

REFLEXIVIZATION IN AKAN

Kofi K. Saah

University of Ghana, Legon.

This paper considers reflexives and the Reflexive Rule in Akan and finds out the conditions under which the rule applies. In doing this, I shall use a set of parameters proposed by Carden and Stewart (1986) and adapted to my purposes here. The parameters, which form the topic of each succeeding section of this paper, will help in eliciting answers to the following:

- (i) how reflexives are marked in Akan,
- (ii) whether reflexivization occurs within or across clause boundaries,
- (iii) which NP positions can be the antecedents of reflexives, and
- (iv) whether reflexivization is to the right or left of the antecedent.

Nous nous proposons dans cette communication de nous pencher sur les verbes réfléchis et la règle concernant la réflexivisation verbale en Akan, pour déterminer les conditions dans lesquelles la règle s'applique. Pour ce faire, nous utilisons un ensemble de paramètres proposés par Carden et Stewart (1986). Ces paramètres qui font l'objet des sections successives de cette communication aideront à rechercher des réponses aux questions suivantes:

- (i) quelles sont les marques des verbes réfléchis en Akan?
- (ii) la réflexivisation se fait-elle uniquement à l'intérieur des propositions ou peut-elle aller au delà de celles-ci?
- (iii) quelles sont les positions de GN (groupe nominal) susceptibles d'être des antécédents des verbes réfléchis?
- (iv) la réflexivisation se produit-elle à droite ou à gauche de l'antécédent?

0. INTRODUCTION

Reflexivization is a syntactic process by which languages indicate the interaction between two coreferential NPs within a sentence. A reflexive, according to Saha (1987:215) is 'a linguistic device such as a word, particle, or affix used to convey a grammaticalized notion of animate or nonanimate entities interacting with themselves.' I shall adopt this as a working definition of the reflexive.

The formulation of the rule of reflexivization, especially for English, shows that certain restrictions/conditions must be obeyed for the rule to apply. One is that for reflexivization to take place, there must be two coreferential NPs; another is that the two coreferential NPs must be within the same clause or simplex sentence.

My aim in this paper¹ is to consider reflexives and the Reflexive Rule in Akan to find out the conditions under which the rule applies. I shall use a set of parameters proposed by Carden and Stewart (1986)², adapted to suit my purposes here. The parameters, which form the topics of each succeeding section, will help in eliciting answers to the following:

- (1) how reflexives are marked in Akan,

¹ I owe the inspiration to research and write on this topic to the personal communication I had with Prof. Guy Carden of the University of British Columbia. An earlier version was read to the Linguistic Circle of Accra on 19th May, 1987. I have benefitted from a discussion with Prof. L.A. Boadi when preparing this version. All errors in judgment or analysis are, however, wholly mine. My special thanks to Dr. K.A. Sampson of the Dept. of Modern Languages, University of Legon, for translating the abstract into French.

² These parameters are formulated within the Government and Binding framework. Though I shall use some of the terminology of this theory, the commoner expressions of the Extended Standard Theory will also be widely used.

- (2) whether reflexivization occurs within or across clause boundaries,
- (3) which NP positions can be antecedents of reflexives, and
- (4) whether reflexivization is to the right or left of the antecedent.

In the examples and discussion coreferential NPs will be marked with the same letter index while non-coreferential NPs will receive different indices. The symbols = and $\neq$ will also be used to mark coreferentiality and noncoreferentiality or disjoint reference.

1. REFLEXIVES IN AKAN

Akan has morphologically marked reflexives which are necessarily coreferent with some structurally defined local antecedent. They are formed by a pronoun + *hõ* which translates literally as 'body', 'outside' etc. just as English morphologically marks reflexives with a pronoun + *self*. As we shall see, the reflexive reading of this pronoun + *hõ* structure is sometimes clouded by the ambiguity between a reflexive reading and possessive interpretations (of body and body parts) in some contexts.

