



LINGUISTIC DISCOVERY

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

Volume 12
Issue 2
2014

Emai's Variable Coding of Adjuncts

Ronald P. Schaefer and Francis O. Egbokhare

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville and
University of Ibadan

doi: 10.1349/PS1.1537-0852.A.443

url: <http://journals.dartmouth.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/Journals.woa/1/xmlpage/1/article/443>

Linguistic Discovery

Published by the Dartmouth College Library
Copyright to this article is held by the authors. CC BY-NC

ISSN 1537-0852

linguistic-discovery.dartmouth.edu

Emai's Variable Coding of Adjuncts

Ronald P. Schaefer and Francis O. Egbokhare

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville and University of Ibadan

This paper examines the morphosyntactic character of clauses containing adjuncts in Emai (Edoid and West Benue Congo). In clauses differing as to discourse function, adjunct coding is variable. Some adjunct types are consistently structured as either head of a phrase or complement in a phrase headed by a verb. Other adjuncts are coded more variably. In canonical declarative clauses, they appear in postverbal position unmarked by a verb, but in one or more noncanonical clause types, their clause requires a verb otherwise latent. Resulting patterns are assessed from a perspective in Croft (2001), where adjuncts are relations with their matrix clause as argument.

1. Introduction¹

The adjunct/argument distinction is widely recognized in language description and explanation. It is most often associated with a syntactic criterion; nonetheless, the semantic nature of adjuncts and arguments has drawn some attention (Matthews 1981, 2007, Croft 2001). For the languages of sub-Saharan Africa, adjunct and argument have received minimal scrutiny. Watters (2000) notes that adjuncts (X) generally follow objects (O) in SVOX languages, while in SOV languages they either precede V (SXOV) or follow V (SOVX).

For this paper, we explore adjunct structures in Emai, a West Benue Congo language within southern Nigeria's Edoid group (Elugbe 1989, Williamson and Blench 2000). Typologically, Emai is relatively strict SVO with lexical and grammatical tone but little inflectional morphology and few prepositions (Schaefer and Egbokhare 1999, 2007, to appear). Word order is pervasive as a marker of grammatical relations. Regarding clause structure, Emai is characterized by simple predicates as well as complex predicates consisting of verbs in series, verbs in construction with postverbal particles, and verbs in series with verbs and postverbal particles (Schaefer and Egbokhare 2010). In addition, Emai shows an extensive array of preverbs (Schaefer and Egbokhare 2000), many of them adverb like, that affect interpretation of clausal event (*che* 'again,' *ya* 'almost,' *duu* 'for no reason,' *kakégbé* 'perseveringly,' *kpao* 'initially') or a core participant (*zemi* 'very many,' *gba* 'together').²

¹Data incorporated in this paper derive from research sponsored by the National Science Foundation, (BNS #9011338 and SBR #9409552), the U.S. Department of State (College and University Affiliations Program grant ASJY 1333), Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, particularly its Distinguished Research Professor award, and the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, particularly its Inaugural Lecture series. We thank these institutions for their continued support, while not extending to them any responsibility for our data interpretation.

²Orthographic conventions for Emai generally reflect Schaefer and Egbokhare (2007), where **ɔ** represents a lax mid back vowel, **ɛ** a lax mid front vowel, and **vb** a voiced bilabial approximant. For tone, acute accent marks high, grave signals low, and acute followed by an apostrophe designates high downstep. Abbreviations for grammatical morphemes used in this paper include: APP = applicative, ASS = associative, C = continuous, CL = change of location, CS = change of state, F = factative, H = habitual, ID = identity pronoun, IND = indicative, LOC = locative, MAN = manner, NEG = negative, NF = negative focus, PAP = past perfect, PF = positive focus, PRP = present perfect, R = relator, SC = subject concord, TEMP = temporal perspective.

2. Adjunct Character

Croft (2001) reviews a number of criteria proposed to distinguish adjuncts from arguments. The classic syntactic criterion holds that adjunct constituents are optional while arguments are obligatory. This seems relatively straightforward. In (1a-b), an adjunct (e.g. *in the park*) is peripheral to its associated verb, since it can be omitted without consequence to grammaticality. In contrast, arguments (*George, the dog*) are obligatory relative to their predicate; argument omission results in ungrammaticality (1a-c).

- (1a) George chased the dog in the park.
- (1b) George chased the dog.
- (1c) *George chased in the park.

