

## VERB EXTENSIONS IN LIKPE (SEKPELÉ)

Felix K. Ameka

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics

f.k.ameka@hum.leidenuniv.nl

The noun class systems of the Ghana-Togo-Mountain (GTM) languages have attracted a lot of interest and have been used as a defining feature of the group as the “Class languages” (Westermann and Bryan 1952). Verb extensions, or verb derivational suffixes, also occur in the GTM languages yet they have not received much attention. This paper examines the syntax and semantics of verb extensions in Likpe (SEKPELÉ) ISO 639-3: lip, a Na-Togo language. Likpe has two rather productive extensions: the causative **-s** and the associative **-ko**. In addition there are two semi-productive ones **-f** ‘contactive’ and **-ə** ‘transitive’. Each of these forms is described and the possibilities of combining the extensions are explored. The question is also raised as to whether some recurrent forms at the ends of certain verb stems such as a final **-kV** as in **táks** ‘be.on’ or a final **-ma** as in **yoma** ‘hang’, are historically verb extensions. This is related to the lexicalization and fossilization of verb extensions with some verb stems e.g. **bóko** ‘bring’ < **b** ‘come’+ **ko** ‘ASSOC’. The use of the associative marker on both verbs and pronouns and its relation to a comitative preposition and the NP linker are used to assess the claims about the possible grammaticalisation paths of verb extensions.

Le system des classes dans les langues Ghana-Togo-Mountain (GTM) ont généré beaucoup d’intérêt, et mené à leur designation comme “Class Languages” (langue de classes) (Westerman et Bryan 1952). Des extensions verbales ou des derivations suffixales verbales aussi se trouvent dans les language GTM, mais elles n’ont pas été accordées la même attention. Dans cet article, j’examine la syntaxe et la semantique des extensions verbales dans Likpe (SEKPELÉ) ISO 639-3: lip, une language Na-Togo. Likpe à les deux extensions productives, **-s** causatif et **-ko** associatif. Je discute aussi deux suffixes semi-productifs, **-f** ‘contactif’ et **-ə** ‘transitive’. Je discute chacune de ces suffixes et recherche les possibilites de combinaison des extensions. Je soulève aussi la question à savoir si des formes recurrentes à la fin de quelques mots telles que **-kV** dans le mot **táks** ‘etre.sur’ ou **-ma** dans le mot **yoma** ‘suspendre’, sont historiquement des extensions verbales. Ceci est lié à la lexicalisation et la fossilisation des extensions verbales des mots tels que **boko** ‘apporter’ < **b** ‘venir’ + **ko** ‘ASSOC’. J’évalue l’hypothese des trajets de grammaticalisation en tenant en utilisant l’utilisation de la forme associative pour des verbes et des pronoms, d’une part, et leur relation à la preposition comitative et le connecteur de NP, d’autre part.

### 0. INTRODUCTION

“Verb extension” is a term used in the Africanist literature to designate the verbal affixes that are used to extend the verb root to form verb stems. Such affixes may change the valency of the root or stem to which they are added. For example, they can be used to derive reflexive, reciprocal, causative, or passive verb stems. They may also signal the direction or orientation of the state of affairs coded in the verb root/stem, such as ventive, or itive. And they may mark aspectual distinctions on the verb, e.g. stative. It is worth noting that some of the meanings expressed by these affixes are of an inflectional nature (e.g. aspect) while others are of a derivational character (e.g. change in valency). “Derivational” functions seem more common (Hyman 2007). Verb extensions occur across the four phyla of the African continent; as such the phenomenon has been described as an areal characteristic of African languages (Meeussen 1975, Gilman 1986, Heine and Zelealem Leyew 2008, Creissels et al 2008). Heine and Zelealem Leyew (2008:21) observe further that such derivational verb suffixes “can also be observed widely in non-African languages”.

Verb extensions occur in the Ghana-Togo-Mountain (GTM) languages, which used to be called *Togorestsprachen* or Central Togo languages, yet their having this feature has not been given the same prominence in the literature as their active noun class and concord systems. In fact the occurrence of verb extensions in Greenberg’s (1963) Kwa (= “Old” Kwa, Williamson 1989) has generally been underplayed. Recall

that for Westermann and Bryan (1952) the hallmark of a Kwa language is that it lacks verb derivations (cf. Hyman 2004). The relative lack of attention to verb extensions in GTM languages reflects a more widespread attitude. Gerhardt (1988) observes that in comparison to noun class prefixes, verb extensions have not received the same level of attention from comparative linguists. Commenting with specific reference to West African languages, he writes: “The verbal systems of West African languages with their intricate morphologies, apparently lend themselves less readily than the nominal class systems to a quick analysis. Linguists have therefore had more difficulties in presenting them” (Gerhardt 1988:3).

Reflecting on a similar question of why the comparative study of Niger-Congo verb extensions have lagged behind that of noun classes, Hyman (2007:150) admits that verb extensions “are less easy to study”. Their elicitation requires a more in-depth familiarity with the grammar in comparison to nouns and their agreement patterns. Noun morphology, in his view, can be read off a word list. Derived verb stems with extensions will not necessarily show up in word lists. Hyman gives two other reasons. One is, as already pointed out, verb extensions are less unique to Niger Congo. A further factor concerns the difficulty in recognising and segmenting verb extensions as “they are more subject to erosion, fusion, and reanalysis than (noun class) prefixes.” (Hyman 2007:151). I suggest that with respect to GTM languages, this last factor may have been instrumental in the relative neglect of the study of their verb extensions in comparison to their noun class systems. In a later section (Section 3), I will demonstrate this difficulty in recognising some verb extensions synchronically in Sekpelé.

With respect to Niger-Congo languages as a whole, Hyman (2007) points out that the widespread assumption is that Proto-Niger-Congo had verb extensions. It is furthermore assumed that the more complex and complete systems such as those found in Bantu (see Trithart 1983, and Schadeberg 2003 for Proto-Bantu reconstructed verb extensions) and Atlantic correspond to the Proto situation (see Voeltz 1977 for reconstructions of Proto-Niger-Congo verb extensions). From a crosslinguistic and typological point of view, the Niger-Congo verb extension systems have two salient characteristics, according to Creissels et al (2008:109): (i) the Niger-Congo systems contain distinct reciprocal and decausative forms, whereas middle voice forms are used in other languages; (ii) there are applicative extensions in the Niger Congo languages obligatorily used to introduce complements, which are treated as obliques in other languages, as direct arguments. As we shall see below one of the verb extensions that have been retained in the GTM languages including Likpe has the function of introducing an oblique argument like a comitative as a direct argument.