It is possible for a structure like *ne hõ* to receive the reading 'himself/herself/itself' in some structures and 'his/her/its body' or 'near him/her/it' in others. We shall return to this problem later. For the moment, consider the following examples:

- 1a. **Kofi de sekan twaa ne hõ** 'Kofi cut himself with a knife'
 K with knife cut + PST 3s REFL
 $no\ hõ = K; \neq X$
- b. **Kofi de sekan twaa no** 'Kofi cut him with a knife'
 K. 3s
 $no = X; \neq K$
- 2a. **Kofi de sekan twaa me** 'Kofi cut me with a knife'
 K. 1s
- b. **Mede sekan twaa me hõ** 'I cut myself with a knife'
 1s-with knife cut + PST 1s REFL
 $me\ hõ = me; \neq X$
- c. ***Mede sekan twaa me**
 1s 1s
 (Though this may be semantically clear, it is not the right way to say it. It might be possible if a special context is invented.)
- 3a. **Kofi de sekan twaa wo** 'Kofi cut you with a knife'
 K. with knife cut + PST 2s
- b. **Wode sekan twaa wo hõ** 'you (sg) cut yourself with a knife'
 2s 2s REFL
 $wo\ hõ = wo \neq X$
- c. ***Wode sekan twaa wo**
 2s 2s
 (Semantically clear but syntactically ill-formed. May be possible in an invented context.)

These examples show that the pronoun + *hō* structures are reflexives and that reflexivization is obligatory in Akan once its structural description is met.

Plain object pronouns in Akan are not reflexive. These forms are ‘necessarily disjoint in reference from NPs in a structural position to serve as antecedents of reflexives’ (Carden and Stewart, 1986:2). Consider more examples:

- 4a. **Kofi piraa no** ‘Kofi hurt him’
 K. hurt + PST 3s
 $no = X; \neq X$
- b. **Opiraa no** ‘Heⁱ hurt him^j’
 3s hurt + PST 3s
 $no = X; \neq O$
- c. ***Wopiraa wo**
 2s 2s
 Not possible if the two ‘wo’s refer to the same person.
- d. **Opiraa me** ‘He hurt me’
 3s hurt + PST 1s
- e. ***Me piraa me** Not syntactically well-formed
 1s 1s

4c and 4e show that the plain object pronouns in NP2 position make the sentences syntactically ill-formed. To be well-formed the structures must obligatorily undergo reflexivization.

2. RANGE PARAMETER

In many languages like English, the antecedent must be a clausemate of the reflexive. This restriction is commonly known as the ‘clausemate condition’ on reflexivization in earlier versions of TG. In the Government and Binding (GB) framework, the antecedent must be in the ‘governing category’ of the reflexive. The Range parameter proposed by Carden and Stewart seeks to find out whether all languages obey this restriction or not. The feature [+ clausemate] is used where a language obeys this constraint. Consider the following in English:

- 5a. Tomⁱ told Sally about himselfⁱ
 $himself = T; \neq S, X$
- b. *Tomⁱ says that Sally dislikes himselfⁱ
- c. Tomⁱ says that John^j dislikes himself^j
 $himself = J; \neq T, X$

5b is not possible in English because the reflexive pronoun ‘himself’ occurs in a different clause from the one in which Tom occurs (i.e. ‘himself’ occurs in the lower sentence/clause while Tom occurs in the higher or matrix sentence). They are therefore not clausemates. The reflexive pronoun in 5a is in the same clause as Tom therefore reflexivization is possible. 5c is grammatical but the reflexive pronoun cannot be construed as Tom. Tom cannot be said to be the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun, therefore the reflexive pronoun is not coreferential with Tom. It is rather coreferential with John which is in the same clause as the reflexive pronoun. The ungrammaticality of 5b follows from its violation of the clausemate condition on

reflexivization; it is not a problem of gender distinction. Thus reflexivization in English is subject to the clausemate condition³.

Akan appears to have this also. Consider the following:

- 6a. **Kofi pe se Ama pira ne hõ**
 K want + PRES that A. hurt + PRES 3s REFL
 'Kofi wants Ama to hurt herself'
ne hõ = A, ≠ K, X
- b. **Kofi pe se Ama pira no** 'Kofi wants Ama to hurt him'
 3s
no = K, X; ≠ A
- 7a. **Kofi suro se Ama bepira ne hõ**
 K fear + PRES that A. FUT + hurt 3s REFL
 'Kofi is afraid that Ama will hurt herself'
ne hõ = A, ≠ K, X
- b. **Kofi suro se Ama bepira no**
 K 3s
 'Kofi is afraid that Ama will hurt him'
no = K, X; ≠ A

In all these examples, the reflexive is coreferential with the subject of the lower sentence. This shows that in typical complement clauses (6, 7), the antecedent must be a clausemate of the reflexive.

