1. Introduction

This paper attempts to analyse possessive NP's within the general framework of pronominalization (from a basically Chomskian viewpoint). To decide how best to generate such NP's in the grammar of the Efik language, the analysis which derives such NP's from an embedded 'have' sentential source in a complex sentence is critically examined and on both semantic and syntactic grounds, this kind of analysis is rejected. It is then suggested that possessive NP's be directly generated in the base. Finally, the paper relates the so-called picture nouns to possessive pronominalization by adducing syntactic, semantic and tonal arguments to show that such nominals are in fact possessive rather than reflexive in nature.

1. This paper is taken from Essien [1974a]. Tones are indicated as follows:

- High Tone
- Downstepped Tone
- Low Tone
- Rising Tone
- Falling Tone
(ii) the NP does not violate those known constraints, e.g. Langacker's backward condition, with respect to the application of T in the phrase marker, where T stands for the necessary transformational rule;
(iii) the phrase marker itself is of a certain configuration, e.g. reflexivization applies in a simplex.

2. Possessive Pronominalization

By Possessive Pronominalization, we mean the pronominalization process by which the pronominal forms mml 'my', fò 'your', èsìe 'his/her/its', ènnyìn 'our', èmbùfò 'your (pl)', èmmò 'their' are derived in cases where they have coreferent interpretations, as in (1):

(1) a. èmì ènyòm ùdèmè èmmì 'I want my share'
    b. èfò ènyòm ùdèmè fò 'you want your share'
    c. èìnyè ènyòm ùdèmè èsìe 'he/she/it wants his/her/its share'
    d. ènnnyìn ènyòm ùdèmè ènnnyìn 'we want our share(s)'
    e. èmbùfò ènyòm ùdèmè èmbùfò 'you (pl) want your share(s)'
    f. èmmò ènyòm ùdèmè èmmò 'they want their share(s)'

It should be noted that except in the singular, where there are minor differences in form, the personal and the possessive pronouns are the same in form.

Strictly speaking, it is only the third person possessive pronouns (èsìe and èmmò) which may be transformationally derived in the manner described in Section 5. The first and second person possessive pronouns, mml, fò, ènnyìn and èmbùfò, characteristically occur in the base, or are derived by the Pronoun Conjunction Rule, as we shall see in Section 5.

3. Analysis of Possessive NP's

Within the standard transformational-generative theory, an English sentence such as (2a) is derived from a structure underlying (2b), which contains an embedded relative S:

(2) a. This is my book.
    b. This is the book which I have.

We refer to this analysis as the "complex sentence" analysis. In Efik,
however, there are strong reasons against the "complex sentence" analysis of possessive NP's such as ñèmi ésié, ñèmi mmò, etc. as we shall see presently. Since the grammatical function of possessive pronouns such as ésié, mmò, etc. is similar to that of the determiner, our derivation of possessive NP's will have to take this into account. For our purposes, we will call NP's such as ñèmi ésié, ñèm Atá 'Atá's life' "possessive NP's". In Efik, the possessor, for example, ésié or Atá, follows the thing possessed, such as ñèmi or ñèm in the phrases ñèmi ésié and ñèm Atá, respectively.

We present facts and arguments against the "complex sentence" analysis of possessive NP's. Consider the following examples:

(3) a. ñò ëyì p mmòtò Atá 'a thief has stolen Atá's car'

b. ñò ëyì p mmòtò émì Atá ényénédé 'a thief has stolen the car which Atá has'

(4) a. Bássey ímáhá ndítò ésié 'Bassey doesn't like his children'

b. Bássey ímáhá ndítò émì ènyé ényénédé 'Bassey doesn't like the children which he has'

(5) a. èkpàt ñnyí òrô édì émì 'that bag of ours is this'

b. *èkpàt òrô émì ññí ñnyénédé édì émì 'the bag which we have is this'

