the nouns ***'búà'*** (goat) and ***'písígú'*** (sheep) but this is not acceptable in the language. Since ***'ka'*** cannot combine noun phrases, it follows that it will not be able to combine locative constructions.

In (30) below, ***'ka'*** is seen connecting VPs but this is also unacceptable in the language as indicated by the (*) attached to the example.

30. ***í ná dɛ́ɛ́ní a ʧóóné ka tɔà ka dugià ka la dɛ́ɛ́níà**

"You will dry the sheanuts and pound them and cook them and pound them again"

í	**ná**	**dɛ́ɛ́ní**	**a**	**ʧóóné**		**ka**	**tɔà**		**ka**
í	ná	dɛ́ɛ́ní	a	ʧóón	é	ka	tɔ	à	ka
2SG	*will*	*dry*	*the*	*sheanut*	PL	*and*	*pound*	3PL	*and*
PN		V	DET	N		CONJC	V		CONJC

dugià		**ka**	**la**	**dɛ́ɛ́níà**	
dugi	à	ka	la	dɛ́ɛ́ní	à
cook	3PL	*and*	*again*	*dry*	3PL
V		CONJC	ADV	V	
Generated in TypeCraft.					

In examples (31) and (32) below, we see ill-formed examples of ***'ka'*** connecting ADJs and ADVs respectively. In example (31), ***'ka'*** is seen combining the adjectives ***'sáálígá'*** (black) and ***'péélígá'*** (white). But this is unacceptable.

31. ***a tágtáá ɛ́ naŋ sáálígá ka péélígá**

"The shirt is black and white"

a	**tágtáá**	**ɛ́**	**naŋ**	**sáálígá**	**ka**	**péélígá**
a	tágtáá	ɛ́	naŋ	sáálígá	ka	péélígá
the	*shirt*	*is*	FOC	*black*	*and*	*white*
DET	N	V		ADJ	CONJC	ADJ
Generated in TypeCraft.						

'ka' is also seen connecting the adverbs ***'zɛ́'*** (here) and ***'zɛ̀bɛ́è'*** (there) in example (32). This again is unacceptable.

32. ***zɛ́ ka zɛ̀bɛ́è úŋ píílí**

"He tore here and there"

zɛ́	**ka**	**zɛ̀bɛ́è**	**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	ka	zɛ̀bɛ́è	úŋ	píílí
here	*and*	*there*	3SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	PN	V
Generated in TypeCraft.				

The above examples show that ***'ka'*** – conjunction connects only clauses. It does not connect NPs, locative constructions, APs and ADVPs. See summary below.

Table 5

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
'ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X

This conclusion is based on a total of 83 occurrences of the conjunction in the corpus. All 83 occurrences were cases S coordination. The many number of occurrences suggests that the coordinator is very productive in the language.

3.6 The syntactic properties of 'bíí'

In this section I discuss the grammatical categories that the ***'bíí'*** coordinator can combine. Whiles all the coordinators discussed so far are conjunctives coordinators; ***'bíí'*** is a disjunctive connector. Examples (33) – (39) below illustrate the uses of the ***'bíí'*** coordinator.

Firstly, consider example (33). In this example, we see ***'bíí'*** correctly connecting the nouns ***'sáá'*** (TZ) and ***'kábílá'*** (fufu)

33. **Sáá bíí kábílá íŋ ná dì**

"Will you eat TZ or fufu"

Sáá	**bíí**	**kábílá**	**íŋ**	**ná**	**dì**
sáá	bíí	kábílá	íŋ	ná	dì
TZ	*or*	*fufu*	2SG	*will*	*eat*
N	CONJC	N			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, ***'bíí'*** is used to present ***'sáá'*** (TZ) and ***'kábílá'*** (fufu) as alternative foods available. Example (34) below is also a case of NP coordination with ***'bíí'***. The NP in this example is however made up of the definite article and a noun.

34. **A pɔgɔ bíí a bee ɪŋ dɪ kú**

"Did you give it to the woman or the child?"

a	**pɔgɔ**	**bíí**	**a**	**bee**	**ɪŋ**	**dɪ**	**kú**
a	pɔgɔ	bíí	a	bee	ɪŋ	dɪ	kú
the	*wife/woman*	*or*	*the*	*child*	2SG	*take*	*give*
DET	N	CONJC	DET	N		V1	V2

Generated in TypeCraft.

Since ***'bíí'*** can coordinate noun phrases, it follows that it will also be able to coordinate locative constructions which are another nominal category.

Next consider examples (35) and (36). Example (35) is a constructed example of ***'bíí'*** connecting the spatial adverbials ***'zɛ́'*** (here) and ***'zɛ̀bɛ́è'*** (there) while (36) is a case of

'bíí' connecting the temporal adverbials ***'záánìí'*** (yesterday) and '***dìnáá'*** (today). Both of these examples are grammatical.

35. **zɛ́ bíí zɛ̀bɛ́è úŋ píílí**

"Did he tear here or there?"

zɛ́	**bíí**	**zɛ̀bɛ́è**	**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	bíí	zɛ̀bɛ́è	úŋ	píílí
here	*or*	*there*	2SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	PN	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

36. **Záánìí bíí dìnáá ká a záká lè**

"Was it yesterday or today that the house fell?"

Záánìí	**bíí**	**dìnáá**	**ká**	**a**	**záká**	**lè**
záánìí	bíí	dìnáá	ká	a	záká	lè
yesterday	*or*	*today*		*the*	*house*	*fall*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	CONJS	DET	N	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In (37) below, we see ***'bíí'*** connecting two clauses. Clause 1 **(a pɔgɔ ɪŋ dɪ kú)** before ***'bíí'*** and clause 2 **(a bee ɪŋ dɪ kú)** after ***'bíí'*.** This is also grammatical.

37. **A pɔgɔ ɪŋ dɪ kú bíí a bee ɪŋ dɪ kú**

"Did you give it to the woman or did you give it to the child"

a	**pɔgɔ**	**ɪŋ**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**bíí**	**a**	**bee**	**ɪŋ**	**dɪ**	**kú**
a	pɔgɔ	ɪŋ	dɪ	kú	bíí	a	bee	ɪŋ	dɪ	kú
the	*wife/woman*	2SG	*take*	*give*	*or*	*the*	*child*	2SG	*take*	*give*
DET	N		V1	V2	CONJC	DET	N		V1	V2

Generated in TypeCraft.

In example (38) below, we see a constructed example of ***'bíí'*** correctly coordinating ADJs. In this example ***'bíí'*** coordinates two independent adjectives ***'wákú'*** (tall) and ***'kpìrii'*** (short).

38. **Wákú bíí kpìríí**

"Tall or short"

Wákú	**bíí**	**kpìríí**
wákú	bíí	kpìríí
	or	
ADJ	CONJC	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

Because all the examples above are grammatical, it is assumed that ***'bíí'*** can coordinate the categories involved. That is; NPs, APs, ADVPs and clauses.

Next consider example (39). In this example, ***'bíí'*** is used in an enquiry by someone who did not hear clearly if another said pinch or bite. Here ***'bíí'*** seems to be combining VPs.

39. **Í ye ká duŋ bíí finní**

"Did you say bite or pinch?"

Í	**ye**	**ká**	**duŋ**	**bíí**	**finní**
í	ye	ká	duŋ	bíí	finní
2SG	*say*		*bite*	*or*	
	V	CONJS	V	CONJ	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, even though we find the verbs ***'duŋ'*** (bite) and ***'finní'*** (pinch) occurring at either side of ***'bíí',*** they do not function as verbs in this case. They are used for Metalinguistic reference.

In my data, I did not find any case of ***'bíí'*** connecting verbs. I as a native speaker could not construct any valid examples of ***'bíí'*** connecting verbs. The closest case of ***'bíí'*** combining verbs is example (39) above. But as explained it is not a case of VP coordination. I will thus go by the assumption that it is not possible to coordinate VPs with ***'bíí'.***

This inability of the Safaliba ***'bíí'*** to coordinate VPs is similar to the case of Dagaare ***'bíí'*** where the subject of the second clause is not totally omitted but appears as a pronoun even in cases where the subject of the second clause has the same referent as the first.

(Dakubu, 2005:24) states this as follows: "With ***'bíí'***, even if the subject of the second clause has the same referent as the first, it is not totally omitted (or zeroed) but occurs as a pronoun"

The above has shown that ***'bíí'*** can combine NPs, locative constructions, APs, ADVPs and clauses. It can however not coordinate VPs. This means that ***'bíí'*** can connect all categories except VPs. This is summarized in the table below.

Table 6

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
'bíí'	√	~~X~~	√	√	√	√

In the data collected, ***'bíí'*** does not feature prominently. It only occurs 7 times and there were only cases of NP coordination.

3.7 The syntactic properties of 'chɛ'

In this section I discuss the grammatical categories that the ***'chɛ'*** coordinator can combine. This coordinator can have either an adversative or a conjunctive interpretation depending on the context. Thus it can be translated into English as 'but' or 'and', depending on the context. In the following examples on ***'chɛ'***, I show its various uses. Firstly, consider examples (40) and (41).

In example (40) below, ***'chɛ'*** combines two VPs that have the same verb but different objects. In this example, both parts of the construction have the same verb ***'dì'*** (eat) but the object of VP1 before ***'chɛ'*** is ***'sáá'*** (TZ) whiles the object of VP2 after ***'chɛ'*** is ***'kábílá'*** (fufu). This construction is grammatical.

40. **Tì ná dì sáá chɛ dì kábílá pɔɔ**

"We will eat TZ and also eat fufu"

tì	**ná**	**dì**	**sáá**	**chɛ**	**dì**	**kábílá**	**pɔɔ**
tì	ná	dì	sáá	chɛ	dì	kábílá	pɔɔ
1PL	*will*	*eat*	*TZ*		*eat*	*fufu*	*add*
		V	N	CONJC	V	N	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In (43) chɛ combines two VPs that have different verbs with the same subject and different objects.

41. **Tì ná dì sáá chɛ nyú dãã**

"We will eat TZ and drink alcohol"

tì	**ná**	**dì**	**sáá**	**chɛ**	**nyú**	**dãã**
tì	ná	dì	sáá	chɛ	nyú	dãã
1PL	*will*	*eat*	*TZ*		*drink*	*alcohol*
		V	N	CONJC	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

As stated above, this example has two different verbs; ***'dì'*** (eat) and ***'nyú'*** (drink). Both verbs share the subject referent ***'tí'*** (1PL) but they have different objects. ***'Sáá'*** (TZ*)* for the first verb and ***'dãã'*** (alcohol) for the second verb.

In example (42) below, ***'chɛ'*** combines clauses that have different verbs with different subject referents and different objects.

42. **Andama tí pôʔ chɛ Samua bé zàká**

"Andama has gone to the farm but Samua is at home"

Andama	**tí**	**pôʔ**	**chɛ**	**Samua**	**bé**	**zàká**
andama	tí	pôʔ	chɛ	samua	bé	zàká
	go	*farm*			*is*	*house*
Np	V	N	CONJ	Np	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example Andama is the subject of the first verb ***'tí'*** (go) and Samua is the subject of the second verb '***bé'*** (is). These verbs also have different objects **'pôʔ'** (farm) and ***'zàká'*** (house) for ***'tí'*** (go) and ***'bé'*** (is) respectively.

The above examples on ***'chɛ'*** show that ***'chɛ'*** can coordinate VPs and clauses, thus verbal projections. Next I consider categories which ***'chɛ'*** cannot coordinate.

Firstly consider Example (43). This is a case of ***'chɛ'*** connecting NPs. Here ***'chɛ'*** is used to combine the noun phrases ***'a pɔgɔ'*** and ***'a bee'***.

43. ***a pɔgɔ chɛ a bee**

"The woman and the child"

a	**pɔgɔ**	**chɛ**	**a**	**bee**
a	pɔgɔ	chɛ	a	bee
the	*wife/woman*		*the*	*child*
DET	N	CONJC	DET	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

This construction is unacceptable thus marked by the (*) before the example. Since ***'chɛ'*** cannot combine noun phrases, it follows that it will also not be able to combine locative constructions which are a nominal category.

'Chɛ' cannot connect ADVs, either temporal or spatial ones. Examples (44) and (45) show these impossibilities. In (44) ***'chɛ'*** connects two spatial adverbials ***'zɛ́'*** (here) and ***'zɛ̀bɛ́è'*** (there) but this is unacceptable. In (45), ***'chɛ'*** coordinates the temporal adverbials ***'záánìí'*** (yesterday) and ***'dìnáá'*** (today). Again this is unacceptable.

44. ***zɛ́ chɛ zɛ̀bɛ́è úŋ píílí**

"He tore here and there"

zɛ́	**chɛ**	**zɛ̀bɛ́è**	**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	chɛ	zɛ̀bɛ́è	úŋ	píílí
here		*there*	3SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	PN	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

45. ***Záánií chɛ dìnáá záá ŋ bà dì**

"Yesterday and today I did not eat"

Záánií	**chɛ**	**dìnáá**	**záá**	**ŋ**	**bà**	**dì**
záánií	chɛ	dìnáá	záá	ŋ	bà	dì
yesterday		*today*	*all*	1SG	NEG	*eat*
ADV	CONJC	ADV	ADJ	PN		V

Generated in TypeCraft.

Next consider example (46) below.

46. ***sáálígá chɛ pɛ́ɛ́lígá**

"Black and white"

sáálígá	**chɛ**	**pɛ́ɛ́lígá**
sáálígá	chɛ	pɛ́ɛ́lígá
black		*white*
ADJ	CONJC	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, ***'chɛ'*** is seen connecting the adjectives ***'sáálígá'*** (black) and ***'pɛ́ɛ́lígá'*** (white). However this is not acceptable, thus the (*) attached to the example. This indicates that ***'chɛ'*** cannot connect adjectives. However, example (47) below seems to provide evidence to the contrary.

47. **Ú bé wákù chɛ pɔlì**

"He is tall and fat"

Ú	**bé**	**wákù**	**chɛ**	**pɔlì**
ú	bé	wákù	chɛ	pɔlì
3SG	*is*	*tall*		*fat*
PN	V	ADJ	CONJC	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example ***'chɛ'*** appears to be connecting the adjectives ***'wákù'*** (tall) and ***'pɔlì'*** (fat) correctly. The conclusion that can be drawn from this example is contrary to that of example (46) above where ***'chɛ'*** is unable to coordinate adjectives correctly. There is thus a need to resolve this apparent contradiction. If we as with example (22) on page 17 assume that the copular verb is present in the first part and omitted in the second part, the AP here will be an elliptical version of a VP. With this analysis, we are able to explain the apparent contradiction.

The above examples on ***'chɛ'*** show that ***'chɛ'*** can only combine verbal categories i.e. VPs and clauses. This also implies that ***'chɛ'*** cannot combine NPs, Locative constructions, APs and ADVPs. See summary below.

Table 7

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
chɛ	√	√	X	X	X	X

The above suggest that there is only one lexical item ***'chɛ'*** that can function as 'but' and as 'and' depending on the context. Thus ***'chɛ'*** has two different meanings. I will come back to this in the chapter on the semantic and pragmatic properties of coordinators. In the corpus there were a total of 13 occurrences of ***'chɛ'*** 4 were cases of S coordination and 9 were VP coordination.

3.8 Implicational scale

J. R. Payne (1985) proposes an implicational scale that constrains the possible range of coordinators: S – VP – AP – PP – and NP. The prediction that this makes is that individual coordinators, are restricted to cover contiguous categories, e.g. S and VP, or AP, PP and NP. There can be no coordinators according to this hypothesis, that only link sentences and APs, but not VPs or VPs and NPs, but not APs and PPs and so on"

An attempt to test this hypothesis on Safaliba coordinators will require a small modification to cover what exists in Safaliba. In his scale, Payne has the category PP but Safaliba does not have that category. What serves as a PP in English and other European languages come out as locative constructions in Safaliba. Thus, I have replaced PP with LOC its equivalent in Safaliba. The modified scale for Safaliba will thus be as follows: S – VP – AP – PP/LOC – and NP. The result of the test of the scale on Safaliba categories is shown in the table below.

Table 8

	S	VP	AP	PP/LOC	NP
'ní'/ 'aní'	X	X	√	√	√
'á'	X	√	X	X	X
'ka'	√	X	X	X	X
'chɛ'	√	√	X	X	X
'bíí'	√	X	√	√	√

The table above shows that for Safaliba, Payne's predictions hold at least for all coordinating conjunctions. It however falls short for the disjunctive conjunction ***'bíí'. 'bíí'*** is able to link Ss and NP but not VP, which contradicts Payne's predictions.

Payne's scale is however limited to S – VP – AP – PP/LOC – and NP. Payne does not mention ADVs in his scale. But in the scale I propose for Safaliba below, I introduce ADVs and put them between AP and PP/LOC. It is however relevant to add that they could have been placed anywhere between VP and NP without any consequences in Safaliba. The new scale which includes ADVs for Safaliba is as follows: S – VP – AP – ADVs – PP/LOC – and NP. This is represented in the table below.

Table 9

	S	VP	AP	ADV	PP/LOC	NP
'ní'/ 'aní'	X	X	√	√	√	√
'á'	X	√	X	X	X	X
'ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X
'chɛ'	√	√	X	X	X	X
'bíí'	√	X	√	√	√	√

The above table shows that if ADVs are to be added to the scale, they could be placed anywhere between VPs and NPs; At least in the case of Safaliba.