There are certain complex structures, which seem to suggest that the reflexive pronoun may be construed with the subject of the matrix sentence or that of the embedded clause. The problem, however, is whether in such cases the pronoun + hõ structure can be interpreted as reflexives or not.

Consider the following examples:

- 8a. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe ne hõ**
 K want + PRES that A look + PRES 3s REFL/body
 (i) **ne hõ = A** 'Kofi wants Ama to look at herself'
 (ii) **ne hõ = K, X** 'Kofi wants Ama to look at his (naked) body'
- b. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe no** 'Kofi wants Ama to look at him'
 K. 3s
no = K, X; ≠ A

In 8a **ne hõ** may be coreferential with Ama, Kofi or X. When it is interpreted as coreferential with Ama, we get the reading in 8a(i) 'Kofi wants Ama to look at herself'. But when it is interpreted as coreferential with Kofi, **ne hõ** does not get a reflexive reading ('himself') but rather 'him/his body' (i.e. possessive pronoun + body). In 8b where **no** is coreferential with Kofi or X we have a straightforward reading of 'Kofi wants Ama to look at him'.

³ Saha (1987:217-220) provides counter examples to show that reflexivization can take place across clause boundaries in English. A discussion of this will lead us astray from our purpose here.

This means we should reanalyse 8a(ii) as:

- 8c. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe ne hõ**
 K want + PRES that Ama look + PRES 3s + POSS body
 Kofi wants Ama to look at his (naked) body'
ne = K, X; ≠ A

This analysis treats **ne hõ** as having the structure: NR + POSS + body(part). It is not a reflexive structure.

To prove this, consider the following examples in which other body parts can replace **hõ** in the same structure:

- 8d. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe ne nsa**
 K. 3s + POSS hand
 'Kofi wants Ama to look at his/her hand'

nsa may belong to K, A, or X.

- e. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe ne hwene**
 K. 3s + POSS nose
 'Kofi wants Ama to look at his/her nose'

hwene may belong to K, A or X

A stronger proof can be provided since a lexical NP can occur in the same syntactic position as the possessor pronoun **ne** 'his/her' in 8f:

- 8f. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe Kwado hõ/nsa**
 K. Kw. + POSS body/hand
 'Kofi wants Ama to look at Kwando's (naked) body/hand'

Hõ behaves like a body part such as **nsa** 'hand', and can therefore occur with **Kwado**, a lexical NP not coreferential with any of the local NPS in the sentence. In a discourse situation in which **Kwado** has already been mentioned, it can be replaced by the pronoun **ne** 'his' as in 8a. 8a can therefore be derived from underlying structures like :

- 8g. **Kofi pe se Ama hwe Kofi/Ama hõ**

Pronominalization can apply to change the second mention of **Kofi/Ama** into the possessive pronoun **ne** 'his/her' as in 8a. Thus the pronoun **ne** may be derived from three possible sources, giving the three interpretations for 8a. When the pronoun is construed with the subject of the higher sentence (i.e. **Kofi**) or with a sentence-external NP (X), no reflexive reading is possible. The pronoun + **hõ** structure is therefore analysable as a possessive construction involving a body part. When the pronoun is construed with the subject of the lower sentence (ie. **Ama**) we get a reflexive reading besides the pronoun + body part interpretation. This is the only instance where the two NPs involved can be found in the same clause/simplex sentence.

Examples involving other verbs give hope of finding reflexivization across clause boundaries. Consider the following:

- 9a. **Kofi pe se Ama dwene ne hõ**
 K want + PRES that A think + PRES 3s REFL
 NP¹ NP² NP³

- (i) ne hõ = A 'Kofi wants Ama to think about herself'
 (ii) ne hõ = K, X 'Kofi wants Ama to think about him'

b. *Kofi pɛ sɛ Ama dwene no
 K want + PRES that A think + PRES 3s (not possible)
 NP¹ NP² NP³

c. *Kofi pɛ sɛ Ama dwene ne ti/nsa/hwene
 K 3s head, hand, nose
 NP¹ NP² NP³

The data in 9b suggest that a plain pronoun cannot be the object of the lower verb *dwene* 'think'. Besides, we cannot replace *hõ* with other body parts such as *ti* 'head', *nsa* 'hand' and *hwene* 'nose', so it cannot be a body part. Do we then have a reflexive in NP³ which can be coreferential with NP¹, NP² and a sentence-external entity? The answer is yes and no, as can be seen in 9a (i,ii, and iii).