Questions arising from Croft's analysis and illustration are no doubt multiple. Two, however, concern us. One is whether the distributional potential that characterizes locative (i.e. *in the park*), applies equally to other adjunct types, for instance those expressing temporality (*for the afternoon* in 2a) or manner (*clumsily* in 2b).

- (2a) George chased the dog for the afternoon.
- (2b) George chased the dog clumsily.

A second focuses on whether all adjunct types lead to consistent morphosyntactic expression across canonical and noncanonical clause types.³

Directing these questions toward Emai, we find that adjuncts in clause types differing as to discourse function attract nonuniform coding. Some adjunct types across canonical and noncanonical clauses occur as either head of a phrase or as complement in a phrase headed by a verb. Other adjuncts are coded more variably. In canonical declarative clauses, they appear in postverbal position unmarked by a verb, but in one or more noncanonical clause types, e.g. imperative, interrogative or contrastive focus, their clause requires a verb otherwise latent. As an initial sample of this variability, we present Table 1. It reveals that outside of manner, which is consistently unmarked by a verb, and reason, which is consistently verb marked (by *re*), adjuncts with a locative or temporal character require, in addition to a main verb, a latent verb such as *re* or *za*.⁴

³It is worthwhile to note that English adjuncts differ in morphosyntactic expression as well, e.g. noun preceded by a preposition (*in the park*) versus lexical adverb (*clumsily*).

⁴Evidence that *za* and *re* are verbs and not preverbs emerges from tonal behavior in Present Perfect aspect (Schaefer and Egbokhare to appear), where verb phrase initial monosyllabic preverbs like Additive *gbo* 'too, also' (in addition to auxiliaries) show a high low falling tone (*òjè gbòd híán óràn* [Oje ADD PRP.cut wood] 'Oje has cut wood too') but phrase initial monosyllabic verbs do not (*òjè gbé ófè* [Oje PRP.kill rat] 'Oje has killed a rat' not **òjè gbéè ófè*).

	DECL	IMP	INTER	CF
MANNER	verb AD	verb AD		
TEMPORAL DEIXIS	verb AD	verb AD	<i>re</i> verb	AD verb
TEMPORAL BOUND	verb AD	<i>re</i> AD verb		
TEMPORAL QUANTITY	verb AD	<i>re</i> AD verb	<i>re</i> verb	
LOCATIVE	verb AD	verb AD	<i>za</i> verb	AD <i>za</i> verb
REASON	<i>re</i> AD verb	<i>re</i> AD verb		AD <i>re</i> verb

Table 1: Emai adjunct (AD) occurrence with main verb and latent verb (*za* or *re*) across clauses that are canonical, i.e. declarative (DECL), and noncanonical, i.e. imperative (IMP), interrogative (INTER) and contrastive focus (CF).

3. Emai Adjuncts and Arguments

Argument types in Emai exhibit rather consistent distributional behavior compared to the more variable nature of adjuncts. A direct object argument (*óràn* ‘wood’), whose grammatical relation is morphologically unmarked but syntactically indicated by word order, follows a transitive verb such as *hian* ‘cut’ (3a). Verbs like *hian* also occur in series with a transitive verb such as *re* ‘take,’ which precedes its obligatory direct object argument (*ópìà* ‘cutlass,’ 3b-c). Both arguments relate to an overall event of cutting.

(3a) òjè híán órán. / *òjè híán.
Oje PRP.cut wood Oje PRP.cut
‘Oje cut wood. / Oje cut.’

(3b) òjè ré ópìà híán órán.
Oje PRP.take cutlass cut wood
‘Oje used a cutlass to cut wood.’

(3c) *òjè ré híán órán.
Oje PRP.take cut wood
‘Oje cut wood.’

As well, intransitive verbs in series such as *za* ‘be located’ and *se* ‘move up to, as far as, reach, extend to’ precede their obligatory arguments marked by locative preposition *vbi* (4a-b).

(4a) òjè zá vbí áfúzé’ shán sé vbì òkè.
Oje PRP.be.located LOC Afuze walk move.up.to LOC Oke
‘Oje walked from Afuze to Oke.’

- (4b) *òjè zà shàn sé vbì òkè.
 Oje PRP.be.located walk move.up.to LOC Oke
 ‘Oje walked to Oke.’

Emai adjunct types display some distributional consistency across clauses as well. In canonical declaratives they prototypically occupy postpredicate position following an intransitive verb or direct object of a transitive verb. As constituents adjuncts occur either unmarked or marked by preposition *vbì*. Unmarked are temporal deictic adjuncts (*òdè* ‘yesterday’ 5a) and temporal quantity adjunct phrases (*ìkpédè èèà* ‘for three days’ 5b). Marked by *vbì* are temporal ordinal adjunct phrases (*ùkpédé lí òzèèà* ‘on the third day’ 5c) and locative adjuncts (*ímè* ‘farm’ 5d).