Many Kwa languages, for example Gbe and Akanic languages, have not retained verb extensions, while GTM languages have retained them. Here as elsewhere in the comparative study of the Kwa and Niger Congo languages at large, the GTM languages can provide crucial information for understanding both the processes of internal development, and in this particular case, of the loss of verb extensions, and of changes due to contact. My aim therefore in this paper is to examine the system of verb extension in Likpe and cast it in the general comparative historical and typological context of these forms in Kwa and Niger-Congo.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: In the next section (Section 1) some background information relevant for understanding verb extensions in Likpe is provided. Next, the productive verb extensions: the causative and the associative; and the semi-productive extensions: the “contactive” and the “stative” / “transitive” are discussed (Section 2). This is followed by a discussion of putative erstwhile verb extensions (Section 3). Section 4 briefly examines the ordering and stacking of

extensions in one verb word. Section 5 concludes the paper with a summary and reflections on the diachrony of extensions and comparison with other GTM languages.

## 1. SEKPELÉ: THE LANGUAGE AND ITS SPEAKERS

Sekpelé is the auto-denomination of the language spoken in 12 villages in the Likpe traditional area, east and north-east of Hohoe (the district capital and an Ewe (Gbe) speaking town) as far as the Togo border in the northern part of the Volta Region of Ghana. Sekpelé (ISO code 639-3; lip) belongs to the Na-Togo branch of Kwa (Williamson and Blench 2000, Blench this volume).

Sekpelé or Likpe has two major dialect divisions, namely, Sekpelé and Sekwa.<sup>1</sup> It is a tone language with three level tones High, Mid and Low as well as Falling and Rising. The latter is phonetically generated. Each syllable is a tone bearing unit. It has an eight vowel system with both oral and nasalized counterparts: /i ĩ e ẽ ε ε̃ a ã ɔ ɔ̃ o ɔ̃ u ũ / . It has a root-controlled Advanced Tongue Root (ATR) vowel harmony system, with height assimilation in some cases, where the first syllable of the stem determines the ATR value of the prefixes. For instance, the two syllables in the noun stem **-kɔbé** ‘calabash’ have opposite ATR values, but it is the ATR value of the first syllable that determines the ATR value of prefixes: **le-kɔbé** ‘calabash (sg)’ and **a-kɔbé** ‘calabashes’. When this root is compounded with a noun **n-tɔ** ‘alcoholic drink’ and the verb **nɔ** ‘drink’ and functions as the head and therefore determines the class of the resulting word, the prefix has ATR value because the vowel of the first syllable in the stem is +ATR. Thus we have the compounds **di-tɔ-nɔ-kɔbe** [CM-alcohol-drink-calabash] ‘alcohol drinking calabash’ and **ɔ-tɔ-nɔ-kɔbe** [CMPL-alcohol-drink-calabash] ‘alcohol drinking calabashes’. The value of the vowels in the verb root also determines the value of the verbal prefixes but not of the verbal suffixes. Hence unlike the nominal and the verbal prefixes, the productive verb derivational suffixes do not vary in form (although it is tempting in some cases to think that some verb endings do).

Likpe is an SVO language. Grammatical relations are determined by constituent order supported by cross-referencing of the Subject on the verb and the forms of pronominal arguments in the clause. Objects are not cross-referenced on the verb. The Subject cross-reference markers do not signal agreement and are neutralised with respect to number of the Subject. They are distinct from the Subject pronominal clitics and other pronominal forms. The cross-referencing of Subjects can be seen as a covert characterisation of clause types with two sets of markers distinguished: one set (glossed SCR) occurs in pragmatically unmarked main clauses and another set (glossed DEP) occurs in dependent as well as pragmatically marked clause types such as relative clauses, term focus and content question constructions where the lexical subject is in the scope of focus. The former (SCR) has two forms—a central or a mid front vowel (/a/ or /ə/ or /e/ whose choice depends on the cross height of the stem verb vowel, and ∅—which are used in “action” and “stative” clauses respectively, as illustrated in (1).

- (1) a.    **míbé**        **a-bokó**        **ń-tu**        **n-tsyuá**  
          mother    SCR-bring    CM-water    AGR-some  
          Mother brought some water.

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to my Likpe language consultants over the years, especially the late Mr. A. K. Avadu, Mr E.K. Okyerefo, Madam Ekudi Atsyor, madam Georgina Dzata, Ms Justina Owusu Mr. Tevor and his daughter Betty for helping me to understand this and other aspects of their language. I am also grateful to the participants of the August 2006 International Workshop on the Ghana-Togo-Mountain languages, Ho, Ghana, for their comments on my initial ideas on the topic.

- b. **akónɔfi bá-mé e-tsyətsyí bé-lu.fə lə ɔ-púnú kálo**  
 cat AGR-DEF SCR-run 3PL-enter LOC CM-table under  
 The cats ran under the table.
- c. **u-sióbí é-mé é-bé dí-yó**  
 CM-girl AGR-DEF SCR-come CM-house  
 The girl came home.
- d. **li-kplíbí nɔ-mé táké lə ɔ-púnú əsúə**  
 CM-pot AGR-DEF be.on LOC CM-table surface  
 The pot is on the table.

The dependent cross-reference markers are **n-** and **IV-** where the V harmonises with the vowel in the verb stem. The choice of **n-** or **IV-** depends on temporality: the former is used with general present time hence it gets used in present stative constructions, as in (2). The latter tends to be associated with past or non-present situations and hence more active situations. The focus counterpart of (1a) with a dependent cross reference marker on the verb, signalling that the Subject is in focus, is (2a). A Subject relative clause is instantiated in (2b) where the relativised Subject is cross-referenced by the dependent marker on the verb. A where-question involving the subject also takes the dependent cross reference marker as shown in (2c).

- (2) a. **míbé lé-bokó ní-tu n-tsyuə**  
 mother DEP-bring CM-water AGR-some  
 MOTHER brought some water.
- b. **o-saní é n-kpé kɔ-nó**  
 CM-man AGR DEP-be.in CM-goodness  
 the man who is good
- c. **sé fə ke-yifo-kó n-kpé?**  
 where 2SG CM-work-place DEP-be.in  
 Where is your work place?

There are three double complement constructions. In one type of double object construction in the semantic frame of TRANSFER the DATIVE argument precedes the THEME. For the PLACEMENT type the THEME precedes the LOCATIVE. While the order of the 'TRANSFER' construction is fixed, in the PLACEMENT construction the Figure (theme) Ground (location) alignment can be reversed where the LOCATIVE precedes the THEME. A third structure with two complements is one in which the second complement is a situational argument, and typically coded as a nominalised verb. This structure is used to characterise various circumstantial aspects of states of affairs such as modality, attitudinal meanings and aspect (see Ameka 2002, 2009 for further details).

In predicative possessive structures, the possessor and the possessed can be linked to either the Subject or Object function. Thus the linking may also involve Figure-Ground reversal.