3.9 Summary of chapter

This chapter has shown the various syntactic categories that each coordinator can combine. For coordinating conjunctions:

'ka' → Ss

'***á***' → VP

'chɛ' → Ss/ VP

'ní'/ 'aní' → elsewhere

The work has also shown that the disjunction ***'bíí'*** can coordinate all categories except VPs.

This chapter has also shown that so far as coordinating conjunctions are concerned the language conforms to Payne's (1985) implicational sequence. This chapter has shown that at least for Safaliba, if Payne's scale were to include ADVs then they could be placed anywhere between VP and NP.

In totality this chapter has in addition to adding information on the syntactic properties of coordinators in Safaliba, contributed to coordination more generally by testing new data on an already existing theory on coordination.

4 THE SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC PROPERTIES OF COORDINATORS IN SAFALIBA

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the various meanings of each of the coordinators whether semantically encoded or pragmatically inferred. I will first discuss all the properties that each coordinator can exhibit. After that, I will distinguish between those that are semantically encoded and those that are pragmatically inferred from the use of the coordinator so as to be able to assign a specific meaning to each coordinator. I will also compare some of the coordinators where necessary, in an attempt to distinguish between them.

The approach used in the discussion of the semantic and pragmatic properties of the coordinators in this work is highly influenced by Regina Blass's analysis of coordinators in Sissala. See Blass (1990: 32 – 51). In her analysis, Blass argues that, the pragmatic difference among conjoined structures in Sissala might arise not from the lexical meaning of the coordinating conjunctions but from syntactic factors in combination with pragmatic principles.

Central to her analysis are the cognitive and communicative principles of relevance theory as developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986). Relevance theory can be seen as an alternative approach to Grice's theory on communication which in itself was an alternative to the classical code model of communication.

Relevance theory can be seen as an attempt to work out in detail, one of Grice's main claims that in communication, a communicator provides evidence of his or her communicative intention or intention to communicate or convey a certain meaning, and based on the evidence provided, the audience linguistically infers the meaning. Relevance theory however claims that the linguistic meaning recovered through the process of decoding is just one of the inputs to the inferential process which leads to the interpretation of the speaker's meaning.

"The central claim of relevance theory is that the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are precise and predictable enough to guide the hearer towards the speaker's meaning." (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:607).

"The main aim of the theory is to explain in cognitively realistic terms what these expectations amount to and how they might contribute to an empirically plausible account of

comprehension." (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:608). Sperber and Wilson explain communication based on two main principles:

a) The cognitive principle of relevance

"Human cognition tends to be geared towards the maximization of relevance." (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:610)

b) The communicative principle of relevance

"Every act of ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance." (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:612).

By the cognitive principle of relevance, the theory claims that humans have an automatic tendency to maximize relevance, and that this tendency is not a matter of choice but that "the human cognitive system has developed in such a way that our perceptual mechanisms tend to automatically pick out potentially relevant stimuli, our memory retrieval mechanisms tend automatically to activate potentially relevant assumptions, and our inferential mechanisms tend spontaneously to process them in the most productive way" (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:610). *We can then say that the tendency to maximize relevance is an involuntary action.*

Thus they argue that the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance cannot be because speakers obey a co-operative principle and maxims[3] but because the search for relevance is an innate feature of humans. They claim that an utterance is relevant if and only if

i. "The ostensive stimulus is relevant enough to be worth the audience's processing effort." (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:612).

ii. "It is the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences." (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:612).

With regards to relevance to an individual, they argue that:

[3] In his theory of conversational implicatures, Grice claimed the existence of a co–operative principle that determined the way we used language. He claimed that this principle was subdivided in to **Maxims** of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. "The co–portative principle and its component maxims ensure that in a conversation, the right amount of information is provided and that the interaction is conducted in a in a truthful relevant and perspicuous manner" (Huang, 2007:25).
Most relevant to this work is the maxim of manner under which the maxim of orderliness falls. By this maxim of orderliness, Grice stressed that the information provided by the speaker must be orderly. Thus first things should be presented first.

a) "Other things being equal, the greater the positive cognitive effects achieved by processing an input, the greater the relevance of the input to the individual at that time". (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:609).
b) "Other things being equal, the greater the processing efforts expended, the lower the relevance of the input to the individual at that time". (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:609).

According to Sperber & Wilson1995: §3.1-2), a positive cognitive effect is a worthwhile difference to the individual's representation of the world: a true conclusion, for example. False conclusions are not worth having; they are cognitive effects, but not positive ones (Sperber & Wilson 1995: §3.1-2)" (Sperber and Wilson, 2004:612).

The fact that people expect utterances to be optimally relevant plays a key role in Regina Blass's work on coordination in Sissala (Blass, 1990). Blass argues that more complex structures either syntactically or phonologically require more processing effort hence people expect optimal relevance. The "unnecessary" processing effort put on the addressee by the use of a more complex structure in an environment where a simpler one could have been used leads to the expectation of extra positive cognitive effects. Thus the more processing effort involved, the more the expectation of positive cognitive effects. Below is a summary of Blass' analysis of the stylistic effects of conjunctions in Sissala.

4.2 Summary of Blass' analysis of the stylistic effects of conjunctions in Sissala

In her analysis of coordinators in Sissala, Blass shows that Sissala has three different forms of 'and' whose use is syntactically conditioned:

'***Ka***' is used to conjoin Ss,

'***a***' is used to conjoin VPs; and

'***ri***' or '***ari***' is used elsewhere.

She argues that the different coordinate constructions also differ in their pragmatic effects: for example, "sentential coordination with ***'ka'*** is standardly analyzed as suggesting that the event described in the second conjunct was unexpected, whereas non-sentential coordination carries connotations of stereotypicality". (Blass, 1990: 32)

In discussing how the different interpretations can be accounted for, Blass talks about three possible ways of accounting for these differences:

The first option is to argue that the various coordinating conjunctions might differ in their truth-conditional meaning so that ***'ka'*** for example might entail that the event described in the second conjunct was unexpected.

Another option is to assume that the second coordinating conjunction might have a common truth-conditional meaning but differ in their non-truth conditional meaning so that ***'ka'*** for instance might carry a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which an element of unexpectedness was presupposed.

The third option is to argue that the pragmatic difference among conjoined structures might arise not from lexical meaning of the coordinating conjunctions but from syntactic factors. It is this last assumption that she ends with in her analysis.

In her analysis of the Sissala ***'ka'*** and ***'a'***, Blass shows that ***'ka'*** can sometimes be obligatory and other times be optional. She also shows that ***'ka'*** can sometimes suggest that the event described in the second conjunct is unexpected. She argues that the effect of suggesting that the event described in the second conjunct is unexpected is only realised when ***'a'*** (VP coordinator) could also have been used. But there is no such effect when ***'ka'*** is obligatory.

Blass argues that the choice between ***'a'*** and ***'ka'*** in cases where there is a choice will follow from an expectation of optimal relevance: No unnecessary processing effort without some achievement in extra or different positive cognitive effects.

She starts with the premise that S-coordination is more complex and therefore its processing is more demanding than VP-coordination. She also argues that an unexpected fact leads to more contextual effects than expected ones. Therefore, we can explain why the use of ***'ka'*** sometimes has the effect of indicating unexpectedness or discontinuity. It will have this effect in cases where the more simple ***'a'*** could have been used, due to the "unnecessary" processing it puts on the addressee, and the expectation of optimal relevance. This therefore shows that for Sissala, the extra information that may come with the use of ***'ka'*** is not part of the semantic meaning of ***'ka'*** but is a result of the extra processing effort.

With respect to the choice between ***'ri'*** and ***'ari'***, she argues that because ***'ri'*** is a phonologically reduced form of ***'ari'***; ***'ari'*** is more complex and thus its processing involves more effort as compared to ***'ri'***. She also shows that some conjuncts can add some information that is semantically or pragmatically quite different from the preceding ones. She argues that because ***'ari'*** involves more processing effort as compared to ***'ri'***, it can be used as a forewarning that the next conjunct adds some information that is semantically or pragmatically quite different.

With reference to this work, I will adopt Blass's assumption that more complex structures lead to the exertion of more processing efforts hence the expectation of extra positive cognitive effects. However, some of my conclusions will be different. For instance, in the section on the semantic properties of ***'ní' / 'aní',*** I will argue that even though the less complex phonological properties of ***'ní'*** is the reason why it is preferred over ***'aní'*** in normal speech, the common ability of ***'aní'*** to signal the coming of the last conjunct cannot be attributed to this phonological difference but is due to other cognitive factors. I will refer to the above summary of Blass's work from time to time as I discuss the semantic properties of the various coordinators in Safaliba.

4.3 Semantic properties of 'ní' / 'aní'

These coordinators are always translated as 'and'. They can basically be described as group forming coordinators. As mentioned in the syntax chapter, ***'ní' / 'aní'*** have the function of stringing together NPs, locative construction, APs and ADVs.

According Ali (2006:3) the Dagaare ***né/àné*** etymologically "appears to be a commutative marker which has drifted towards a connective for NPs. It seems to have been drawn from ***à*** and ***nê*** which literally stand for 'add' and 'with' respectively. [...]. This combination, ***à + nê,*** could therefore literally mean 'and with' ". Ali (2006:3) states that "despite the possible differences in the etymology of the coordinating conjunctions, which we do not know much about, these forms are basically the same in distribution and meaning in speech [...] ***nê*** is more frequently used than ***ànê*****".** The distribution here refers to syntactic distributing not frequency of use.

Evidence from the collected data suggests that the case of the ***'ní' / 'aní'*** in Safaliba is very similar, if not the same, as their Dagaare counterparts.

It is relevant to state that, even though ***'ní' /'aní'*** may have originated from ***'ní'*** comitative marker, they are now different from ***'ní'*** comitative marker. For instance we can use the expression in example (48) below.

48. **Ken nmaa naŋ a nínnu ní swei**

"Ken cut the meat with a knife"

Ken	**nmaa**	**naŋ**	**a**	**nínnu**	**ní**	**swei**
ken	nmaa	naŋ	a	nínnu	ní	swei
	cut	FOC	*the*	*meat*	*with*	*knife*
Np	N		DET			N

Generated in TypeCraft.

On the other hand, the expression involving ***'aní'*** in example (49) will have a different and perhaps bizarre interpretation. It will mean "*ken cut the meat and also cut a knife"*. Not "*ken cut the meant with a knife"*.

49. **Ken nmaa naŋ a nínnu aní swei**

"Ken cut the meat and a knife"

Ken	**nmaa**	**naŋ**	**a**	**nínnu**	**aní**	**swei**
ken	nmaa	naŋ	a	nínnu	aní	swei
	cut	FOC	*the*	*meat*	*and*	*knife*
Np	N		DET		CONJC	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

The point here is that if ***'ní'*** conjunction and ***'ní'*** comitative marker were the same then it should be possible to use ***'ní'*** comitative in place of ***'aní'*** which has the same syntactic distribution and meaning as ***'ní'*** conjunction. But as can be seen from the examples, it cannot. This backs the claim that even though ***'ní' /'aní'*** may have originated from ***'ní'*** comitative marker, they are now different form ***'ní'*** comitative marker.

In discussing the origins of ***'ní' /'aní',*** two possible hypotheses could be advanced. Firstly, it can be argued that ***'ní'*** conjunction is a truncated form of ***'aní'.*** Because ***'ní' /'aní'*** have the same syntactic distribution and meaning, it is sound to argue that ***'á'*** conjunction and ***'ní'*** comitative marker were combined to form the ***'aní'*** conjunction which was later truncated to get the ***'ní'*** conjunction. This will mean the following derivational history:

'á' *conjunction +* ***'ní'*** *comitative marker =* ***'aní'*** *conjunction* → truncation →***'ní'*** *conjunction*

However it is also possible that ***'ní'*** comitative marker drifted to be used as ***'ní'*** conjunction and ***'aní'*** conjunction was composed in addition to ***'ní'*** conjunction. This will mean that ***'ní'*** conjunction is not a truncated form of ***'aní'.***

Irrespective of the origin of ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'***, evidence from the data suggest that the Safaliba ***'ní'*** like the case of Dagaare as stated earlier, is preferred to ***'aní'***. In the corpus used for this work, ***'ní'*** occurs (11) times whiles ***'aní'*** occurs only (3) times. This then raises the question; why do people prefer ***'ní'***? And when is ***'aní'*** used?

A possible reason for the apparent preference for ***'ní'*** could be the tendency of speakers to want to use simpler forms and thus exert less processing efforts. In comparing ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'***, one is most likely going to come to the conclusion that ***'aní'*** is more complex than ***'ní'*** irrespective of the view one takes on the origin of ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'.***

For instance, if one assumes that ***'ní'*** is a truncated form of ***'aní',*** the analysis would be that, since ***'ní'*** is phonologically shorter than ***'aní'***, ***'ní'*** is simpler. On the other hand if one goes by the assumption that ***'aní'*** was also coined in addition to ***'ní',*** the argument would be that, in addition to the fact that ***'aní'*** is phonologically more complex than ***'ní', 'aní'*** it is also morphologically more complex because ***'aní',*** is a compound word while ***'ní'*** is single unit word.

If this is the case, following Blass's hypothesis that more complex phonological structures lead to the exertion of more processing effort, then ***'aní'*** will be seen to involve more processing efforts as compared to ***'ní'.*** Hence, in the absence of any extra positive cognitive effects, speakers will choose the less expensive ***'ní'.*** Thus unless the speaker intends the statement to be extra relevant, he will always choose the less expensive ***'ní'.*** This can explain why speakers prefer ***'ní'.*** It is however important to add that both ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** have equal status in the grammar.

In the data, it is often the case that when speakers string a list of items together, they usually use ***'aní'*** before the last conjunct and this usually has the effect of signalling the addressee that what is about to come is the last in the list. Consider (50), an example taken from my field work data. This is a response by a speaker when asked to list his siblings. Note here that these are human names and in that sense they are semantically similar.

50. **Samua ní Bakari ní Andama ní Alice aní Amos**

"Samua and Bakari and Andama and Alice and Amos"

Samua	**ní**	**Bakari**	**ní**	**Andama**	**ní**	**Alice**	**aní**	**Amos**
samua	ní	bakari	ní	andama	ní	Alice	aní	Amos
	and		*and*		*and*		*and*	
Np	CONJ	PN	CONJ	Np	CONJ	Np	CONJ	Np

Generated in TypeCraft.

In the above example ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** are used by the speaker to string the names of his siblings. Note that, the speaker uses ***'aní'*** just before the last conjunct even though he could have used ***'ní'.*** In this example, the ***'aní'*** signals to the listener that what is about to come is the last conjunct. In my corpus, all the occurrences of the ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** were in this pattern. ***'ní'*** is used first and ***'aní'*** is used before the last conjunct. This suggests that this is the general pattern.

Examples like these suggest that ***'aní'*** has part of its meaning to signal the coming of the last conjunct. But is it really the case? I will show below that this is not the case. Consider example (51) an altered version of (50).

51. **Samua aní Bakari aní Andama aní Alice ní Amos**

"Samua and Bakari and Andama and Alice and Amos"

Samua	**aní**	**Bakari**	**aní**	**Andama**	**aní**	**Alice**	**ní**	**Amos**
samua	aní	bakari	aní	andama	aní	Alice	ní	Amos
	and		*and*		*and*		*and*	
PN	CONJ	PN	CONJ	PN	CONJ	PN	CONJ	PN

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, it can be seen that speakers can choose to use ***'aní'*** where ***'ní'*** was and ***'ní'*** where ***'aní'*** was. In this example, the use of ***'ní'*** just before the last conjunct also signals to the listener that what is about to come is the last conjunct. Thus ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** can swap positions and functions. Such examples as in (51) show that ***'aní'*** does not have as part of its meaning to signal the coming of the last conjunct and neither does ***'ní'.***

In an attempt to account for the reason for the ability of the conjuncts to signal the coming of the last conjunct, one will be tempted to apply Blass's analysis for Sissala ***'ri'*** and ***'ari*** but this analysis for Sissala ***'ri'*** and ***'ari'*** will not be appropriate here for two reasons.

Firstly, Blass's argument that the Sissala ***'ari'*** is used when the information the conjunct added is semantically or pragmatically quite different cannot hold for Safaliba because as can be seen from example (50) above, they can still be used to show the last conjunct even if the conjuncts are semantically similar. There is nothing semantically so different about human names.

Secondly because both ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** can signal the coming of the last conjunct, Blass's analysis that more complex structures raise expectations of extra positive cognitive effects cannot be used to explain the ability of the coordinators to signal the coming of the last conjunct. If it were the case that only ***'aní'*** could signal the coming of the last conjunct, then Blass's analysis would have been appropriate.

The in ability of Blass's analysis to carry over to Safaliba leaves the question as to why the coordinators are able to indicate the coming of the last conjunct un-answered.

A plausible explanation could be the following:

When a listener processes say ***'ní'***, the interpretation is stored in his short term memory thus is readily available. So when ***'ní'*** is used again, (in the same environment) he just goes for the already processed interpretation in his memory without having to processes it again. However, when a new coordinator is introduced, say ***'aní'***, a new lexical entry has to be accessed which leads to more processing efforts. It is this extra processing efforts that raises the expectations of extra or different cognitive effects given the expectation that the utterance is optimally relevant.