- (5a) ójé híán' órán òdè.
 Oje PAP.cut wood yesterday
 ‘Oje cut wood yesterday.’

- (5b) ójé híán' órán ìkpédè èèà.
 Oje PAP.cut wood days three
 ‘Oje cut wood for three days.’

- (5c) ójé híán' órán vbì ùkpédé lí òzèèà.
 Oje PAP.cut wood LOC day R third
 ‘Oje cut wood on the third day.’

- (5d) ójé híán' órán vbì ímè.
 Oje PAP.cut wood LOC farm
 ‘Oje cut wood on the farm.’

A distinguishing feature of adjuncts, as opposed to arguments, is their tonal impact on a preceding constituent. Relative to a preceding verb argument (*óran*), Emai adjuncts activate high tone spread starting at argument right edge, as in *óran òdè* (5a) versus *óran* (3a). Nonadverb constituents following a verb argument do not activate high tone spread however. In (3b), where verb *hian* follows argument *òpià*, high tone spread is not activated. Verbs in series thus do not trigger high tone spread. In addition, postverbal particles that follow a direct object argument do not activate high tone spread (6a-c), as shown by right edge low tone of *ùì* ‘rope’ preceding Terminative *lee* ‘already, finish,’ Change of Location *ò* or Applicative *lí*.

- (6a) òjè híán' ólí ùì léé.
 Oje PRP.cut the rope TERM
 ‘Oje finished cutting the rope / already cut the rope.’

- (6b) òjè híán' ólí ùì ó vbì èvá.
 Oje PRP.cut the rope CL LOC two
 ‘Oje cut the rope into two.’

- (6c) òjè híán' ólí ùì lí òhí.
 Oje PRP.cut the rope APP Ohi
 ‘Oje cut the rope for Ohi.’

An important feature of nondeclarative clauses containing Emai adjuncts pertains to their potential for variable coding. In information question clauses, temporal deictic adjuncts represented by *òdè* 'yesterday,' for example, correspond to an interrogative proform (*éghè* 'when'). Their predicate phrase requires the verb *rè* 'take' as the initial verb in series (7), despite the fact that *rè* never occurs in the corresponding declarative clause, cf. (5a).⁵

- (7) *éghè* *óje* *ré'* *hían* *ólí* *óràn?*
 time Oje PAP.take cut the wood
 'When did Oje cut the wood?'

òdè.
 yesterday
 'Yesterday.'

A similar condition holds for a *vbi* marked adjunct of place. In transitive declaratives, where a locative adjunct follows a verb and its direct object, place marking is signaled by preposition *vbi* (5d). In information questions, where the locative corresponds to a fronted interrogative proform, the verb *za* 'be located' occurs in the matrix clause and precedes other verbs in series. Thus in declarative (8a), *ímè* 'farm' appears in postverbal position preceded by preposition *vbi*; no *za* marks it. However, when adjunct *ímè* corresponds to an interrogative proform (*ébé'* 'where'), *za* is obligatory in the predicate phrase (8b).

- (8a) *óje* *hían'* *órán* *vbí* *ímè.*
 Oje PAP.cut wood LOC farm
 'Oje cut wood on the farm.'

- (8b) *ébé'* *óje* *zá'* *hían* *óràn?*
 where Oje PAP.be.located cut wood
 'Where did Oje cut wood?'

ímè.
 farm
 'On the farm.'

Fronting of a locative adjunct in a contrastive focus clause leads to similar marking by *za*. When *ímè* occurs in focus position and precedes positive focus (PF) morpheme *lí*, *za* is required in the matrix clause as the initial verb in series.

- (9) *ímè* *lí* *óje* *zá'* *hían* *óràn.*
 farm PF Oje PAP.be.located cut wood
 'It was on a farm that Oje cut wood.'

⁵Temporal deictic adjuncts occur in contrastive focus position, *òdè lí ólí ómóhé é' ólí émàè* [yesterday PF the man PAP.eat the food] 'It was yesterday that the man ate the food,' although not with a latent verb in series. Temporal deictic *òdè* does not occur in imperative clauses; other deictic adjuncts, e.g. *ákhò* 'tomorrow' and *éènà* 'today,' do, though not with a latent verb.

