

A TYPOLOGY OF ÌGBÒ COMITATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Maduabuchi Sennen Agbo
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.
maduabuchi.agbo@uniben.edu

Abstract

There has been a considerable amount of publications on the cross-linguistic study of comitativity. These studies have taken various approaches to the issue of comitativity. Nevertheless, scholars of Igbo grammar are yet to publish accounts of this concept in the language. Thus, this paper sets out to investigate comitativity in Igbo with the aim of identifying the semantic types, the shared features and the morpho-syntactic coding of comitativity. The approach is purely descriptive in order to present this preliminary study in clear and simple terminology. The collection of data includes the natural speech of native speakers, texts from two books of folktales and constructed data. The discussion of the empirical data reveals that there is a semantic type of Igbo comitative termed Lexicalised comitative. They include lexical items with substantive content like *ló iló* 'do enemy', *yì òyì* 'befriend' and *sò* 'follow'. The other semantic type is the Affiliative with verbs such as *kwàdò* 'support', *kwù* 'stand with' and *kwé* 'agree with/believe'. The type known as Instrumentalised comitatives has two sub-groups. They are the *jí* Instrumentaliser and the *-nyú* Instrumentaliser. The third type known as the Modalised comitative comprise seven sub-types. They are *-kò* Modaliser, *-kwù* Modaliser, *-kwàsà* Modaliser, *-nyé* Modaliser, *-chì* Modaliser and *-tà* Modaliser. Each of these types of comitatives is operationalized by the suffixes attached to the verbs denoting comitativity. Of course, the *jí* Instrumentaliser is not a suffix but a verb representing comitativity. The discussion of the data in this paper introduces further areas of research on Igbo comitatives. These are comitative coordination and comitative based causative constructions.

Key Words: *Comitativity, Igbo grammar, Linguistic typology, Accompaniment, Instrumentals*

Ụmị

E nwegasiri ihe nnyocha ndị e biputara maka komitativiti na Lingwistiks. Ihe nnyocha ndị a jigasiri ụzọ di iche iche were lee ihe gbasara komitativiti anya. N'agbanyeghi nke a, ndi nnyocha grama Igbo elebarabeghi ihe di otu a, n'asusu Igbo anya. Ya mere, ihe nnyocha a, kpaliri inyocha komitativiti n'Igbo i ji tugasija udi amuechiche ndi e nwere na ya, na ihe ndi ha jiri yie ibe ha, na ihe ndi ezoro ezo n'usoro okwu ha, nakwa omumu mmebe okwu ha, aka. Uzọ e siri hazie nnyocha a bu n'uzọ nkowa I ji weputa ya bu nnyocha nke izizi n'uzọ ga-edo ndi mmadu anya ma dikwa mfe nghota. Ihe ndi a kpaqbara e jiri mee nnyocha a gunyere: otu ndi nwe asusu si asu asusu ha, ihe edere ede nke sitere n'akwukwo akuko ifo abuo nakwa ihe ndi ewubere ewube I ji mee ya bu nnyocha. Nnyocha nke ihe ndi a akpaqbara gosirina e nwere udi amumechiche komitativiti Igbo a na-akpo *Komitativiti agbanwere ka o ghorokwu mkpuru okwu*. Ha gunyere mkpuru okwu ndi gbara okpurukpu di ka *ló iló*, *yì òyì*, na *sò*. Udi amumechiche nke ozo bu nke *komitativiti agbakwunyere na mkpuru okwu*, nke nwegasiri ngwaa ndi di ka: *kwàdò*, *kwù* na *kwé*. Udi komitativiti nke a gwanyere ndi ozo nwere nkewa abuo. Ha bu ngwanye -ji na ngwanye -nyuo. Udi nke ato nke a na-akpo *komitativiti nnyemaka* nwere nkewa asaa. Ha bu *nnyemaka -kò*, *nnyemaka -kwù*, *nyemaka -kwàsà*, *nnyemaka -nyé*, *nnyemaka -chì*, *nnyemaka -ta* na *nnyemaka -jú*. A na-eji mgbakwunye nke azu a na-etinye na ngwaa gasi eziputa komitativiti udi komitativiti ndi a gasi. Ntughari nke ihe ndi a kpaqbara e jiri mee nnyocha a na-ziputa gaa n'ihu ebe ndi a ka kwesiri inyocha na komitativiti gasi n'Igbo. Ha bu nchikota komitativiti gasi nakwa ihe mwube okwu nke o bu komitativiti gasi na-akpata ya.

Okpurukpu okwu: komitativiti, grama Igbo, udi ndi lingwistiks, nsonyere, ngwa

1. Introduction

Comitativity denotes a situation where every participant of an event contributes individually to the manifestation of the event. In grammatical analysis, comitativity can be

expressed by various categories including nouns and verbs with comitative markers, verbs belonging to the semantic class of comitatives, aspectual categories indicating comitativity and prepositions with comitative denotations. There exists in some languages the comitative case marker while in others are the subordinate comitative clause which operates to show accompaniment in events introduced by the subordinate clause. The linguistic coding of these categories is specifically termed comitative constructions. These constructions can be described within morphology, syntax, semantics or pragmatics.