NP³ can be interpreted as reflexive only when it is construed with NP² which is the subject of its (NP³'s) clause as in 9a(i). Here the clausemate condition is met. The problem is now why the absence of *hõ* in 9b makes the sentence ungrammatical. Again, we need to find out why *ne hõ* in 9a cannot be analysed as a reflexive when it is construed with NP¹(Kofi).

The explanation involves the nature of the verb. Some verbs, when used transitively, require that the particle *hõ* be cliticized to the object NP creating the structure V+NP+hõ e.g. *dwene hõ* 'think about', *sesa hõ* 'change clothes', *tit hõ* 'scratch', *hohoro hõ* 'wash body', *pepa hõ* 'clean/dry body with cloth/towel', *hwe hõ* 'look at (naked) body', *ka hõ asem* 'talk about'.

Used intransitively, *dwene* 'think' may have no *hõ* after it.

- 10a. Kofi redwene 'Kofi is thinking'
 K PROG + think
- b. Kofi dwenee 'Kofi thought'
 K think + PST
- c. Kofi dwenee hõ 'Kofi thought about it'
 K think + PST about (it)

In 10c the presence of *hõ* and the absence of any specified NP in surface structure implies an inanimate object pronoun 'it'.

In the case of the other verbs like *sesa* 'change', *pepa* 'clean/dry', *hwe* 'look', the absence of an NP+hõ or *hõ* only after the verb implies an inanimate object pronoun 'it'.

11. Kofi sesae / pepae / hwæ 'Kofi changed/cleaned/looked at it'
 K change + PST/clean + PST/look + PST (it)

When used transitively (i.e. with overt object NPs) *hõ* must always be cliticised to the object NP, be it animate or inanimate:

- 12a. **Kwameⁱ redwene Ama^j hõ** 'Kwame is thinking about Ama'
 Kw. PROG + think A. about
- b. ***Kwameⁱ redwene Ama^j** 'Kwame is thinking about Ama'
- 13a. **Kwame kaa Ama hõ asem** 'Kwame talked about Ama'
 Kw. say + PST A. about matter
- b. ***Kwame kaa Ama asem**

13b is perfectly grammatical in another context to mean 'Kwame said something to Ama/gave Ama a piece of his mind/told Ama something ponderous'.

We see from 12 and 13 that **hõ** forms an integral part of the verbs under discussion, that is we have cases of verbs + postpositions. the **V + hõ** structures would therefore be entered in the dictionary as lexical verbs. 12a will be derived from an underlying structure like 14⁴:

14. **[Kwameⁱ redwene hõ Ama^j]**
 K. PROG + think about A.

by a rule that cliticizes **hõ** to the right of the object NP Ama, thereby yielding 12a.

The discussion so far indicates that **hõ** exists in the dictionary entries of verbs like **dwene** 'think' and that the appearance of **hõ** in sentences like 12, 13 and 14 is not the result of any transformation.

It is possible for any animate NP that it is immediately preceded by a verb such as **dwene** 'think' to be replaced by **ne** 'his/her', the possessive form of the 3s pronoun **no**. Thus from 15a we can get 15b:

- 15a. **Kwameⁱ redwene Kwameⁱ/Ama^j hõ**
 Kw. PROG + think Kw./A. about
 'Kwame is thinking about Kwame/Ama^j'
- b. **Kwameⁱ redwene ne^{i j} hõ**
 'Kwameⁱ is thinking about himselfⁱ/him/her^j'

where **ne** may refer to either Kwame or any other NP like Ama or an X mentioned earlier in the discourse. When **ne** refers back to the subject NP Kwame with which it shares the same referential index, the reflexive **hõ** merges with the postpositional **hõ** to give **ne hõ** a reflexive reading 'himself'. But where **ne** has a different referential index from the subject Kwame, (Ama or any other sentence -external NP), **hõ** will be analysable as the postpositional element of the phrasal verb **dwene hõ** 'think about'; therefore **ne hõ** cannot be the result of reflexivization.

Returning now to 9a, repeated here as 16a, we see that reflexivization is only possible where NP³ is coreferential with NP².