First, there is the problem of the grammatical status of (3b) and (5b), which are questionable and ungrammatical respectively. The fact that the complex sentence paraphrases of the possessive sentences of (3a)-(5a) kind vary in grammaticality is a strong case against deriving such possessive sentences from such complex sentences. Second, even in cases where the complex sentences are grammatical, there is a semantic problem, for (4a) and (4b), for example, are not paraphrases as such, as those who favor this kind of analysis would wish. For while (4a) merely states the fact that Bassey does not love or like his children, (4b) carries the implication that he does love other children. Similarly, even if (3b) were grammatical, I am not at all sure whether it is semantically equivalent to (3a).

Next, consider the following examples, which pose semantic problems of different sorts:
Although (6b), (7b) and (8b) are syntactically well-formed, they are semantically anomalous, for ufòk 'house', mmotò and úbòk útòm 'occupations' are "owned" though they do not in fact exist. (8b) is particularly problematic because of the apparent contradiction there—they have not yet found the occupations and yet they "have" them. However, these are problems for those who favor the complex sentence derivation of possessive NP's.

Syntactically, there are also convincing reasons against the complex sentence analysis. Consider personal names, for example, as in (9):

(9) a. Arìt ìnyàng
b. ìmè Akpàìn

which in fact mean the following respectively: Ìnyàng's Arìt and Akpàìn's ìmè. Support for this claim comes from such questions and answers as those in (10).

(10) a. ụfàn ànịe? 'whose friend?' Ans. ìnyàng 'Ìnyàng's'
b. éyèn ànịe? 'whose child?' Ans. Akpàìn 'Akpàìn's'

Note that personal names are similarly patterned, as the examples in (11) indicate.

(11) a. Arìt ànịe? 'whose Arìt?' Ans. ìnyàng 'Ìnyàng's'
b. ìmè ànịe? 'whose Imè?' Ans. Akpàìn 'Akpàìn's'

Observe that the order of these personal names is the same as for the ordinary possessive NP's: the possessor follows the possessed. If personal names of the kind in (9) could be regarded as possessive NP's of some sort, it would be simply ludicrous to derive them from such strings as (12):

(12) a. *Arìt émè ìnyàng énỳènèdè 'Arìt which Ìnyàng has'
b. *ìmè émè Akpàìn énỳènèdè 'Imè which Akpàìn has'
Perhaps the strongest case against the derivation of possessive NP's from complex sentences with an embedded relative S with nyéné 'have' can be seen from the following examples. First consider (13):

\[(13)\]
\[
a. \text{Effiong enyéné ñmóto} \quad \text{'Effiong has a car'}
\]
\[
b. \text{Effiong enyéné ñmóto ésle} \quad \text{'Effiong has his own car'}
\]

where both nyéné, which, according to the complex sentence analysis, is supposed to be the source of possession, and a possessive pronoun (esle) occur together. If nyéné is the source of possession, then (13b) should be paraphrasable as (14).

\[(14)\]
\[
*\text{Effiong enyéné ñmóto émì enyé enyénéndé}
\]
\[
\quad \text{'Effiong has a car which he (Effiong) has'}
\]

The above example, (14), shows that although nyéné may be a source of possession, it is certainly not the case that all possessive cases are derived from the nyéné source.

Second, consider the following:

\[(15)\]
\[
a. \text{Básséy õkút ñwán eyên fò} \quad \text{'Bassey has seen your son's wife'}
\]
\[
b. *\text{Básséy õkút ñwán émì eyên énynénédé émì àfò enyénéndé}
\]
\[
\quad \text{'Bassey has seen the wife which the son has which you have'}
\]

Not only is (15b) ungrammatical but it is also semantically anomalous, since it means both the son and father have the same wife.