Anderson (1994) succinctly describes the representative features of comitative events and postulates that they typically include a human element associated with the main participants of an event denoted by the predication structure. This is corroborated in Plungian (2000) which holds that in comitativity, there is a primary agent or object which plays a main role in the event signified by the predicate. This primary agent is accompanied by a secondary one. Thus, comitative events consist of accompaniment, instrumental and modal relations. Accompaniment relations involve two participants accomplishing the same task in the event represented by the predicate. The more easily noticeable participant in an accompaniment relation is the *accompanee*. The typical accompanee has human features and can be represented by a noun, pronoun, or pronominal affix. The less noticeable or flat participant is termed the *companion*. The companion is perceived as indirectly or minimally involved with the accompanee in the accompaniment relation. The typical companion also has human features but it could also serve as the tool used by the other to do the task. An instrumental situation is more often than not grammaticalized. Modal relations depict the modification of the predicate by an adverb or adverbial marker as the case may be. Consequently, a comitative relation outlines the participant, inter-participant and intra-participant relations (Stolz et al 2006).

Gil (2004), Feldman (2002) and McNally (1993) have identified grammatical features that should not be associated with comitativity. They include reciprocals, conjunctions, pluralisation structures and predicates with a collective and not, distributive reading. Comitative constructions hardly feature mental and emotional predicates, and also, verbs of motion and posture.

These constructions have been investigated for a number of West African languages including Ewe, Hausa, Kanuri, Kpelle and Mende (Trawinsiki 2012: 14). The relatedness of comitativity to plurality and thematicity is explored in Archipov (2009), while Stolz et al (2006) note that typological studies on comitativity have focused on the relationship between it and the manner or instrumentality of its expression. The trend in the linguistic literature is to focus on one language and one type of comitative construction. Where there is a typological study, the focus is on comparisons and an attempt to give a unifying account of comitative constructions for these languages (Trawinsiki 2012: 15).

Comitative constructions have not been considered in any appreciable manner in the literature on Igbo grammar. Emenanjo (1978; 2010; 2015) appear to be the only suggestive attempts in Igbo grammar to refer to the concept of comitativity. Emenanjo (1978: 97) introduces the notion of ‘extensional suffixes used with or without other things to express prepositional ideas in Igbo.’ The description of the functions of these extensional suffixes hints at comitativity. The examples (1a-c) from Emenanjo (1978, 2010 and 2015) in Table 1 are termed congregatives, associatives or directionals as the case may be. These seem to be the only published examples in Igbo grammar that are indicative of comitative concepts.

Table 1

	Extensional suffix	Meaning	Example
A	-kò¹ -kú	Congregative/associative	bú-kò ‘carry together’ bí-kò ‘live together’ tá-kú ‘stick to’
b.	-tá	Directional	Zu-tà ‘buy for’
c.	-sá	Superessive	Kpo-sa ‘throw upon’

(Emenanjo 1978: 97; 2010:6; 2015: 322)

Therefore, there is the need for a detailed and systematic description of comitativity in the language. This gives rise to the issues that motivate this investigation. These issues are (i) the semantic classification of comitatives, (ii) the shared characteristics of Igbo comitatives and, (iii) how comitativity is encoded in the morpho-syntax.

To this end, the research objectives focus on (i) identifying the semantic types of Igbo comitatives, (ii) identifying the abiding features of comitatives in the language and, (iii) identifying the grammatical coding of Igbo comitatives. This attempt is, without doubt, a preliminary description of the phenomenon in the language. Hopefully, it should be the tentative steps to the comprehensive investigation of these constructions in Igbo and a contribution to the cross-linguistic research on comitatives.

The cross-linguistic study of comitativity explores the many strategies of expressing it in different languages. These strategies constitute the characteristic features of the constructions. The first of these is the **comitative content**, which has been observed by Anderson (1994) and is understood as the uneven but cooperative involvement of the participants in an event. In this wise, there exists an accompaniment relation with a three-way relationship involving the accompanee, the companion and the *relator*, that forms the relation between the two participants (Lehmann 1992: 627). The linguistic expression of comitative content always represents the agent and the patient who jointly participate in the event but not of equal commitment. Another characteristic feature is **relatedness** where the individuals involved in a comitative construction have affiliation or similarity to one another. This similarity is observed as universal conceptual-semantic connections which can be abstracted from specific morpho-syntactic constructions in a language. Miller (1985), McNally (1993) and Urtz (1994) note this feature. They postulate that the predicate structures of comitative constructions have elements that are syntactically and lexico-semantic represented. The third characteristic feature of **structural constituency** is understood to mean that there is an accompanitive reading to the lexical items involved in a comitative construction. Stolz (2006: 31) notes that in an accompaniment situation, the three components (accompanee, companion and relator) must not all be fully represented. Again, ‘the linguistic expressions representing the two participants as well as the relator may combine in one word.’