- 16a. **Kofiⁱ pe se Ama^j dwene ne^{i j k} hõ**
 K. want + PRES that A. think + PRES 3s REFL/about
 NP¹ NP² NP³

⁴ I am indebted to Prof. Boadi (personal communication) for this kind of analysis.

- (i) *ne hō* = A 'Kofiⁱ wants Ama^j to think about herself^β'
 (ii) *ne hō* = K, X 'Kofiⁱ wants Ama^j to think about himⁱ k'

- b. **Kofiⁱ pɛ sɛ Ama^j dwene Kwadwo^k hō**
 K. want + PRES that A. think + PRES Kw. about
 NP¹ NP² NP³
 'Kofiⁱ wants Ama^j to think about Kwadwo^k'

From the discussion of verbs like *dwene hō* 'think about' and the examination of 16a, b, we can make the following generalizations:

- (i) NP³ may be made up of a lexical NP + *hō* as in 16b and it cannot be coreferential with either NP² or NP¹. *Hō* in this structure cannot therefore be a reflexive marker;
 (ii) NP³ may be made up of a 3s pronoun + *hō* which can refer back to both NP¹ and NP² as well as X;
 (iii) Where the pronoun + *hō* structure (*ne hō*) is construed with NP¹ or X, a reflexive interpretation is not possible (16a(ii)). *Hō* is not a reflexive marker but rather the postpositional element of V² *dwene hō* 'think about' which has been cliticized to NP³;
 (iv) Where the pronoun + *hō* structure (*ne hō*) is construed with NP² (16a(i)), a reflexive interpretation is possible regardless of whether the verb obligatorily selects the postposition *hō* or not when used transitively. In this context there is a merger of the reflexive *hō* with the postposition *hō*, possible because both NP³ and NP² are in the same clause.

To summarize, some verbs pattern with the postposition *hō* (which has the same form as the reflexive marker *hō*) in such a way as to suggest that reflexivization across clause boundaries is possible. This is disproved, however, by closer examination. Reflexivization is only possible when the reflexive and its antecedent are in the same clause, or, to use GB terminology, in the same 'governing category'.

3. ANTECEDENT-LOCATION

This parameter has to do with the structural position of the antecedent of the reflexive. English, according to Carden and Stewart, appears to have antecedents which occur in 'a considerable range of structural positions: subject, direct object, indirect object and objects of certain prepositions' (Reflexives and Anti-Reflexives: Basic Paradigm to Test:3). In this section we shall find out which NP positions serve as antecedents to reflexives.

3.1 SUBJECTS

In the Akan examples so far, the antecedents were always surface subjects. It is interesting to note that when a genitive construction occurs in subject position, the possessed noun (i.e. possessum) can be the antecedent of a reflexive. Consider the following:

- 17a. **Kofi yere piraa ne hō** 'Kofi's wife hurt herself'
 K + POSS wife hurt + PST 3s REFL
ne hō = yere; ≠ K, X

- b. **Kofi yere piraa no** 'Kofi's wife hurt him'
K + POSS wife hurt + PST 3s
no = K, X; ≠ yere
- c. **ɔmaa Kofi yere piraa ne hõ**
3s + cause + PST K + POSS wife hurt + PST 3s REFL
'He caused Kofi's wife to hurt herself'
ne hõ = yere; ≠ ɔ, K, X
- d. **ɔmaa Kofi yere piraa no**
3s + cause + PST K + POSS wife hurt + PST 3s
He caused Kofi's wife to hurt him'
no = K, ɔ, X; ≠ yere

We see that in genitive constructions occurring in subject position, the possessed Np (i.e. possessum) can be the antecedent of the reflexive. The reflexive **ne hõ** in 17a,c can only be construed with the possessed noun **yere** 'wife', not with Kofi or a sentence-external entity 'X'. The plain object pronoun in 17b,d is construed with the possessor noun Kofi or 'X'.

It appears therefore that the common restriction is that the antecedent of the reflexive must be a subject. Are other antecedent locations possible? That is, can NPs other than subjects trigger reflexivization? To answer this, we need to examine additional data.