Third, the ungrammaticality of (16a) is significant:

\[(16)\]
\[
a. *\text{èkà lómé óyôm ènyé} \quad \text{'Ime's mother wants him'}
\]

where ènyé refers to lómé. The ungrammaticality\(^2\) of the above sentence is easily accounted for by the fact that as a simplex the structure underlying it does not qualify as a proper analysis for simple pronominalization,

\[^2\text{In some dialects (16a) seems to be grammatical. In such dialects, then, simple pronominalization is not limited to the complex. Even so, (16b) is clearly preferable to (16a) is such dialects.}\]
which in Efik occurs only in complex and conjoined structures. If the structure underlying (16a) is a simple structure, then it cannot also be a complex structure at the same time. In other words, èkà lmé 'Ime's mother' is not in fact derived from a sentential source. Incidentally, the way to save (16a) is not to pronominalize the object of the sentence, which is lmé, in the deep structure, as the grammaticality of (16b) shows.

(16) b. èkà lmé óyöm lmé 'Ime's mother wants Ime'

Finally, from a general linguistic point of view, Lyons [1968:391-95] has argued that an analysis which derives possessive phrases such as 'John's book' from an underlying source in which the possessor noun like 'John's' is the deep subject and the verb 'have' is a deep structure verb is incorrect:

"In most of the transformational accounts of English syntax so far published, it has been assumed that phrases like John's book are to be derived from an underlying structure in which the 'possessive' noun is the subject of the verb 'have': in other words, it is assumed that have is a deep structure verb (like read, etc.), which differs, however, from the majority of transitive verbs in that (in possessive sentences) it cannot undergo the passive transformation (*A book is had by John). There are many reasons for believing that this account of the relationship between 'have' sentences and possessive phrases is incorrect" (p. 391).

In our analysis 'have', or nyene in Efik, is in fact not a deep structure verb but is transformationally introduced.

Interestingly, Lyons has shown, in support of his position, that expressions such as 'John's' above is a kind of adjective. But an adjective is a noun modifier. Although in Efik expressions such as lmé in the phrase èkà lmé 'Ime's mother' are not adjectival in function and syntax, they certainly act like a noun modifier, as we will show presently.

Enough has been given to show that there are very grave problems if one wishes to derive possessive sentences from complex sentences containing embedded relative clauses with nyene. The question then is, how best can they be derived? We think that possessive NP's should be derived in the base with the possessor NP as a constituent of the determiner system by the following expansion rules of the base:
The possessor NP will be dominated by the NOM of the DET. Given a possessive NP like èbé èsìe 'her husband', the structure would look like the following:

![Diagram of NP structure]

The analysis of possessive NP's as part of the determiner is justified on both syntactic and semantic grounds. There are two kinds of noun modifiers in Efik, namely pre-nominal modifiers like quantifiers and Wh-question morphemes, and post-nominal modifiers like demonstratives, the definite article and numerals, which together constitute the determiner system. Observe, for example, that (17a) parallels (17b):

(17) a. éyén  {órò} 'that/the'  b. éyén  {Bássèv} 'his/her/its'
    'child'  {émi}  'this'  'child'  {éslé}  'his/her/its'
    'yonder'  {ókò}  'child'  {ñnyín}  'our'

It is not only in Efik that possessor NP's behave like nominal modifiers. In English, as shown above, Lyons has shown that NP's like 'John's' are adjectival in function in such phrases as 'John's book'. On the other hand, Postal [1966] has argued that elements such as 'my', 'our', 'him' in 'myself', 'ourselves', and 'himself' respectively "are of course articles, definite articles, in fact genitive type definite articles".

Semantically, the possessor NP, like the demonstrative or article, appears to definitize the NP in which it occurs. Thus, in (18), for example, where only definite NP's occur in the subject position, a possessive NP occurs as a subject.

