

STRUCTURES OF COORDINATION IN EWE

Alex K. Dzameshie
University of Ghana, Legon

This article examines coordination in Ewe, looking at various aspects of this syntactic phenomenon, including: (1) overt and covert coordination, (2) phrasal and clausal coordination, (3) the interface between coordination and compression rules (e.g., conjunction reduction, reciprocity, etc.), and (4) constraints on coordination.

Cet exposé étudie la coordination en langue ewe, en tenant compte de divers aspects de ce phénomène syntaxique, y compris: (1) la coordination explicite et implicite; (2) la coordination au niveau des propositions et des groupes de mots; (3) le rapport entre les règles de la coordination et celles de la compression (ex. la réduction de conjonction, la réciprocité, etc.); et (4) les limites de la coordination.

0. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is essentially to provide a descriptive analysis of the syntactic phenomenon of coordination in Ewe. It will highlight the salient syntactic features of Ewe coordinate structures including structural types, devices for achieving syntactic/verbal compactness, and certain syntactic constraints on coordination.

Coordination is a common but important syntactic phenomenon exhibited by natural languages. In investigating this phenomenon, scholars have paid attention to its associated syntactic features such as the connecting devices, structural types, compression rules, and constraining principles (Christophersen and Sandved 1977; Stockwell 1977; Baker 1978; Radford 1988, O'Grady and Dobrovolsky 1992).

In structures of coordination, the conjuncts are typically joined by means of conjunctions. The constituents of the coordinate structure may be either 'part of sentences' (as in (1) and (2) below) or clauses (in (3) and (4) below).

- (1) The manager and I made the choice.
- (2) John and the boys will arrive today.
- (3) The team played very well, and their coach was very pleased.
- (4) Jane cleaned the kitchen, and her sister cooked supper.

The conjuncts in a coordinated structure may appear in either their full forms or shortened versions. The production of the shorter forms may be explained in terms of compression rules which include conjunction reduction, gapping, reciprocation, and anaphoric substitution (Stockwell 1977; Baker 1978). Sentence (6), for instance, is a compact version of (5), produced through the rule of conjunction reduction which deletes the second of any two identical elements that are found in parallel structures.

- (5) Henry *sleeps a lot*, and Tom *sleeps a lot*.
- (6) Henry and Tom sleep a lot.

The italicised clauses in (5), for example, are parallel and so the rule deletes the second occurrence of the identical element *sleeps a lot*, thus providing (6).

The reciprocal formation rule introduces each other into a coordinate structure in English as a device for achieving syntactic compactness as in (7) and (8).

- (7) Kweku respects Tony, and Tony respects Kweku.
- (8) Kweku and Tony respect each other.

Stockwell (1977) discusses other devices for achieving syntactic compactness. These are gapping and anaphoric substitution. Gapping is very similar to conjunction reduction, but differs from it in an important respect. While conjunction reduction

deletes identical elements in general, gapping is limited to the deletion of identical verbs. The anaphoric substitution rule achieves structural compression by replacing a longer phrase with only part of that phrase or even with a special single word (e.g., a pronoun).

Radford's (1988) discussion of coordination in English draws attention to the pertinent issue of the kinds of elements that can or cannot be conjoined. The following points emerge from his analysis. First, only sequences that are legitimate constituents can be conjoined; nonconstituent elements cannot be coordinated. Second, in ordinary or simple coordination, only sequences belonging to identical categories can be conjoined. For example, while English allows the conjoining of pairs of noun phrases or pairs of prepositional phrases, an NP and PP, for instance, cannot be coordinated. A related property is that the category type of the resultant coordinate structure produced is identical to the category type of the conjuncts (O'Grady and Dobrovolsky 1992).

Radford (1988) identifies two types of conjoining: ordinary/simple coordination and shared constituent coordination. Ordinary coordination involves conjoining identical word-level categories (9) or phrasal categories (10). What Radford identifies as shared constituent coordination refers to coordinate construction in which there is a sequence shared between the two conjuncts (11).

- (9) Verbs
He eats and drinks a lot.
- (10) Adjectives
She is unassuming and sociable.
- (11) Nouns
Mr. Tola accepted, but Mr. Kome rejected the committee's proposals.

1. COORDINATION IN EWE

In Ewe, sentences such as (12) and (13) illustrate structures of coordination.