3.2 DIRECT OBJECTS

Examples like the following suggest that direct objects can be antecedents of reflexives:

- 18a. **ɔmaa me piraa me hõ** 'He made/caused me to hurt myself'
3s + cause + PST 1s hurt + PST 1s REFL
NP¹ NP² NP³
me hõ = me; ≠ ɔ
- b. ***ɔmaa me piraa me** (syntactically ill-formed)
3s 1s 1s
NP¹ NP² NP³
- c. ***ɔbema no apira ne hõ** 'Heⁱ will make/cause him^j to hurt himself'
3s + Fut + cause 3s PERF + hurt 3s REFL
NP¹ NP² NP³
ne hõ = no; ≠ ɔ, X

If we consider 18a,c we might be tempted to analyse NP² which comes after the causative verb **ma** 'cause' as the direct object of the verb. The 3s pronoun in 18c is in the object form, but its object status is suspect. In fact, the causative constructions in these examples are not true serial verb constructions (SVCs). In a true SVC, a single NP is the subject of two or more finite verbs; but in the causative construction, the subject of the verb **ma** 'cause' is not the subject of the second verb. The sentences in 18 have the following structure:

- 18e. [NP¹ V^a [NP² V^b NP³]]
S¹ S² S² S¹

NP² which is the antecedent of the reflexive NP³, is the subject of the sentential complement. The whole of the downstairs sentence (S²) is the complement of the verb **ma** (V^a).

There are parallel structures in the language which support this analysis, for example:

- 18f. **womaa opiraa ne hõ**
 2s + cause + PST 3s + hurt + PST 3s REFL
 NP¹ NP² NP³
 'You made him/her hurt him/herself'

ne hõ = O; ≠ Wo, X

- g. **Emaa opiraa no hõ** (Fante)
 2s + cause + PST 3s + hurt + PST 3s REFL
 NP¹ NP² NP³

no hõ = O; ≠ E, X

It appears that both the subject and object forms of the 3s pronoun can be used after the verb **ma** in these sentences. The verb always takes a sentential complement; not a simple NP like **me** 'I/me', **ɔ(no)** 'he/him, she/her' etc. Examples above marked as NP² are therefore not direct objects of the verb **ma** 'cause', but subjects of the complement sentence. And reflexivization applied in the complement sentence where NP² is in subject position and is the antecedent of the reflexive NP³. I have not yet found any genuine direct object antecedent as a reflexive.

3.3 INDIRECT OBJECTS

We shall now examine the case for indirect objects as antecedents of reflexives. Consider the following:

- 19a. **Owura no tɔ etuo maa Kofi de weɔn ne hõ**
 Master the buy + PST gun give + PST K. with/take watch + PST 3s REFL
 NP¹ NP² NP³ NP⁴
 'The master bought a gun for Kofi to protect himself with'
ne hõ = K; = Owura, X

- b. **Owura no tɔ etuo maa Kofi de weɔn no**
 Master the buy + PST gun give + PST K. with/take watch + PST 3s
 NP¹ NP² NP³ NP⁴
 'The master bought a gun for K. to protect him with'
no = Owura, X; = K

The sentences above have the following structure:

- 19c. [NP¹ V^a NP² V^b NP³ V^c NP⁴]
 S S

Here we have true SVCs where NP¹ is the subject of both V^a and V^b. NP³, which is the object of the dative verb **ma** 'give' appears to be the indirect object and the antecedent of the reflexive NP⁴ in 19a. We seem to have found an indirect object which is the antecedent of a reflexive.

The situation is not so simple. NP³ is not an indirect object, as an examination of the sentence 18a will show. It is possible to analyse this sentence as emanating from

either conjoining or embedding. Either of these analyses shows that NP³ is not an underlying indirect object’.

First, consider 19d as the structure underlying 19a:

- 19d. [Owura no tɔɔ etuo maa Kofi] na
Master the buy + PST gun give + PST K. and

[Kofi de etuo no weɛn ne hɔ̃
K. take gun the protect + PST 3s REFL

It appears reflexivization applied in the second conjunct before conjunction reduction applied to derive 19a. To derive 19a from 19d the conjunction *na* ‘and’ is deleted with the subject NP of the second conjunct (Kofi) under coreference with the indirect object of the first conjunct. It could therefore be argued that reflexivization in 119a applied at the level where the antecedent NP³ was a subject.