(18) a. éyén  Okón  éslìmà  ñdítàn  édém  étí  étí
       1  2  3  4  5

'Okon's son likes to be very arrogant'
(18) b. éyén órò ésimá ánditànj idém étl étl
    'that child likes to be very arrogant'

c. Ātā ésimá ánditànj idém étl étl
    'Ata likes to be very arrogant'

d. *éyén ésimá ánditànj idém étl étl
    'a child likes to be very arrogant'

4. Compound Nominals

As we have seen above, a possessive NP is a complex NP, by which I mean an NP dominating another NP (or other NPs). There are some nominals which look like possessive NPs and we wish to examine whether they do in fact qualify as possessive cases. Consider the following examples:

(19) a. étō īwèd 'a stick for writing'

b. ìkpókóró úďá 'a table for eating'

c. úfók ìbòk 'a house for medicine'

Syntactically, the NP's in (19) look like possessive NP's: there is a preceding and a following nominal in each case, just as in the possessive case. However, as even the English glosses show, there is no basis for a possessive interpretation of these NP's, from a semantic point of view. These NP's characteristically involve instrumentality or purpose: thus étō īwèd is 'a stick for writing' or 'a stick for the purpose of writing'. A possessive gloss like 'a book's stick' for étō īwèd is clearly unacceptable. Similarly, an instrumental gloss for a possessive NP like éyén Bássèy 'Bassey's child' would be clearly unacceptable. Thus 'a child used for Bassey' is clearly not a gloss for éyén Bássèy.

There are also syntactic differences between the NP's in (19) and possessive NP's. While the NP's in (19) may allow the plural morpheme mìmè, some possessive NP's do not, as (20) and (21) respectively show.

(20) a. mìmè étō īwèd 'pens'

b. mìmè ìkpókóró úďá 'dining tables'

c. mìmè úfók ìbòk 'hospitals'
(21) a. *nmè ñwèd èkòn 'Okon’s books'
b. nmè èkpàt èyèn òrò 'the boy's bags'
c. nmè bìà ñnyín 'our yams'

However, nmè ètè ndi tà òrò 'the fathers of those children' and nmè èbè èbàn Òrò 'those women's husbands' are grammatical, where both NP's are [+Human]. It should be noted that in (21), although the possessors are human, the things possessed are inanimate.

Secondly, while a possessive NP like èkpàt Bássey émè 'this bag belongs to Bassey' or 'the bag belonging to this Bassey' is structurally ambiguous, as the phrase markers in (22) show, an NP such as étò ñwèd émè 'this pen' is not.

(22) a.

N
NP
DET
NOM
ART
NP
N
èkpàt
Bássey

(22a) underlies the interpretation 'this bag of Bassey', while (22b) underlies 'the/a bag of this Bassey'.

Therefore, such NP's as étò ñwèd, úfòk ìbòk, èkpókóró údúla are not possessive, though they look like such NP's in form. Rather one may regard them as such English compounds as 'night show', 'play group', 'baby sitter', etc. We suggest therefore that they be analysed as compounds.
We shall not attempt the analysis of compounds here. Langacker [1972:77] suggests that for such compounds as 'armchair', 'rattlesnake', etc. this rule will work:

"The meaning \( N_1 \) with \( N_2 \) can be expressed by a compound of the form \( N_2N_1 \)."

In Efik, however, the meaning \( N_1 \) for \( N_2 \) can be expressed by a compound of the form \( N_1N_2 \). For example, \( \text{hwèd íkwó} \) 'a book for songs' and \( ìkpó \text{mbrè} \) 'a thing for play'.

Finally, on the differences between possessive NP's and compounds, observe that the former are a "conjunction" of NP's, if I may be permitted to use this expression in a rather special sense, whereas the latter are a "conjunction" of N's. This follows from our observation that whereas NP's like \( \text{èkpàt Bàlàyé émè} \) are structurally ambiguous, NP's like \( ìfòk \text{hwèd émè} \) 'this house for books', i.e. 'school' are not.