This analysis is different from Blass's analysis in that whiles Blass attributes the choice of ***'ari'*** before the last conjunct in Sissala to the differences in processing efforts resulting from their phonological differences; this new analysis attributes it to other cognitive factors. i.e. the accessing of a new lexical item.

Even though the general pattern is to use ***'ní'*** first and use ***'aní'*** before the last conjunct, it is not uncommon to find constructions involving only one of the two or cases where they are used interchangeably. According to my intuition, such cases are usually seen as a sign of lack of coherence on the part of the speaker because of one or more of the following reasons.

- Speaker is still processing his thought whiles he speaks
- Speaker is not fluent in the language.
- Speaker is hesitating, either because he is reluctant to add that information or because he is uncertain about what to say.

In summary, this section suggests that ***'ní'*** and ***'aní'*** have the same status in the grammar and appear to have originated from the comitative marker ***'ní'*** (with). As to the meaning of ***'ní'*** and ***'aní',*** I suggest that even though ***'aní'*** is frequently used before the last conjunct, they have the same meaning which is equivalent to the English 'and' i.e. the logical connector &. This meaning does not include signalling the coming of the last conjunct; rather, the differences in effects follow from pragmatic principles. Not (as Blass says for Sissala ***'ri'*** /***'ari'***) from the differences in processing efforts resulting from their phonological differences, but from the fact that the use of ***'aní'*** in those environments usually requires the extra processing efforts. And it is these processing efforts that make listeners expect some extra positive cognitive effect e.g. of the coming of the last conjunct.

Therefore, even though the less complex phonological properties of ***'ní'*** is the reason why it is preferred over ***'aní'*** in normal speech, the apparent ability of ***'aní'*** to signal the coming of the last conjunct cannot be attributed to this phonological difference but is due to other cognitive factors.

4.4 Semantic properties 'á'

The ***'á'*** coordinator is also one of the varieties of the 'and' conjunction in Safaliba. It has the function of stringing verbs and verb phrases together. For instance in the example below taken from a narrative description on tapioca making, ***'á'*** is seen coordinating a series of verbs.

52. **Í maŋ pirísíà á pirísíà á poosià**

"You crumble them and crumble them and sieve them"

Í	**maŋ**	**pirísíà**		**á**	**pirísíà**		**á**
í	maŋ	pirísí	à	á	pirísí	à	á
2SG	HAB	*crumble*	3PL	*and*	*crumble*	3PL	*and*
		V		CONJC	V		CONJC

poosià	
poosi	à
sieve	3PL
V	

Generated in TypeCraft.

This list of constituents coordinated by ***'á'*** in this example could theoretically go on and on. The ***'á'*** coordinator thus behaves like ***'ní'*** in that it can also string an infinite number of elements.

The actions described by the verbs coordinated by ***'á'*** usually combine to depict sequential actions in a larger single event. Consider the constructed example in (53) below.

53. **Í diibu níi ká Naa tí ɔŋi á basi**

"It is your food that Naa has gone to fetch and thrown away"

í	**diibu**	**níi**	**ká**	**Naa**	**tí**	**ɔŋi**	**á**	**basi**
í	diibu	níi	ká	naa	tí	ɔŋi	á	basi
2SG	*food*	FOC	COMPL		*go*	*fetch*	*and*	*throw away*
	N			PN	V	V	CONJ	V
Generated in TypeCraft.								

In this example, the verbs ***'ɔŋi'*** (fetch) and ***'basi'*** (throw away) are coordinated by ***'á'*** to depict the actions of fetching and throwing away. It is worth stating that these two actions are perceived as sequential actions in one event. Thus the fetching and throwing away are perceived as one big event but subdivided into two sequential actions.

The above suggest that ***'á'*** encodes sequential actions, but is this really the case? For instance it is possible to say "Today I went to the farm and went to the river and went to the market" with ***'á'*** in Safaliba when in fact the speaker went to the market before going to the farm. Thus the order is not necessarily strict.

54. **dìnáá ŋ tí naŋ pôʔ á tí manní chɛ tí daa**

"Today I went to the farm and went to the river and went to the market"

dìnáá	**ŋ**	**tí**	**naŋ**	**pôʔ**	**á**	**tí**	**manní**	**chɛ**	**tí**	**daa**
dìnáá	ŋ	tí	naŋ	pôʔ	á	tí	manní	chɛ	tí	daa
today	1SG	*go*	FOC	*farm*		*go*	*river*		*go*	*market*
ADV		V		N	CONJC	V	N	CONJC	V	N
Generated in TypeCraft.										

The order of the constituents coordinated by ***'á'*** in (54) is not necessarily strict because it is possible to use the expression even if the speaker went to the market first. This could be an answer to the question "what did you do today"? Because the order of the conjuncts in (54) is not necessarily strict, it will not be accurate to claim that ***'á'*** encodes sequential actions.

In other to account for this common but not obligatory sequential relationship between conjuncts coordinated by ***'á',*** two possible explanations can be given depending on one's school of thought.

Firstly, if one is a Gricean pragmatist, one will take the approach used by Grice (1981) to analyse the sequential ordering of conjuncts coordinated by the English 'and'. In this analysis, Grice uses two examples to explain the different sequential orderings of the actions described by constituents coordinated by the English 'and'.

a) He took off his boots and got into the bed
b) He got into the bed and took off his boots

In a), it is understood that the referent took off his boot before going into the bed but in b), it is understood that the referent got in to the bed before taking off the boots.

In Grice's view the understanding of these two as "communicating different sequential orderings of the actions described is to be attributed to his manner maxim of orderliness; in other words the understanding is arrived at entirely pragmatically. [...] he took the communicated temporal ordering to constitute a conversational implicature." (Carston 2002:222 – 223). Thus apart from the expectation that speakers should be orderly in speech, there is no other reason why one should think the referent necessarily took off his boots before he got into the bed or that he necessarily got into the bed before he took off his boots. Applying this to example (54) above, there is no reason to think the speaker necessarily went to the farm before going to the river. Thus Grice's maxim of orderliness is the reason why going to the farm is perceived as preceding going to the river. The temporal ordering constitutes a conversational implicature.

On the other hand if one is a relevance theorist, one will attribute the sequential relationship between conjuncts coordinated with ***'á'*** to the accessing of contextual assumptions. "either retrieved ready-made from memory or constructed from partially articulated assumptions schemas in memory together with the new information provided by

the utterance" (Carston 2002:226). For instance Carston gives the following explanation for the sequential interpretation of the sentence below.

c) He handed her a scalpel and she made the incision.

In her view, when we hear this example, "we are given immediate access to a bundle of stereotypical materials of this sort, a surgical operation script, involving scalpels and making of incisions, and, perhaps, a more general abstract schema about one person handing something to the other for the other to do something with it. Etc" (Carston 2002:226). Carston argues that "on the basis of this readily accessible information, it is instantly assumed that the making of the incision followed the handing over of the scalpel and the scalpel is used for making the incision" (Carston 2002:226).

Carston argues that the relevance theoretic comprehension strategy provides evidence why we end up with stereotypical interpretation. She claims that this is the most accessible interpretation available to the hearer and provided that it satisfies his expectations of relevance he stops there.

Even with examples like example (53) ***'Í diibu níi ká Naa tí ɔŋi á basi'*** (It is your food that Naa has gone to fetch and thrown away) above, one could attribute the sequential relation to the fact that changing the order will run counter to the normal assumptions on how fetching and throwing away occur. Thus you have to first fetch the food before you can throw it away. This is thus not triggered by the ***'á'*** but due to pragmatic factors.

Thus irrespective of the view one takes it is clear that the sequential relation expressed by constructions coordinated by ***'á'*** are not part of the meaning of ***'á'*** but due to other cognitive factors.

In constructions involving ***'á',*** the ***'á'*** may be dropped to de-emphasize the verb that it precedes. Consider example (55). This example is similar to example (53).

55. **Í diibu níi ká Naa tí ɔŋi dì**

"It is your food that Naa has gone to fetch and eaten"

í	**diibu**	**níi**	**ká**	**Naa**	**tí**	**ɔŋi**	**dì**
í	diibu	níi	ká	naa	tí	ɔŋi	dì
2SG	*food*	FOC	COMPL		*go*	*fetch*	*eat*
	N			PN	V	V	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In example (53) where the coordinator is present, the coordinator puts emphasis on the action described by the verb it precedes. This emphasis could be to indicate that the action described by the verb is non-stereotypical. For instance in example (53), emphasis is placed on what happens after Naa fetches the food. Because throwing the food away is not normal, the speaker wants to draw the listener's attention to the abnormality and he does this by introducing the coordinator ***'á'*** just before the verb ***'basi'*** (throw away).

However in (55) where eating the food is stereotypical or normal, the ***'á'*** is not there. If the ***'á'*** were to be provided in (55), it will still put emphasis on the verb it precedes. In such a case, the reason could be that Naa was not expected to eat the food probably because it has gone bad.

It can therefore be concluded from the above that, in addition to emphasizing a point, ***'á'*** can be put before the conjunct to indicate a non-stereotypical situation and is omitted in stereotypical situation. Note however that these properties of ***'á'*** indicating a non-stereotypical situation and emphasizing a point are very much related. The reason for the emphasis is usually because the action described is non-stereotypical. Thus the emphasis is to highlight the non-stereotypicality.

The above suggest that the ability of indicating non-stereotypicality or emphasis is part of the semantic content of ***'á'***. But I will show below that these properties are not part of the meaning of ***'á'*** but are due to pragmatic reasons.

First consider the following example taken from a descriptive narrative on how ***'dawadawa'*** is made from my corpus.

56. **Dua ŋmaní maŋ náá pɔsíà á wà pirigià á pɛgíà kɔŋ á dı dɛ́ɛ́ní […]**

"I will go and pluck dawadawa fruits and come and peel them and wash them and dry them"

Dua	**ŋmaní**	**maŋ**	**náá**	**pɔsíà**		**á**	**wà**	**pirigià**		**á**
dua	ŋmaní	maŋ	náá	pɔsí	à	á	wà	pirigi	à	á
dawadawa	*fruit*	1SG	*will*	*pluck*	3PL		*come*	*peel*	3PL	
N	N			V		CONJC	V			CONJC

pɛgíà		**kɔŋ**	**á**	**dı**	**dɛ́ɛ́ní**
pɛgí	à	kɔŋ	á	dı	dɛ́ɛ́ní
wash	3PL	*hunger*		*take*	
V		N	CONJC	V1	V2

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example the use of ***'á'*** before ***'wà pirigià'*** (come and peel them), before ***'pɛgíà'*** (wash then) and before ***'dı dɛ́ɛ́ní'*** (take and dry them) does not in any way suggest non-stereotypicality or emphasis. They only indicate sequential actions. Note also that in examples such as (56) above, ***'á'*** is mandatory. If ***'á'*** is removed, the whole construction will become ungrammatical. This shows therefore that there are situations where ***'á'*** is obligatory and others where it is optional. Another implication is that, the added effect of indicating stereotypicality or emphasis only occurs in cases such as examples (53) where ***'á'*** is optional.

Examples like (56) show that ability to indicate non-stereotypicality or emphasis is not part of the meaning of ***'á'*** but must be due to pragmatic factors. To be more specific, based on Blass's analysis that more complex structures require more processing efforts thus raise expectations of extra positive cognitive effects, we can attribute this added effect of indicating non-stereotypicality to the extra processing efforts exerted. Remember that the ***'á'*** only has this effect of indicating non-stereotypicality in cases where it is optional. Thus because of the availability of a simpler option, the construction involving ***'á'*** is deemed to be more complex thus listeners expect it to be more relevant. This expectation is actually met by the non-stereotypicality interpretation. We can thus conclude that the added effect of indicating non-stereotypicality is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted to process the ***'á'***.

The above claim that the added effect of indicating non-stereotypicality is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted to process the ***'á'*** is further illustrated in the constructed examples in (57) and (58) below.

57. **A baa ká a bee va á ku**

"It is the dog that the child has hit and killed"

a	**baa**	**ká**	**a**	**bee**	**va**	**á**	**ku**
a	baa	ká	a	bee	va	á	ku
the	*dog*		*the*	*child*	*hit*		*kill*
DET	N	CONJS	DET	N	V	CONJC	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

58. **A baa ká a bee va ku**

"It is the dog that the child has hit and killed"

a	**baa**	**ká**	**a**	**bee**	**va**	**ku**
a	baa	ká	a	bee	va	ku
the	*dog*		*the*	*child*	*hit*	*kill*
DET	N	CONJS	DET	N	V1	V2

Generated in TypeCraft.

In these examples, it can be seen that (57) involves the use of the coordinator ***'á'*** whiles (58) does not have the coordinator. In (57) emphasis is placed on ***'ku'*** (kill) which is preceded by the coordinator ***'á'***. In (58) where there is no coordinator, there is no such emphasis. We can therefore conclude that because (57) involves the use of the coordinator, it is more complex than (58) where there is no ***'á'***. Thus (57) involves more processing efforts as compared to (58). We can thus attribute the effect of indicating emphasis to the extra effort exerted in processing the ***'á'*** in (57). Hence the extra processing effort exerted in (57) is compensated for by the non-stereotypicality effect.

Note also that the two examples above show that a serial verb construction can be formed when the ***'á'*** coordinator is dropped from a coordinate construction.

In example (57), the verbs ***'va'*** (hit) and ***'ku'*** (kill) are coordinated using ***'á'*** to show two sequential actions with ***'va'*** (hit) preceding ***'ku'*** (kill). However, in example (58) where ***'á'*** is dropped, the whole construction changes from a coordinate construction into as serial verb construction. The omission of the coordinator in (58) turns the previously sequential actions in

to two simultaneous actions. It can therefore be said that the presence of the coordinator in (57) puts the construction in slow motion by breaking the actions described by the verbs into two sequential actions. Thus the presence of the ***'á'*** can indicate that there is a small time gap between the actions described by the two verbs.

Lastly, the coordinator ***'á'*** can also be introduced between reduplicated verbs and serial verb constructions for emphasis and exaggeration. Consider the following constructed example.

59. **Samua ŋ wà zɛ́ á wà dì dì dì**

"Samua came here and ate and ate and ate"

Samua	**ŋ**	**wà**	**zɛ́**	**á**	**wà**	**dì**	**dì**	**dì**
samua	ŋ	wà	zɛ́	á	wà	dì	dì	dì
	FOC	*come*	*here*		*come*	*eat*	*eat*	*eat*
Np		V	ADV	CONJC	V	V1	V2	V3

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example the speaker duplicates the verb ***'dì'*** (eat) to show how much Samua ate. As will be shown in the next example, the speaker can choose to introduce ***'á'*** to put even more emphasis on how much Samua ate.

60. **Samua ŋ wà zɛ́ á wà dì á dì á dì**

"Samua came here and ate and ate and ate"

Samua	**ŋ**	**wà**	**zɛ́**	**a**	**wà**	**dì**	**á**	**dì**	**á**	**dì**
samua	ŋ	wà	zɛ́	a	wà	dì	á	dì	á	dì
	FOC	*come*	*here*		*come*	*eat*		*eat*		*eat*
Np		V	ADV	DET	V	V	CONJC	V	CONJC	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

Even though in example (59) the reduplication of the verb ***dì*** (eat) places emphasis on how much Samoa ate. Example (60) involves even more emphasis because of the presence of ***'á'***. In fact (60) can even be seen an attempt by the speaker to exaggerate how much Samua ate. Like the above analysis, it can be argued that because ***'á'*** is optional, the effect of

indicating exaggeration in (60) is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted in processing it.

In summary, this section on the Semantic properties of ***'á'*** has established the following about the ***'á'*** coordinator in Safaliba.

Firstly, with regards to the meaning of ***'á',*** it has been suggested in this section that ***'á'*** only encodes the same meaning as the English 'and' i.e. the logical connector &.

Its ability to depict a sequential relation between the conjuncts it coordinates is not part of its meaning but due to pragmatic factors. The section has argued that depending on one's school of thought, the pragmatic reasons for the sequential relation could be different. Whiles Gricean pragmatists will attribute it to Grice's maxim of orderliness, relevance theorists, will attribute the sequential relationship between conjuncts coordinated but ***'á'*** to the accessing of contextual assumptions "either retrieved ready-made from memory or constructed from partially articulated assumptions schemas in memory together with the new information provided by the utterance" (Carston 2002:226).

With respect to the ability of ***'a'*** to have the effects of emphasizing the conjunct it precedes to indicate a non-stereotypical situation and also its ability to have the effect of exaggerating the proposition it precedes, this section has argued that because it only has these effects in cases where it is optional, these properties are due to pragmatic factors and not part of the meaning of ***'á'.*** Specifically, they are the result of the extra processing effort exerted to process it compared to serial verb constructions.

4.5 Semantic properties of the 'ka' coordinator

This coordinator is always translated as 'and' and is used to combine only clauses. According to Schaefer (2009:137), a clause following the ***'ka'*** conjunction is normally understood as expressing some category of information which is off the narrative storyline.