- (12) **míe kpɔ Adzo kple Afi**
we see Adzo and Afi
We saw Adzo and Afi.
- (13) **Kofi he zikpui eye wò nɔ anyi de e dzi**
Kofi pull seat and he sit ground PREP its top
Kofi pulled the chair and sat on it.

The words **kple** 'and' and **eye** 'and' are conjunctions. As will be discussed in more detail below, Ewe manifests both phrasal and clausal coordination as illustrated by (12) and (13), respectively. In Ewe, a structure of coordination may involve connecting either parts of a sentence (12) or connecting clauses (13) by means of conjunctions, disjunctives, or special connectors.

2. TYPES OF COORDINATION

Coordinate structures in Ewe may be classified in terms of two criteria: (1) syntactic structure and (2) linguistic coding. With reference to the first criterion, two types of coordination may be identified: phrasal and clausal. Based on the second criterion, two types of coordination may be distinguished: overt and covert coordination.

2.1 PHRASAL COORDINATION

In Ewe, simple coordination involves conjoining words or sequences that belong to only one grammatical category: the NP. All the NPs in a coordinate nominal phrase may be nouns as shown in (14) and (15).

- (14) *Yao kple Abla wo dzo*
 Yao and Abla they leave
 Yao and Abla have left.
- (15) *wo le gutsuwo kple nyɔnuwo di-m*
 they be men and women want-PROG
 Men and women are wanted.

Alternatively, all the NPs in the coordinate structure may be pronouns as in (16).

- (16) *veviedodo hĩa na nye kple wò*
 perseverance need for me and you
 You and I need to persevere.

A phrasal structure of coordination may comprise a combination of nouns and pronouns, since they both are categorized as noun phrases, as evidenced in (17) and (18).

- (17) *wò kple Kɔmi di-m Adzo le*
 you and Kple want-PROG Adzo be
 It is you and Kɔmi Adzo is looking for.
- (18) *ema nye mí kple nufialawo fe dɔdeasi*
 that be we and teachers POSS duty
 That is a duty for us and teachers.

Note that certain scholars (e.g., Radford 1988) make a distinction between word-level and phrase-level elements in ordinary/simple coordination. In (16), for example, the conjuncts *gutsuwo* 'men' and *nyɔnuwo* 'women' are single words. On the other hand, in (19), the italicised conjuncts are phrases. However, since phrases, technically, can be either single words or group of words, this article does not make a distinction between word-level conjuncts and word-group level constituents; both types are treated as cases of phrasal coordination.

- (19) *ame siwo xlẽ Agbo fe agbalẽ-a kple ame siwo se efe*
 person who read Agbo POSS book-the and person who hear his
nufɔ-a ɖi ɖase be agbalẽnyala ga wò nye
 talk-the bear witness that scholar great he be
 Those who read Agbo's book and those who heard his talk testified that he is a great scholar.

2.2 CLAUSAL COORDINATION

The second structural type of coordination evident in Ewe may be called clausal coordination. This involves conjoining two or more clauses by a coordinating conjunction as may be seen in (20) and (21).

- (20) *Kɔku vu vɔ-a eye Kɔmi ge ɖe xɔ-a me*
 Kɔku open door-the and Kɔmi drop PREP room-the in
 Kɔku opened the door and Kɔmi entered.
- (21) *Ama to de-a Afɛ fo detsi eye Yawɔ ɖa*
 Ama pound palm^nut-the Afɛ prepare soup and Yawɔ cook
akple
 akple
 Ama pounded the palm nut, Afɛ prepared the soup, and Yawɔ cooked *akple*.

Another type of clausal coordination that occurs in Ewe is the one referred to by Radford (1988) as shared constituent coordination.

- (22) **Eyram mɔ anyi eye Selɔm nɔ anyi ɖe aba dzi**
 Eyram lie ground and Selɔm sit ground on bed top
 Eyram lay down and Selɔm sat on the bed.

In this sentence, the sequence **ɖe aba dzi** 'on the bed' is shared between the two conjuncts **Eyram mɔ anyi** 'Eyram lay down' and **Selɔm nɔ anyi** 'Selɔm sat down'.