Likpe also makes use of serial verb constructions (SVCs) in which the verbs must share the same Subject. The Subject is expressed on subsequent verbs by a Subject pronominal concord marker. Example (1b) above is an instantiation of an SVC where the subject 'cats' is cross-referenced on the first verb **tsyətsyí** 'run' by the SCR **e-**. It is however marked on the second verb by the pronominal **bé** '3PL'.

Negation is marked on the verb by a nasal prefix which occurs immediately before the verb root and after any other verbal markers like tense markers or Subject

proclitics. It undergoes homorganic nasal assimilation depending on the root consonant in the verb, e.g., **m-ba** ‘not come’; **n-ta** ‘not throw’;

Modifiers follow the head in a noun phrase and, except for the qualifiers, agree with the noun head in number and class. The possessor precedes the possessed in a possessive nominal phrase. Pronominal possessors are juxtaposed to the possessed while nominal possessors are linked by a possessive marker (**e**)to ‘POSS’.

Likpe, like the surrounding languages, has two classes of adpositions—a class of two prepositions: a locative **lɔ/lí** and a comitative/instrumental **kú**; and a class of about a dozen postpositions grammaticalised from body parts and environment terms (Ameka 2007).

## 2. SEKPELE VERB EXTENSIONS AND PREDICATE STRUCTURE

Sekpele has retained a number of verb derivational suffixes. The verb extensions form a cline from the productive to semi-productive to frozen forms. Two of these extensions are rather productive. These are the causative **-sɔ** (Section 2.1) and the associative **-ko** (Section 2.2). In addition there is a semi-productive extension **-fɔ** which can be characterised as a “contactive” or telic or directional derivative (Section 2.3). Furthermore there is a verb ending **-ə** which is transparently and synchronically a stative extension on some verbs, for instance, **si** ‘sit’, and transitive extension on some other verb roots like **lu** ‘leave, exit’ but which has become frozen with other verb roots (Section 2.4). Moreover, some endings on verbs could be thought of as frozen or formal extensions which cannot be analysed synchronically as such (Section 3). The extensions can be stacked, but it appears that a maximum of two extensions can occur on a verb root (Section 4).

Ring (2008:45-46) in fact treats multisyllabic verbs in Sekpele as monosyllabic verb roots with a restricted set of verbal suffixes. As he put it: “multisyllabic verbs appear with a limited number of syllables which can be considered suffixes.” The “suffixes” identified there independently include the productive and semi-productive extensions as well as some of the forms I consider frozen extensions. However, some of the items they list as multisyllabic are questionable. For instance they list **hia** ‘want/need’ as consisting of a stem and a Vowel. But this form is a borrowing or, at worst, an areal word found in other geographically related languages with the same meaning and same form and is considered a root. The point of this example is that one cannot treat all apparent multisyllabic forms as being made up of a root and a suffix.<sup>2</sup> An attempt is made in this paper to motivate the synchronic suffixal status of the forms discussed. In addition in Ring (2008), the associative extension is cited as **-nko** and is presented as an alternate of another ending **-nkli**. The **-n-** of at least the associative morpheme is definitely a ligature, and probably the one on **-nkli** is the same thing. Moreover, I think these two endings have different functions so they are not alternatives as presented. I will suggest in section 3.3 that **-nkli** seems to be a “separative” extension which is no longer productive.

The structure of a monoverbal predicate is shown in (3).

### (3) Predicate structure:

Subject Pronoun/ cross-reference - TAM-NEG-Verb root-suffix-suffix

<sup>2</sup> A couple of the final endings that are mentioned in Ring (2008) can be viewed as putative extensions but they are not discussed further in this paper. Three of such forms are:

(a) **-dí** as in **kpali** ‘call’, **tidi** ‘touch/feel’, **fuádi** ‘tear’ and **sadi** ‘comb’.

(b) **-be** as in **labe** ‘lie’ and **siabe** ‘chop’.

(c) **-ni** as in **mini** ‘swallow’, **sini** ‘open’, **woni** ‘write’ and **fumini** ‘fly’

As we shall see below when there is more than one suffix some principles govern the order in which they occur (Section 4).

## 2.1 THE CAUSATIVE EXTENSION –SÉ

The causative suffix is used with some change of state verbs that denote physical property and result state verbs to form causative verb stems. The meaning of such verb stems is ‘cause to V’. The relationship between the causative verb stem and the non-extended verb stem is quite transparent in most cases and is evident from the following pairs of examples:

- (4) a. **ku-tu kó-mó e-tú**  
 CM-soup AGR-DEF SCR-boil  
 The soup is boiled.
- b. **tú-sé ku-tu kó-mó**  
 boil-CAUS CM-soup AGR-DEF  
 Heat up the soup.
- (5) a. **o-sanklí ú-tsyi se-labé**  
 3SG-wake.up 3SG-come.from CM-sleep  
 He woke up from sleep.
- b. **o-sanklí-sé wə**  
 3SG-wake.up-CAUS 3SG  
 He woke her up.
- (6) a. **se-bo siá-mó e-lú**  
 CM-towel AGR-DEF SCR-become.pierced  
 The towel is pierced. i.e. The towel has a hole in it.
- b. **o-be é-mó e-lu-n-sé li-yibibi ná-mó**  
 CM-arrow AGR-DEF SCR-pierced-LIG-CAUS CM-fruit AGR-DEF  
 The arrow has pierced the fruit.
- (7) a. **awu nyá-mó fáká lí peg**  
 garment AGR-DEF hang LOC peg  
 The garment hangs on the peg.
- b. **fi kótu é-mó a-fáka-sé li peg**  
 take:IMP coat AGR-DEF 2SG-hang-CAUS LOC peg  
 Hang the coat on the peg.

In all the instances presented so far, the derived causative stem involves an increase in the valency of the verb. Thus in the (b) sentences a new argument is introduced which has the role of agent/causer. However there are forms involving the causative suffix which have intransitive uses. For instance, the form **fə-sé** ‘fulcrum break of pliable things’ is a causativised form of the verb **fə** ‘open, expose the inside of something’. It is used intransitively in (8a) and transitively in (8b).

- (8) a. **u-yibí é-mó ə-fə.sé**  
 CM-stick AGR-DEF SCR-break  
 The stick broke.
- b. **ú-fə.sé u-yibí é-mó**  
 3SG-break CM-stick AGR-DEF  
 He broke the stick.

Similarly, the form **fu.só** ‘squat’, which has the causative morpheme lexicalised with it, is used intransitively in (9a) and, in (9b), it occurs in an SVC where it shares its object argument with the first verb **fi** ‘take’. Another positional verb **kpə.só** ‘lean’ also has the causative extension lexicalised with it, and is used intransitively in (10).