This suggests that the coordinator cannot be used to coordinate events that are part of the same story line. Checks on the data seem to support this claim. First consider example (61). This example is taken from Schaefer (2009:136)

61. **ká ba kú nɔɔsɪ á sɔsɪ Naaŋmɪnɪ**

"That they should kill fowls and ask God"

ká	**ba**	**kú**	**nɔɔsɪ**		**á**	**sɔsɪ**	**Naaŋmɪnɪ**
ká	ba	kú	nɔɔ	sɪ	á	sɔsɪ	naaŋmɪnɪ
that	3PL	*give*	*fowls*	PL		*ask*	*God*
CONJS	PN	V	N		CONJC	V	Np

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, the ***'á'*** is used to coordinate two propositions that are part of the same story line in the following sense: The fowls are to be killed to be used to worship God. (They are to be sacrificed to God.) Thus in this sense they belong to the same story line.

Next consider example (62). This is a modified version of example (61). In this example, I have inserted a subject ***'ba'*** (3PL) to meet the syntactic requirements of ***'ka'***.

62. **ká ba kú nɔɔsɪ ka ba sɔsɪ Naaŋmɪnɪ**

"That they should kill fowls and they should ask God"

ká	**ba**	**kú**	**nɔɔsɪ**		**ka**	**ba**	**sɔsɪ**	**Naaŋmɪnɪ**
ká	ba	kú	nɔɔ	sɪ	ka	ba	sɔsɪ	naaŋmɪnɪ
that	3PL	*give*	*fowls*	PL	*and*	3PL	*ask*	*God*
CONJS	PN	V	N		CONJ	PN	V	Np

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, the two propositions are not seen as part of the same story line in the sense of (61) above. In (61), the fowls are to be killed to be used to worship God. (They are to be sacrificed to God) but in (62), the killing of the fowls and the worshiping of God are parallel. They are seen as different and perhaps unrelated events. They are not seen to belong to the same story line at least in the sense of (61).

Throughout the data there were no examples of cases where the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** are seen to belong to the same story line. On this basis therefore, I argue as Schaefer (2009:137) that clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** express some category of information which is off the narrative storyline.

In his analysis, Schaefer (2009: 138) also claims that "[...] clauses with ***'ka'*** might be better classified as subordinate". However, it is important to point out that this subordinate relation is more pragmatic than syntactic.

This argument that clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** might be better classified as subordinate is backed by the fact that the action or events described by the second clause or subsequent clauses usually depend on the first clause semantically. This dependency relation may however take various forms. It can be a case of precedence, consequence, entailment etc.

Note however that, this dependency relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** does not entail that we are dealing with subordination. The interpretation of the dependency relations is natural for pragmatic reasons. For instance, in example (63) below, the second clause ***'tí tì pôʔ'*** (we go to the farm) is semantically dependent on the first clause ***Baba ná wà*** (Baba will come) in the sense that *going to the farm* is interpreted as coming after *Baba has come*.

63. **Baba ná wà ka tí tì pôʔ**
"Baba will come and we will go to the farm"

Baba	**ná**	**wà**	**ka**	**tì**	**tí**	**pôʔ**
baba	ná	wà	ka	tì	tí	pôʔ
	will	*come*	*and*	*we*	*go*	*farm*
Np		V	CONJC	PN	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

Here, there is a temporal sequence between the conjuncts coordinated by the conjunction ***'ka'***. This is a case of a semantic dependency of precedence.

Also in example (64) below, the second and third clauses ***yà tí mɔɔ*** (you go to the forest) and ***yà tí túúsì a ʧóóné*** (you go and pick the sheanuts) respectively are semantically dependent on the first clause ***yà maŋ dɪ yà tásàsí*** (you take your basins). This is also a case of a semantic dependency of precedence.

64. **yà maŋ dı yà tásàsí ka yà tí mɔɔ ka yà tí túúsì a ʧóóné**

"You take your basins and you go to the forest and you go and pick the sheanuts"

yà	**maŋ**	**dı**	**yà**	**tásàsí**		**ka**	**yà**	**tí**	**mɔɔ**	**ka**	**yà**	**tí**	**túúsì**
yà	maŋ	dı	yà	tásà	sí	ka	yà	tí	mɔɔ	ka	yà	tí	túúsì
2PL	HAB	*take*	2PL	*basin*	PL	*and*	2PL	*go*	*forest*	*and*	2PL	*go*	*pick*
PN		V	PN	N		CONJC	PN	V	N	CONJC	PN	V1	V2

a	**ʧóóné**	
a	ʧóón	é
the	*sheanut*	PL
DET	N	

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, it is only after you have picked the basins (clause 1) that you go to the forest (clause 2) and pick the sheanuts (clause 3). In this example too, there is a temporal sequence between the conjuncts coordinated by the conjunction ***'ka'***. In other words, there is a chronological order in which the two events occur. If the order in which the clauses occur is changed, they will have a different meaning. Note that in all of these examples, the clauses could have been separated syntactically.

In the next example, we see a case of a dependency relation of consequence between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'***.

65. **A loore và naŋ Samua ka ú bari kabi.**

"The car hit Samoa and his leg got broken"

a	**loore**	**và**	**naŋ**	**Samua**	**ka**	**ú**	**bari**	**kabi**
a	loore	và	naŋ	samua	ka	ú	bari	kabi
the	*car*	*hit*	FOC		*and*	3SG	*leg*	*break*
DET	N	V		PN	CONJ		N	V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example the verb in the first clause is ***'và'*** (hit) whiles the verb in the second clause is ***'kabi'*** (break). Here, the event described by the second verb is a direct result of what is described by the first verb. Thus the second conjunct in this example is directly caused by the

first. (The car hitting him causes the breaking of his leg). Thus there is a semantic dependency relation of consequence.

There could also be a semantics dependency relation of containment between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*.** This is shown in the following example taken from a descriptive narrative of how gari is made from my corpus.

66. **Í maŋ tí gbende suba níí pôʔ [...] ka í tí sɔrí à ...**

"You go to the cassava owner's farm and you go and count them"

í	**maŋ**	**tí**	**gbende**	**suba**	**níí**	**pôʔ**	**ka**	**í**	**tí**	**sɔrí**	**à**
í	maŋ	tí	gbende	suba	níí	pôʔ	ka	í	tí	sɔrí	à
2SG	HAB	*go*	*cassava*	*owner*		*farm*	*and*	2SG	*go*	*count*	3PL
		V	N	N	DET	N	CONJC		V1	V2	

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this the example, the action described by the verb ***sɔrí*** (count) is seen as having taken place during the time spent at the farm. So even though *counting the cassava* is independent of *going to the farm*, the counting is seen to have taken place during the time spent at the farm.

This claim that ***'ka'*** does not entail that we are dealing with subordination is further backed by the following English examples from Carston (2002:223).

a) He handed her the scalpel and she made the incision
b) We spent the day in town and I went to Harrods
c) She shot him in the head and he died instantly

These examples are cases of the "so called asymmetric or directional conjunction [...] their meaning is crucially affected by the order of the conjuncts" (Carston, 2002:224).

In a) and c), the event described in the second clause is interpreted as coming after the first and as a direct consequence of the first. In b), the relation is one of containment, where going to Harrods is seen as taking place during the time spent in town.

Based on the above, it can thus be concluded that the dependency relation between clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** is not a quality or property of ***'ka'*** – conjunction but due to general pragmatic reasons.

In summary it can be said that in addition to providing further evidence to support Schaefer's (2009:137-138) claims that clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** express some category of information which is off the narrative story line. This section has shown that the dependency relation between the clauses is only pragmatic not syntactic.

This section has shown that like the case of the English 'and', the semantic dependency relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** can take forms such as containment, entailment, consequence etc. This section has also shown that there is a temporal relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** and that changing the order of the conjuncts will lead to a different interpretation.

With regards to the meaning of ***'ka'***, I suggest that based on the fact that all the occurrences of ***'ka'*** where cases where the conjuncts were not of the same story line, ***'ka'*** encodes that the clauses coordinated express some category of information which is off the narrative storyline. Thus ***'ka'*** only encodes 'and'+ information which is off the narrative storyline. The temporal sequence and the dependency relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** is however not part of its meaning but due to pragmatic reasons.

4.6 The semantic properties of 'chɛ'

Unlike the coordinators discussed so far this coordinator does not seem have one static meaning as it can be translated as 'and' or as 'but' depending on the context.

According to Schaefer (2009:138), the conjunction ***'chɛ'*** marks a degree of contrast between clauses, sometimes as strong as English 'but', but often less so. ***'chɛ'*** is used when presenting alternatives or unexpected contrasts, and also perhaps for indicating tension in a situation.

As indicated earlier the ***'chɛ'*** has both a conjunctive and an adversative faction; thus in discussing the semantics of ***'chɛ'***, it is relevant to investigate when the conjunctive interpretation is applicable and when the adversative interpretation is applicable. That is when ***'chɛ'*** functions as 'and' and when it functions as 'but'? The discussion below attempts to account for the different uses of ***'chɛ'.***

4.6.1 Adversative vs. conjunctive interpretation of 'chɛ'

According to Ali (2006:14), the Dagaare ***'chɛ'*** "functions as 'and' when it connects clauses in which the second clause does not have a subject, but behaves like 'but' when (i) there is a subject in the second clause; or (ii) when an expression of contrast is expressed in the light of the first clause; or (iii) when either of the clauses is in the negative."

In the following examples and discussion, I show that the case of the Safaliba ***'chɛ'*** is not different. First consider example (67).

67. **tì ná dì sáá chɛ dì kábílá pɔɔ**

"We will eat TZ and also eat fufu"

tì	**ná**	**dì**	**sáá**	**chɛ**	**dì**	**kábílá**	**pɔɔ**
tì	ná	dì	sáá	chɛ	dì	kábílá	pɔɔ
1PL	*will*	*eat*	*TZ*		*eat*	*fufu*	*add*
		V	N	CONJ	V	N	

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example it is evident that the second part after ***'chɛ'*** has no overt subject. Because there is no overt subject in this example, ***'chɛ'*** functions as 'and'. It is relevant to note that this is a case of VP coordination.

Next consider example (68) where both conjuncts have subjects.

68. **Andama tí pôʔ chɛ Samua bé zàká**

"Andama has gone to the farm but Samua is at home"

Andama	**tí**	**pôʔ**	**chɛ**	**Samua**	**bé**	**zàká**
andama	tí	pôʔ	chɛ	samua	bé	zàká
	go	*farm*	*but*		*is*	*house*
N	V	N	CONJ	N		N

Generated in TypeCraft.

This example has Andama as the subject of the first clause whiles Samua is the subject of the second clause. Because both clauses have subjects, ***'chɛ'*** function as 'but'. It also important to note here that because both constituents on either side of ***'chɛ'*** have subjects means this is a case of clausal coordination.

Next consider example (69). This is a translated example from Dagaare in Ali (2006:8). This example is a case where there is a contrast in the second proposition with respect to the first proposition.

69. **ŋ dìè chɛ kɔŋ naŋ kuuri ma naŋ**

"I have eaten but am still hungry

ŋ	**dìè**		**chɛ**	**kɔŋ**	**naŋ**	**kuri**		**ma**	**naŋ**
ŋ	dì	è	chɛ	kɔŋ	naŋ	ku	ri	ma	naŋ
1SG	*eat*	PFV	*but*	*hunger*	FOC	*kill*	IMP	1SG	FOC
	V		CONJC	N		V			

Generated in TypeCraft.

Here the expectation raised by the first proposition is contradicted by the second proposition. It is generally expected that if one eats he will be satisfied. It is therefore contrasting for one to eat and still be hungry. Note here that ***'chɛ'*** is interpreted as 'but'. Note also that this is a case of clausal coordination.

Next consider examples (70) and (71). In (70), the first conjunct that is before ***'chɛ'*** is negated while in (71) the second conjunct i.e. after ***'chɛ'*** is negated. In both cases ***'chɛ'*** functions as 'but'. These provide evidence that when either of the clauses is in the negative, ***'chɛ'*** functions as 'but'.

70. **Ú ba bé wákù chɛ pɔlì**

"He is not tall but he is fat"

ú	**ba**	**bé**	**wákù**	**chɛ**	**pɔlì**
ú	ba	bé	wákù	chɛ	pɔlì
3SG	NEG	*is*	*tall*	*but*	*fat*
			ADJ	CONJ	ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

71. **Ú bé wákù chɛ ba pɔlì**

"He is tall but he is not fat"

ú	**bé**	**wákù**	**chɛ**	**ba**	**pɔlì**
ú	bé	wákù	chɛ	ba	pɔlì
3SG	*is*	*tall*	*but*	NEG	*fat*
		ADJ	CONJ		ADJ

Generated in TypeCraft.

It is clear from the above that that Ali's generalisation for Dagaare can apply to Safaliba. However, a revision or modification is not out of place.

Under the section on the syntactic properties of the ***'á'*** coordinator in pages 13 – 18 of this work, a clause was defined as one that had an overt subject. Cases where the subject was not overt were considered as VPs. Going by this definition the generalizations above could be further simplified so that Ali's (2006:14) observation for Dagaare that ***'chɛ'*** functions as 'and' when it connects clauses in which the second clause does not have a subject would be equated to VP as defined in this work. Remember also that in the syntax chapter it has been established that ***'chɛ'*** can only coordinate VPs and clauses. Thus if it has been established that cases where the subject was not overt are VPs then all the other scenarios where it functions as 'but' will refer to clauses, as clauses are the only other category ***'chɛ'*** can coordinate. This line of argument will lead to the following generalization for Safaliba:

'chɛ' functions as 'and' when coordinating VPs and functions as 'but' when coordinating clauses

The following examples prove that this generalisation is valid for Safaliba.

a) ***'Mary dugra naŋ 'chɛ' yiila'*** means Mary is cooking and singing
b) ***'Mary dugra naŋ 'chɛ' ú yiila naŋ'*** means Mary is cooking but she is singing.

Note here that because a) has no overt subject in the second constituent, it is a VP but the presence of the subject ***'ú'*** (2SG) in b) makes it a case of S coordination.

The above generalisation that ***'chɛ'*** functions as 'and' when coordinating VPs and functions as 'but' when coordinating clauses suggests that these different interpretations are syntactically conditioned.

Next, I argue that if it is the case that the different meanings of ***'chɛ'*** are syntactically conditioned, then there is a case to argue for two different lexical items ***'chɛ'*** 1 meaning 'but' and ***'chɛ'*** 2 meaning 'and'.

According to Kroeger (2004:14), "the lexicon can be thought of as the speaker's "mental dictionary" [...] "each word must have a lexical entry which contains information about the meaning, pronunciation and grammatical features of that particular word. The grammatical information contained in the lexical entry will determine the context in which the word may occur. An important part of this information is the word's syntactic category". Thus in determining what constitutes an independent word, the semantic content, syntactic properties and the morphological form all come into play. With respect to ***'chɛ'*** one will notice that there are two different meanings assigned to the same form. This suggests that it may just be a case of two different words that have the same phonological representation i.e. homophones[4]. This argument is further supported by the fact that these two meanings have a strict syntactic environment in which they occur.

Based on the above, I suggest that, there should be two different ***'chɛ'***; one meaning 'but' and the other meaning 'and'. I will therefore go by this assumption as I discuss the semantic properties of ***'chɛ'***. I will therefore discuss the semantic properties of ***'chɛ'*** adversative 'but' separate from that of ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and'.

This new analysis that there are two lexical items means that table (7) in the syntax chapter has to be separated. Because the syntactic properties of the coordinators were investigated together, there will be no need to retest for the syntactic properties of each coordinator. The table will just be separated. Below are the new separated tables for the coordinators.

Table 10 *'chɛ'* conjunction 'and'

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
***'chɛ'* – 'and'**	X	√	X	X	X	X

[4] Homophones are words that have the same phonological representation but have different meanings

Table 11 *'chɛ'* adversative 'but'

	S	VP	AP	LOC	ADV	NP
***'chɛ'* – 'but'**	√	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~

4.6.2 Semantic properties 'chɛ' adversative

As stated by Schaefer (2009:138), the conjunction ***'chɛ'*** marks a degree of contrast between clauses, sometimes as strong as the English 'but', but often less so. Based on the analysis that there are two different ***'chɛ',*** I suggest that Schaefer is referring to ***'chɛ'*** adversative 'but' when he makes these claims about ***'chɛ'***. In support of this claim that Schaefer is referring to ***'chɛ'*** adversative 'but', I first introduce example (72). This is an example from Ali (2006:16) translated into Safaliba. In this example it is seen that ***'chɛ'*** is used to prompt the listener that the expectation raised by the first proposition will not be met by the proposition in the second clause.

72. **A kɔlibaa léyé naŋ chɛ ú ba ŋma**

"The bottle fell but it did not break"

a	**kɔlibaa**	**lé**	**yé**	**naŋ**	**chɛ**	**ú**	**bá**	**ŋma**
a	kɔlibaa	lé	yé	naŋ	chɛ	ú	bá	ŋma
the	*bottle*	*fall*	PAST	FOC	*but*	3SG	NEG	*break*
DET	N	V			CONJ			V
Generated in TypeCraft.								