As in English (cf. Radford 1988), there is an important restriction on shared constituent coordination in Ewe. This type of coordination is possible only in those cases where the shared sequence is a possible constituent of each of the conjuncts. For instance, (22) is grammatical because the shared sequence **ɖe aba dzi** 'on the bed' is a constituent of both conjuncts. This is clear from (23) which is the fuller version of (22).

- (23) **Eyram mɔ anyi ɖe aba dzi eye Selɔm nɔ anyi ɖe aba dzi**
 Eyram lay down on the bed and Selɔm sat down on the bed

The ungrammaticality of (24) can be explained in terms of the restriction stated above. Note that (24) is the elliptical form of (25).

- (24) ***Eyram mɔ eye Selɔm nɔ anyi ɖe aba dzi**
 (25) **Eyram mɔ anyi me aba dzi eye Selɔm nɔ anyi ɖe aba dzi**

In (25), **anyi ɖe aba dzi** 'down on the bed' is not a constituent of any of the clauses containing it. The point is that in the first conjunct, **anyi** 'down' goes with the verb **mɔ** 'lie' to form the phrasal verb **mɔ anyi** 'lie down'. Similarly, in the second conjunct, **anyi** goes with the verb **nɔ** 'sit' to form the phrasal verb **nɔ anyi** 'sit down'. So, the contrast is clear: the sentence with a coordinate structure in (22) is grammatical because the sequence **ɖe aba dzi** 'on the bed' is a constituent of both conjuncts, but (24) is ungrammatical because the constituency restriction has been violated; the sequence **anyi ɖe aba dzi** is a constituent of neither of the conjuncts.

Another important principle governing coordination in Ewe is that only elements that belong to identical categories (viz., nouns/noun phrases or clauses) can be conjoined. (Note that in Ewe, verbs and adjectives cannot be overtly conjoined). For instance, sentences (26) and (27) are grammatical because the conjoined elements in each case are members of the same category. In (26) the italicised constituents are NPs and can, therefore, be conjoined with the conjunction **kple** 'and'. In (27) the conjoined sequences are clauses and therefore **eye** 'and' is used as the coordinating conjunction.

- (26) **Kɔbla nye nufiala kple senyala**
 Kɔbla is teacher and lawyer
 Kɔbla is a teacher and lawyer.
- (27) **Kɔbla fe dɔme nyo eye wɔ-wɔ-a nuteɖe hã**
 Kɔbla POSS stomach good and he-does-HAB faithful also
 Kɔbla is a kind person and he is faithful too.
- (28) ***Kɔbla nye gadzikpɔla eye nufiala**
 Kɔbla is treasurer and teacher
 Kɔbla is a treasurer and a teacher.

On the other hand, (28) is ungrammatical because the conjoined elements (italicised) belong to different categories: while the first sequence is a clause, the second constituent is an NP. These two different categories of constituents cannot be conjoined with the coordinate conjunction **eye** 'and'. This conjunction conjoins only clausal sequences such as those in (27).

2.3 OVERT COORDINATION

As indicated earlier, coordination in Ewe may be overt or covert. Coordination is overt when the phrases or clauses are explicitly conjoined with an overt connector. As in other languages, Ewe has a closed set of coordinating conjunctions that are used for conjoining phrases or clauses.

In phrasal structures of coordination, the conjunctions **kple** 'and', **kpakple** 'and', and the disjunctives **alo** 'or' and **loo alo** 'either . . . or' may be used. Other connectors used in phrasal coordination are: **hã** 'and, also' and **o . . . o** 'either . . . or, neither . . . nor'. Note that **kpakple** is normally used to indicate that the items in the list have been exhaustively listed. It must be noted that, as in English, there is no limit on the number of coordinated items that can precede the coordinating conjunction in Ewe (see (30)). Consider examples (29)–(33) in which some of the conjunctions indicated above have been used.

- (29) **ame tsitsi-wo kple ðeviwo**
 person old-PL and children
 adults and children
- (30) **awu afɔwui afɔkpa atakpui kpakple atalegbe**
 shirt sock shoe shorts and trouser
 shirt, sock, shoes, and a trouser
- (31) **yeye-tɔ alo xoxo-tɔ**
 new-one or old-one
 the new one or the old one
- (32) **Kofi alo Kɔbla**
 Kofi or Kɔbla
- (33) **afɔkpa loo alo awu**
 shoe either or shirt
 either a shoe or a shirt/dress

Observe that sometimes the determiner **siaa** 'both/all/as well as' may be used to indicate that all the items in a compound phrase are included. That is, the use of **siaa** emphasizes the point that none of the items in the list is excluded. For instance, one may say:

- (34) **amewo lãwo kple xewo siaa a-kpe fu**
 humans animals and birds all FUT-meet suffering
 Human beings, animals as well as birds will suffer.
- (35) **wò kple nye siaa di-m Adzo le**
 you and I all want-PROG Adzo is
 Adzo wants both you and me.