- (9) a. **li-kpéfi**    **nó-mó**    **fu.só** **ló**    **le-kpomé**    **ká.ma**  
 CM-child    AGR-DEF    squat LOC    CM-chair    back  
 The child squats behind the chair.
- b. **fi**            **li-tsyitsya** **e- fu.só**    **ló**    **wə**  
 take:IMP    CM-basket 2SG-squat    LOC    3SG  
 Take the basket and cover it (= chicken).  
 i.e., take the basket and put it upside down over it.
- (10) **a-gbeli**            **nyá-mó**    **kpə-só**    **ló**    **li-kubíku**    **əsúś**  
 CM-cassava        AGR-DEF    lean            LOC    CM-stump    surface  
 The tubers of cassava are leaning against the tree stump.

While the forms **fə** ‘open’ and **fə.só** ‘break’ (see example 8) are both in my corpus, it is hard to relate some of the other causative verb stems to synchronically recognisable roots. For instance, I do not have a verb root **fu** in my corpus that could be the base for the verb **fu.só** ‘squat’ in my database. However, in a Likpe verb wordlist collected by Kevin Ford in the early 70s, he recorded a verb **fu** ‘squat’ which he suggests was used intransitively with the causative derivative **fu.só** ‘squat’ used transitively. This suggests that the root could have fallen out of use and synchronically cannot be related to the causative form.

The causative extension in Likpe seems to produce some special semantic effects in some contexts. It is lexicalised in the form **wu-n-só** ‘help’. I have not found a related root **wu**. However, it appears that causative extensions in some Bantu languages like Zulu are used to express what is called an “adjutive” i.e. help, specialised meaning (Schadeberg 2003:73). The causative extension in Likpe also can be used to resolve some ambiguities. For instance, the intransitive use of the verb form **lo** means ‘finish’, as in (11b). But when the same form occurs in a transitive construction it translates as ‘kill’, as in (11a). When this root is extended with the causative morpheme it forms a transitive verb of the ‘finish’ sense.

- (11) a. **ó-lo**            **o-kplako**  
 3SG-finish    CM-pig  
 He killed the pig.
- b. **ke-yifó**    **ká-mó**    **á-lo**  
 CM-work    AGR-DEF    SCR-finish  
 The work is finished.
- c. **ó-lo-só**                    **ke-yifó**    **ká-mó**  
 3SG-finish-CAUS        CM-work    AGR-DEF  
 He fished the work.

In general, many ‘change of state’ or inchoative verbs can be causativised by extending them with the causative suffix. One striking exception is the verb **ba** ‘shatter-break’ which does not occur with a causative extension but does participate in a causative/inchoative verbal alternation as illustrated in (12) (see e.g. Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005 on multiple argument realisation).

- (12) a. **li-kkplibi nɔ́-mɔ́ á-ba**  
 CM-pot AGR-DEF SCR-break  
 The pot broke.
- b. **Sáka á-ba li-kkplibi nɔ́-mɔ́**  
 Name SCR-break CM-pot AGR-DEF  
 Saka broke the pot.

Another set of verbs, static locative verbs like **tákó** ‘be.on’, **kpé** ‘be.in’ and **tí** ‘be covered’, do not take the causative extension to form caused locative verb stems that would translate as ‘put on’, ‘put in’ or ‘cover’. Rather the causative locative interpretations are derived from their use in transitive or serial verb constructions (see Ameka 2007). This means that this morphological causative formation strategy is just one of the causativization devices available in the language.

The causative extension can be added to a verb stem that has already been extended with say the associative extension, to which we now turn.

## 2.2 THE ASSOCIATIVE EXTENSION –KO

### 2.2.1 The verb extension -ko

Verbs derived using the associative verb extension **-ko** ‘ASSOC’, as the label implies, tend to include in their frame a participant who is “associated” with another participant in the realisation of the state of affairs. The nature of the association relation may be one in which one participant does the same kind of thing together with another participant. Such situations are reciprocal ones and in this case the form is used to extend verb roots that can be thought of as symmetrical predicates where participants do things to one another as in example (13). Verbs which have ‘interaction’ or ‘joint-action’ or ‘do together’ as part of their semantics can occur in one of two patterns at least: either the participants are conjoined, or form a plural entity and together function as a single argument in a one-place construction (see 13a, 14a). On the other hand, they can be presented as independent participants filling different core roles where one person is doing something to the other one, and the other one does the same (interaction). Or one participant does something with the other (because they both want the same thing), that is they do the same thing together in the same place and at the same time (see Wierzbicka 2009 and references therein on the meanings of ‘joint-action’ and ‘inter-action’). In these cases, the predicate consists of the verb root and the associative extension. In such structures, the participant viewed as initiating or controlling the joint action is linked to the Subject position in a two-place (or three-place) construction as in (13b) and (14b). The participant viewed as the non-initiator of the action is linked to the Object position. In these instances of use, the associative extension can be viewed as an applicative affix enabling the introduction of an otherwise oblique or peripheral argument into the clause as a core argument.

- (13) a. **boo-tsyá ka.ma**  
 IPL:POT-join back  
 We shall meet later, i.e. see you later.
- b. **n-tsyá-ko mbá n-tsyí ɔ-ko é-mɔ́**  
 1SG-join-ASSOC those DEP-carry CM-ghost AGR-DET  
 ‘I met those who carried the corpse.’



- (14) a. **li-kpéfi nǎ-mǎ kú wo ambe á-kpo**  
 CM-child AGR-DET LINK 3SG mother SCR-fight  
 ‘The child and his mother fought’
- b. **li-kpéfi nǎ-mǎ á-kpo-n-ko wó ambe**  
 CM-child AGR-DET SCR-fight-LIG-ASSOC 3SG mother  
 ‘The child fought (with) his mother’

An accompanying participant in a situation which would otherwise be thought of as an oblique comitative participant may be added through the marking of the verb with the associative extension, as illustrated in (15).

- (15) a. **Sáka kú Esí a-ye-n-kó o-kpâ bǎ-bǎ**  
 Name LINK Name SCR-walk-LIG-ASSOC CM-dog 3PL-come  
 Saka and Esi walked with a dog and they came.
- b. **u-tsyí wə ɔ-n-tə-ko ke-bikə-kó**  
 3SG-carry 3SG 3SG-LIG-move-ASSOC CM-bury-place  
 He carried her and went with her to the burial ground.

However, an instrumental or manner accompanying participant cannot be introduced into the core frame of a predication by the use of an associative extended verb. For instance in example (16a), the agent participant bought a drink and went home together with the drink. This information is packaged in an SVC where the second verb is an associative extended one. Compare this with example (16b) and the unacceptable (16c) where the entity that the agent went home with is happiness, depicting the manner associated with the event. Such a participant cannot be promoted to a core status with an extended associative verb, as the ungrammaticality of (16c) shows. Note that it is marked in (16b) with the comitative/instrumental preposition **kú**.