In contrast, locative arguments of a verb do not give rise to *za*. As an argument of verb *o* ‘enter’ in declarative clauses, *ímè* in postverbal position follows preposition *vbi*.

- (10) òjè ó vbí ímè.
 Oje PRP.enter LOC farm
 ‘Oje entered the farm.’

In information question clauses, where *ímè* corresponds to fronted interrogative proform *ébé* ‘where,’ *za* is disallowed (11a-b). As well, occurrence of *ímè* in contrastive focus position does not lead to a matrix clause predicate phrase with *za* as a verb in series (11c).

- (11a) ébé’ ójé ó’-ì?
 where Oje PAP.enter-F
 ‘Where did Oje enter?’
- (11b) *ébé’ ójé zá’ ó?
 where Oje PAP.be.located enter
 ‘Where did Oje enter?’
- (11c) ímè mè lí ójé ó’-ì.
 farm my PF Oje PAP.enter-F
 ‘It was my farm that Oje entered.’

It is likewise the case for *vbi* marked locative arguments (e.g. *ùdékèn* ‘wall’) with transitive verbs (e.g. *fí* ‘hit,’ 12a). Neither information question clauses (12b) nor negative contrastive focus clauses (12c) with such verbs lead to verb *za* in series.

- (12a) òjè fí úkpórán vbì ùdékèn.
 Oje PRP.hit stick LOC wall
 ‘Oje hit a stick on the wall.’
- (12b) ébé’ ójé fí’ úkpóràn?
 where Oje PAP.hit stick
 ‘Where did Oje hit the stick?’
- (12c) ùdékèn kí ójé fí’ úkpóràn.
 wall NF Oje PAP.hit stick
 ‘It wasn’t on a wall that Oje hit the stick.’

This brief overview of Emai locative and temporal forms reveals adjuncts in nondeclarative clauses scaffolded by a latent verb. Scaffold structures framed by a latent verb in series also affect adjuncts of temporal quantity. In declarative clauses *ìkpédè èéà* ‘for three days,’ for instance, is postverbal and unmarked by a preposition (13a). In information question clauses (13b), where the temporal quantity constituent corresponds to a fronted interrogative proform (*ìkpédé èkà* ‘how many days’), the verb *re* ‘take’ is obligatory and precedes other verbs in series.

(13a) ójé híán' órán íkpédè èèà.
 Oje PAP.cut wood days three
 'Oje cut wood for three days.'

(13b) íkpédé ékà ójé ré' híán órán?
 day quantity Oje PAP.take cut wood
 'For how many days did Oje cut wood?'

íkpédè èèà.
 days three
 'For three days.'

Imperative clauses with adjunct *íkpédè èèà* grammatically mandate *rè* as well; *rè* must occur in the matrix clause and in a position preceding other verbs in series (14a-b). Temporal quantity adjuncts, though, are not found in contrastive focus clauses.

(14a) rè íkpédè èèà híán órán.
 take days three cut wood
 'Take three days to cut wood. / Cut wood for three days.'

(14b) *hìàn órán íkpédè èèà.
 cut wood days three
 'Cut wood for three days.'

Another adverbial adjunct type utilizing latent verb *rè* expresses temporal bounding for an event. In declarative clauses, *ékéín íkpédè èèà* 'within three days' is marked by preposition *vbi* (15a) and occupies postpredicate position. In corresponding imperatives (15b), *rè* is obligatory with *ékéín íkpédè èèà* as complement; the resulting *rè ékéín íkpédè èèà* constituent precedes other verbs in series. Temporal bounding adjuncts articulate neither information question nor contrastive focus clauses.

(15a) ólí ómóhé híán' ólí órán léé vbí ékéín íkpédè èèà.
 the man PAP.cut the wood TEMP LOC inside days three
 'The man had finished cutting the wood within three days.'

(15b) rè ékéín íkpédè èèà híán ólí órán léé.
 take inside days three cut the wood TEMP
 'Finish cutting the wood within three days.'