Note that **siaa**, in a sense, is like English both. But there is an important difference: Whereas both may be used only when two items or two groups of items are involved, the use of **siaa**, is not restricted to two items; it may also be used when the items are more than two (as in 34). In certain contexts, **katã** 'all' may be used interchangeably with **siaa** as illustrated by (36) and (37).

- (36) **wò kple Adzo katã di-m me-le**
 you and Adzo all want-PROG I-be
 I want both you and Adz
- (37) **wò kple Adzo siaa di-m me-le**
 you and Adzo all want-PROG I-be
 I want both you and Adzo.

The use of *katā* / *siaa* like this suggests the meaning 'not just this or that, but both or all'. For instance, (36) and (37) means 'I want not just you or Adzo; I want both of you'.

In clausal structures of coordination, the conjunction *eye* 'and' is used for additive coordination, *gake* 'but' for contrastive coordination and *alo* / *loo alo* 'or/either . . . or' are used for alternative coordination as shown in (38)–(41).

- (38) *ɲutsu-a tu ʋə-a eye wò dzo*
man-the close door-the and he leave
The man closed the door and left.
- (39) *Kɔmi do yli gake ame aɖeke me-se-e o*
Kɔmi speak shout but person none NEG-hear-it not
Kɔmi shouted but no one heard it.
- (40) *Kofi ate ɲu a-dzra-e na wo alo ate ɲu a-na wo*
Kofi can FUT-sell-it to them or can FUT-give them
Kofi can sell it to them or give it to them.
- (41) *é di be ye-a ɖu nu gba loo alo ye-a*
s/he want to s/he-FUT eat thing first either or s/he-FUT
le tsi gba
bathe water first
Does s/he want to eat first or take a bath first?

Recall, as was pointed out in (28), that the conjunction *eye* is never used in phrasal coordination; this explains the ungrammaticality of (42). Conversely, *kple* is restricted to phrasal coordination. (43) is ungrammatical because two clauses are conjoined with *kple*.

- (42) a. *nyɔnua ɖo aɖanu na Edem kple Eyram*
woman offer advice to Edem and Eyram
The woman advised Edem and Eyram.
- b. **nyɔnua ɖo aɖanu na Edem eye Eyram*
- (43) a. *Kɔsiwɔ fo detsi eye Abla ɖa akple*
Kɔsiwɔ prepare soup and Abla cook akple
Kɔsiwɔ prepared soup and Abla cooked *akple*.
- b. **Kɔsiwɔ fo detsi kple Abla ɖa akple*

2.4 COVERT COORDINATION

Covert coordination occurs when two or more clauses are juxtaposed without any explicit connecting word, but the sentence is interpreted by native speakers as possessing a conjunction in the underlying structure.

- (44) *legba to ɲku me-fo-a aɖaba o*
idol grow eye NEG-blink-HAB eyebrow not
An idol has eyes but it never blinks.

In this sentence, there is an 'understood' conjunction *gake* 'but' that invisibly connects the two clauses *legba to ɲku* 'an idol has eyes' and *mefo-a aɖaba o* 'it doesn't blink'.

Certain serial structures in Ewe may be considered as a special kind of covert clausal coordination. Typically, a serial construction comprises a sequence of verbs or verb phrases preceded by a NP which serves as the subject for all the VPs. Some examples of serial constructions in Ewe are given in (45)–(47).

- (45) **Akɔfa fɔ vɔ vɔ-a kaba**
 Akɔfa wake open door-the quickly
 Akɔfa got up and and opened the door quickly.
- (46) **Kɔku tsɔ ga-a de kotoku me**
 Kɔku take money-the put pocket inside
 Kɔku pocketed the money.
- (47) **Mawuli de gbɔ**
 Mawuli reach return
 Mawuli went and came back.