Generally, it is expected that when a bottle falls, it will break but in this example, when the bottle falls it does not break. Because the event described in the second clause deviates from the normal by not breaking, ***'chɛ'*** is used to prompt the listener of this deviation. Thus ***'chɛ'*** is used to cancel the expectation raised by the first proposition in this example.

Further evidence in support of this claim that Schaefer is referring to ***'chɛ'*** adversative 'but' when he makes his claims about ***'chɛ'*** is the fact that when ***'chɛ'*** is interpreted as conjunction 'and', there is no such contrast associated with the interpretation. Consider example (73) taken from a descriptive narrative on how sheabutter is made from my corpus.

73. **Kaaŋ nii ná du zaale chɛ kɛɛ kɔŋ nii praa**

"The oil will come up leaving the water under"

Kaaŋ	**nii**	**ná**	**du**	**zaale**	**chɛ**	**kɛɛ**	**kɔŋ**	**nii**	**praa**
kaaŋ	nii	ná	du	zaale	chɛ	kɛɛ	kɔŋ	nii	praa
oil	FOC	*will*	*climb*	*hang*		*leave*	*water*	FOC	*under*
N			V1	V2	CONJC	V	N		ADV

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' is seen coordinating two VPs. The relevant point here is that there is no contrastive interpretation associated with this construction. It is just seen as 'and then'. Contrast here is defined in the sense of example (72) above.

Going by the evidence above and Schaefer's claims about ***'chɛ'*** which I have argued refer to ***'chɛ'*** adversative 'but', it can be concluded that ***'chɛ'*** adversative 'but' encodes that there is a degree of contrast between the propositions expressed. It can thus be equated to the English form 'but'.

4.6.3 Semantic properties 'chɛ' conjunction

When used as 'and', ***'chɛ'*** can be used to show a sequential relationship between conjuncts, where one event precedes the other. Consider the constructed example below.

74. **Ŋ dì chɛ wà ka tì yémé**

"Let me eat and we go"

ŋ	**dì**	**chɛ**	**wà**	**ka**	**tì**	**yémé**
ŋ	dì	chɛ	wà	ka	tì	yémé
1SG	*eat*		*come*	*and*	2PL	*go*
	V	CONJC	V			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example there is a sequential relationship between the first and the second propositions. The whole construction is divided into two separate events. The second event only starts after the first event has ended. Hence it is only when *the eating has finished that the going will begin*. Thus in this example, the first event ***'dì' (***eat) chronologically precedes the second ***'wà'*** (come). (The eating takes place before the coming).

Even though the above example shows positively that ***'chɛ'*** can indicate a sequential relation between the conjuncts, it coordinates it is relevant to check whether this sequential interpretation is part of the meaning of ***'chɛ'.*** To prove that the ability to indicate a sequential relation between the conjuncts is not part of the meaning of ***'chɛ'***, there must be evidence that ***'chɛ'*** can occur in an environment where there will be no sequential interpretation. But so far all the examples show this relationship.

One trend that has been noticed is that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction seems to always occur at the last conjunct. Thus apart from ***'chɛ'*** conjunction showing a sequential relationship, it can also exhibit the property of signalling the last conjunct. This property is even more apparent when it occurs in a narrative. With the aid of a narrative of how yam is cultivated, taken from my corpus, I will illustrate this property.

This narrative in 4.6.4 was recorded during my field work. In this text, occurrences of ***'chɛ'*** and ***'ka'*** will be looked at and an attempt will be made to explain the various choices made by the speaker. I will focus my attention on ***'chɛ'*** explaining the various meanings or connotations it may convey. As with all natural speech the text is not as coherent as a written text would be. The sentences have also been numbered to make reference easier. Lastly, the relevant conjunctions have been bolded for the sake of clarity.

4.6.4 Narrative of how yam is cultivated

I. Ka i naŋ woore ka i kɔ nyuye kakaa iŋ maŋ ɛ.

If you want to farm /cultivate yam this is what you do.

II. I naa nmaa i teŋgɛ

You go and cut your land

III. **Ka** i kyɛ bee pite

And you clear it (first clearing)

IV. **Ka** í kɔri ka a mɔɔru wa kyí

And you wait till when the grass has dried

V. **Ka** i ti chogi a.

And you go and burn them

VI. **Chɛ kɔ** vugsi. Ana baŋ bɔla gbaga níi.

And you farm yam mounds (make yam mounds). That is what they call gbaga.

VII. **Chɛ ka** í tí pɛ í nyuye níi a wa a vení ka a nyuye miŋ kyi.

And you go and harvest your yams and let the yams too dry

VIII. Tɔ í vugsi níi haŋ wa kyi, í nyuye miŋ kyi

When your mounds are dry and your yam too are dry,

IX. **Ka** i ti fare.I na tɔngi maasi a nyuye bilibili ka a be bera.

And you go and start. You can cut the yam in to small bits if they are big

X. **Ka** í tugire

And you will be digging

XI. **Chɛ** di iŋgre. i buta naŋ níi

And be putting (the yam) you are planting.

XII. **Ka** i naŋ wa buri. Aníme miŋ haŋ ɛ billi ana wuna ka i woore i ku la maase a i naŋ butaa a miŋ blɛ.

And when you plant, some that are small for those ones if you like you will not cut them again. You just be planting them like that.

XIII. **Ka** i wa buri sa i na pagi

When you finish planting you will close (the holes you dug to put the yam in)

XIV. **Chɛ ka** í maasi mɔɔru bíí vaaru a dogli a zu. Ka maasuŋ, ka a miníŋga ta tɔŋgi meraa ganí bíí ka a kɔŋ níi haŋ be a poo níi ka a kɔŋ zaa ta tɔŋgi yi a kali miníŋga yela.

And you cut grass or leaves and put on top (mounds). So moisture, so that the sun will not be able to scorch them (yams) so that the moisture in them (yams) so that all the moisture does not evaporate because of the sun.

XV. **Chɛ ka** í kɔta blɛŋ ka a nyuye wa buli.

And you will be waiting till the yams germinate.

XVI. **Ka** a nyuye wa buli íŋ nyɛ mɔɔru haŋ yite í naa kɔ a poo chaaní.

When the yams are growing and you see grass growing you go and weed the grass.

XVII. **Ka** a nyuye tata ana woore daaru in a nyɛ a haŋ dʒana teŋge.

When the yams are growing they will need staking. You will see them lying down.

XVIII. **Ka** í wo daaru a wa ba a ka a vili a du.

And you go and look for sticks and come and stake them

XIX. **Ka** i la kɔta blɛŋ ka a miŋ tata. ka saa kene a na tata. I naa kaara ka mooru la yi a poo

And you will be waiting and they (yams) will be growing

XX. **Ka** i la ti kɔ buyee

And you go and weed the grasses for the second time

XXI. **Chɛ ka** í kɔta. Ka í naŋ kɔri ka a nyuye wa kpɛ

And you will wait again. When you wait and they enter (mature)

XXII. **Ka** í tí tugi kaa ka a kpɛya a ɛya naŋ níi.

And you go and dig to see if they have entered (mature)

XXIII. **Ka** í kɔta ka a vaaru wa kyi

And you wait when the leaves dry

XXIV. **Ka** i ti pɛ a nyuye. Í saya.

And you go and harvest. You have finished.

4.6.5 Observations and discussion

In this narrative, ***'chɛ'*** occurs in two different environments. It either occurs with ***'ka'*** to form a compound coordinator or it occurs alone. In this section, I will focus only on the cases when it occurs alone. I will come back to the cases when it forms the compound coordinator in the next chapter where I will be discussing compound coordinators.

Firstly consider sentences (I – VI). As can be seen from the narrative, sentences (I – V) involve the use of ***'ka'***. It is only at (VI) that ***'chɛ'*** is used. Immediately after the ***'chɛ'*** in (VI) the speaker adds ***'ana baŋ bɔla gbaga níi'*** (That is what they call ***'gbaga'***). With this comment, the speaker indicates to the listener that that sentences (I – VI) belong to the same process or group of processes called ***"gbaga".***

At this point it is important to note that ***'chɛ'*** only appears at the last conjunct of the group. The continuous use of ***'ka'*** from sentences (I – V) in the narrative raises the expectation that the speaker will continue the list. It is the introduction of ***'chɛ'*** at sentence (VI) that cancels that expectation. It indicates to the listener that the next statement is the last activity involved in the process been described and in this case: ***'gbaga'*** making. Thus ***'chɛ'*** is used to indicate the coming of the last conjunct of the sequence of envents that constitute ***'gbaga'*** making.

Next consider sentences (VIII – XI). As can be seen from sentences (VIII – XI), the next appearance of ***'chɛ'*** alone is at sentence (XI) which again is the last conjunct among the group. Here like the first appearance of ***'chɛ'*** in (VI) the speaker adds a comment ***'í buta naŋ níi'*** (you are planting). Like the case of ***'chɛ'*** in sentence (VI), the speaker uses ***'chɛ'*** to indicate that, the next statement is the last in the action involved in the process and in this case the process is planting. The comment after sentence (XI) is to summarize that all that has been said belong to the same process of planting. Thus here again ***'chɛ'*** is used to signal the coming of the last conjunct of the sequence of events that naturally belong together.

The use of ***'chɛ'*** in the above examples to signal the coming of the last conjunct suggests that it has this property as part of its meaning. In all the examples available, it seems to be the case that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction occurs at the last conjunct and has this property of signalling the coming of the last conjunct. Thus in the absence of any contrary data, I propose that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' has the signalling of the last conjunct as part of its meaning.

In an attempt to subject this proposition that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' has the signalling of the last conjunct as part of its meaning to scrutiny, I will attempt to apply Blass' Blass's analysis that more complex structures lead to the expectation of extra positive cognitive effects. If this analysis is able to carry over, it will mean that this proposition that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' has the signalling of the last conjunct as part of its meaning is faulty as it will provide evidence that the signalling of the last conjunct is a result of the exertion of extra processing efforts and not part of the meaning of ***'chɛ'*** conjunction.

For Blass's analysis to hold here, one has to establish that constructions involving ***'chɛ'*** are more complex and thus requires more processing efforts so that the extra effect of signalling the coming of the last conjunct will be attributed to extra processing efforts involved. A look at the data shows evidence to the contrary. In the narrative, all the constructions coordinated by ***'chɛ'*** are VP whiles those coordinated by ***'ka'*** are S. So on the basis of syntactic complexity, the constructions involving ***'ka'*** are more complex. Thus because the constructions involving ***'chɛ'*** are less complex, it is not possible to apply Blass analysis. This thus means that indeed ***'chɛ'*** has the signalling of the last conjunct as part of its meaning. Also because ***'chɛ'*** always signals the last conjunct it can be equated to the English 'and then'. If this is the case that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction means 'and then', then the sequential relation between the conjuncts will follow.

Based on the above, I suggest that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' is equivalent to 'and then' and thus the sequential relation between the conjuncts coordinated by it is natural.

If it is the case that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction means 'and then', then one can argue that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which the last conjunct was presupposed. This analysis is motivated by Blass's discussion on the Sissala ***'ka'.***

To sum up, this section on the semantics of ***'chɛ'*** conjunction has shown that the coordinator can indicate a sequential relation between the conjuncts it coordinates and can also signal the coming of the last conjunct.

With respect to the meaning of ***'chɛ'*** conjunction, I suggest that because there are no examples where it cannot be equated to 'and then', ***'chɛ'*** conjunction means 'and then' and thus the sequential relation between the conjuncts coordinated follow naturally. I also suggest that because ***'chɛ'*** conjunction means 'and then', ***'chɛ'*** conjunction carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which the last conjunct was presupposed.

4.7 Semantic properties 'bíí'

This coordinator is a disjunctive coordinator and can be equated to the English 'or'. The coordinator ***'bíí'*** has a relatively wide scope as it can coordinate all the categories except VPs.

Constructions involving this coordinator can be of an interrogative nature. That is, they can carry a question tag with them. Consider the following constructed example of a speaker making an enquiry.

75. **Zɛ́ bíí zɛ̀béè úŋ píílí?**

"Did he tear here or there?"

zɛ́	**bíí**	**zɛ̀béè**		**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	bíí	zɛ̀	béè	úŋ	píílí
there	*or*	*here*	*there*	2SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJ	ADV			

Generated in TypeCraft.

In the above example, the speaker is asking if the referent tore one place or the other. Note here that it is the ***'bíí'*** that indicates that the speaker is making an enquiry and not making a declaration. In other words it is the ***'bíí'*** that carries the question mark in this example.

Also, ***'bíí'*** can be used to present alternatives. Consider example (76) below. This example is the first thing my aunty asked me when I went to the village to collect the data for this thesis.

76. **Sáá bíí ɲúúrì bíí kábílá íŋ ná dì**

"Will you eat TZ or yam or fufu?"

sáá	**bíí**	**ɲúúrì**	**bíí**	**kábílá**	**íŋ**	**ná**	**dì**
sáá	bíí	ɲúúrì	bíí	kábílá	íŋ	ná	dì
TZ	*or*	*yam*	*or*	*fufu*	2SG	*will*	*eat*
N	CONJC	N	CONJC	N			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, ***'bíí'*** in addition to carrying a question tag is used to present ***'sáá'*** (TZ) and ***'kábílá'*** (fufu) as alternative foods available for me. Here the ***'bíí'*** behaves like the English 'or' which can also be used in presenting alternatives.

Examples like these suggest that ***'bíí'*** has as part of its meaning to carry the question tag. But as will be shown below this is not the case. First consider example (77). This example could be an answer to the question "who stole the money?"

77. **Samua bíí Naa ŋ zu a lígbíírí**

"It is either Samua or Naa who stole the money"

Samua	**bíí**	**Naa**	**ŋ**	**zu**	**a**	**lígbíírí**
samua	bíí	naa	ŋ	zu	a	lígbíírí
	or		FOC	*steal*	*the*	*money*
PN	CONJ	PN		V	DET	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, the speaker answers the question by presenting potential takers of the money. Even though the speaker is not certain about what he is saying he is not asking a question but he is making a declaration. He is declaring that it is either Naa or Samua who stole the money. Thus ***'bíí'*** can be used in a non–interrogative manner.

It is important to point out that this construction can also be used as a question. It can be used in a scenario where some money has been stolen and the speaker suspects that it is either Naa or Samua who stole the money but is not sure thus he is seeking clarification from the listener. In such a scenario the construction will be interpreted as "was it Naa that stole the money or was it Samua that stole the money?" Actually in the case of Safaliba, there would be no need to rephrase the construction.

Because ***'bíí'*** can be used for both interrogative and non–interrogative constructions, as shown above, I suggest that ***'bíí'*** does not have as part of its meaning to signal a question. That is the question tag is not part of its meaning.

In accounting for the source of the question tag, I propose that following a relevance theoretic point of view, the interrogative and non–interrogative interpretations should be attributed to the listener's expectations of relevance taking into account background information that he may be privy to. Thus the listener will go for the interpretation that best suits his expectations of relevance in the given context at that given time.

Apart from presenting potential takers of the money, the speaker in example (77) above, is also expressing uncertainty. He/she is not sure if it is Samua who stole the money or if it is Naa who stole the money. It can be concluded therefore that ***'bíí'*** can be used to express uncertainty on the part of the speaker. This ability to express uncertainty does not entail that it is part of the meaning of ***'bíí'.*** The reason is that ***'bíí'*** can be used in scenarios where there is no element of uncertainty. For instance if a speaker were presenting alternative routes to a

particular location, he would use ***'bíí'*.** The use of ***'bíí'*** in such a case would not in any way express uncertainty. Consider the following example.

78. **Í ná tòŋí bʊ zɛ́ bíí Í ná tòŋí bʊ zɛ̀bɛ́è azaa ná tí níí bee**

"You can pass here or you can pass there all will take you there."

Í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**bʊ**	**zɛ́**	**bíí**	**Í**	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**bʊ**	**zɛ̀bɛ́è**		**azaa**
í	ná	tòŋí	bʊ	zɛ́	bíí	í	ná	tòŋí	bʊ	zɛ̀	bɛ́è	azaa
2SG	FUT	*can*	*pass*	*here*	*or*	2SG	FUT	*can*	*pass*	*here*	*there*	*all*
		V1	V2	ADV	CONJ			V1	V2	ADV		ADJ

ná	**tí**	**níí**	**bee**
ná	tí	níí	bee
FUT	*go*	*you*	*there*
	V	PN	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, it is clear the speaker is very certain of what he is saying. Because ***'bíí'*** does not always express uncertainty, as shown above, I suggest that this too is not part of the meaning of ***'bíí'***. Like the case of its interrogative and non–interrogative interpretation, I propose that this too be attributed to the listener's expectations of relevance taking into account background information that he may be privy to. Thus the listener will go for the uncertainty interpretation if it best suits his expectations of relevance in the given context at that given time.

It is important to note that throughout the examples presented so far, the propositions in one way or the other present alternatives. For instance, in example (75) the speaker presents alternative places that the referent could have torn. In example (76) alternative foods are presented whiles in example (77) alternative takers of some stolen money is presented. Because in one way or the other alternatives are presented by the use of ***'bíí'*** I suggest that ***'bíí'*** has part of its meaning to present alternatives.

In summary, this section on the semantic properties of ***'bíí'*** suggests that because ***'bíí'*** can be used for interrogative and non–interrogative constructions, ***'bíí'*** does not have as part of its meaning to carry the question tag.