Not all adjuncts with temporal significance require latent *rè*. In fact, some evince no latent verb as scaffold. Adjuncts expressing temporal ordinal relations (e.g. *úkpédé lí ózèèà* 'on the third day'), for instance, appear in postpredicate position marked by preposition *vbi* (16a). Nonetheless without latent *rè*, they retain postpredicate position in imperative clauses (16b) and in contrastive focus clauses they occupy focus position (16c).⁶

⁶Temporal ordinal adjuncts occur in information question clauses with a complex structure, although not one involving a latent verb in series. Ordinal adjuncts correspond to a question frame marked by the identity pronoun *í*

- (16a) ólí ómóhé híán' ólí órán vbí úkpedé lí ózèèà.
 the man PAP.cut the wood LOC day R third
 'The man cut the wood on the third day.'
- (16b) híàn ólí órán vbí úkpedé lí ózèèà.
 cut the wood LOC day R third
 'Cut the wood on the third day.'
- (16c) úkpedé lí ózèèà lí ólí ómóhé híán' ólí órán.
 day R third PF the man PAP.cut ólí wood
 'It was on the third day that the man cut the wood.'

Adjuncts expressing a temporal frequency relation (e.g. *ìsèvá* 'twice') also occur in postpredicate position (17a), although not as a constituent marked by preposition *vbi*. Without *re* or any other latent verb in the matrix clause, temporal frequency adjuncts retain postpredicate position in imperative clauses (17b), correspond in information questions to an interrogative pronoun (*ísékà* 'how often' in 17c) and occupy contrastive focus position (17d).

- (17a) ólí ómóhé é' ólí émáé ìsèvá.
 the man PAP.eat the food twice
 'The man ate the food twice.'
- (17b) è ólí émáé ìsòkpá.
 cut the wood once
 'Eat the food at once.'
- (17c) ísékà ólí ómóhé é' ólí émàè?
 how.often the man PAP.eat the food
 'How often did the man eat the food?'
- ìsèvá.
 twice
 'Twice.'
- (17d) ìsèvá lí ólí ómóhé é' ólí émàè.
 twice PF the man PAP.eat the food
 'It was twice that the man ate the food.'

ID and the verb *yi* 'identify' and its complement noun *édé* 'day.' Ordinal adjuncts thus do not correspond to *éghè re* interrogatives, as temporal deictic adjuncts do.

- (i) í yì édé lí ó híán' ólí órán?
 ID identify day R he PAP.cut the wood
 'On which day did he cut the wood?'
- úkpedé lí ózèèà.
 day R third
 'On the third day.'

In stark contrast to these last two temporal types, adjuncts expressing reason exhibit a more consistent verb scaffold pattern. Adjunct reason constituents (e.g. *òhíó ísì òjè* 'because of Oje') do not occur in postpredicate position in declarative clauses (18a). Instead, as complement they immediately follow verb *rè* as the initial verb phrase in series in declaratives (18b), in imperatives (18c), and when they occupy contrastive focus position (18d), *rè* is retained as the initial verb in series.⁷

(18a) **ólí ómóhé gbé' ófé òhíó ísì òjè.*
 the man PAP.kill rat cause ASS Oje
 'The man killed rats because of Oje.'

(18b) *ólí ómóhé rẹ' òhíó ísì òjè gbé ófè.*
 the man PAP.take cause ASS Oje kill rat
 'The man killed rats because of Oje.'

(18c) *rẹ òhíó ísì òjè é ólí émàè.*
 take cause ASS Oje eat the food
 'Use Oje as the reason for eating the food.'

(18d) *òhíó ísì òjè lí ólí ómóhé rẹ' é ólí émàè léé.*
 cause ASS Oje PF the man PAP.take eat the food TEMP
 'It was because of Oje the man finished eating the food.'

Differing from reason adjuncts and exhibiting a distinct placement for their latent verb compared to temporal and locative types are adjuncts conveying aspectual and temporal extent. Adjuncts of aspectual extent (*gbègbéí* 'completely') occur in postpredicate position in declarative (19a) and imperative (19b) clauses. In information questions, where adjuncts of aspectual extent correspond to interrogative proform (*ébé'* 'how') and an accompanying manner (MAN) preverb *i*,⁸ their matrix clause requires the postpredicate verb *sé* 'extend to, reach' as the final verb in series (19c). Aspectual extent adjuncts fail to occupy contrastive focus position.

⁷Reason adjuncts correspond to the complex interrogative frame *émé' ó zẹ khi* 'why,' which does not involve a latent verb in series. Instead, the erstwhile matrix clause occurs in an embedded indicative marked clause (indicative complement *khi*) under a cause verb, i.e. *zẹ*. It is this matrix cause verb that syntactically corresponds to the reason adjunct.

(i) *émé' ó zẹ-í' khí ólí ómóhé é' ólí émàè léé?*
 what it PAP.cause-F IND the man PAP.eat the food TEMP
 'What caused the man to finish eating the food?'

òhíó ísì òhànmì.
 cause ASS hunger
 'Because of hunger.'