There are several perspectives on verb serialisation as well as unresolved issues on the subject. Reviewing various viewpoints on the underlying form of serial structures, Larson (1991) distinguishes three different proposals. One view is that all the sequenced verbs might constitute a coordinate structure. This assumes that all the verbal elements occupy a coordinate status in that none of them is subordinate to the other. A second perspective is that the VPs in a serial structure "might represent a nested sequence of adjunctions to a main verb" (p. 187). This suggests that all the other verbs perform a series of secondary predications and, thus, are subordinate to the first (i.e., principal) verb in status. The third proposal is that the relation among the sequenced verbs might be neither coordinate nor subordinate. In this view, the VPs might constitute a series of verbal complements.

The perspective that is immediately relevant here is the one that views the VPs in a serial structure as constituting a structure of coordination. In this view, the VPs may be seen as truncated versions of underlying clauses. It must be emphasised, however, that even though in a given language the VPs in certain serial constructions may constitute a structure of coordination, the relation among the verbs in certain other serial structures may not be coordinate at all. In other words, a particular language (e.g., Ewe) may have coordinate serial constructions as well as non-coordinate ones. In coordinate serial verb constructions, the constituent verbs represent discrete actions performed at different points in time; each of these verbs maintains its distinct lexical meaning (Bamgbose 1982). In a sense, the sequenced VPs may be seen as representing a 'list' of actions performed by the subject NP. For instance, a sentence such as (48a) may be analysed as comprising the underlying clauses listed in (48b)–(48f), which are intuitively understood by native speakers as conjoined by the clausal conjunction *eye* 'and' in the underlying form. It may thus be assumed that the surface form in (48a) is produced through the application of the compression rule referred to in the literature as conjunction reduction rule. (See more on compression rules below).

- (48) a. **Afi ɣutsɔ fɔ fu mo kplɔ xɔme do dzo da nu**
 Afi herself wake wash face sweep room light fire cook thing
egbea
 today
 Afi herself woke up, washed her face, swept the room, lit the stove, and cooked today.
- b. **Afi ɣutsɔ fɔ egbea**
 Afi herself woke up today.
- c. **Afi fu mo egbea**
 Afi washed her face today.
- d. **Afi kplɔ xɔme egbea**
 Afi swept the room today.

e. **Afi do dzo egbea**

Afi lit the stove today.

f. **Afi da nu egbea**

Afi cooked today.

Now consider the serial constructions in (49)–(53).

- (49) **nyɔnua do yli yɔ srɔ̃a**
 woman let[^]out shout call spouse
 The woman yelled, calling her husband.
- (50) **ɲutsua zɔ yi ŋgɔ**
 man walk go forward
 The man stepped forward.
- (51) **Adzo kɔkɔ wu Ama**
 Adzo tall pass Ama
 Adzo is taller than Ama.
- (52) **Aku tsɔ asi fo dɛvi-a**
 Aku take hand beat child-the
 Aku spanked the child with her hand.
- (53) **Kɔmi dze mɔ yi Keta**
 Kɔmi start road go Keta
 Kɔmi set off for Keta.

Unlike (48a), serial structures such as (49)–(53) pose a problem to an analysis that assumes that all serial constructions comprise VPs in coordination. Normally coordination involves conjoining constituents that represent discrete entities, actions, etc. But in the serial constructions in (49)–(53) the VPs do not indicate separate actions. For example, within the context suggested by (52), **tsɔ asi** ‘take hand’ and **fo** ‘beat’ are not separate actions; they are simply a decomposition of the same concept (viz., spank) into serial components. In non-serialising languages (e.g., English), a concept such as spank will normally be rendered by means of a single lexical verb. Serial structures such as these in which there is decomposition of single concepts into serial constituents have been referred to as complex serial verb constructions, which are distinguished from coordinate serial verb constructions (Bamgbose 1982).

To summarise at this point, our claim is that in Ewe there is covert coordination in only certain serial constructions; these are coordinate serial verb constructions in which the sequenced verbs retain their individual lexical meanings and can be clearly perceived as indicating separate actions. But there are other serial constructions in Ewe for which covert coordination cannot be claimed since the sequenced VPs do not incontrovertibly represent discrete actions.