Gil (2004) adduce that markers of comitativity in some languages can be ‘macrofunctional.’ In other words, a particular marker can depict a comitative construction as predicative, another one as depictive while a third one will be marked as attributive. Predicative comitatives include predicate structures that denote comitativity. Depictive comitatives on the other hand, show that

1 The transcription follows standard Igbo orthography: à (low tone); á (high tone); and ā downstep. All tones are marked to avoid ambiguity due to lexical variance among the dialects. Igbo has phonological features of vowel harmony where the eight vowels in the language are neatly divided into two sets. One set comprises vowels produced with the Advanced Tongue Root (+ATR) while the other set comprises vowels with –ATR. In standard Igbo, –ATR vowels are represented with the sub-dot, e.g. [ɔ̣] while the +ATR vowels do not have the sub-dot. The abbreviations used here are: IND-indicative, DET-determiner, PRON-pronoun, EMPH-emphasiser, PL-plural, S-singular, 3s (subj)-third person singular for subjects, 3s (obj)-third person singular for objects, 3pl-third person plural, PROG-progressive, AGR-agreement marker,

the participants in the event jointly partake in it while attributive comitatives characterize the event as one.

There are coordinate constructions that have the features of comitativity. Dyla (1988) treats them as conjunction structures with no overt conjunction markers. For McNally (1993) they are complex NPs comprising a head NP and a non-head daughter PP. Furthermore, Feldman (2002) recognizes them as complex NPs, where the preposition *with* subcategorises for two arguments including a nominative NP and an instrumental NP.

This paper takes a broad approach to the issue of comitativity in Igbo. Therefore, all the strategies described in the literature will be applied in discussing the concept. Particular attention will be paid to the features of comitative content in Igbo verbs, and the concept of relatedness and structural constituency in the predicate structure. The notions of predicative, depictive and attributive comitatives will be explored and the pragmatic and semantic features of Igbo comitatives will be investigated.

1.1. Methodology

Since this is an introductory study, the approach is to deliberately avoid any established theory in the analysis of the observed data. It is hoped that the description of the first hand data will be essential in understanding with clarity the concept in Igbo. Besides, the description of data devoid of theoretical leanings will be interesting to Igbo grammarians studying diverse aspects of the grammar. It will also contribute the facts of Igbo to the typological study of comitativity across languages.

The examples used in this paper come from a number of sources including the natural conversations of native speakers and the collection of folktales *Nza na Obu* by F. Chidolue Ogbalu and *Omalinze*, a book of Igbo proverbs edited by E. Nolie Emenanjo. The intuitive knowledge of the language by the author also contributed to the data base. This collection of data from books is based on their documentation of the original rendition of oral folktales. That practice is now lost among Igbo speakers even though it depicts a lot of data on any aspect of Igbo grammar.

The natural data derives from the recorded speech of 34 Igbo speakers in everyday banter. The settings were informal and the speakers were not influenced in any way to produce expected data. The recording was done over a period of three months. 408 utterances containing comitative expressions were transcribed. Again, the aforementioned books were explored for data and 203 clauses containing comitative concepts were extracted. Then the composed texts were morpho-syntactically marked up for comitative constructions. The data was then sorted into 45 illustrative single clause constructions and presented to 16 native-born speakers, purposively selected from the Nnewi, Nsukka, Owerri and Abakilike dialects of the language. They are also students of Igbo and Linguistics at the University of Benin, Nigeria. They functioned as both language consultants and also for grammaticality and acceptability judgments.

These naturalistic examples were supplemented by data constructed by the author, who is a native speaker. This was done in accordance with the developments in the cross-linguistic study of comitativity. Consequently, in certain circumstances during the grammaticality judgments, the author had to provide the context of the data for the native-speaker consultants to understand better the concepts. In providing the contexts, the author had to improvise some data with the approval of the consultants.

The rest of the paper is organized thus. In Section 2 the description of the Igbo predicate structure is given as a background to the description of the data. Sections 2.1-2.4 comprise the description of comitativity in the collected data. Section 3.0 is the conclusion of the study.

2. Igbo Predicate Structure

A predicate is the part of a clause or sentence traditionally seen as representing what is said of or predicated of the subject (Matthews 1997:291). Bowers (2001), adopting a formal semantics approach, views a predicate as ‘an unsaturated expression’ that must combine with an entity in order to form a proposition. Based on these views of the predicate, the Igbo predicate structure includes the Igbo verb and its morpho-semantic structure. These morpho-semantic features are well described in Emenanjo (2005) with the classification of the Igbo verb. The general consensus is that a lexical representation of the verb includes the verb root and some morphological accompaniments. This has been formalised in the timeless definition of the Igbo verb as being ‘made up of three mutually obligatory and complementary elements.’ These obligatory elements comprise the verb itself, the complement and the bound cognate noun (Emenanjo 1978; 1975, 2005, 2011, 2012). In other words, the occurrence of the Igbo verb in any syntactic construction represents this assertion. The description of examples (2-4) below, also mentioned in Agbo (2014: 9-10), illustrate this fact.