If we analyse 19c as coming from complementation (embedding) we get the same result. Take an underlying structure like:

- 19g. [Owura no tɔɔ etuo maa Kofi [sɛ
Master the buy gun give K. that
NP¹ NP² NP³

[Kofi mfa nweɛn ne hɔ̃]]
K. take + SUBJUNC watch 3s REFL
NP⁴ NP⁵

NP⁴, which is the subject of the embedded sentence will trigger reflexivization in that sentence. It is then pronominalized to produce a sentence like 19h below:

- 19h. Owura no tɔɔ etuo maa Kofi sɛ ɔmfa nweɛn ne hɔ̃
‘The master bought a gun for Kofi so that he would protect himself with it’

Where NP⁴ is not pronominalised, it is deleted with the complementizer *sɛ* ‘that’ (because NP⁴ = NP³); and the verb *mfa* (take + subjunctive) is replaced by *de* ‘take/with’ to derive 19a.

The foregoing discussion shows that what appear to be indirect object triggers of reflexivization are, in fact, ‘deep’ subjects. We can therefore state that indirect objects cannot be antecedents of reflexives.

Note also that though the reflexive pronoun marked by *hɔ̃* in most examples so far is a direct object (DO), it is possible for it to occur in indirect object position. This means we might expect it to occur in the reflexive counterpart of the following:

- 20a. Ama de ntama furaa abofra no ‘Ama dressed the child in the cloth’
A. take/with cloth put on + PST child the
NP¹ NP² NP³
- b. *Ama de ntama furaa ne hɔ̃ ‘Ama dressed herself in the cloth’
A. take/with cloth put on + PST 3s REFL
NP¹ NP² NP³

ne hɔ̃ = A; ≠ X

Most speakers of the language do not accept this sentence, though all agree that it is semantically well-formed. To be acceptable, the reflexive NP³ should be deleted to yield:

- 20c. **Ama de ntama furae** 'Ama put on cloth/A. dressed herself'
A. take cloth put on + PST

Here the reflexive is marked by an absence of an overt IO. This appears to be the case for this and other verbs like *dware* 'wash/bathe', *sa* '(to) syringe', *sera* '(to) oil' etc. Where these verbs are used, the absence of an overt IO is interpreted to mean a reflexive. In other words, the absence of an IO in surface structure indicates 'an animate entity is interacting with him/herself'.

There are other sentences in which the reflexive IO is overtly expressed:

- 20d. **Ama de ntoma kataa ne hō** 'Ama covered herself with cloth'
A. take cloth cover + PST 3s REFL
- e. **Kofi de etuo no weɔn ne hō** 'Kofi protected himself with the gun'
K. take gun the protect + PST 3s REFL

4. RELATIVE POSITION OF ANTECEDENT AND TARGET

The target⁵ here refers to the reflexivized NP. The data so far suggests that the antecedent must command and precede the target. In other words, reflexivization looks to the right for the target.

There are some sentences in Akan which seem to suggest that leftward/backward reflexivization is possible. Consider the following:

- 21a. i. **Kofi hō hyehye no** 'Kofi feels hot'
K. + POSS body burnt + PRES 3s
- ii. ***Kofi hyehye no** 'Kofi feels hot'
- b. **Ne hō hyehye no** 'His/her body burns him', or
3s + POSS body burnt + PRES 3s 'he/she feels hot'
- c. **Me hō tutu me** 'My body aches', 'I feel bodily pains'
1s + POSS body pain + PRES 1s
- d. i. **Wo hō keka wo?** 'Does your body itch?', 'Do you itch?'
2s + POSS body itch + PRES
- ii. ***Wo keka wo?** 'Does your body/do you itch?'
2s + POSS itch + PRES 2s

The verbs above all describe physical sensations. They require NPs + body parts as their subjects. Where the body part *hō* 'body' is omitted (21a.ii, d.ii) the result is grammatically unacceptable. The pronoun + *hō* subjects in 21b, c, and d.i are

⁵ This is not a Carden and Stewart parameter. I borrowed it from Napoli (1979).

therefore not the result of reflexivization. They are made up of NP + POSS + **hõ** where **hõ** is ‘body’ but not ‘self’.