In Ewe, special connectives that are called serial connectors (SER[^]CONN) in this article are sometimes used in serial structures. One such connector is **he** ‘and then’ which appears in (54).

- (54) **Esi le tsi do awu kla srɔ̃-a he-dzo yi**
 Esi bathe water wear dress inform spouse-the SER[^]CONN-leave go
dɔme
 work

Esi took a bath, dressed up, said goodbye to her husband, and then left for work.

Another serial connector is **da** ‘and’ in (55). This connector is usually used when simultaneous actions are involved as evident in (55) and (56)

- (55) **Akuvi yi *ɖa-gblɔ* nya la na Kɔmi**
 Akuvi went SER[^]CONN-say case the to Kɔmi
 Akuvi went and disclosed the matter to Kɔmi.
- (56) **Kofi de *dzi-a* yi *ɖa-gbe* *adɔba* la**
 Kofi climb height-the went SER[^]CONN-pluck pawpaw the
 Kofi climbed (the pawpaw tree) and plucked the pawpaw.

Another structure in which covert coordination occurs in Ewe is what Ameka (1991) calls the overlapping clause. In this kind of construction, two clauses are juxtaposed, and the subject of the second clause is coreferential with the object of the first clause as in (57).

- (57) **sukuviawo fo *fiafitɔ* la wò ku**
 students beat thief the he die
 The students beat up the thief, and he died.

In this sentence, *fiafitɔ la* 'the thief', which is the object of the first clause *sukuviawo fo fiafitɔ la* 'the students beat up the thief', is coreferential with the pronoun *wò* 'he', which is the subject of the second clause *wò ku* 'he died'.

3. COORDINATION AND COMPRESSION RULES

Like other languages (e.g., English), Ewe has certain syntactic devices by which syntactic or verbal compactness is achieved. Three of these compression rules conjunction-reduction, anaphoric substitution, and reciprocal formation.

3.1 CONJUNCTION-REDUCTION RULE

This rule becomes operational on a coordinate construction that exhibits parallel structures. When this rule applies, it deletes identical elements in the parallel structures. For example, in (49) the clauses *Afi ɖu nu* 'Afi ate' and *Adzo ɖu nu* 'Adzo ate' are parallel structures; thus it is permissible to delete the second occurrence of the identical italicised elements.

- (58) **Afi *ɖu* *nu* eye Adzo *ɖu* *nu***
 Afi eat thing and Adzo eat thing
 Afi ate, and Adzo ate.

In sentences such as (58), the rule performs a second operation: the subject of the second clause along with the conjunction *eye* is moved to the position immediately before the predicate. These moved elements are conjoined to the subject of the first clause to form a compound subject. But since Ewe does not permit the use of *eye* in phrasal coordination, this conjunction is replaced by *kple* (which is one of the permissible phrasal conjunctions). The output of the rule is seen in (59).

- (59) **Afi *kple* Adzo *wo-ɖu* nu**
 Afi and Adzo they-eat thing
 Afi and Adzo ate.

Observe that the compound subject of such a resulting sentence is 'repeated' in the form of an anaphoric pronoun *wo* 'they'.

It is this conjunction-reduction rule that governs the formation of coordinate serial verb constructions, we argue. Consider the serial construction in (61), for instance, which is the product of this rule where the subjects of the two conjoined clauses are identical (see the italicised NPs in the underlying form in (60)). In sentences such as (60), the rule deletes the second occurrence of the identical NPs along with the conjunction *eye*, thus producing the serial construction in (61).

- (60) *Ama fɔ eye Ama do go*
 Ama wake and Ama get out
 Ama got up and went out.
- (61) *Ama fɔ do go*
 Ama wake get out
 Ama got up and went out.

Note that in Ewe, while verbs can be covertly conjoined by juxtaposing them (as in (61) and (62b)), they cannot be overtly conjoined. This is evident in (62c) and (62d). This restriction contrasts with English, for instance, in which verbs may be overtly conjoined through conjunction reduction as in (63b) which is the reduced version of (63a).

- (62) a. *Kofi ti kpo eye wò do yli*
 Kofi jump and he shout
 Kofi jumped and shouted.
- b. *Kofi ti kpo do yli*
 Kofi jumped and shouted.
- c. **Kofi ti kpo eye do yli*
- d. **Kofi ti kpo kple do yli*
- (63) a. Mary writes and Mary bakes.
 b. Mary writes and bakes.