2. **Òbí mè-rè** **èmèmmé**
 Obi do-IND feast
 ‘Obi did a feast’

In (2) above, the verb *mé* ‘make/do’ obligatorily co-occurs with the nominal element *èmèmmé* ‘feast’. The claim here is that every Igbo verb must co-occur with a nominal element which serves as its complement. The idea of the bound cognate noun is illustrated in (3) below.

3. **Òbí mè-rè** **èmèmmé** **émé**
 Obi do-IND feast EMPH
 ‘Obi indeed held a feast/Obi indeed caused a feast to be held’

Émé morphologically derives from the verb *mé* ‘do/make’ and it serves as an emphasiser morpheme. In the literature this is known as the Bound Cognate Noun or BCN. All Igbo verbs have the BCN, which always occur bound to the verb and follows it in the construction as shown in (2) above and illustrated again in (3).

4. **Ó mè-rè** **émé**
 3s do-IND EMPH
 ‘It was made to happen indeed/It indeed happened’

In examples (3) and (4) above the nominal element *èmèmmé* and the BCN *émé* are regarded as arguments and/or direct objects of the verb, respectively (Emenanjo 1978:129). However, Agbo (2013), relying on cross-linguistic evidence, claims that the subject (external argument) of the verb is the participant in the clause that initiates the action represented by the verb, while the object (internal argument) is the participant that is completely affected by the action of the subject as it is represented by the verb. Therefore, while the nominal element *èmèmmé* is an argument because it is a participant that is completely affected by the action of the verb, the BCN *émé* is simply a morphological derivation of the verb *mé* and not its argument or direct object. Sections 2.1 to 2.4 below investigate comitativity in the light of Igbo predicate structure.

2.1. Lexicalized Comitatives

Lexicalized comitatives include predicate structures consisting of a verb root and its noun element. These structures have been lexicalized in the language and denote comitativity in their conception and semantics. In examples (5a-e) the predicates *lò iló* ‘do enemy’, *yí òyì* ‘befriend’, *sò* ‘follow’, *pá* ‘carry’ and *kpú* ‘pull’ in their context of usage have comitative concepts. In (5a), the *accompanee* is *Òbí*, for it is human and it is the easily noticeable participant in the

accompaniment relation. He also initiates the enmity. The verb root *ló*, which has causative reading, immediately precedes the companion *Ádá* to portray who the enmity affects. This companion is less noticeable but also human and minimally involved in the event depicted by the predicate. The noun *íló* ‘enemy’ which immediately follows the complement, has an attributive function. Therefore, the construction in (5a) is typical of Lexicalized comitatives in Igbo.

5.

- a. **Òbí nà-é-l** **Àdá** **íló**
 Obi PROG-AGR-do Ada enemy
 ‘Obi is in enmity with Ada’
- b. **Nwóké** **nà-á-yì** **nwányị** **òyị**
 Man PROG-AGR-do woman friend
 ‘A man dates a woman’
- c. **Nwá** **áhù** **sò** **nná** **ya**
 child DET with father 3s
bíá táá
 come today
 ‘The child came with his father today’
- d. **Ònyé** **pà-rà** **óché** **ím?**
 Who carry-IND chair 1s
 ‘Who is with my chair?’
- e. **Ódò kpú** **éwú** **bíá**
 Odo drag goat come
 ‘Odo came with a goat’

Example (5b) has a similar structure to (5a). The accompanee is *Nwóké* who has the features already mentioned as in (5a). The verb root *yí* with a causative reading precedes the complement *nwányị*, who is the companion. This is immediately followed by the noun, *òyị* ‘friend’, which has an attributive function. The resulting construction depicts an accompaniment relation. In (5c) the predicate structure consists of the verb form *sò* ‘accompany’ and the complement (patient) *nná yá* ‘his father’. Therefore, the agent *Nwá áhù* is the accompanee while the complement (patient) *nná yá* represents the companion. Both accompanee and companion have the features $\pm$ human but *Nwá áhù* is the more prominent participant in the accompaniment while *nná yá* takes the background in the comitative event. Example (5d) is an example from the Nsukka dialect. The verb *pá* denotes ‘carry with’ whenever it occurs with its complement. So in (5d) the predicate *pá óché* ‘carry with chair’ denotes the association of the agent with the chair and not just the physical act of carrying the chair. Therefore in (5d) *ònyé* ‘who’ is the accompanee while *ím* ‘1s’ is the companion in the accompaniment relation. The same analysis pertains to *kpú* ‘pull’ in (5e) for it has a comitative reading of ‘pull along’. Therefore, when the verb takes a complement as in *kpú éwú* ‘pull goat along’ the resulting predicate clearly denotes a comitative reading. Here *Ódò* is the accompanee while *éwú* ‘goat’ is the companion. Note that in (5a-e) there is a *relator*, which forms the relationship between the accompanee and companion. The relator is the conceptualized manner in which the accompanee and companion associate with each other in the denoted events.