Other body parts can occur in the same syntactic position as **hõ** in 21, with other verbs that describe such physical sensations:

- 22a. i. **Kofi ti pae no**
K. + POSS head ache + PRES 3s
‘Kofi’s head aches’, ‘Kofi has a headache’
- ii. **Ne ti pae no**
3s + POSS head ache + PRES 3s
‘His head aches’, ‘He has a headache’
- iii. ***Ne pae no**
- b. i. **Ama yamu keka no**
A. + POSS stomach ache + PRES 3s
‘Ama’s stomach aches/pains her’, ‘Ama has a stomach-ache’
- ii. **Ne yamu keka no**
3s + POSS stomach ache + PRES 3s
‘Her stomach aches/pains her’, ‘She has a stomach-ache’
- iii. ***Ne keka no**

hõ in 21 behaves in a similar manner to other body parts when they co-occur with verbs of physical sensation. The NP + **hõ** structures in 21 therefore do not result from leftward/backward reflexivization. In a suitable situation of discourse, it is possible to elicit a sentence like 23b or 23c where a true reflexive occurs to the left of the antecedent, at least in the surface structure:

- 23a. **Hena na Kofi piraa no?** ‘Whom did Kofi hurt?’
Who FOC(us) K. hurt + PST 3s

The answer to this question may be either 23b or 23c.

- b. **Ɔno ankasa hõ na opirae** ‘It was himself/his own self that he hurt’
3s EMPH REFL FOC 3s + hurt + PST
Ɔno ankasa hõ = O; ≠ X
- c. **Ne hõ na opirae**
3s REFL FOC 3s + hurt + PST
‘It was himself (that) he hurt’
ne hõ = O; ≠ X

23c appears to be grammatically ill-formed for most speakers though it is semantically acceptable. 23b with the emphatic marker **ankasa** is preferable.

Granted that both sentences are grammatically acceptable in Akan, it can still be shown that they are not examples of leftward reflexivization. 23b, c may be derived from an underlying structure like 24a:

- 24a. [O'piraa ɔno (ankasa)ⁱ] 'Heⁱ hurt himⁱ EMPH'
3s hurt + PST 3s EMPH

This undergoes reflexivization to yield:

- 24b. [Oipiraa ɔno (ankasa) hō] 'He hurt his own self'
3s + hurt + PST 3s EMPH REFLⁱ
 $\text{ɔno(ankasa)hō} = \text{O}; \neq \text{X}$

24b then optionally undergoes the Focus Marking Rule to prepose the reflexive to sentence-initial position and attach the focus marker **na** to it to derive:

- 25a. ɔno ankasa hō na opirae
3s EMPH REFL FOC 3s + hurt + PST
'It was himself/his own self (that) he hurt'

and possibly:

- 25b. Ne hō na opirae
3s REFL FOC 3s + hurt + PST

If this analysis is accepted, it will confirm that even in situations where a reflexive precedes its antecedent in surface structure, it can be proved that the antecedent preceded the target at the time/level where reflexivization applied.

From this we conclude that the antecedent must always command and precede its target when reflexivization applies. Reflexivization cannot be backward or leftward in the language.

5. CONCLUSION

This study shows that Akan has the following reflexive parameters:

1. It has morphologically marked reflexives formed by pronoun + **hō**.
2. Plain object pronouns are not reflexives in all three persons (ie. no plain object pronouns are permissible in reflexive contexts).
3. Akan obeys the clausemate condition on reflexivization. There is no reflexivization across clause boundaries in the language.
4. Subjects only can be antecedents of reflexives.
5. Reflexivization is forward/rightward, not backward/leftward.

REFERENCES

- Boadi, L.A. 1972. Some aspects of Akan deep structure. *Journal of West African Languages* 2:83-90.
 Carden, Guy and William A. Stewart. 1986. Unexpected reflexive parameters in pidgins and creoles. Accepted for presentation, LSA 1986. *LSA Bulletin*.
 ———. 1986. Cross-linguistic parameters for reflexives: towards a descriptively adequate binding theory. *LSA Abstract*.
 ———. Reflexives and anti-reflexives: basic paradigm to test. (Undated)
 Carden, Guy. 1987. Reflexive parameters in Twi (Akan). MS.
 Radford, Andrew. 1981. *Transformational syntax: a student's guide to Chomsky's extended standard theory*. Cambridge: University Press.
 Napoli, Donna Jo. 1979. Reflexivization across clause boundaries in Italian. *Journal of Linguistics* 15.1:1-28.
 Saah, Kofi. 1987. Reflexive parameters in Akan. Paper read at a meeting of the Linguistic Circle of Accra, 19th May, 1987.
 Saha, P.K. 1987. Reflexivization in American English. *Journal of American Speech* 62.3:211-234.

Revision received November, 1989.