3.2 ANAPHORIC SUBSTITUTION RULE

In Ewe, the anaphoric substitution rule uses a special word (e.g., a pronoun) to represent a noun or a longer phrase. For instance the pronouns *wò* 'he' and *e* 'him' in (65) are anaphoric substitutes for the italicised NPs *Kofi* and *Mawu* 'God', respectively in (64). Note that the anaphoric pronoun used is always identical in number with the antecedent NP.

- (64) *Kofi vɔa Mawu eye Kofi ɔo-a to Mawu*
 Kofi fear God and Kofi listen-HAB ear God
 Kofi fears God and obeys Him.
- (65) *Kofi vɔa Mawu eye wò ɔo-a to-e*
 Kofi fear God and he listen-HAB ear-him
 Kofi fears God and obeys Him.

3.3 RECIPROCAL FORMATION RULE

Ewe also achieves verbal/syntactic compactness by means of what is referred to as reciprocal formation rule. In Ewe, this rule introduces the reciprocal pronoun *wo nɛwo* 'each other' into the truncated version of certain conjoined structures as illustrated in (67).

- (66) *Kɔsiwɔ bu-na Edem eye Edem bu-na Kɔsiwɔ*
 Kɔsiwɔ respect-HAB Edem and Edem respect-HAB Kɔsiwɔ
 Kɔsiwɔ respects Edem, and Edem respects Kɔsiwɔ.
- (67) *Kɔsiwɔ kple Edem wo bu-na wo nɛwo*
 Kɔsiwɔ and Edem they respect-HAB they selves
 Kɔsiwɔ and Edem respect each other.

4. CONCLUSION

This article investigates the syntactic phenomenon of coordination in Ewe by examining various key aspects of the phenomenon, including its linguistic coding, types exhibited, governing principles or restrictions, and the interface between coordination and compression rules. The study shows that like English and some other languages, shared constituent coordination in Ewe is governed by the constituency condition (Radford 1988; Baker 1978). In addition, in Ewe (like English), ordinary phrasal coordination is regulated by the principle of identical categories condition (Radford 1988; O'Grady and Dobrovolsky 1992). Beyond this, Ewe exhibits certain peculiar restrictions: while noun phrases can be overtly conjoined, it is ungrammatical to conjoin verbs by means of coordinating conjunctions. Another important syntactic restriction exhibited by Ewe relates to the use of two coordinating conjunctions: **kple** and **eye**. While the former is restricted to phrasal coordination, the latter is found only in clausal coordination. The study also uncovers an interesting feature about the determiner **siaa** 'both.' While in English the use of both is restricted to two items, **siaa**, on the other hand may occur with not only two referenced items, but also three or more items.

It is also shown in this study that Ewe has serial verb constructions, a phenomenon known in several other West African languages. They are cited as examples of the conjunction reduction rule.

This study has an important implication for future research on the phenomenon of coordination. The syntactic characteristics of coordination in Ewe, especially the restrictions on the use of **kple** and **eye**, the constituency and category principles and the syntactic behaviour of **siaa** call for crosslinguistic studies of this syntactic phenomenon. Such studies will uncover not only the identifiable universal features of the phenomenon, but also its language-specific peculiarities as well as its typological features.

REFERENCES

- Ameka, Felix K. 1991. Ewe: Its grammatical constructions and illocutionary devices. Ph.D. dissertation, Australian National University.
- Baker, C. L. 1978. Introduction to generative-transformational syntax. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1989. English syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Bamgbose, Ayo. 1982. Issues in the analysis of serial verb construction. *JWAL* 12.2:3–21.
- Christophersen, Paul and Arthur O. Sandved. 1977. An advanced English grammar. London: Macmillan Education.
- Larson, Richard K. 1991. Some issues in verb serialization. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative and cognitive approaches*, 185–210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lefebvre, Claire. 1991. Take serial constructions in Fon. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative and cognitive approaches*, 37–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- O'Grady, William and Michael Dobrovolsky, eds. 1992. *Contemporary linguistic analysis: An introduction*. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman.
- Radford, Andrew. 1988. *Transformational grammar: A first course*. Cambridge: Cambridge Universities Press.
- Stockwell, Robert P. 1977. *Foundations of syntactic theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.