2.2. Affiliative Comitatives

In affiliative comitatives the predicate contains an agent that adheres to the patient of the clause by a bond of commitment. It is obvious that the agent and patient here are human. In (6a) below, the predicate containing the verb *kwàdò* 'support' combines with the agent (accompanee) *Òbí* and the patient (companion) *Àdá* to form the proposition. This proposition shows the affiliation of the accompanee to the companion by a bond of commitment. The relator, which is this bond of commitment, is inherent in the meaning of the verb *kwàdò*. The description of (6b) follows the pattern in (6a) but in (6b) the verb *kwù* 'stand' reads as 'associate with' in context. Therefore, the accompanee *Òbí* is associated with the companion *Àdá*. As in (6a) the relator is inherent in the meaning of the verb.

6.

- a. **Òbí** **kwàdò-rò** **Àdá**
 Obi support-IND Ada
 'Obi supports Ada'
- b. **Òbí** **kwù-rù** **Àdá**
 Obi stand-IND Ada
 'Obi associates with Ada'
- c. **Há** **kwè-rè** **nà** **chúkwú**
 3pl believe-IND in God
 'They believe in God'

The proposition in (6c) consists of the subject *Há* 'They' and the predicate *kwé nachúkwú* 'believe in God'. The verb *kwé* represents in its reading a bond of commitment and affiliation between the accompanee *Há* and the companion *chúkwú* 'God'.

It can be seen that in affiliative comitatives the predicates have the reading of the accompanee and companion being associated with each other by some form of natural bond.

2.3. Instrumentalised Comitatives

Instrumentalised comitatives are constructions that indicate the involvement of contrivances in the event. In other words, either the accompanee or companion is a mechanism used to realize the events described. The verb *jì* 'hold' characterizes these constructions in (7a-c), and is termed the *jì instrumentaliser*. In (7a) the accompanee *Àdá* uses the companion *àgwà* 'beans' to augment the *òsìkápá* 'rice' being prepared. The verb *jì* which forms part of the predicate, denotes the relator for it indicates what holds the accompanee and companion together. In (7b) the predicate *jì ógbátùmtùm* 'hold bike' contains the companion while the accompanee *Òbí* which completes the proposition is seen to use the companion to carry out the event. For (7c) the accompanee *Òbí* is associated with the companion *úgwó ójì* 'obligation of kolanut' in a relationship of *noblesse oblige*. In other words, the accompanee is described as being associated with indebtedness for not presenting the traditional kolanut to the patient of the clause *ànyí* 'us'. *Jì* instrumentalises *úgwó ójì* 'obligation of kolanut', which is the companion in the comitative event. The sentence is typically used in situations where a host, due to exigencies, is unable to present the traditional kolanuts to his guests.

2.3.1. *jì instrumentaliser*

7.

- a. **Àdá** **jì** **àgwà** **gwáá** **òsìkápá**
 Ada hold beans mix rice
 'Ada augmented the rice with some beans'

- b. **Òbí** **jì** **ógbátùmtùm** **bía**
 Obi hold motorbike come
 ‘Obi came in a motor bike’
- c. **Òbí** **jì** **ànyị** **úgwó** **ójí**
 Obi hold 2pl debt kolanut
 ‘Obi owes us the obligation of presenting kolanuts’

2.3.2. –nyúó Instrumentaliser

Instrumentalised comitatives are also realised with the suffixation of –nyúó ‘extinguish’ to the causative verbs *gbá*, *hú*, *mé* and *kwó*. Thus, the comitatives in (8a-d) are termed the –nyúó instrumentaliser. They are predicates in the imperative mood. The accompanee in all the constructions have human features but their companions are different mechanisms that can be used to put out fire. The relator in these constructions is denoted on the verb semantics. The causative –nyúó suffix represents the event of extinguishing fire. For example, (8a) is typically used when directing someone to turn off fire from a stove or gas cooker. These kitchen apparatuses have knobs for turning off the fire. Therefore, the companion in (8a) would be the tool on the stove or gas cooker that functions to turn off the fire. The expression in (8b) is used when one is directed to blow out fire from a traditional hearth used for cooking. In this wise, the companion is the breath of the accompanee that is blown onto the fire to quench it. For (8c), the expression comes in the context of using water to extinguish fire. Hence, the verb denotes water as the companion in the comitative event. In (8d) the causative verb *mé* ‘do’ has a generic meaning. Therefore, the expression is used in situations where the directive is not specific on how to extinguish the fire. In words, it can be used instead of any of the expressions in (8a-c). Therefore, the companion is whatever mechanism that is used to put out a fire.