5. Formulation of Possessive Pronominalization

We shall now turn to the central concern of the paper, namely, the formulation of Possessive Pronominalization, which we shall sometimes refer to as the "possessive rule". Consider, for example, the simple sentence in (23):

(23) \( ìmé éyényàm ìmòtò èsìe \) 'Ime will sell his car'

(23) is structured as (24a), omitting the details:

(24) a. 

```
S
  NP₁ C
    ìmé 
  VP
    VB
    éyényàm
  NP₂
    N
      ìmòtò
    DET
      NOM
    NP₃ C
      ìmé
```

The possessive rule will apply to a configuration like (24a) provided:

(i) \( NP_1 \) and \( NP_3 \) are coreferential;
(ii) \( NP_3 \) is immediately preceded by an N;
Let us suppose for the moment that the above conditions are not only necessary but also sufficient for the application of the possessive rule. But do these conditions guarantee that in a phrase marker like (24a) above, it is possessive pronominalization and not reflexivization that applies, since (24a) is after all a simplex? (Reflexivization is limited to the simplex in Efik).

We will answer this question by comparing a proper analysis for reflexivization, such as the phrase marker in (24b), with (24a).

(24) b.

Reflexivization will apply to (24b) if NP₁ and NP₂, which are subject and object respectively in a simplex, are coreferential. Doubtless, (24a) and (24b) are similar. But they also differ, in fact in a non-trivial way. Observe that in (24b), NP₂, which is identical with NP₁, is the object of the simplex (being immediately dominated by the VP), whereas in (24a), NP₃, which is identical with NP₁, is not the object of the simplex as such. It is only part of the object NP, NP₂ (which is immediately dominated by the VP). Clearly (24a) is not a proper analysis for reflexivization and the conditions for the application of the possessive rule seem to recognize this. So given the phrase marker such as (24a) and the conditions for the application of possessive pronominalization as spelled out above, reflexivization on such a phrase marker is ruled out. Observe that the conditions for possessive pronominalization make no mention of the simplex condition and although coreference is one of the conditions, it is not required that this hold between the subject and object in a phrase marker such as (24a). However, possessive pronominalization is blocked if the NP for this rule is part of the subject, as (25) shows.
(25) a. *ọkụk ẹsị́ ẹkàbị́ọt Bàssèy ịbụt ọzọ 'his money made Bassey arrogant'
   
   b. *Eyèn ẹsị́ ẹmà ẹbị́nè ẹtẹ́ ọrọ 'his son joined the man'

Apparently the constraint on backward pronominalization is violated here. However, it does seem as if the constraint does not affect (26) below.

(26) a. ọkụk ẹsị́ ẹkàbị́ọt Bàssèy 'it is his money that Bassey wasted'
    
   b. Eyèn ẹsị́ ẹtẹ́ ọrọ ẹkèbị́nè 'it is his son that the man joined'

The constraint is not in fact violated since (26a,b) derive from (27a,b):

(27) a. Bàssèy ẹkàbị́ọt ọkụk ẹsị́ 'Bassey wasted his money'
    
   b. ẹtẹ́ ọrọ ẹkèbị́nè eyèn ẹsị́ 'the man joined his son'

where the pronoun follows the antecedent, in obedience to the constraint. Even if (27) are not exact paraphrases of (26), there is no doubt that they are derived from the latter by a transformation that moves the object out of its normal position (Efik is a SVO language) to the position normally occupied by the deep subject, for topicalization.

In Efik it seems, therefore, that the constraint that does not permit a pronoun to precede the nominal to which it refers in a simplex is operative at the time the possessive rule is ready to apply. There is evidence, too, that this is also true of reflexivization, since (28a) is grammatical and yet the reflexive pronoun clearly precedes the NP Bassey to which it refers.

(28) a. Ịdẹ́m ẹsị́ ẹkà Bàssèy ọtụ́k 'Bassey has cheated himself'
    
   As in (26), the reflexive pronoun Ịdẹ́m ẹsị́ must have been moved to the front from its object position (at which time it obeyed the constraint), by the topicalization transformation, as it seems clear from (28b), from which (28a) is derived.

