

## Clausal Identity Types

The case of the Akan Consecutive

Dorothee Beermann , NTNU, Trondheim, Norway

Conceptually the difference between government and agreement seems clear. “Government is defined as a type of syntactic relation between constituent A and B where B depends on A and A is inherently relational.” [5] While grammatical functions are unique which is, e.g., reflected in LFG's Uniqueness Principle, this does not hold for agreement where many elements can represent the same property, a phenomenon known as extended exponency. Also under government formatives may agree, such as subjects or objects and their verbs, leading to the co-occurrence of government and agreement, however, the relation between grammatical units may also lie outside of the scope of government and agreement, such as adjunction. With government and agreement as our basic attributes, we can derive a matrix of clausal types which reflects differences in the morpho-syntactic realisation of clausal identity. The matrix is shown in Figure 1.

CI-1	[government +] [agreement -]	(rektion)
CI-2	[government -] [agreement +]	(concord)
CI-3	[government +] [agreement +]	(head marking)
CI-4	[government -] [agreement -]	(adjunction)

Figure 1 *Clausal Identity Types*

Assuming that government and agreement are relational primitives and that generalisations about languages can be formulated in terms of those primitives, we will look in our presentation at Akan serial verb constructions (SVC)s and what we will call 'purpose clauses' for the lack of another theory neutral term. SVCs are strings of verbs and verb phrases which co-occur without a connective. In Akan verbs in a SVC must agree in Tense/Aspect, as well as in Polarity. In terms of the clause identity matrix shown in Figure 1, the relation between verbs in an Akan SVCs is of type CI-2, that is, it is agreement rather than government that provides the morpho-syntactic glue that identifies verbs as belonging to one 'structure'.

Between Akan scholars the functional status of the so-called consecutive marker which can occur on non-initial verbs in an SVC, and which introduce purpose or intent remains a matter of debate [1][3][6]. Although often understood as part of the Tense Aspect system, Boadi [1] argues that purpose clauses are infinitives of some sort, and that their syntactic function within the SVC is that of an adverbial or adjunct clause. This would make some SVC's instances of CI-4 and draw their status as SVCs into question.

In our presentation we will discuss in more detail the grammatical pattern that we can only summarize here, giving a few suggestive examples taken from Boadi [1]. (1) illustrates an Akan SVC where the V2 carries the prefix *a-*<sup>1</sup> which is marked as INF, following Boadi, but which alternatively has been glossed as CONS, standing for consecutive which is a notion well established in West African linguistics[5]. Evidence for the interpretation of the *a-* prefix as an Aspect marker comes from the fact that CONS can only occur after the Progressive- and the Future marker which seems to suggest a certain form of 'Concorde'. However, while Polarity forces negative agreement between all verbs in the SVC ((2)), purpose clauses headed by an [*a-V*] do not obey this constraint ((3)). This is of course unexpected if we assume that the prefix is an Aspect marker, while it complies with the assumption that

---

1 The affix might be underlyingly à- as has been claimed by Osam [6]. Akan's tonal contour affects affix realisation, a fact that we cannot describe here.

purpose clauses are infinitive by nature. The latter assumption is furthermore supported by the fact that they occur as subordinate clauses, either selected by a group of Akan complement verbs [2] or after the complementizer *nà*. As we will specify in our presentation, governed purpose clauses have interesting properties in their own right. They can occur with open subjects and, if chained, they obey negative concord, a constraint that does not apply to them when occurring in an SVC. As observed by Hyman [4], Kwa verbs, in comparison to Bantu verbs, lack valence-relating morphology and the ability to govern many dependents. This development has given way to the Kwa verb which as a rule governs only one dependent but gains the potential to express consecutive or integrated events compositionally in multi-verb constructions such as an SVC. Building on previous work on Kwa verbs we will be able to show that agreement and adjunction are the main grammatical tools used to achieve clausal identity in Akan sentential projections, making it a CI-2+4 type of language.

(1) **Ǿ̀rètrá h Ǿ̀ádi gúá**

“He is staying there to trade”

Ǿ̀	rètrá	h Ǿ̀	ádi		gúá s	
Ǿ̀	rè	trá	h Ǿ̀	á	dì	gúá
he.3SG	PROG	stay	INF	engage.in	trade.V>N	
PRO	V		ADV	V	V	

(2) **Ǿ̀àm fá bí á `nkyèr é**

“He did not take any to show us”

Ǿ̀	à	m	fá	bí	á	`n	kyèr é
SG	PAST	NEG	take	some	PAST	NEG	show
PRO	V			QUANT	V		

(3) **Ǿ̀rémfá bí àkyèr éy éñ**

“He is not taking any to show us”

Ǿ̀	ré	m	fá	bí	à	kyèr é	y éñ
he.SBJ.3SG	PROG	NEG	take	some	INF	show	us.OBJ2
PRO	V			QUANT	V		PRON

*References*

[1] Boadi, L.A. (2008). Tense, Aspect and Mood in Akan. In Ameka, F.K. and M.E. Kropp Dakubu (eds) *Aspect and Modality in Kwa Languages*. Benjamins.

[2] Boadi, L.A. (2005) *Three Major Syntactic Structures in Akan*. Black Mask Ltd., Accra.

[3] Dolphyne, F.A. (1971). A classification of Akan verb stems. In Actes du 8e Congrès de la Soci\et\ Linguistique d'Afrique Occidentale, M Houis(ed).

[4] Hyman, L. (2000). How to become a Kwa verb. Paper at the Symposium on Areal Typology of West African Languages, Leipzig.

[5] Lehmann, C. (2009). Rektion und Syntaktische Relationen. *Folia Linguistica*. Volume 17, Issue 1-4, Pages 339–378.

[6] Osam, E.K (2003) An introduction to the Verba and Multi-Verbal System of Akan. In Beermann, D.A. and Lars Hellan (ed) *Proceedings of the Trondheim Summer School on Multi-Verb Constructions*.