- (16) a. **ó-ya n-tǎ ú-su-kó dí-yó**  
 3SG-buy CM-drink 3SG-go-ASSOC CM-house  
 He bought a drink and went with (it) home.
- b. **ú-su dí-yó kú di-suáyúś**  
 3SG-go CM-house COM CM-happiness  
 He went home with happiness.
- c. **\*ú-su-kó di-suáyúś dí-yó**  
 3SG-go CM-happiness CM-house

The associative extension seems to have been lexicalised with some verbs to derive other verbal meanings. Thus it is suffixed to the verb **tǎkǎ** ‘be.on’, yielding **tǎkǎ-n-ko** ‘follow’. A person followed, i.e. the target of a movement with the aim of being in the same place as the other, is introduced as the Object of this derived associative verb, as in (17).

- (17) **Pius ɔ-tǎkǎ-n-ko Betty**  
 Pius SCR-be.on-LIG-ASSOC Betty  
 Pius followed/chased Betty.

The associative extension is also lexicalised with the verb **bǎ** ‘come’ to form the verb **bǎ-ko** ‘come with, bring’ as illustrated in (18). It seems to be also lexicalised in the

verb **mininko** ‘wrestle’. I have not yet come across a related root. The associative suffix also seems to be lexicalised with the verb **tsyi** ‘come.from’ to express the verbal meaning ‘begin’ or ‘start’ as illustrated in (19a, b).

- (18) **Sáka kú Ésí a-boko o-tē**  
 Saka COM Esi SCR-come.ASSOC CM-goat  
 Saka and Esi brought a goat.
- (19) a. **bo-mble é-tsyí.ko o-la bo-to kekleke**  
 1PL-all SCR-origin.ASSOC CM-prayer CM-throw IDEO.hard  
 We all started praying earnestly.
- b. **u-fiebi ko dí-tsyi.ko bɔ-sɔ kekleke**  
 CM-wind just DEP-origin.ASSOC CM-hit IDEO.hard  
 A wind just began to blow hard.

The associative extension then is used to derive verb stems that introduce and mark a co-participant, an accompanying participant or a participant that is the target of a movement in an event frame. However, the associative verb extension is not used to introduce accompanying instrumental participants. This function is reserved for the preposition **kú** ‘COM’. This preposition can also be used to introduce comitative participants into the clause either in an adjunct phrase to the clause or as an adjoined phrase within an NP. One striking thing about the associative extension is that it is used within an NP to mark inclusive participation just as the comitative preposition is used to conjoin additive NPs. This use of the associative extension in an NP is discussed in the next section.

### 2.2.2 The associative extension on pronouns

The associative extension is also used to derive inclusive pronouns. The inclusionary construction in which such forms are used have a template that looks like this: [Pronoun-ASSOC NP]<sub>NP</sub>. Such structures open up a participant role and indicate that the referent(s) of the pronouns together with the participants represented by the juxtaposed NP are involved in doing the same thing, as is evident from the examples in (20).

- (20) a. **wo-n-ko wə ɔ-nyimi li-bɔ mfo**  
 3SG-LIG-ASSOC 3SG CM-sibling DEP-come here  
 HE WITH HIS SIBLINGS came here.
- b. **bo-n-ko mɔ ba-yetsyuɔ be-tsyuɔ**  
 1PL-LIG-ASSOC 1SG CMPL-mate AGR-some
- e-sú Klatsyi**  
 SCR-go Krachi  
 I and some of my mates went to Krachi.

In this usage also, the associative extension is used to introduce a co-participant of a joint action. Thus there is a unitary function of the form. The possible relations between the associative extension and the comitative preposition are returned to in the concluding section.

## 2.3 THE “CONTACTIVE” EXTENSION –FÉ

This extension has been found so far on three verb roots. These are listed in (21). The use of the derived verbs is illustrated in (22).

- (21) Verb roots and their derived “contactive” forms
- |    |           |       |              |                        |
|----|-----------|-------|--------------|------------------------|
| a. | <b>lu</b> | leave | <b>lu-fé</b> | enter, arrive, welcome |
| b. | <b>tu</b> | ?meet | <b>tu-fé</b> | spit                   |
| c. | <b>yi</b> | ?fill | <b>yi-fé</b> | get.down, descend      |
- (22) a. **ɔ-yi-fé**                      **lɔ nkenke bó-mó əsúə**  
 3SG-V-CONT                      LOC bicycle                      AGR-DET surface  
 He got down from the bicycle. (Pear Story)
- b. A: **ə-lu-fé**  
 2SG-leave-CONT  
 Welcome
- B: **waa!**  
 OK

The common denominator of the extension in the contexts where it has been found seems to be a contact with an endpoint of the activity denoted in the verb stem. Because of this, I initially described it as a “telic” or “directional” extension. But these do not capture the idea that the endpoint is somehow reached. It seems that a term like “contactive” (suggested to me by Gerrit Dimmendaal) is more revealing. As is evident in example (23), it is possible to add a causative extension to a “contactive” extended verb form.

- (23) **yi-fé-só**                      **li-kpéfi nɔ-mó**  
 V-CONT-CAUS:IMP                      CM-child                      AGR-DET  
 Put the child down (from the back).

Even though this extension is very restricted, it appears that because it is used in the everyday welcoming routine adjacency pair, as in (22b), its transparent relation to at least the verb root **lu** ‘leave’ will persist for some time.

## 2.4 THE VERB SUFFIX –Ə: STATIVE AND/OR TRANSITIVE EXTENSION

The clearest context in which this suffix has been found and in which it can be analysed as a derivational suffix is when it occurs with the verb root **si** ‘sit’. There are arguably one or two other verb roots to which it is attached where the relation between the root and the derived verb may seem transparent. For many other forms, the suffix appears to have become fossilised with the verb roots. In one context of occurrence with the verb **si** ‘sit’ the suffix appears to have a transitive function. Consider the forms in the following examples:

- (24) a. **si-ə**                      **ká-só**  
 sit-VE:IMP                      CM-ground  
 Sit down.
- b. **si-ə**                      **le-kpomé**  
 sit-VE:IMP                      CM-chair  
 Sit on the chair.

- c. **di-sé**      **o-kpâ**      **dí-si-ə**  
 ??-where    CM-dog    DEP-sit-VE  
 Where did the dog sit?

In other contexts the extended verb form **si-ə** ‘seat’ appears to be used for past interpretation with causative meaning. Compare the difference between the sentences in (25a) and (25b) where the latter, with the extended verb form, has a more durative and past habitual reading and the former, a present durative reading. This appears to involve some state reading hence the extension could also be viewed as a stative suffix.

- (25) a. **n-sí**      **Cape Coast**  
 1SG-sit    Cape Coast  
 I live/stay in Cape Coast. (present)
- b. **n-sí-ə**      **Cape Coast**  
 1SG-sit-VE Cape Coast  
 I lived in Cape Coast./ I used to live in Cape Coast. (past)

These readings are reflected in some of the collocations in which the extended form **siə** participates. Thus in (26a) the verb form is used in the sense of ‘live’ in the past. And in (26b) it has the same past interpretation but with a reading reflecting the positional semantics of the root. In (26c) there is a transitive interpretation at play.