(28) b. Bàssèy ọtụ́k Ịdẹ́m ẹsị́ 'Bassey has cheated himself'

If the constraint on examples such as (26), where the following NP in each case is [-Pro], is operative at the time the possessive pronominalization is ready to apply, it is not operative at all if the following NP is itself a pronoun as (29) are perfectly grammatical.
Let us return to the application of the possessive transformation, having seen the sort of configuration on which it operates and the conditions on which it operates. Given the phrase marker (24a) and the fulfillment of the conditions for possessive pronominalization, the rule will apply marking the feature [+Pro] and [+Pos] (Possessive) on the NP which is dominated by DET. If this NP is already [+Pro], the rule will simply mark [+Pos]. In the case of (24a), the NP will later be realized as esie. In this way, (23) will be generated.

Next, let us take an example which involves both possessive pronominalization and reflexivization. Let us consider (30).

(30) Atá ekpép idem ésié ñwëd yè ākúk ésié
    'Ata has put himself through school with his money'

Underlying (30) is (31a).

(31) a. S
    NPc
    VP
    VB NPc NPc
    Atá ekpép Atá ñwëd
    COMP-PHRASE (COMPLEMENT PHRASE)
    NPc
    COMP
    Prep N DET
    yè ākúk Atá

(31a) is a proper analysis for both reflexivization and possessive pronominalization. The question is, which of these two rules precedes the other? We suggest the rules be applied cyclically and that possessive pronominalization precede reflexivization, since the latter will not have to look back to embedded sentences in a complex structure. The application of possessive pronominalization generates (31b).

(31) b. Atá ekpép Atá ñwëd yè ākúk ésié
    'Ata has put Ata through school with his money'
When reflexivization applies, (30) is generated.

So far we have been looking at possessive pronominalization in a simplex. Now, consider (32), which is a complex.

(32) Árit óyôm ñnyìn îkpémè éyén ésiê 'Arit wants us to mind her baby

Underlying (32) is (33), omitting details:

(33) $\text{S} \quad \text{NP}_1 \quad \text{NP}_2 \quad \text{NP}_3 \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{NP}_4$

Underlying (32) is (33), omitting details:

(33) fulfills all the conditions for the application of the possessive rule:

(i) there are two coreferent NP's ($\text{NP}_1$ and $\text{NP}_4$);

(ii) one of the coreferent NP's, $\text{NP}_4$, is immediately preceded by an N and dominated by a DET;

(iii) the N that immediately precedes $\text{NP}_4$ is a left sister of the DET that dominates the same NP.

(33), therefore, is a proper analysis for possessive pronominalization and when the rule applies, (32) is generated. So possessive pronominalization applies in both simplexes and complexes, provided, of course, the necessary conditions are met.

Backward possessive pronominalization is not permissible even in environments where backward simple pronominalization is allowed. Thus (34) is ungrammatical.

(34) *èdfèkè éyén ésiê èdídé, ñyèsìan Bássey 'if his son comes, I will tell Bassey'

In fact, it seems to be the case that backward possessive pronominalization
is not allowed whether in a simplex or complex. Recall that even in (26), at the time the rule applied, it applied in a forward direction. It was a later rule, Topicalization, which moved the objects, of which the possessive pronouns happen to have been a part, forward. It is only in (29c), where the following coreferent NP is itself a pronoun, that possessive pronominalization is apparently seen to have taken place in a backward direction.

In Section 2, we said that the first and second person possessive pronouns ̀m_mì/ǹnyìn 'my/our' and ̀fò/ǹbùfọ 'your/your (pl)' characteristically occur in the base, or are derived by the Pronoun Conjunction Rule. Examples such as (35) are straightforward cases: the possessive pronouns occur in the base as ̀amì 'I' and ̀afọ 'you', as the underlying structures in (36) show.