Also because ***'bíí'*** does not always express uncertainty, it has been suggested that this too is not part of the meaning of ***'bíí'***.

These two properties are attributed to the listener's expectations of relevance taking into account background information that he may be privy to. Thus the listener will go for the interpretation that best suits his expectations of relevance in the given context at that given time.

However, because the propositions coordinated by ***'bíí'*** present alternatives in one way or the other this section suggests that ***'bíí'*** has the presentation of alternatives as part of its meaning.

4.8 Summary of the chapter

In totality, this chapter has looked at the semantic content of the various coordinators. It has looked at the pragmatic effects that the use of some of the coordinators can have. It has also given a proposal to on how the ambiguity of ***'chɛ'*** should be accounted for.

Under the section on the semantic properties of ***'ní'/'aní'*** this section suggested that ***'ní'/'aní'*** have the same meaning equivalent to the logical connector & but that the difference in effect follows from pragmatic principles. I have suggested an analysis different from that of Blass (1990) for Sissala ***'ri'*** /***'ari'.*** What I propose is that, when a listener processes say ***'ní'***, the interpretation is stored in his short term memory thus is readily available. So when ***'ní'*** is used again, (in the same environment) he just goes for the already processed interpretation in his memory without having to processes it again. However, when a new coordinator is introduced, say ***'aní'***, a new lexical entry has to be accessed which leads to more processing efforts. It is this extra processing effort that raises the expectations of extra or different cognitive effects given the expectation that the utterance is optimally relevant.

This section also argued that even though the less complex phonological properties of ***'ní'*** is the reason why it is preferred over ***'aní'*** in normal speech, the common ability of ***'aní'*** to signal the coming of the last conjunct cannot be attributed to this phonological difference but is due to other cognitive factors.

In the section on the semantic properties of ***'a'*** it was suggested that ***'á'*** encodes the same meaning as the English 'and' i.e. the logical connector &.

With respect to the ability of ***'a'*** to depict a sequential relation between the conjuncts it coordinates, this section argues that this is not part of its meaning but due to pragmatic factors.

This section argues that depending on one's school of thought, the pragmatic reasons for the sequential relation could be different. Gricean pragmatists will attribute it to Grice's maxim of orderliness, whiles relevance theorists will attribute the sequential relationship between conjuncts coordinated but ***'á'*** to the accessing of contextual assumptions. "either retrieved ready - made from memory or constructed from partially articulated assumptions schemas in memory together with the new information provided by the utterance" (Carston 2002:226).

Also with respect to its ability to have the effects of emphasizing the conjunct it precedes to indicate a non – stereotypical situation and also its ability to have the effect of exaggerating a proposition it precedes, it is argued here that because the compound only had these effects in cases where it is optional, these properties are due to pragmatic factors and not part of the meaning of ***'á'.*** Specifically, they are the result of the extra processing effort exerted to process it.

In the section on the semantic properties of ***'ka',*** further evidence to support Schaefer's (2009:137-138) claims that clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** express some category of information which is off the narrative story line and that clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** should be described as subordinate is provided. This section also shows that the dependency relation between the clauses is only pragmatic.

This section also shows that like the case of the English 'and', the semantic dependency relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** can take forms such as containment, entailment, consequence etc.

It has also been demonstrated that, there is a temporal relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** and that changing the order of the conjuncts will lead to a different interpretation.

With regards to the meaning of ***'ka'***, it is suggested here that ***'ka'*** only encodes that the clauses coordinated express some category of information which is off the narrative story line. The temporal sequence and the dependency relation between the clauses coordinated by ***'ka'*** are attributed to pragmatic reasons.

Under the section on the semantic properties of ***'chɛ'***, it is first proposed that there should be two different ***'chɛ'***; one meaning 'but' and the other meaning 'and'

Under the section on ***'chɛ'*** adversative, it is argued that Schaefer refers to ***'chɛ'*** adversative, when he claims that ***'chɛ'*** marks a degree of contrast between clauses, sometimes as strong as the English 'but'**.** With respect to the meaning of ***'chɛ'*** adversative, it was concluded that ***'chɛ'*** adversative only encodes that there is a degree of contrast between the propositions expressed. It was also said that ***'chɛ'*** adversative can be equated to the English form 'but'.

In the section on the semantics of ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and', it was shown that the coordinator can indicate a sequential relation between the conjuncts it coordinates and also that it can signal the coming of the last conjunct.

However with respect to the meaning of ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' it was said that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction 'and' is equivalent to the English form 'and then' and that the sequential relation between the conjuncts coordinated by ***'chɛ'*** conjunction naturally follows from its meaning. It was also suggested that because ***'chɛ'*** conjunction means 'and then', ***'chɛ'*** conjunction carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which the last conjunct was presupposed.

Lastly under the section on ***'bíí',*** it was suggested that because ***'bíí'*** can be used for interrogative and non–interrogative constructions, ***'bíí'*** does not have as part of its meaning to carry the question tag. It was also suggested that because ***'bíí'*** does not always express uncertainty, this too is not part of the meaning of ***'bíí'***.

The ability of ***'bíí'*** to exhibit these two properties are attributed to the listener's expectations of relevance taking into account background information that he may be privy to. Thus the listener will go for the interpretation that best suits his expectations of relevance in the given context at that given time. However, because the propositions coordinated by ***'bíí'*** present alternatives in one way or the other it is suggested in this section that ***'bíí'*** has the presentation of alternatives as part of its meaning.

In totality, this chapter has been able to assign specific meanings to the various coordinators by separating the meanings that are pragmatically derived from the bare meaning of the various coordinators. This thus contributes new information to the study Safaliba coordinators as this sort of information was previously unavailable in the language.

5 COMPOUND COORDINATORS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will first give an introduction on what compound coordinators are and how they are formed. This section will also include information on the possible combinations that exist in Safaliba. In this section, I will try to establish some general features about compound coordinators. Based on these general features, I will make some generalisations that I will assume apply to all compound coordinators. Next I will investigate each of the possible compound coordinators in detail. I will discuss both the syntactic and semantic properties of each compound coordinator. However, I will dwell more on the meaning and interpretation. I will also try to show some differences between the use of the compound coordinator and the use of their single constituents. Lastly in cases where the use of the compound leads to some extra pragmatic effect, I will try to account for that effect.

5.2 Compound coordinators

As the name suggests, compound coordinators are formed by the combination of two or more individual coordinators. It "involves a regrouping of *simple* conjunctions in ways that are unique to the various combinations applicable" (Ali, 2004: 14). Compound coordinators involve single coordinators modifying the coordinator that they precede. Even though they are formed from combinations of individual coordinators, such combinations are not haphazard. Thus not all combinations are acceptable. For instance we can have ***'á'*** and ***'chɛ'*** combining to form the compound ***'á chɛ'*** but we cannot have ***'á'*** and ***'ka'*** combining to form ***'á ka'***. The combinations that form compound coordinators usually have a strict syntactic order that cannot be altered. The following are the acceptable combinations for Safaliba compound coordinators.

- ***'á'*** + ***'chɛ'*** = ***'á chɛ'***
- ***'chɛ'*** + ***'ka'*** = ***'chɛ ka'***
- ***'chɛ'*** + ***'Bíí'*** = ***'Chɛ bíí'***
- ***'á'*** + ***'chɛ'*** + ***'ka'*** = ***'á chɛ ka'***
- ***'á'*** + ***'chɛ'*** + ***'bíí'*** = ***'á chɛ bíí'***

5.2.1 Syntax of compound coordinators

With regards to the syntax, the categories that a compound coordinator can coordinate are restricted by the categories that the right most constituent can coordinate, irrespective of whether the others can also coordinate them or not. This will be shown in the following examples involving the compound coordinator ***'chɛ bíí'*** formed from ***'bíí'*** and ***'chɛ'*** conjunction. As stated in the syntax chapter ***'bíí'*** can coordinate S, AP, PP/LOC, ADV, and NP whiles ***'chɛ'*** conjunction can only coordinate VPs. In these examples it will be seen that the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** can coordinate all the categories that the right most constituent ***'bíí'*** can coordinate. Thus it can coordinate S, AP, PP/LOC, ADV, and NP even though ***'chɛ'*** conjunction cannot coordinate them. It is important to state here that even though the compound is able to syntactically coordinate all the categories that the right most constituent can, not all of them are very productive. Thus even though they may be syntactically correct, they may be a bit awkward. None the less they are grammatical and meaningful.

First consider (79). This is a modified version of example (33) in the syntax chapter. In this example, we see the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** coordinating the nouns ***'sáá'*** (TZ) and ***'kábílá'*** (fufu).

79. **Sáá chɛ bíí kábílá íŋ ná dì**

"Will you eat TZ or fufu?"

Sáá	**chɛ**	**bíí**	**kábílá**	**íŋ**	**ná**	**dì**
sáá	chɛ	bíí	kábílá	íŋ	ná	dì
TZ		*or*	*fufu*	2SG	*will*	*eat*
N	CONJC	CONJC	N			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

It must be stated that even though this construction is both syntactically and semantically correct, it is not used very frequently. The important point here is that while ***'chɛ'*** conjunction on its own cannot connect NPs, ***'bíí'*** on its own can; thus the ability of the compound to coordinate NPs. In this example, the coordinator is used to ask a question. This construction is interpreted to be more emphatic than using only ***'bíí'.***

Next consider example (80). In this example, the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** is seen coordinating two adverbs ***'zɛ́'*** (here) and ***'zɛ̀bɛ́è'*** (there). Here too, while ***'chɛ'*** conjunction cannot coordinate adverbs on its own, ***'bíí'*** can.

80. **Zɛ́ chɛ bíí zɛ̀bɛ́ɛ̀ úŋ píílí?**

"Did he tear here or there?"

zɛ́	**chɛ**	**bíí**	**zɛ̀bɛ́ɛ̀**		**úŋ**	**píílí**
zɛ́	chɛ	bíí	zɛ̀	bɛ́ɛ̀	úŋ	píílí
there	*but*	*or*	*here*	*there*	2SG	*tear*
ADV	CONJC	CONJC	ADV			V
						Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, in addition to carrying the question tag, the compound coordinator expresses uncertainty on the part of the speaker.

In the next example, the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** is seen coordinating the adjectives ***'wákú'*** (tall) and ***'kpìrii'*** (short). Even though this construction is both syntactically and semantically correct, it is also a bit awkward.

81. **Wákú chɛ bíí kpìríí**

"Tall or short"

Wákú	**chɛ**	**bíí**	**kpìríí**
wákú	chɛ	bíí	kpìríí
		or	
ADJ	CONJC	CONJC	ADJ
			Generated in TypeCraft.

Here again, the ***'chɛ'*** conjunction cannot coordinate adjectives on its own but because ***'bíí',*** can coordinate adjectives the compound is also able to coordinate them. In this example, the compound is used to present alternatives.

Lastly consider example (82). Here the compound is seen connecting two full clauses.

82. **a pɔgɔ ɪŋ dɪ kú chɛ bíí a bee ɪŋ dɪ kú**

"Did you give it to the woman or did you give it to the child"

a	**pɔgɔ**	**ɪŋ**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**chɛ**	**bíí**	**a**	**bee**	**ɪŋ**	**dɪ**
a	pɔgɔ	ɪŋ	dɪ	kú	chɛ	bíí	a	bee	ɪŋ	dɪ
the	*wife/woman*	2SG	*take*	*give*		*or*	*the*	*child*	2SG	*take*
DET	N		V1	V2	CONJC	CONJC	DET	N		V1

kú
kú
give
V2
Generated in TypeCraft.

In this example, it is important not to confuse ***'chɛ'*** adversative for ***'chɛ'*** conjunction. It is ***'chɛ'*** conjunction that is under discussion here not ***'chɛ'*** adversative. Here too, even though ***'chɛ'*** conjunction cannot coordinate clauses the compound can because ***'bíí'*** can coordinate them. If ***''chɛ'*** adversative which is able to coordinate clauses were to replace the compound coordinator the sentence would be awkward. It will be as awkward as the English form "*Did you give it to the woman but did you give it to the child".*

The above implies that, the categories that the compound coordinator ***'chɛ bíí'*** can coordinate are determined by the categories that its last constituent ***'bíí'*** can coordinate. Thus the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** can coordinate the following categories.

Table 12 'Syntactic properties of *'chɛ bíí'*

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**PP/LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
'chɛ'	~~X~~	√	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~
'bíí'	√	~~X~~	√	√	√	√
'chɛ bíí'	√	~~X~~	√	√	√	√

As can be seen from the table, the compound coordinator is able to combine S, VP, AP, LOC, ADV and NP. This is however contrary to the expectation that it should be restricted by the more restricted constituent. Thus it is expected that since ***'chɛ'*** conjunction cannot coordinate S, LOC, ADV and NP then the compound should not be able to coordinate them but in this case it does. This indicates that ***'chɛ'*** conjunction only modifies ***'bíí'*** and has no real syntactic

role. It is therefore safe to say that, the syntactic head[5] of the compound coordinator ***'chɛ bíí'*** is the right most constituent ***'bíí'.***

Checks in the data suggest that his ability of the rightmost constituent to determine the categories that the compound coordinator can combine applies to all the other compounds. It is therefore justifiable to make the generalisation that the right most constituent of a compound coordinator is the **syntactic head** of that compound coordinator.

A follow up implication from the above is that the syntactic restrictions of a compound coordinator are dependent to the syntactic restrictions of the head constituent.

5.2.2 Semantics of compound coordinators

In terms of the meaning of compound coordinators, the interpretation of the compound is heavily dependent on the interpretation of the syntactic head. The modifying constituents also contribute to the meaning but in varying degrees. The contribution to the interpretation can sometimes be very significant as in the case of ***'chɛ ka'*** where the contrastive interpretation of ***'chɛ'*** adversative greatly influences the interpretation of the compound.

Even though the meaning or interpretations of the compound coordinators are based on the meaning of their constituents, the compounded coordinators sometime have slightly different interpretations in the meaning of the sentences they coordinate. However, this different meaning is not a complete deviation from the original meaning their constituents carry. Ali (2004: 13) states the following about Dagaare compound coordinators. "In most cases there may be a slight shift in meaning of the sentences they coordinate but not a complete distortion or deviation from their original meaning."

Because the meaning of the compound coordinator is heavily dependent on the interpretation of the syntactic head, it is appropriate to refer to the syntactic head as also being the **semantic head**[6]. This generalization applies to all other compound coordinators.

[5] According to (Radford 1997:510) "The head (constituent) of a phrase is the key word that determines the properties of the phrase." By this definition therefore the element that determines the syntactic properties of a larger unit is the syntactic head of the unit. Therefore, in extending this definition to compound coordinators, the syntactic head of the compound coordinator is the key unit that determines the syntactic properties of the compound coordinator.

[6] Based on the definition of the syntactic head earlier, the semantic head of the compound coordinator is the key unit of the compound that determines the semantic properties of the compound.

In terms of function, the compound coordinators are usually basically the same as the head constituent. The only difference is that the compounds carry some extra connotations added by the modifying constituents. For instance, the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** basically has the same function as its head ***'bíí'***. Remember that in the section on the semantics of ***'bíí'*** it was shown that ***'bíí'*** can carry a question tag, present alternatives and express uncertainty. The compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** also exhibited those same properties in the examples (79) – (82) above. For instance, in example (79), it was used to ask a question thus carrying the question tag. In example (80), in addition to carrying the question tag, it is used to present alternatives. This does mean that these are part of the meaning of the compound. The analysis regarding these properties for ***'bíí'*** applies.

In the next section, I look at each compound coordinator in more detail. However attention will be focused on the meaning and function of the compound coordinator.

5.3 The compound 'a chɛ'

This coordinator is formed from ***'á'*** and ***'chɛ'*** conjunction. It is translated as 'and then'. As stated above a compound can coordinate the same categories as its syntactic head. Thus the compound ***'á chɛ'*** like its head unit ***'chɛ'*** can coordinate only VPs See table 13 below for details.

Table 13 Syntactic properties of *'á chɛ'*

+	S	VP	AP	PP/LOC	ADV	NP
'á'	X	√	X	X	X	X
'chɛ'	X	√	X	X	X	X
'á chɛ'	X	√	X	X	X	X

This compound did not feature very prominently as there were only 5 occurrences of it in the corpus. As expected, they were all cases of VP coordination.

With regards to the meaning, the compound like its head constituent is translated as 'and then'. However, this compound is more emphatic. It is more like a stressed 'and then'. With this compound both constituents can be used in place of the compound for syntactic reasons. However, if any of them did, the construction will either lose some of its emphasis or it will lose the 'and then' interpretation totally. Consider example (83). This is a modified version of sentence (VI) from the narrative on yam cultivation presented earlier.

83. **Á chɛ kɔ vugsi**

"And make yam mounds"

á	**chɛ**	**kɔ**	**vugsi**
á	chɛ	kɔ	vugsi
		farm	*yam-mounds*
CONJC	CONJC	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

With this construction, the speaker could have used either ***'á'*** alone in place of the compound or he could have as in the narrative, simply used ***'chɛ'***. The example with the compound is seen as an emphatic form of the original as used in the narrative. If on the other hand ***'á'*** was used in place of the compound, the construction will no longer signal the last conjunct in the group. There will be some expectation that the speaker will continue to list thus taking away the 'and then' connotations.