- (26) a. **u-sí-ə**      **n-kpó**      **kentsye**  
 3SG-sit-VE CM-life    long  
 He lived (a) long (life).
- b. **u-si-ə**      **m-bí**  
 3SG-sit-VE CM-faeces  
 He shat/defecated.
- c. **u-sió**      **é-mé**      **ə-si-ə**      **ko-lá**  
 CM-woman    AGR-DET    SCR-V-VE    CM-dream  
 The woman dreamt.

It appears that the form **si-ə** ‘be seated, be settled’ which suggests a stative reading of the suffix is used in a greeting context. Thus a greeting to someone in the afternoon or evening is **é-si-ə oo** [2SG-sit-VE UFP] literally ‘you are seated’ i.e. ‘greetings’. From its use in such a context, the form has gained a nominal interpretation, as is evident in example (27), as ‘greeting’.

- (27) **té**      **Kofi si.ə**      **ə-té**      **mɛ**  
 give:IMP    Kofi greeting    2SG-give    1SG  
 Give greetings to Kofi for me.

The extended form **si-ə** ‘greeting’ can be further extended with the causative extension yielding a verb interpretation ‘to greet’ as illustrated in (28).

- (28) **məə-si.ə-sé**      **mé**  
 1SG.POT-greet-CAUS    3PL  
 I greet them. i.e. I send them greetings.

Thus far it seems reasonable to treat the suffix **-ə** as an extension on a verb like **sí** ‘sit’ to generate transitive, past and stative readings. The form **-ə** occurs at the end of various verb stems too. In most of these cases, it can be seen as a transitivity form. For instance the verb **luə** ‘throw/go away’ is probably derived from the verb **lu**



e. **fáka** hang e. **táka** rise

Although one cannot very readily segment the forms into a root and a **-kV** ending, the semantics of most of the verbs in which the ending occurs suggests that the **-kV** form could probably be linked to a Proto-Niger-Congo **\*ke** extension reconstructed by Voeltz (1977) as a ‘stative neuter’ extension. This form is supposed to have an **\*ik** reflex in Proto-Bantu (Hyman 2007).

Most of the verbs listed in (31) do have stative uses. The translations of ‘bury’ and ‘take.out’ for two of them suggest more active forms, however, their perfective uses can have a post state reading. This suggests that a stative reading could be attributed to the **-kV** ending. Speculations about the etymology and comparable data from neighbouring GTM languages for two of the forms **tákó** and **fáka** provide further hints for the plausible status of **-kV** as an erstwhile or frozen extension in these verbs.

The verb **tákó** ‘be.on’ is a basic stative verb. But it can be used transitively and have a placement or caused position reading without any further morphological measure (Ameka 2007). A plausible etymology for **tákó** ‘be.on’ is that it is derived from the general locative verb **tá** ‘be.at’ for inanimates plus the **-kV** ‘stative’ extension. A parallel situation has been suggested for the form **teĩ** ‘be.on’ in Tuwuli, a Ka-GTM language. Harley (2005:56) suggests that **teĩ** ‘be.on’ comes from **te** ‘put.on’ plus an extension **-ni** ‘stative’. A further plausible piece of evidence for the claim that **-ke** in the Likpe word **léke** ‘become good’ may have been an extension is that there seems to be a root cognate with the stem in Tuwuli, namely, **le** ‘become good’.

Similarly, evidence from Lelemi (Na-GTM), a geographical and genetic neighbour of Sekpelé, suggests that the form **fáka** ‘hang, point suspension’ may well have been made up of **fá** and a suffix **ká** although this cannot be readily justified synchronically. In Lelemi there is a verb root **fa** whose infinitive form is given by Allan (1973:246) as **bo-fa** ‘to hang down’ which can be causativised/transitivised with an extension as in **bo-fa-la** ‘to hang something’. Thus **fáka** ‘hang, point suspension’ could morphologically be made up of **fá** + **VE** (stative) which in turn can get causativised as **fáka-só** ‘cause to be hanged’ as we have seen in example (7), repeated here as (32).

- (32) a. **awu nyá-mó fáká lí peg**  
 garment AGR-DEF hang LOC peg  
 The garment hangs on the peg.
- b. **fi kótu é-mó a-fáka-só li peg**  
 take:IMP coat AGR-DEF 2SG-hang-CAUS LOC peg  
 Hang the coat on the peg.

Interestingly, some of the other forms with **-kV** ending can host other extensions. Thus we have seen that **tákó** ‘be.on’ can take the associative to form **tákó-n-ko** ‘follow’. The verb **táka** ‘rise’ can be causativised to form **táka-só** ‘raise’. These suggest a stacking of suffixes, a topic to which we return in Section 4.

There seems to be enough evidence from a Likpe internal perspective and from comparative as well as historical perspectives that would support a derivational suffix analysis of the **-kV** ending. Tempting as this is, more work needs to be done with respect to the history before we can be sure.

## 3.2 THE –MA ENDING

A –**ma** form occurs at the end of a number of verbs in Sɛkpele. A number of these that I have come across are listed in (33).

(33) –**ma** ending verbs

- |    |              |               |    |                           |                   |
|----|--------------|---------------|----|---------------------------|-------------------|
| a. | <b>yóma</b>  | hang dangling | b. | <b>tsyilama</b> [tsyrama] | surround          |
| c. | <b>kloma</b> | remember      | c. | <b>floma</b>              | turn into, change |

It is again tempting to suggest that this extension is a retention of the Proto-Niger-Congo \*-**ma** reconstructed as a stative positional extension (Voeltz 1977) with an \*-**am**- reflex in Proto Bantu (cf. Schadeberg 2003, Hyman 2007). A piece of evidence in support of such a position is the positional words **yóma** ‘hang dangling’, which is probably based on a verb **yo** ‘reach, arrive’, and **tsyilama** ‘surround’ (see Ameka 2007 for their semantics). A stative account (but not necessarily a positional one) can be argued for **floma** ‘turn into, change’ and **kloma** ‘remember’. In fact, **kloma** ‘remember’ can be causativised to derive an active verb **kloma-só** ‘remind’. Nevertheless, it remains an open question whether the –**ma** ending can be synchronically analysed as a derivational suffix. For one thing it does not seem to be productive as the causative or associative are. In addition, the relation between the roots and the stems derived using the –**ma** ending do not seem that transparent.

## 3.3 THE –LV ENDING

There is an –**IV** ending on various verbs that suspiciously looks like an extension. Some of the verbs in which it is found are listed in (34).