(35) a. Bássèy óyòm èyèn mìmì  'Bassey wants my child'

b. ènyè èwèt ènyìnj fò  'he has written your name'

(36) a.

```
S
   /\    
NP    VP
     /\   /
    VB   NP
       /\   /
      N   DET
            /
           NOM
         /
        NP
    Båssèy óyòm èyèn
  1  2  3
```

b.

```
S
   /\    
NP    VP
     /\   /
    VB   NP
       /\   /
      N   DET
            /
           NOM
         /
        NP
    Ènyè èwèt ènyìnj
  1  2  3
```
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The surface forms *mì* (sometimes *mì*, especially in fast speech) and *tò* are derived by a morphophonemic rule. Observe that the morphophonemic rule is not necessary in the case of the plural possessives. Thus *òbiò ṣe nnyìn 'our country', *òbiò mbufò 'your country', and *òbiò mmò 'their country* are derived from (37a), (37b), and (37c) respectively.

(37) a. NP b. NP c. NP

So the rule is required required to apply only in the case of [+Sing] pronouns in such structures as (36) and (37).

In the following examples, however, it seems that ṣe nnyìn and *mbufò* are derived by the Pronoun Conjunction Rule:

(38) a. ̀mì ye Arìt iyom unen ṣe nnyìn 'Arit and I want our right(s)'  
    b. ̀fo ye Arìt eyom unen *mbufò* 'you and Arit want your right(s)'

The Pronoun Conjunction Rule derives, among other things

(a) The First Person Plural from a conjunction of the First Person (singular and plural) with either of the other persons or in fact both of these persons at the same time;

(b) The Second Person Plural from a conjunction of the Second Person (singular or plural) with the Third Person.

Thus we have the following:

(39) a. ̀mì/ßenyìn ye ̀fo/mbufò = ßenyìn  
        'I/we and you (pl)'  
        'we'

b. ̀mì/ßenyìn ye ̀rí = ßenyìn  
    'I/we and Arit'  
    'we'

c. ̀mì/ßenyìn ye ènyé/mmò = ßenyìn  
    'I/we and he/she/it/they'  
    'we'

d. ̀mì/ßenyìn ye ̀fo/mbufò ye ènyé/Arìt/mmò = ßenyìn  
    'I/we and you (pl) and he/Arit/they'  
    'we'

e. ̀fo/mbufò ye ènyé/Arìt/mmò = *mbufò*  
    'you (pl)'
The details of the Pronoun Conjunction Rule are discussed in Essien [1974a:158-60]. The point to note here is that certain conjunctions involving pronouns (and other non-pronominal NP's) can be reduced to single pronouns. The reduction is optional in some cases and obligatory in others.

Let us return to the examples in (38) and let us consider (38a) in particular. This sentence is derived from (40), omitting details.

(40)

The Pronoun Conjunction Rule will apply to (40) obligatorily deriving ḷnyln from ぇmì ぇ Arlt, which forms part of the object of the S. In this way, (38a) is derived. ぇmì ぇ Arlt as the subject of the sentence can be optionally collapsed to derive ḷnyln, thus deriving (41):

(41) ḷnyln ье ੰ 准入 ḷnyln 'we want our right(s)'

6. Possessive Pronominalization and the So-Called Picture Nouns

In English, the sentences such as (42) are considered as reflexive sentences.

(42) a. John saw a picture of himself
    b. Mary told a story about herself

Some attempts have been made to analyse 'himself' and 'herself' in the above sentences within the general framework of reflexivization. Thus Jackendoff [1968:14f, 1975:135] suggests that the N analysis of Chomsky [1970] would offer a solution to the derivation of the reflexives connected with nominals like 'picture' and 'story', which have come to be known as "picture nouns".
In Efik, however, we want to say that the forms connected with the so-called picture nouns are not in fact reflexive pronouns derived as a result of reflexivization but lexical items generated in the base in possessive positions. There are a number of reasons for our analysis. First, although there are sentences like (43), there are also sentences like (44).