This difference in pragmatic effect between the compound and its head unit ***'chɛ'*** can be attributed to differences in processing efforts. Remember that original statement involves the use of a single coordinator and that it has been assumed that more complex structures require more processing efforts. It has also been assumed that more processing efforts result in the expectation of more positive cognitive effects. Therefore because the compound is more complex and requires more processing efforts, it is expected to result in some extra positive cognitive effect. Thus we can say the effect of indicating emphasis is just the result of the extra processing efforts exerted in processing the compound. This is also in line with Blass's hypothesis that more complex structure resulting in the expectation of more positive cognitive effects.

There were no examples of the compound where it did not have this meaning of 'and then + emphasis'. On this basis therefore I suggest that this compound encodes 'and then + emphasis' Like its head unit, it can be said that because ***'á chɛ'*** always means 'and then + emphasis', ***'á chɛ'*** carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which the 'and then + emphasis' was presupposed. Thus people will only use it if and only if they want to convey the connotations 'and then + emphasis'.

To sum up the discussion on this coordinator, I suggest that the compound is basically an emphatic form of its head unit ***'chɛ'*** conjunction. It encodes 'and then' with some emphasis. I

also suggest that the extra effect of indicating emphasis is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted to process it. Lastly I also suggest that it is specialized for use only in cases where 'and then + emphasis' was presupposed.

5.4 The compound 'chɛ ka'

This compound is formed from the combination of ***'chɛ'*** adversative and ***'ka'***; and is translated as 'and'. Like the syntactic head constituent ***'ka'***, ***'chɛ ka'*** can coordinate only clauses. This is shown in the table below.

Table 14 Syntactic properties of *'chɛ ka'*

+	S	VP	AP	PP/LOC	ADV	NP
'chɛ'	√	X	X	X	X	X
'ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X
'chɛ ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X

In my corpus this compound featured a bit more frequently it had total of (12) occurrences. As expected, all of them were cases of S coordination.

Like those coordinated by the head of the compound ***'ka'***, constructions coordinated by this compound are also normally understood as expressing some category of information which is off the narrative storyline.

Even though this compound is translated as 'and', it exhibits some element of contrast and emphasis. This contrast can be attributed to the presence of the ***'chɛ'*** adversative which indicates contrast. The contrast involved here is however not as strong as 'but'. It is important to note that this element of emphasis that the compound denotes is to highlight the contrast.

Consider example (84). This is a case of the compound coordinating two clauses.

84. **ŋ tí naŋ pôʔ chɛ ka samua tí manni**

"I went to the farm whereas Samua went to the river"

ŋ	**tí**	**naŋ**	**pôʔ**	**chɛ**	**ka**	**samua**	**tí**	**manni**
ŋ	tí	naŋ	pôʔ	chɛ	ka	samua	tí	manni
1SG	*go*	FOC	*farm*		*and*		*go*	*river*
	V		N	CONJC	CONJC	Np	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

This example is interpreted with some element of contrast and emphasis equivalent to the English form ‘whereas’.

Even though syntactically both ***‘chɛ’*** adversative and ***‘ka’*** can be used in place of the compound coordinator, the construction loses its ‘whereas’ interpretation when either ***‘chɛ’*** adversative or ***‘ka’*** replaces the compound.

When ***‘ka’*** replaces the compound, the construction loses the contrast and emphasis that the compound denotes. The construction changes from ‘whereas’ to just ‘and’. This is shown in example (85) below. In this example, the element of emphasis and contrast that was exhibited by the compound is lost as it becomes a case of just ‘and’.

85. **ŋ tí naŋ pôʔ ka Samua tí manní**

“I went to the farm and Samua went to the river”

ŋ	**tí**	**naŋ**	**pôʔ**	**ka**	**Samua**	**tí**	**manní**
ŋ	tí	naŋ	pôʔ	ka	samua	tí	manní
1SG	*go*	FOC	*farm*			*go*	*river*
	V		N	CONJC	Np	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

On the other hand, when ***‘chɛ’*** adversative alone is used in place of the compound, the contrast becomes too strong. As can be seen from the example below, it changes from ‘whereas’ to ‘but’.

86. **ŋ tí naŋ pôʔ chɛ Samua tí manní**

“I went to the farm but Samua went to the river”

ŋ	**tí**	**naŋ**	**pôʔ**	**chɛ**	**Samua**	**tí**	**manní**
ŋ	tí	naŋ	pôʔ	chɛ	samua	tí	manní
1SG	*go*	FOC	*farm*			*go*	*river*
	V		N	CONJC	Np	V	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

It is worth noting that even though the construction in example (86) where ***'chɛ'*** replaces ***'chɛ ka'*** is grammatical, speakers are more likely to introduce a new focus marker ***'naŋ'*** after ***'tí'*** (go) to make the contrast more explicit as in (87)

87. **ŋ tí naŋ pôʔ chɛ Samua tí naŋ manní**

"I went to the farm but Samua went to the river"

ŋ	**tí**	**naŋ**	**pôʔ**	**chɛ**	**Samua**	**tí**	**naŋ**	**manní**
ŋ	tí	naŋ	pôʔ	chɛ	samua	tí	naŋ	manní
1SG	*go*	FOC	*farm*			*go*	FOC	*river*
	V		N	CONJC	Np	V		N

Generated in TypeCraft.

Because the compound ***'chɛ ka'*** is never translated as either 'and' alone or 'but' alone, it is appropriate to say that both constituents contribute to its meaning. It can thus be concluded that the compound ***'chɛ ka'*** means 'and' + some element of contrast and emphasis. However, this element of contrast involved is not as strong as 'but'. Simply put it encodes 'and' + some element contrast that is greater than 'and' but less than 'but'. This means that the compound carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in contexts in which an element of contrast less than 'but' is presupposed. That is to say that if the speaker does not intend to express 'and' + some element of contrast and emphasis he will not use it.

Apart from just indicating 'and' + some element of emphasis to highlight the contrast, ***'chɛ ka'*** can occur in a narrative to indicate the start of a new process. First consider sentence (VII) from the narrative on the cultivation of yam presented earlier.

'***Chɛ ka'*** í tí pɛ í nyuye níi a wa a vení ka a nyuye miŋ kyi.

"And you go and harvest your yam and bring. And let the yam too dry."

In this sentence, the speaker chooses to use the compound ***'chɛ ka'*** when he could have simply used only ***'ka'***. This example marks the beginning of a new process. Remember from the narrative that the previous process was ***'gbaga'*** making (Land preparation). Thus in this sentence, the speaker has moved from the previous process of ***'gbaga'*** making to a new process: ***'pɛ í nyuye'***[7] (Harvest your yams). That is the harvesting and bringing of the seed

[7] **'pɛ í nyuye'** actually means "harvest yams" but in the yam farming communities they usually move to a new site every year. Some farmers usually wait till the next planting season before they harvest their yams and then

yams. In this example the speaker could have used only ***'ka'***, but if he did, there would be no reason to think that what he is about to add does not belong to the previous process of ***'gbaga'*** making. It is only because the speaker adds the ***'chɛ'*** to the ***'ka'*** that the listener is able to know that, what the speaker is speaking of at that point is not part of the previous process. Thus ***'chɛ ka'*** is used to indicate to the listener that the speaker has moved on and has started to talk about a new process.

Next consider (XIV) from the same narrative of how yam cultivated.

'Chɛ ka' í maasi mɔɔru bíí vaaru a dogli a zu...

"And you cut grass or leaves and put on top (top of the yam mounds)..."

Here again the speaker has moved on from the previous process of planting to a new process: mulching. Also in this example, the speaker could have used only ***'ka'***. But again, there would be no reason to think that what he is about to add does not belong to the previous process. Here too, it is only because the speaker adds the ***'chɛ'*** to the ***'ka'*** that the listener is able to know that, what the speaker is speaking of at that point is not part of the previous process of planting. Thus in this example too ***'chɛ ka'*** is used to indicate to the listener that the speaker has moved on and has started to talk about a new process.

This thus suggests that maybe the compound has the marking of the start of a new process as part of its meaning. But as I will argue below this is not the case.

First and foremost, when the compound occurred in example (86), it did not indicate the start of a new process. In that example, it only showed contrast. Secondly, it is possible to account for the effect of indicating start of a new process pragmatically. Thus because the ability of ***'chɛ ka'*** to mark the start of a new process can be accounted for pragmatically, that property cannot be said to be part of the meaning of the compound.

If one assumes as in Blass (1990); that more complex structures require more processing efforts thus leading to the expectation of extra positive cognitive effects, one will be able to explain this effect. As the examples above show, the compound has this effect only in cases

---

select some as seed yams. Others also harvest all before and store. Here the speaker is talking about former situation where they wait till the next planting season .So he goes to harvest the seed yams from the old site and brings them to the new site.

where a more complex option is chosen ahead of a simpler alternative. Naturally speakers will always choose simpler alternatives ahead of complex ones but the exact opposite happens here. Because the complex option is chosen ahead of the simpler one, there is the expectation that the construction will have some extra positive cognitive effect that the simpler one could not carry. This expectation is met by the added the effect of indicating the start of a new process. Thus we can attribute the ability of ***'chɛ ka'*** to indicate the start of a new process to the extra processing efforts required to process it.

Remember that when it occurred in example (86) it was not in direct competition with any other coordinator but in the narrative it was. Thus choosing to inject fresh processing efforts to process the compound when the speaker could have used the already processed ***'ka'*** means a more expensive option has been chosen. Thus the above analysis.

Because we can give a pragmatic account of the ability of the compound to signal start of a new process, I suggest that this is not part of its meaning but is due to pragmatic reasons. This thus leaves us with only 'and' + some element of contrast that is less than 'but' as the meaning of ***'chɛ ka'.***

5.5 The compound 'chɛ bíí'

This coordinator is made up of ***'chɛ'*** adversative and ***'bíí'.*** The compound is translated as "or" and has some extra degree of contrast associated due to the presence of ***'chɛ'***. As shown earlier in table (12) above, ***'chɛ bíí'*** can coordinate the following grammatical categories. S, AP, PP/LOC, ADV and NP.

This coordinator too did not feature very prominently in the corpus. There were just 3 natural occurrences. All of them were cases of NP coordination. However my intuitions tell me it is very productive in the language. Thus the low number of occurrences could be due the genre of data collected.

Constructions that are coordinated by this compound behave like those that are coordinated by only ***'bíí'***. They can thus carry a question tag, be used to present alternatives and express uncertainty. Like the case of ***'bíí'***, I suggest these are due to pragmatic reasons. The arguments for claiming that these properties when exhibited by ***'bíí'*** are due to pragmatic reasons carry over here. I will therefore focus on other properties the compound does not share with its head constituent ***'bíí'.***

First it is relevant to state that with this compound, only ***'bíí'*** can be used meaningfully in place of the compound. Consider the following examples.

First I present an example with the compound coordinator. This is an example of the compound ***'chɛ bíí'*** coordinating two clauses. Here it is used to present alternatives.

88. **í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ pɔgɔ chɛ bíí í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ bee**

"You can give it to my wife or you can give it to my child"

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**chɛ**	**bíí**	**í**	**ná**
í	ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	chɛ	bíí	í	ná
1SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*		*or*	2SG	FUT
		V1	V2	V3		N	CONJC	CONJC	PN	

tòŋí	**dɪ**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**bee**
tòŋí	dɪ	kú	ŋ	bee
can	*take*	*give*	1SG	*child*
V1	V2	V3		N

Generated in TypeCraft.

Next is a case where the compound has been replaced by, only ***'bíí'***. This example is both grammatical and meaningful but carries slightly different connotations.

89. **í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ pɔgɔ bíí í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ bee**

"You can give it to my wife or you can give it to my child"

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**bíí**	**í**	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**
í	ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	bíí	í	ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú
2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*	*or*	1SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*
PN		V1	V2	V3		N	CONJ			V1	V2	V3

ŋ	**bee**
ŋ	bee
1SG	*child*
PN	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

Examples (88) and (89) are the same construction with the coordinator in example (89) changed to only ***'bíí'*.** These two examples basically have the same interpretation only that example (88) which involves the compound is seen as an emphatic form the one in (89) where only ***'bíí'*** is used. The difference between the two can thus be reduced to emphasis. Thus even though ***'bíí'*** can replace the compound and still be meaningful, the effect of emphasis is lost when ***'bíí'*** replaces the compound.

This difference in pragmatic effect can be attributed to differences in processing efforts. Remember that example (88) involves the compound coordinator while (89) involves the single coordinator ***'bíí'*.** Thus all things held constant, the compound will be assumed to be more complex. Therefore if the compound is more complex, it follows that it will require more processing efforts thus resulting in the expectation of more positive cognitive effects. By this analysis we can explain the source of the extra effect of indicating emphasis. It is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted. This is in line with Blass's hypothesis that more complex structure result in more cognitive effects.

Next consider example (90) below. This is a case where the compound has been replaced by only ***'chɛ'*.** This example shows that if ***'chɛ'*** is used in place of the compound, the construction will assume a different and perhaps awkward meaning.

90. **í ná tòŋí dı kú ŋ pɔgɔ chɛ í ná tòŋí dı kú ŋ bee**

"You can give it to my wife but you can give it to my child"

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dı**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**chɛ**	**í**	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dı**
í	ná	tòŋí	dı	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	chɛ	í	ná	tòŋí	dı
2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*		2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*
PN		V1	V	V3		N	CONJC	PN		V1	V2

kú	**ŋ**	**bee**
kú	ŋ	bee
give	1SG	*child*
V3		N

Generated in TypeCraft.

In the above example, even though the construction is grammatical, it is semantically awkward. It is as awkward as its English translation. (You can give it to my wife but you can give it to my child).

To sum up the discussion on this coordinator, I suggest that the compound is basically an emphatic form of its head unit. Thus it encodes 'or' with some emphasis. It is however important to point there that the level of emphasis is less than the involved ***'á chɛ bíí'*** which will be discussed later. I also suggest that the extra effect of indicating emphasis is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted in processing it. Another follow up implication is that the compound carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which 'or' with some emphasis less than the one involved in ***'á chɛ bíí'*** is presupposed.

So far only two constituent compound coordinators have been discussed. Next I look at three constituent compound coordinators. These three constituent compounds are not very different from there double counterparts. They are just modifications of their two constituent counterparts to indicate extra emphasis. Thus I will not duel much on them. I will only try to distinguish them from their head unit and the two component counterparts.

5.6 The compound 'á chɛ ka'

This coordinator is made up of ***'á', 'chɛ'*** adversative and ***'ka'***. This compound is translated as 'and'. Because ***'ka'*** is the rightmost constituent thus syntactic head, the compound ***'á chɛ ka'*** like ***'ka'*** can coordinate the following categories.

Table 15 Syntactic properties of 'á chɛ ka'

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**PP/LOC**	**ADV**	**NP**
'á'	X	√	X	X	X	X
'chɛ'	√	X	X	X	X	X
'ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X
'á chɛ ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X

Like clauses coordinated by the head constituent ***'ka',*** clauses coordinated by ***'á chɛ ka'*** express some category of information which is off the narrative storyline.

With this compound, only ***'ka'*** can be used in place of the compound and still have a meaningful interpretation. Consider the following examples.

91. **Dì sa á chɛ ka tì yémé**

"Finish eating and we will go"

dì	**sa**	**á**	**chɛ**	**ka**	**tì**	**yémé**
dì	sa	á	chɛ	ka	tì	yémé
eat	*finish*	*and*		*and*	2PL	*go*
V	V	CONJ	CONJ			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

The example above is an example involving the compound ***'á chɛ ka'***. Next is a case where the compound is replaced by ***'ka'.*** This construction is both grammatical and meaningful in the language. However this construction loses the stress or emphasis that was attached to the compound.

92. **Dì sa ka tì yémé**

"Finish eating and we will go"

dì	**sa**	**ka**	**tì**	**yémé**
dì	sa	ka	tì	yémé
eat	*finish*	*and*	2PL	*go*
V	V			V

Generated in TypeCraft.

If the other two constituents replace the compound the construction will either be syntactically wrong as in (93) or it will not be meaningful as is (94).

93. ***dì sa á tì yémé**

"Finish eating and we will go"

dì	**sa**	**á**	**tì**	**yémé**
dì	sa	á	tì	yémé
eat	*finish*	*and*	2PL	*go*
V	V	CONJ		V

Generated in TypeCraft.

94. **Dì sa chɛ tì yémé**

"Finish eating and we will go"

dì	**sa**	**chɛ**	**tì**	**yémé**
dì	sa	chɛ	tì	yémé
eat	*finish*	*but*	2PL	*go*
V	V	CONJ		V

Generated in TypeCraft.

The construction is (93) is ungrammatical for syntactic reason but the one in (94) is awkward. It is as awkward as its English form (finish eating but we go).

There is very little difference between the construction involving the compound and the one involving only ***'ka'***. If one has to distinguish them, the only difference will be that the compound can be interpreted as 'and then' while the single coordinator is seen as just 'and'. According to one Kipo B an informant, "they are just the same only the ***'á chɛ ka'*** is more emphatic".