⁸That manner *i* is a synchronic preverb, not a verb, is supported by its distribution. It never occurs as a simple predicate, transitive or intransitive, or as one constituent of a complex predicate. It arises only in manner expressions where a manner related constituent has been fronted, e.g. manner demonstrative adjunct (*ìyá* 'that way,' *ìná* 'this way') or with information question word *ébé'* 'how.' In contrast, *sé*, *za* and *rẹ* occur as simple predicates or as constituents of complex predicates (Schaefer and Egbokhare to appear).

(19a) ójé ánmé' óí étò á gbègbéí.
 Oje PAP.scrape her hair CS completely
 'Oje scraped off her hair completely.'

(19b) ànmè óí étò á gbègbéí.
 scrape her hair CS completely
 'Scrape off her hair completely.'

(19c) ébé' ójé í' ánmé óí étò sé?
 how Oje PAP.MAN scrape her hair extend.to
 'To what extent did Oje scrape her hair?'

ó ì ànmè óí étó á gbègbéí.
 he NEG scrape her hair CS completely
 'He did not scrape off her hair at all.'

Other aspectual extent adjuncts include *jáún* 'completely, crisply' (20a-b) and *sésésé* 'completely, neatly' (21a-b). In interrogative clauses they, too, give rise to latent verb *se*.

(20a) ólí ógó tóó' á jáún.
 the bush PAP.burn CS crisply
 'The bush burned to a crisp.'

(20b) ébé' ólí ógó í' tòò sé?
 how the bush PAP.MAN burn extend.to
 'To what extent did the bush burn?'

ó tóó' á jáún.
 the PAP.burn CS crisply
 'It burned to a crisp.'

(21a) ólí ót^óí fúán-í' sésésé.
 the ground PAP.be.clean-F completely
 'The ground was absolutely clean.'

(21b) ébé' ólí ót^óí í' fùàn sé?
 how the ground PAP.MAN be.clean extend.to
 'To what extent was the ground clean?'

ó fúán-í' sésésé.
 it PAP.be.clean-F completely
 'It was absolutely clean.'

Another adjunct type, temporal extent (*títítí* 'long time'), occurs in postpredicate position in declarative (22a) clauses. In information questions, where adjuncts of temporal extent correspond to interrogative proform *ébé'* 'how' and its manner preverb *i*, their matrix clause requires not only the extent verb *se* in series but also the temporal verb *tee* 'be long' (22b).

Temporal extent adjuncts do not appear in imperative clauses or occupy contrastive focus position.⁹

(22a) ólí ómóhé múzán-í' títítí.
 the man PAP.wait-F long.time
 'The man waited for a long time.'

(22b) ébé' ólí ómóhé í' mùzàn téé sè?
 how the man PAP.MAN wait be.long extend.to
 'How long did the man wait?'

ó múzán-í' títítí.
 the PAP.wait-F long.time
 'He waited for a long time.'

A distinct and final pattern characterizes adjuncts of manner. They reveal no evidence of a latent verb. Manner adjuncts (*kóíkóí* 'in a gulping fashion') occur in postpredicate position regardless of whether their clause is declarative (23a) or imperative (23b). When manner adjuncts in information questions correspond to interrogative proform (*ébé'* 'how') and manner preverb *i* (23c), their matrix clause fails to show a latent verb like *se*, *re* or *za*. Manner adjuncts of this type do not occupy contrastive focus position.

(23a) ólí ómòhè ò ó è ólí émáé kóíkóí.
 the man SC C eat the food gulpingly
 'The man is gulping the food / eating the food in a gulping fashion.'

(23b) è ólí émáé kóíkóí.
 eat eat food gulpingly
 'Gulp the food. / Eat the food in a gulping fashion.'

(23c) ébé' ólí ómóhé ó ò í è émàè?
 how the man SC H MAN eat food
 'How does the man eat food?'

ó ò è óí kóíkóí.
 he H eat it gulpingly
 'He eats it in a gulping fashion. / He gulps it.'

⁹Temporal extent adjuncts fail to occur in contrastive focus and imperative clauses, as the examples below illustrate.

(i) *títítí lí ólí ómóhé múzán'-ì.
 long.time PF the man PAP.wait-F
 'It was for a long time that the man waited.'

(ii) *mùzàn títítí.
 wait long.time
 'Wait a long time.'