- |         |             |             |          |             |             |                |
|---------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| (34) a. | <b>yilá</b> | cross       | b.       | <b>kulá</b> | hide        |                |
|         | c.          | <b>wula</b> | yawn     | d.          | <b>yila</b> | become/get hot |
|         | e.          | <b>kulə</b> | get long |             |             |                |

From this sample of verbs, it is evident that the –**IV** ending appears in transitive (34 a, b) and intransitive ones (34 c, d, e). The semantics of the intransitive ones suggests an inchoative feature. It is very likely that this ending is related to the –**LA** causative extension used in Lɛlemi (Allan 1973), which we mentioned earlier. The –**IV** ending does have a transitive causative flavor. However, one of the forms **kulə** ‘get long’ can host the causative morpheme to derive **kulə-só** ‘lengthen’. Can one isolate –**IV** synchronically as a verb extension? Its behavior is not as robust to warrant such an analysis.

## 3.4 THE –NKLI ENDING

As already indicated, Ring (2008) presents –**nkli** and –**nko** as if they were alternatives of the same ending. However, as we have already seen (Section 2.3) –**nko** is clearly a productive associative extension that introduces comitative arguments into the core frame of a clause. The –**nkli** ending, on the other hand, seems to be an erstwhile frozen “separative” suffix (cf. e.g. Schadeberg 2003). Consider the meanings of the forms in which this ending is found, as listed in (35).

(35) Verbs ending in –**nkli** (Sɛkpele) or –**ngli** (Sekwa) (see Tornu 2007 Appendix)

- |    |                |               |        |
|----|----------------|---------------|--------|
| a. | <b>nyankli</b> | <b>yangli</b> | untie  |
| b. | <b>sinkli</b>  | <b>singli</b> | return |

c. **sankli** wake up

The meanings of the forms reflect the meaning proposed for the “separative” extension in Bantu, namely, “movement out of some original position” (Schadeberg 2003:78). Thus one moves from a position or state of sleep and hence wakes up and we get the **-nkli** ending on the verb. One has a change of location back to where they were previously, meaning that they return to a place and the verb used to express this has an **-nkli** ending on it. The verb **nyankli** demonstrates more clearly the “separative” sense of the ending. In fact it is the one form with this ending which can be rather confidently related transparently to a synchronic root.

There is an intransitive verb **nyā** ‘become lost’ which as we have seen in Section 2.2 can enter into construction with the causative extension to derive the form **nya-n-só** ‘lose something, release’. It seems reasonable to claim that when a “separative” ending is added to this root, it derives a form which means ‘untie’. In the appendix in Ring (2008) **nyankli** and **nya-n-só** are given as synonyms and one can see the relationship—to lose something, release something (causative) and to loosen or untie something (separative) have similar meanings.

As we have seen with other endings, some of the forms with the **-nkli** ending can enter into construction with another suffix. Thus **sankli** ‘wake up’ can be causativised to form **sankli-só** ‘wake someone up’ which we have seen in Section 2.2 example (5), repeated here for convenience in (36).

- (36) a. **o-sanklí**            **ú-tsyi**            **se-labé**  
 3SG-wake.up    3SG-come.from    CM-sleep  
 He woke up from sleep.
- b. **o-sanklí-só**            **wə**  
 3SG-wake.up-CAUS    3SG  
 He woke her up.

It appears that the **-nkli** ending may have been an extension but synchronically it has frozen with various roots and it is no longer an active derivational suffix.

In this Section 3, we have seen various endings of verbs which, from the available evidence, could be argued to be erstwhile verb extensions. They are rather inert and are only partially recognisable as recurrent form-meaning pairings. One can hardly claim that any of these endings are active derivational verb suffixes. Nevertheless, they provide clues to the stacking of suffixes on verbs, a topic to which we now turn.

## 4. STACKING OF EXTENSIONS

In Section 2, I suggested that there are at least two slots for verb derivational suffixes. In the course of the discussion, I pointed out the forms that combine with each other. The basic principle of the stacking seems to be that the lexicalised endings occur closest to the root. Thus all the frozen verb endings discussed in section 3 occur closest to the root before any other suffixes.

In terms of the productive and semi productive suffixes, the overriding principle is that the “causative” extension occurs at the rightmost edge, the second suffix position. The first position is filled by the “contactive” the “associative” or the “transitive/stative”. These three extensions in occurring in the first position seem to be mutually exclusive. They can each co-occur with the causative but not with each other. In example (37a) below we have the normal order of the “associative” and “causative” suffixes on the verb **su** ‘go’. In (37b), however, the order of these two suffixes is reversed. This can be explained by the fact that the “causative” is semi-



lexicalised in the verb **wu-n-só** ‘help’ so it occurs closest to the root and then followed by the “associative”.

- (37) a. **ú-nə**      **le-kpome** **u-su-ko-só**      **ká.ma**  
 3SG-pull    CM-chair    3SG-go-ASSOC-CAUS      back  
**séké**      **ló**    **ɔpúnú**      **eflɔ**  
 a.little    LOC table      near  
 She pulled the chair and went with it backwards a little from the table.
- b. **ba-wuu-n-só-ko**      **wə** **u-bíkə**      **wó** **ambe** **é-mé**  
 3PL-??-LIG-CAUS-ASSOC    3SG 3SG-bury    3SG mother AGR-DEF  
 [He had hoped that the people he helped would come and...]  
 They would help him bury his mother

This further shows that the lexicalized suffixes occur first and then the productive forms occur. And for the productive ones, the order is fixed: “contactive”/ “associative”/ “transitive/stative” followed by the “causative”. The occurrence of the causative at the end of a string of extensions in Likpe is the opposite of the ordering principle proposed for Bantu known as the CARP template: causative, applicative, reciprocal, passive (Hyman 2003). The order in Likpe is a mirror image in a way of the Bantu template. Whether this has any significance for the diachrony of suffixes in Niger Congo remains an open question.

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the foregoing I have described two productive extensions-the causative and the associative-and two rather restricted extensions-the “contactive” and the “stative”/transitive. I have also suggested that some endings of verbs look like erstwhile or frozen extensions on the verb. The applicability of the more or less productive extensions to the same verb root is demonstrated with two verb roots in (38).

- (38) a. **tsyá**      join, meet (intr.)      b. **lu**      leave, exit  
**tsyá-ko**      meet with (tr.)      **lu-fó**      arrive, enter  
**tsyá-só**      reconnect      **lu-n-só**      pierce  
**lú-ə**      exit (transitive)

Along the way, I have suggested some links to Proto-Niger-Congo reconstructions which still need to be further investigated. One question that needs further exploration is the history of the forms and their relation to forms in other languages. I can only offer some observations here.

The form of the causative extension in Likpe **-só** is rather widespread in Benue-Kwa languages and could probably be a reflex of the causative extension reconstructed for Proto-Niger-Congo as **\*-ci \*-ti** (Voeltz 1977, Hyman 2007). For this to be substantiated, one needs to work out a bit more systematically the sound correspondences. But the development is plausible.