- 8.
- a. **gbà-nyúó** **ókú**
 move-extinguish fire
 ‘Turn off the fire’
- b. **hù-nyúó** **ókú**
 blow-extinguish fire
 ‘Blow out the fire’
- c. **kwò-nyúó** **ókú**
 scoop.water-extinguish fire
 ‘Extinguish the fire with water’
- d. **mè-nyúó** **ókú**
 do-extinguish fire
 ‘Extinguish the fire’

2.4. Modalised Comitatives

Modalised comitatives comprise suffixes attached to verb roots to depict comitative events in the predicate structure. These suffixes are typical examples of the *relator* (Section 1) in Igbo. In the data under investigation, these suffixes include –*jú*, –*kó*, –*kwú*, –*kwàsà*, –*nyé*, –*chié* and *tá*. In examples 9-16 below the constructions where these suffixes operate are explored.

2.4.1. –jú Modaliser

The –*jú* modaliser suffix when attached to an activity verb function to relate how the accompanee surfeits with the companion in the task of carrying out the event depicted by the predicate. For example, in (9a) the accompanee is *Ó* ‘3s (subject)’ while the companion is *yá* ‘3s (object)’. However, the relatedness between this accompanee and the companion is depicted by –

jú, which indicates what the accompanee does in association with the companion, that is, the filling up of the companion with *mírí* ‘water’.

- 9.
- | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| a. | Ó | gbà-jù-rù | yá | mírí |
| | 3s | move-fill-IND | 3s | water |
| | ‘S/he filled it up with water’ | | | |
| b. | Há | rì-jù-rù | nrí | àfó |
| | 3pl | eat-fill-IND | food | stomach |
| | ‘They ate to their stomachs’ content’ | | | |
| c. | Òbí | dè-jù-rù | ákwúkwó | |
| | Obi | write-fill-IND | book | |
| | ‘Obi filled the book with writing’ | | | |

The description of (9a) relates to that of (9b) in the sense that the *-jú* modaliser performs the same function here. The accompanee in (9b) is *Há* ‘3pl’ while the companion is *àfó* ‘stomach’. The *-jú* relator portrays what the accompanee does in relation to the companion which is the filling of the stomach with *nrí* ‘food.’ In (9c) the accompanee is *Òbí* while the companion is *ákwúkwó* ‘book.’ The *jú* suffix as the relator connects the accompanee to the companion in the event. Nonetheless, the verb *dé* ‘write’ inherently denotes that the accompanee filled the book with his writing.

2.4.2. *-kò* Modaliser

The *-kò* modaliser suffix represents the features of togetherness between the accompanee and the companion. The *-kò* modaliser denotes both the relator and the companion. They usually occur in clauses where the accompanee is plural and the event of togetherness with the companion depicted on the verb. This is why in (9a) the accompanee *Há* ‘3pl’ associates with the companion, who is inherently represented in the *-kò* modaliser suffix. The same description is applicable to (9b) where the accompanee *Úmùákwúkwó* ‘students’ and the companion are related in the event where the companion and relator are depicted by the *-kò* modaliser. So also in (9c) the accompanee *Òbí nà Adá* ‘Obi and Ada’ and are similarly described.

- 9.
- | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------|------------|-------------------|
| a. | Há | bì-kò-rò | nà | Jos |
| | 3PL | live-together | in | Jos |
| | ‘They lived together in Jos’ | | | |
| b. | Úmùákwúkwó | nò-kò-rò | nà | kláási |
| | students | be-together-IND | in | class |
| | ‘The students stayed together in the class’ | | | |
| c. | Òbí | nà | Adá | zù-kò-rò |
| | Obi | and | Ada | meet-together-IND |
| | ‘Obi and Ada met with each other in the market’ | | | |

2.4.3. *-kwù* Modaliser

The *-kwù* modaliser relate the act of the accompanee moving to be with the companion. In (10a) the accompanee *Ó* (3s) moves to be with the companion *dí yá* ‘her husband’. This type of event is also related in (10b) where the accompanee *Ó* (3s) also goes to be with the companion *nná yá* ‘his father’. The *-kwù* modaliser suffix also functions the same in (10c) where the accompanee *Há* ‘3pl’ stays with the companion *nné há* ‘their mother.’

10.

- a. **Ó** **gbà-kwù-rù** **dí** **yá** **n'Àbá**
 3s move-be.with-IND husband 3s.obj in.Aba
 'She ran to be with her husband in Aba'
- b. **Ó** **jè-kwù-rù** **nná** **yá** **n'úgbó**
 3s go-be.with-IND father 3s.obj in.farm
 'S/he went to stay with his/her father on the farm'
- c. **Há** **nò-kwù-rù** **nné** **há** **n'ógè**
 3pl stay-be.with-IND mother 3pl.obj in.time
áhù
 DET
 'They stayed with their mother at that time'

2.4.4. –kwàsà Modaliser

Like other modalisers, the –*kwàsà* suffix also attaches to verb roots and functions as the relator. In the predicate structures of (11a-c) it relates the comitative notion of 'cover with' when attached to the verb. Therefore, the interpretation of (11a) is that the accompanee *Ó* '3s' covers the companion *Òbí* with the accusation of *óshí* 'stealing'.

11.