As would have been observed, the compound ***'á chɛ ka'*** behaves very much like ***'chɛ ka'.*** They are both emphatic forms of their head unit ***'ka'***

When one compares ***'ka', 'chɛ ka'*** and ***'á chɛ ka',*** it can be concluded that ***'chɛ ka'*** is an emphatic form of ***'ka'*** and ***'á chɛ ka'*** is an even more emphatic form.

This difference in level of emphasis can be attributed to differences in processing efforts. Note that ***'ka'*** is a single coordinator whiles ***'chɛ ka'*** is a compound coordinator. Following Blass's analysis that more complex forms require more processing effort thus raise expectations of some extra cognitive effect, it can be argued that the compound ***'chɛ ka'*** is more complex than ***'ka'***. Following the same hypothesis, ***'á chɛ ka'*** will be even more complex. Thus one can say that since more complex structures result in the achievement of more cognitive effects, (and in this case the effect is emphasis), it follows that ***'chɛ ka'*** is an emphatic form of ***'ka'*** and ***'á chɛ ka'*** is even more emphatic.

The above implies that in terms of meaning, the compound coordinator ***'á chɛ ka'*** in not very different from its semantic head ***'ka'.*** It is only an extra emphatic form of ***'ka'.*** Thus it encodes in a more emphatic way that the coordinated clauses express some category of information which is off of the narrative storyline.

5.7 The compound ‘á chɛ bíí’

This compound behaves like the compound coordinator ***‘chɛ bíí’.*** It is also translated as “or” and serves as a disjunctive coordinator. The compound ***‘a chɛ bíí’*** can coordinate the following categories.

Table 16 Syntactic properties of ‘a chɛ bíí’

	S	VP	AP	PP/LOC	ADV	NP
‘á’	~~X~~	√	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~
‘chɛ’	√	√	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~
‘bíí’	√	~~X~~	√	√	√	√
‘a chɛ bíí’	√	~~X~~	√	√	√	√

Like the head component ***‘bíí’***, the constructions involving this compound can be of an interrogative nature thus they can carry a question tag. They can also be used to present alternatives and express uncertainty. Consider the next example. This is a constructed example of the compound coordinator coordinating two clauses. In this example the speaker uses the compound to present two alternatives.

95. **í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ pɔgɔ á chɛ bíí í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ bee**

“You can give it to my wife or you can give it to my child”

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**á**	**chɛ**	**bíí**	**í**
í	ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	á	chɛ	bíí	í
2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*			*or*	2SG
		V1	V2	V3		N	CONJC	CONJC	CONJC	

ná	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**bee**
ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú	ŋ	bee
FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*child*
	V1	V2	V3		N

Generated in TypeCraft.

Among the members of the compound coordinator ***‘á chɛ bíí’***, only ***‘bíí’*** can on its own coordinate structures that the group coordinate and still be meaningful. If the other two replace it the construction will either become syntactically incorrect or semantically awkward. See

examples (96) – (98). In example (96), the coordinator ***'á'*** is used in place of the compound. This is however syntactically wrong.

96. ***í ná tòŋí dı kú ŋ pɔgɔ á í ná tòŋí dı kú ŋ bee**

"You can give it to my wife or you can give it to my child"

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dı**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**á**	**í**	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dı**	**kú**
í	ná	tòŋí	dı	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	á	í	ná	tòŋí	dı	kú
2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*		2SG	*will*	*can*	*take*	*give*
PN		V1	V2	V3	PN	N	CONJC	PN		V1	V2	V3

ŋ	**bee**
ŋ	bee
1SG	*child*
PN	N
	Generated in TypeCraft.

Next consider example (97)

97. **Í ná tòŋí dı kú ŋ pɔgɔ chɛ í ná tòŋí dı kú ŋ bee**

"You can give it to my wife but you can give it to my child"

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dı**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**chɛ**	**í**	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dı**
í	ná	tòŋí	dı	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	chɛ	í	ná	tòŋí	dı
2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*		2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*
PN		V1	V	V3		N	CONJC	PN		V1	V2

kú	**ŋ**	**bee**
kú	ŋ	bee
give	1SG	*child*
V3		N
	Generated in TypeCraft.	

In this example, only ***'chɛ'*** is used in place of the compound. Even though syntactically ***'chɛ'*** alone is able to connect clauses, thus is able to coordinate this example, it is not acceptable in this context. In this construction, the use of ***'chɛ'*** only makes the construction

awkward. It is as awkward as its English translation (You can give it to my wife but you can give it to my child).

Unlike, ***'á'*** and ***'chɛ'*** which cannot replace the compound, ***'bíí'*** is able to replace the compound and still be semantically meaningful. It will however not be as emphatic as the compound ***'á chɛ bíí'.*** See example (98) below.

98. **í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ pɔgɔ bíí í ná tòŋí dɪ kú ŋ bee**

"You can give it to my wife or you can give it to my child"

í	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**	**ŋ**	**pɔgɔ**	**bíí**	**í**	**ná**	**tòŋí**	**dɪ**	**kú**
í	ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú	ŋ	pɔgɔ	bíí	í	ná	tòŋí	dɪ	kú
2SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*	1SG	*wife/woman*	*or*	1SG	FUT	*can*	*take*	*give*
PN		V1	V2	V3		N	CONJ			V1	V2	V3

ŋ	**bee**
ŋ	bee
1SG	*child*
PN	N

Generated in TypeCraft.

As has be argued throughout the discussion so far, the extra effect shown by the use the compound is the result of the extra processing effort exerted in processing the compound. The case of ***'á chɛ bíí'*** is not different.

When ***'bíí', 'chɛ bíí',*** and ***'a chɛ bíí'*** are compared it will be seen that ***'chɛ bíí'*** is only an emphatic form of ***'bíí'*** and ***'a chɛ bíí'*** is an even more emphatic form. The difference in emphasis can be said to be the result of the extra processing efforts involved in the processing of the complex units. Thus the more complex the compound is, the greater the emphasis will be.

Because this compound too cannot be replaced by any of the constituents and still have the same level of emphasis I suggest that this compound also carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which 'or + emphasis' greater than that exhibited by ***'chɛ bíí'*** is presupposed.

It is worth stating the compound ***'a chɛ bíí'*** is most natural in case of dispute. For instance if something is stolen and there are two suspects and the speaker wants to ask if it is

person A or person B that stole the money the speaker will use ***'a chɛ bíí'***. It can even be said that ***'a chɛ bíí'*** has some negative connotations attached. It has an element of lack of trust. This element of luck of trust can be attributed to the extra amount of stress involved.

A general comment about compound coordinators is that they seem to be very specialized constructions designed to convey very specific connotations. Thus it can be said that compound coordinator carry constraints on relevance, specializing them for use only in specific environments.

5.8 Summary of chapter

This chapter has shown the following about compound coordinators. In the introduction it was established that because the categories that the compound coordinator can coordinate are determined by the categories that the right most constituent can coordinate, the rightmost constituent is the syntactic head. With regards to meaning and function, it was suggested that the syntactic head is also the semantic head because the meaning of the compound coordinator is heavily dependent on its interpretation. Still in the introduction, it was suggested that the compound coordinators basically have the same functions as the head constituent only that they carry some extra connotations added by the modifying constituents.

About the compound ***'á chɛ',*** this chapter suggests that the compound is basically an emphatic form of its head unit ***'chɛ'*** conjunction. It claimed that the compound encodes 'and then' with some emphasis. It was also suggested here that the extra effect of indicating emphasis is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted to process it. Lastly it was suggested that the compound ***'á chɛ',*** is specialized for use only in cases where 'and then + emphasis' was presupposed.

On the compound ***'chɛ ka'***, it was suggested that the compound encodes 'and' + some element of contrast that is less than 'but'. Its ability to indicate the start of a new process was however attributed to cognitive factors.

On the compound ***'chɛ bíí',*** it was suggested that the compound is basically an emphatic form of its head unit ***'bíí'***. Thus it encodes 'or' with some emphasis. Thus it is an emphatic 'or'. The emphasis here is however lass that the one involved with the use of ***'á chɛ bíí'***. It was also said that the extra effect of indicating emphasis is the result of the extra processing efforts exerted in processing it. Lastly it was said that compound carries a constraint on

relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which ‘or’ with some emphasis less that that involved in ***‘á chɛ bíí’*** is presupposed.

With regards to the compound coordinator ***‘á chɛ ka’,*** it was suggested in terms of meaning, the compound coordinator ***‘á chɛ ka’*** in not very different from its semantic head ***‘ka’.*** It is only an extra emphatic form of ***‘ka’.*** Thus it encodes in a more emphatic way that the coordinated clauses express some category of information which is off of the narrative storyline.

Lastly on the compound ***‘a chɛ bíí’,*** it was shown that the compound is also not too different from the meaning of its head ***‘bíí’.*** It was said that the compound carries a constraint on relevance, specializing it for use only in context in which ‘or + emphasis’ greater than that exhibited by ***‘chɛ bíí’*** is presupposed.

On a whole this chapter has provided information about compound coordinators in Safaliba. It has also for the first time subjected compound coordinators in Safaliba to some form of pragmatic analysis. It can thus be said that this chapter has contributed to general linguistic by testing new data on an already existing linguistic theory.

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter aims at providing a summary of the topics discussed and conclusions that were arrived at in this thesis. As stated in the introduction the work aimes to look into coordination in Safaliba with a focus on the coordinators ***'ní' / 'aní', 'á', 'ka', 'chɛ'*** and ***'bíí'***.

In chapter one, a general background about Safaliba was given. Here, information about the language and people is provided. This included information about the classification of the language, location of the language, number of speakers, dialectal situation, historical background, religious affiliation and occupation of the speakers. This chapter also gave an overview of previous research and states the research problem.

In chapter two, the basic grammatical properties of Safaliba were presented with the aim of facilitating the reader's understanding of these issues as they pertain in Safaliba. Topics discussed included: grammatical categories such as nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and numerals. Serial verb constructions, locative constructions, relative clauses and subordinate clauses were also discussed.

In chapter three the syntactic properties of the various coordinators was discussed. The following table summarizes the results. The table specifies the grammatical categories that each coordinator can coordinate.

	S	**VP**	**AP**	**ADV**	**LOC**	**NP**
'ní' / 'aní'	X	X	√	√	√	√
'á'	X	√	X	X	X	X
'ka'	√	X	X	X	X	X
'chɛ' - but	√	X	X	X	X	X
'chɛ' - and	X	√	X	X	X	X
'bíí'	√	X	√	√	√	√

In addition to the table, it was established that even though ***'ní'*** does not connect VPs and clauses in normal speech, it is possible to use it to coordinate clauses in figurative or idiomatic language and proverbs. It was also shown that there are two types of ***'ka'*** in Safaliba; ***'ká'*** subordinator and ***'ka'*** conjunction. This is new compared to Schaefer (2009:137-138) where it was suggested that there are three types of ***'ka',*** including ***'ka'*** hypotheticality marker.

With respect to ***'chɛ',*** note that according to the table there are two lexical items ***'chɛ'***. This analysis differs from that of Schaefer, who does not distinguish between VP coordination and S coordination for ***'chɛ'.*** Last under this chapter, it was shown that as far as coordinating conjunctions are concerned, the language conforms to Payne's (1985) implicational sequence. This chapter established that at least for Safaliba, if Payne's scale were to include ADVs, then they could be placed anywhere between VP and NP.

In chapter four, the semantic and pragmatic properties of the coordinators were discussed. Where the use of any coordinator led to some extra effect, an attempt was made to account for the effect. The table below summarizes the findings of this chapter.

Table 17 Summary for single coordinators

Coordinator	**Encoded meaning**	**Common pragmatic interpretation**
'ní' / 'aní'	The same as the English 'and'(i.e the equivalence of the logical connector &)	• signalling the coming of the last conjunct (***'aní'***)
'á'	The same as the English 'and' (i.e the logical connector &)	• emphasizing the conjunct it precedes to indicate a non-stereotypical situation • exaggerating the proposition it precedes
'ka'	The same as the English 'and' + what follows is off the narrative storyline	• temporal sequence between the clauses coordinated • dependency relation between the clauses coordinated
'chɛ' **adversative**	The same as the English 'but': contrast between the propositions expressed	
'chɛ' **conjunction**	The same as English 'and then': event A precedes event B	• Signalling the coming of the last conjunct
'bíí'	The same as English 'or': present alternatives	• Carry the question tag. • express uncertainty

Semantically encoded meaning here refers to the information that is part of the meaning of the coordinator while common pragmatic interpretations refer to those added effects that are achieved as a result of inference. These common pragmatic interpretations are not part of the meaning of the coordinators.

As for ***'ní'/'aní'*** the analysis for the ability of ***'aní'*** to signal last conjunct differs from Blass's analysis of ***'ri'*** /***'ari'*** in Sissala. Whiles Blass attribute the difference in processing effort due to their phonological differences, I propose a different analysis: When a listener processes say ***'ní'***, the interpretation is stored in his short term memory thus is readily available. So when ***'ní'*** is used again, (in the same environment) he just goes for the already processed interpretation in his memory without having to processes it again. However, when a new coordinator is introduced, say ***'aní'***, a new lexical entry has to be accessed which leads to the exertion of more processing efforts. It is this extra processing effort that raises the expectations of extra or different cognitive effects given the expectation that the utterance is optimally relevant.

In chapter five compound coordinators where discussed. They were defined as combination of two or more individual coordinators to achieve special effects. It was established that the right most constituent of the compound coordinator is both the syntactic and semantic head. It was also established that the categories that the compound coordinator can coordinate are determined by the categories that the head constituent can coordinate.

As for the semantic and pragmatic properties of the compound coordinators, these are presented in the following table.

Table 18 Summary for compound coordinators

Compound coordinator	**Encoded meaning**	**Common pragmatic interpretation**
'á chɛ'	and then	• emphasis of last conjunct
'chɛ ka'	'and' + some element of contrast that is less than 'but'	• and start of a new process
'chɛ bíí'	'or'+ emphasis' less than that exhibited by ***'a chɛ bíí'***	
'á chɛ ka'	and+ emphasis' greater than that exhibited by ***'chɛ ka'***	
'a chɛ bíí'	'or '+ emphasis' greater than that exhibited by ***'chɛ bíí'***	• Lack of trust or suspicion

As stated for the single coordinators, the semantically encoded meaning refers to the information that is part of the meaning of the coordinator while common pragmatic interpretations refer to those added effects that are achieved as a result of inference and thus not part of the meaning of the coordinator.

As to how the pragmatic effects are explained, this thesis uses relevance theory to account for the various pragmatic effects.

On the whole this thesis has been able to exhaust its set goals of discussing the coordinators ***'ní' / 'aní', 'á', 'ka', 'chɛ'*** and ***'bíí'***. It tempted to look at their syntactic properties and how they could be combined to form compound coordinators. Also, attempts were made to identify and account for the various meanings and connotation of these coordinators, either individually or in a group as compounds.

In sum this thesis has, in addition to adding to the relatively limited research on Safaliba, contributed to general linguistics by testing new data on already existing theories, principles

and assumptions. The good part is that whiles some of those theories and principles could account for the cases in Safaliba, others could not; thus the raising of new explanations.

References

Ali K.K. 2006. Coordination in Dagaare: *Journal of Dagaare Studies Volume 6*

Bodomo, A. B. 1997. *The Structure of Dagaare*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. (Huang, 2007:25).

Bodomo, A. B. 2000. *Dagaare*. LINCOM EUROPA.

Blass, R. 1990. *Relevance Relations in Discourse: A study with special reference to Sissala*. Cambridge Uníversity Press.

Carston, R., 2002. *Thoughts and Utterances: The pragmatics of Explicit communication* Blackwell publishing

Dakubu, M. E. 2005. *Collected Language Notes on Dagaare Grammar*. Legon: Accra Institute of African Studies.

Haspelmath, M. 2007. *Coordination*. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. II: Complex constructions.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hartmann, R.R.K., and F.C. Stork. 1972. *Dictionary of language and linguistics.* London: Applied Science.
Fromhttp://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAClause.htm

Huang, Y, 2007. *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press

Kluge Angela and Hatfield H. Deborah 2002 *Sociolinguistic Survey of the Safaliba Language area.* SIL International

Kroeger, R.P. 2004. Analysing Syntax: A lexical-functional Approach. Cambridge university press.

Lobeck, A. 2000. *Discovering grammar: an introduction to English sentence structure*. Oxford University Press.

Naden, A.J. 1988. The Gur languages: *The languages of Ghana*, ed. by M. E. Kropp

Dakubu, 12-49. London: Kegan Paul International for the International African Institute. (Cited in Schaefer 2009)

Payne, John R. 1985. “Complex phrases and complex sentences.” In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. II.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-41.

Radford A. 1997 *syntactic theory and the structure of English: a minimalist approach* Cambridge university press.

Sebba, Mark. 1987. *The syntax of serial verbs.* Creole Language Library 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.9683101704.From:http://www.sil.org/linguistics/BibliographyLinguistics/Sebba1987.htm

Schaefer, P. and Schaefer, J. 2003. *Collected field reports on the phonology of Safaliba*. Legon: Accra Institute of African Studies.

Schaefer, A.P.2009. *Narrative storyline marking in Safaliba*. Doctorial thesis, The University of Texas.

Sperber and Wilson, 2004: Relevance Theory In: Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward (ed.) *the hand book of pragmatics*: Blackwell publishing