The associative extension is a bit more complicated. My perusal of the reconstructed forms does not immediately point to a form that could be the ancestor of the Likpe form. However, the associative extension seems to be one derivational suffix that many of the GTM languages have retained. The equivalents of the associative extension I have come across are listed in (39).

## (39) Associative extensions in GTM languages

Tuwuli	<b>-mla</b>	joint participant, applicative (Harley 2005)
Avatime	<b>-no</b>	applicative (Rebecca Defina and Saskia van Putten, p. c.)
Nyagbo	<b>-no</b>	comitative (James Essegbey p.c.)
Tafi	<b>-no</b>	comitative (Mercy Lamptey Bobuafor)
Lɛlemi	<b>-ngu</b>	joint participant (Allan 1973), comitative (Höftmann 1971)
Sekwa	<b>-ngu</b>	associative
Sekpele	<b>-(n)ko</b>	associative

The interesting thing is that the forms listed show a clear divide between the Ka-Togo (Tuwuli, Avatime, Nyagbo and Tafi) forms and the Na-Togo (forms). In fact, it is significant that the Sekwa form and the Lɛlemi one are identical suggesting that it is probably an older form which got transformed to the Sekpele variant by the normal processes of simplification and devoicing that have taken place in the latter dialect.

Two pathways for the emergence of verb extensions in Niger-Congo languages have been proposed, namely, serial verb constructions through verbal attraction, and the (re)grammaticalization of a preposition to a verbal suffix (Hyman 2007 and references therein). The latter development seems more plausible for the associative extension in Likpe and Lɛlemi. Given that both languages have a comitative/instrumental preposition **kú** ‘with’, it is plausible that a string like [Verb Prep NP] gave rise to a [Verb + Suffix NP] structure. A scenario for such a development is given in (40):

## (40) Possible path of development of the associative extension in Likpe (and Lɛlemi)

Verb [**kú** NP]<sub>Prep</sub> -> \*[Verb-**n-kú**]<sub>Verb</sub> NP -> Verb-**ngu** NP -> Verb-**nko** NP

One question that this scenario raises is whether there was a parallel development in the NP, where the NP linker **kú** ‘and, with’ got attracted to plural pronouns in inclusionary constructions; or the use in the NP developed through the spread of the verbal associative marker to the NP domain. It is difficult to establish how the processes occurred.

It is apparent from the foregoing that verb extensions in a GTM language like Likpe provide fertile ground for exploring issues in the typological and historical aspects of the various languages. They deserve as much attention as the nominal classification systems which have been their defining typological feature till now. Perhaps the retention of an associative/comitative extension can also be used to characterize these languages.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AGR	agreement marker	NEG	negation marker
ASSOC	associative extension	PL	plural
CAUS	causative extension	POT	potential
CM	class marker	SCR	subject cross reference
COM	comitative preposition	SG	singular
CONT	contactive extension	TAM	tense-aspect-modality marker
DEF	definiteness marker	V	Verb
DEP	dependent cross reference marker	VE	verb extension

IDEO	ideophone	VENT	ventive
IMP	imperative	1	first person
LIG	ligature	2	second person
LOC	locative preposition	3	third person

## REFERENCES

- Allan, E. J. 1973. A grammar of Buem. Ph.D dissertation. University of London.
- Ameka, F. K. 2002. The progressive aspect in Likpe: Implications for aspect and word order in Kwa. In F. K. Ameka and E. K. Osam, (eds.) *New directions in Ghanaian Linguistics*. Accra: Black Mask pp 85-111.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. The coding of topological relations in verbs: the case of Likpe (Sεkpεlé). *Linguistics*, 45 (5-6). 1065-1104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Likpe. In Gerrit J. Dimmendaal (ed.) *Coding Participant marking construction types in twelve African languages*. 239-280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blench, R. this volume. Do the Ghana-Togo Mountain languages constitute a genetic group? *The Journal of West African African Languages* 36.1-2.
- Creissels, D., G. Dimmendaal, Z. Frajzyngier and C. Koenig 2008. Africa as a morphosyntactic area. In Heine B. and D. Nurse (eds.) *A linguistic geography of Africa*. 86-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Kevin. n.d. Likpe verbs list. Manuscript.
- Gerhardt, L. 1988 A note on verbal extensions in Jarawan Bantu. *The Journal of West African Languages* 18(2).3-8.
- Gilman, C. 1986. African areal characteristics: sprachbund, not substrate? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 1(1). 33-50.
- Greenberg J. H. 1963 *The languages of Africa*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Harley, M.W. 2005. A descriptive grammar of Tuwuli, a Kwa language of Ghana. PhD dissertation University of London.
- Heine, B. and Zelealem Leyew. 2008. Is Africa a linguistic area? In: Heine B. and D. Nurse (eds.) *A linguistic geography of Africa*. 15-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Höftmann, H. 1971. The structure of Lelemi language. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Encykloädie
- Hyman, L. M. 2003. Suffix ordering in Bantu: a morphocentric approach. *Yearbook of Morphology* 2002. 245-281.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. How to become a Kwa verb. *The Journal of West African Languages* 30(2) 69-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. Niger-Congo verb extensions: Overview and discussion. In D. L. Payne and J. Peña (eds.) *Selected Proceedings of the 37<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on African Linguistics* 149-163, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Levin, B & M. Rappaport Hovav 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meeusen, A. E. 1975. Possible linguistic Africanisms. Fifth Hans Wolff Memorial Lecture. *Language Sciences* 35. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Ring, J. A (ed.) 2008. *Language structures of Sεkpεle (Likpe)*. (Applied Linguistic Studies in Ghanaian Languages) Tamale: Ghana Institute of Linguistics Literacy and Bible Translation.
- Schadeberg, T. C. 2003. Derivation. In: Nurse D. and G. Philoppson (eds.) *The Bantu languages*. London: Routledge, pp 77-89.
- Tornu, C. E. 2007. Aspects of Sεkpεle (Likpe) phonology. MPhil Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.
- Trithart, L. 1983. The applied suffix and transitivity: a historical study in Bantu. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Voeltz, E. 1977. Proto Niger-Congo extensions. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Westermann, D. H. and M.A. Bryan 1952. *Languages of West Africa*. Handbook of African Languages 2. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 2009. Reciprocity: An NSM approach to linguistic typology and social universals. *Studies in Language* 33 (1): 103-174 doi 10.1075/sl.33.1.05wie.
- Williamson, K. 1989 Niger-Congo overview In J. Bendor Samuel (ed.) *The Niger Congo languages*. 3-45. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Williamson, K & R. Blench. 2000. Niger-Congo. In B. Heine and D. Nurse (eds.) *African languages: an introduction*. 11-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.