- a. **Ó** **bó-kwàsà-rà** **Òbí** **óshí**
 3s put on-cover-IND Obi stealing
 'S/he accused Obi of stealing'
- b. **Fàdá** **fé-kwàsà-rà** **ànyí** **mírí** **ńsọ**
 priest fly-cover-IND 2pl water holy
 'The priest sprinkle us with holy water'
- c. **Ó** **dó-kwàsà-rà** **ákpàtì** **yá** **n'élú**
 3s lay.on-cover-IND box 3s (obj) on.top
tébùlù
 table
 'S/he laid her/his box to be on the table'

In (11b) above, the accompanee *Fàdá* 'priest' covers the companion *ànyí* 'us' with *mírí ńsọ* 'holy water.' Again, in (11c) the accompanee *Ó* '3s' covers the companion *tébùlù* 'table' with the box *ákpàtì*. This is done by placing it on the table.

2.4.5. –Nyé Modaliser

The –*nyé* modaliser, as a relator, represents the benefaction which relays from the accompanee to the companion. In (12a) the accompanee *Ádà* bestows the companion *Òbí* with her companionship. Likewise, in (12b) the accompanee shows that she stands with the companion in the matter at hand. The same notion of benefaction is portrayed in (12c), where the accompanee *Há* 'they' impart respect on the companion *Ádà*.

12.

- a. **Ádà** **nò-nyè-rè** **Òbí**
 Ada stay-give-IND Obi
 'Ada stayed with Obi'
- b. **Ádà** **kwù-nyè-rè** **Òbí**
 Ada stay-give-IND Obi

- c. ‘Ada stands with Obi’/Ada is supportive of Obi’
Há **kwà-nyè-rè** **Adà** **ùgwu** **úbòsì**
 3pl push-give-IND Ada respect day
íméégó **yá**
 bride.price 3s.obj
 ‘They bestowed Ada with respect on the day of her bride price ceremony’

2.4.6. –*chì* Modaliser

The –*chì* modaliser as a relator depicts the encasing or confining of the companion by the action of the accompanee. In (13a) the accompanee *Adà* encases the companion *ngwùgwù ósè* ‘parcel of pepper’ with some leaf or paper which is indicated in the reading of the verb. In (13b) the accompanee *Dí yá* ‘her husband’ replaces the stolen car with a new one, for the companion *yá* ‘her.’ This replacement is conceptualized as encasing an empty situation with something tangible. For (13c) the accompanee *Obí* locks up the companion *úzò yá* ‘his door’ with a key.

13.

- a. **Àdà** **kè-chì-rì** **ngwùgwù** **ósè** **yá**
 Ada tie-close-IND parcel pepper 3s
 ‘Ada tied up her parcel of pepper’
- b. **Dí** **yá** **zù-chì-ri** **yá** **mótò** **yá**
 husband 3s buy-close-IND 3s car 3s
é **zù-rù**
 PRON steal-IND
 ‘Her husband bought another car to replace the stolen one’
- c. **Obí** **gbà-chì-rì** **úzò** **yá**
 Obi move-close-IND door 3s
 ‘Obi locked his door with a key’

2.4.7. –*tà* Modaliser

The –*tà* modaliser in (14a-c) represents an associative situation where the accompanee or companion benefits from the event depicted by the predicate. Therefore in (14a) the action of the accompanee *Nné* ‘mother’ is beneficial to the companion *m* ‘me’ while in the interrogative clause in (14b) the accompanee *ì* ‘you’ is asked what he has benefited from the companion *úlo ákwúkwó* ‘school’. In (14c) the accompanee *Ó* ‘he/she’ benefits from finding the companion *égó yá* ‘his money’.

14.

- a. **Nné** **pà-tà-rà** **m** **nrí** **ó**
 mother carry.with 1s food ó
 ‘Mother kindly come with some food for me o’
- b. **Kèdú** **ihé** **ì** **jè-tà-rà** **n’ úlo**
 what thing 2s walk-with-IND in
ákwúkwó
 school
 ‘What have you gained by your education?’
- c. **Ó** **chò-tà-rà** **égó** **yá** **n’ ímé**
 s/he find-with-IND money 3s inside
úlo **yá**
 house 3s

‘S/he found her/his money in her/his house’

2.5. Summary

As mentioned in Section 1, the current trend in the typological study of comitativity is to give a comparison and simple description of the types of constructions. For ease of reference, in Table 2 below is presented a summary of the Igbo morphemes functioning as comitatives.

Table 2

Lexicalised Comitatives	Affiliative Comitatives	Instrumentalised Comitatives	Modalised Comitatives
Ló ílō ‘do enemy’	Kwàdò ‘support’	Jí ‘hold’	-jú ‘fill with’
Yí òyì ‘befriend’	Kwù ‘associate/stand with’	-Nyúó ‘extinguish’	-kò ‘be-together’
Só ‘follow’	Kwé ‘agree with’		-kwù ‘be-with’
Pá ‘carry’			-kwàsà ‘cover-with’
Kpú ‘pull’			-nyé ‘stay-with’
			-chí ‘close-with’
			-tá ‘come-with’

The lexicalized comitatives have inherent comitative concepts and representation in structure. The affiliatives take agents which in conception and reading have a bond of commitment with their patients in the clause. In Instrumentalised comitatives, the accompanee or companion is a device used to actualize the event. Modalised comitatives represent comitative events by attaching to verb roots in the predicate structure.