4. Discussion

In the preceding section we called attention to Emai's latent verb coding patterns for some clause structures that incorporate adjuncts. For several adjunct types (locative, temporal bounded, deixis and quantity as well as aspectual and temporal extent), one or more of their noncanonical clauses, i.e. imperative, interrogative or contrastive focus, were coded with a latent verb, whereas their canonical declarative clause was not. Moreover, coding was not uniform across adjunct types, either by latent verb form (*re*, *za*, *se*, *tee*) or position (pre- versus post-matrix predicate). Still other adjunct types revealed either no latent verb (manner, temporal frequency and temporal ordinal) or consistently required a preceding verb (reason). As a summary of Emai adjunct behavior and its accompanying clausal coding we present Table 2.

	DECL	IMP	INTER	CF	R-Q
MANNER	verb AD	verb AD	<i>ébé' i</i> verb		in situ
A EXTENT	verb AD	verb AD	<i>ébé' i</i> verb <i>se</i>		in situ
T EXTENT	verb AD		<i>ébé' i</i> verb <i>tee se</i>		in situ
T FREQ	verb AD	verb AD	<i>ísékà</i> verb	AD <i>li</i> verb	ex situ
T ORDINAL	verb <i>vbi</i> AD	verb <i>vbi</i> AD		AD <i>li</i> verb	ex situ
T DEIXIS	verb AD	verb AD	<i>éghè re</i> verb	AD <i>li</i> verb	ex situ
T BOUND	verb <i>vbi</i> AD	<i>re</i> AD verb			
T QUANT	verb AD	<i>re</i> AD verb	<i>ikpédè èkà re</i> verb		ex situ
LOCATIVE	verb <i>vbi</i> AD	verb <i>vbi</i> AD	<i>ébé' za</i> verb	AD <i>li za</i> verb	ex situ
REASON	<i>re</i> AD verb	<i>re</i> AD verb		AD <i>li re</i> verb	ex situ

Table 2: Coding of Emai adjunct (AD) types (where A is Aspectual and T is Temporal) by verbs *se*, *tee*, *re*, and *za* relative to clause types declarative (DECL), imperative (IMP), interrogative (INTER), contrastive focus (CF) and response to information question (R-Q).

At the outset we noted in passing Croft's (2001) comparison of adjunct and argument semantic character. His semantic analysis emphasizes adjuncts as relations relative to their associated predication, following theoretical arguments laid out by Langacker (1987: 214-216), who posits a relation as existing when the definition of one concept inherently requires reference to another concept. If adjuncts are inherently relations, they are functions, i.e. predicates, that take an argument. With reference to (24), *in the park* is then a predicate whose single argument is the event of chasing. One and the same semantic component, i.e. *chase*, can thus be a relation or a filler argument of a role in a relation. While chasing is a relation with George and dog as filler arguments, chasing is also a filler argument for the relation being-in-the-park.

(24) *George chased the dog in the park.*

Earlier, we identified two questions that derive from Croft's analysis and illustration. Do all adjunct types lead to consistent morphosyntactic expression across clause types? And do all adjuncts manifest similar distributional potential? More importantly for Croft's analysis is a third

question: Is there morphosyntactic evidence to support the claim that an adjunct is a relation and so can take an associated event as filler argument?

Recall Croft's position that adjuncts are relations taking as their filler argument a matrix clause event. The facts from Emai suggest that not all adjunct constituents are relations vis-à-vis the matrix predicate, i.e. predicates that take a matrix event as filler. Instead, a number of adjunct types appear to be filler arguments for a latent verb that under varying discourse conditions appears in series in the matrix predicate phrase. It is these filler adjunct types, locative and temporal deixis for example, and their latent verbs, *za* and *re* respectively, that as a relation could take the matrix clause event as filler.

Not all adjunct expressions serve as filler argument for a latent verb however. Some appear to be relations that could directly take the matrix predicate as filler. The clearest example of this adjunct type is manner; adjuncts expressing temporal frequency and temporal ordinal sequence also appear to be exemplars of this type.

Based on these distribution facts from Emai, one could formulate a relation-filler cline for adjuncts in which the propensity to serve as a filler argument increases while the propensity to serve as a relation decreases. The most comprehensive filler adjunct would be REASON, which requires the verb *re* in all clauses where its exponents occur. The next most filler-like adjunct would be LOCATIVE, which requires latent verb *za* in contrastive focus and interrogative clauses. The least filler-like and most relation-like adjunct would be MANNER, which revealed no latent verb. TEMPORAL would clearly be the most inconsistent class since temporal frequency and temporal ordinal evince no latent verb, while temporal deixis, temporal quantity and temporal bound lead to latent verb *re* in either interrogative or imperative clauses or both.