This study has focused on identifying the various types of comitative constructions in Igbo. In other languages, especially where comitatives are well studied the focus would be on any one type such as comitative coordination (McNally 1993), macro-functionality (Gill 2004) and Instrumentalised comitatives (McNally, 1993). This is the current trend in the literature (Trawinisiki, 2012) as noted in the introduction to this paper. Since this study is exploratory in conception, the focus is classification rather than an in depth investigation of each particular category.

3. Conclusion

This paper’s aim has been to identify the semantic types of Igbò comitatives, describe their shared features and explain the morpho-syntactic coding of comitativity. The exposition of the empirical data shows that lexical items with substantive content form a distinct type of comitatives. In this study, they have been classified as lexicalized comitatives. The typical Igbo comitative is represented in the predicate structure that contains the verb and other morphological structures. This structural feature is shared by all types of comitatives. Based on this fact, three other types are identified. They are the Affiliative, the Instrumentalised and the Modalised comitatives. The comitative event in each of these types is denoted by the operationalization of various verb suffixes. These suffixes then function to give the distinct feature of each type of comitative in Igbò. The investigation of comitativity in the language is still at the preliminary stage. Nevertheless, this attempt opens up further areas of research on comitativity including comitative coordination and comitative-based causative constructions in the language.

References

- Agbo, M. (2013). *A Role and Reference Grammar Analysis of the Igbo Verb*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Ibadan.
 Agbo, M. (2014). Causativity in Igbò Personal Names. *Journal of Universal Language*, Volume 15 Number 2.
 Bowers, J. (2001). Predication. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds). Oxford: Blackwell, Pp299-333.

- Anderson, J. (1994). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Archipov, A. (2009). Comitative as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Epps P. and Archipov, A. (eds). *New challenges in Typology2: Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dyla, S. (1988). Quasi-comitative coordination in Polish. *Linguistics* 26: 383-414.
- Emenanjo, Nolue (1978). *Elements of Modern Igbo Grammar*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Emenajo, Nolue (1975). Aspects of the Igbo Verb. *Igbo Language and Culture*. Ogbalu, F.C and Emenanjo, N. E. Eds. Ibadan: Oxford University Press. 160 - 173.
- Emenanjo, N. (2004). *Omalinze: A book of folktales*. Ibadan: University Press Plc
- Emenanjo, Nolue (2005). Igbo Verbs: Transitivity or Complementation. *Trends in the Study of Languages and Linguistics in Nigeria (A Festschrift for P.A. Nwachukwu)*. Ndimele, O. Ed. Port Harcourt: Grand Orbit Communication and Emhai Press. 479 - 497.
- Emenanjo, N. (2011). Extensional suffixes and lexicalization. In Uchechukwu C. (ed). *Extensional suffixes and clitics in Igbo*. Onitsha: Varsity Press Limited
- Emenanjo, Nolue (2012). *Inulgbuzo: Igbo proverbial lore*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press
- Emenanjo, E. 2015. *A Grammar of Contemporary (constituents, features and processes)*. Port Harcourt: M&J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd.
- Feldman, A. (2002). On NP-coordination. In *The UIL OT Yearbook*. Utrecht: The Netherlands.
- Gil, D. (2004). Rian Indonesia Sama: Explorations in Macro-functionality. In M. Haspelmath (ed). *Coordinating Constructions (Typological Studies in Language)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lehman, C. (2005). The Functional domain of concomitance. A Typological study of instrumental and comitative relations. In *Typological studies in participation (Lehman, C. ed.)* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 9-104.
- Matthews, Peter (1997). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- McNally, L. (1993). Comitative Coordination: A case study in group formation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1, 347-349.
- Miller, J. (1985). *Semantics and Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogbalu, F. (1997). *Nzana Obu*. Onitsha: University Publishing Company
- Plungian, B. (2000). *General Morphology: An Introduction*. Moscow: YPCC.
- Stolz, T., Stroh, C. & Urdze, A. (2006). *On Comitatives and Related Categories. A Typological study with special focus on the languages of Europe*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Stalnaker, R. (1974). Pragmatic Presuppositions. In M.K. Munitz and P. Unger (eds). *Semantics and Philosophy*. New York: New York University Press, 197-213.
- Strawson P. (1950). On Referring. *Mind* 59. 320-344
- Trawinsiki, B. (2012). *Polish Comitative Constructions. Empirical Investigation and Formal Description*. PhD Thesis University of Tübingen.
- Urtz, B. (1994). *The Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of a nominal conjunction. The case of Russian*. PhD Thesis Harvard University.