MANNER < TEMPORAL < LOCATIVE < REASON

Extent adjuncts, however, exhibit unique properties, as shown by their interrogative frame. They manifest a correspondence relation to not only an information question word (*ébé* 'how') and its preverb *i* but also a latent verb (*se*) or verbs (*se*, *tee*) in postpredicate position, neither of which surfaces in imperative or contrastive focus clauses. The syntactic position of latent verbs associated with extent adjuncts thus contrasts with the position of latent verbs for locative and temporal adjuncts.

Extent adjuncts would be troublesome for a relation-filler cline. They consistently require a latent verb (or verbs) in interrogative clauses but position it after, not before, the matrix predicate. Where would extent adjuncts best fit on a relation-filler cline? Moreover, one wonders whether there might be other linguistic evidence that would identify structural affinities between or among Emai adjunct types. One fact to consider in this regard is shape of adjunct response frame relative to its information question. In question-answer discourse contexts, many adjunct types occur in response to an information question as phrases isolated from clause structure, i.e. *ex situ* as summarized in Table 2 and exemplified in (7), (8b), (13b) and (17c). Three adjunct types, aspectual extent, temporal extent and manner, fail this test however; each requires an *in situ* frame in which the respective adjunct follows its matrix verb, as in (19c), (22b) and (23c), repeated here as (25), (26) and (27).

- (25) ébé' ójé í' ánmè óí étò sé?
 how Oje PAP.MAN scrape her hair extend.to
 'To what extent did Oje scrape her hair?'

ó ì àn m̀ óí étó á gbègbéí.
 he NEG scrape her hair CS completely
 'He did not scrape her hair completely.'

- (26) ébé' ólí ómóhé í' m̀zàn téé sè?
 how the man PAP.MAN wait be.long extend.to
 'How long did the man wait?'

ó m̀zán-í' títíí.
 he PAP.wait-F long.time
 'He waited for a long time.'

- (27) ébé' ólí ómóhé ó ̀ í è émàè?
 how the man SC H MAN eat food
 'How does the man eat food?'

ó ̀ è óí kókóí.
 he H eat it gulpingly
 'He gulps it.'

In situ responses as well as interrogative proform in information questions (*ébé'* and *i*) thus suggest that adjuncts with a postpredicate latent verb are similar to adjuncts that reveal no latent verb; both are more relation like than filler like. Clearly, a simple correlation between morphosyntactic properties and adjunct status as relation or filler is not straightforward.¹⁰ Nonetheless, it does appear that while all adjunct expressions may be relational, not all adjuncts are relations. Some adjuncts are fillers that require a latent verb, especially in clause types outside the canonical declarative.

References

- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical construction grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 Elugbe, Ben. 1989. *Comparative Edoid: Phonology and lexicon*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
 Langacker, Ronald. W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar, Vol I: Theoretical perspectives*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
 Matthews, Peter H. 1981. *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 -----. 2007. *Syntactic relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 Schaefer, Ronald P. and Francis O. Egbokhare. 1999. *Oral tradition narratives of the Emai people, Part I and Part II*. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.

¹⁰The correlation between position of latent verb relative to matrix verb, i.e. preceding vs following matrix predicate, and shape of interrogative response allowed, i.e. *in situ* vs *ex situ*, suggests that a more complex parameter than relation/argument may be operating. For the moment, however, we leave this notion unexplored.

- , 2000. Emai preverb order. Proceedings of the 2nd World Congress of African Linguistics, Leipzig 1997, ed. by H. Ekkehard Wolff and Orin D. Gensler, 733-746. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- , 2007. A dictionary of Emai: An Edoid language of Nigeria. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- , 2010. On Emai ditransitive constructions. Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook, ed. by Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath and Bernard Comrie, 115-145. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- , To appear. A reference grammar for Emai: A Nigerian Edoid language. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watters, John. R. 2000. Syntax. African languages: An introduction, ed. by Bernd Heine and Derek Nurse, 194-230. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, Kay and Roger Blench. 2000. Niger Congo. African languages: An introduction, ed. by Bernd Heine and Derek Nurse, 11-42. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Author's Contact Information (corresponding author):

Ronald P. Schaefer
Center for International Programs
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Edwardsville, IL 62026-1616
rschae@siue.edu

Francis O. Egbokhare
Department of Linguistics and African Languages
University of Ibadan
Ibadan, Nigeria
foegbokhare@yahoo.com