(43) a. àmì ǹmékùt ádịsé ịdèm mì 'I have seen a picture of myself'
   b. ènyé éyétịn mbụk ịdèm ési 'he will tell the story of himself'
(44) a. àmì ǹmékùt ádịsé ịdèm fọ 'I have seen a picture of yourself'
   b. ènyé éyétịn mbụk ịdèm mì 'he will tell the story of myself'

where ịdèm fọ and àmì are not coreferential in (44a) and ịdèm mì and ènyé are not coreferential in (44b). Surely the sentences in (44) do not qualify as reflexive sentences in our definition (cf. p.131, Section 5) and ịdèm fọ and ịdèm mì in these examples cannot therefore be regarded as reflexive pronouns. If so, we ought to look at similar forms in (43) with suspicion, even though they may happen to be coreferential with the subjects of the sentences. For if the forms in (43) were truly reflexive pronouns, then (44) ought to be ungrammatical, where these forms and the subjects of the sentences are not coreferential.

Secondly, whereas the formatives ǹmì, ési, etc. can be optionally deleted in a reflexive sentence without a change in meaning (cf. Essien [1974b]), as (45) show, the possessive forms in (43) cannot be deleted, as the ungrammaticality of (46) show.

(45) a. ènyé ánàm ịdèm ési 'he is harming himself'
   b. ènyé ánàm ịdèm 'he is harming himself'
(46) a. *àmì ǹmékùt ádịsé ịdèm 'I have seen a picture of myself'
   b. *ènyé éyétịn mbụk ịdèm 'he will tell the story of himself'

Thirdly, on the other hand, the deletion of ịdèm in (45a), for example, which is a reflexive sentence results in one interpretation, while the deletion of ịdèm in (43) and (44) results in a different interpretation of the sentences, as (47), (48) and (49) which correspond to (45a), (43) and (44) respectively show.
Notice in particular that the effects of the deletion of ìdèm in (43) and (44) are the same. Semantically, (43) and (44) are different from (48) and (49), respectively. For example, in (43a), ñdíse ìdèm ìmì means 'a picture of myself' or ('of my person'), whereas ñdíse ìmì in (48a) means 'the picture that I own' (not necessarily of myself or my person). In addition, whereas ñdíse in (43a) is indefinite, ñdíse in (48a) is definite. Similarly in (44a), ñdíse ìdèm fò is interpreted as 'a picture of yourself' (or 'your person'), whereas in (49a) ñdíse fò means 'the picture belonging to you' (not necessarily of yourself or your person). Again ñdíse in (44a) is indefinite while ñdíse in (49a) is definite.

Fourthly, as a lexical item of the nominal class, ìdèm in (43) can be preceded or followed by a nominal modifier, like any nominal in the language, but ìdèm as part of a reflexive pronoun does not allow any modifiers, as (50) and (51), respectively, show.

(50) a. ìmì èmèkùt ñdíse ëdīyē ìdèm ìmì 'I have seen a picture of my pretty self'
    b. ènyé èyètìì ìmì ìdèm ësìì òrò 'he will tell a story of that self
       of his'

(51) a. *ìmì èmènyììnè ëdīyē ìdèm ìmì 'I have helped my pretty self'
    b. *Bàssèy òwòt ìdèm ësìì òrò 'Bassey has killed that self of his'

In addition, the reflexive-like forms in (43) are freely used with non-picture nouns, as these examples show.

(52) a. ñyòm ìkùk ìdèm ìmì 'I want my personal money'

---

3ìmì èmèkùt ëdīyē ìdèm ìmì ke úkùtìsò 'I have seen my pretty body in the
mirror' is grammatical. But here ìdèm means 'body', not 'self'.
(52) b. Atá idígé éyèn ìdèm fò
   'Ata is not your begotten child (i.e. is adopted) '
   c. ñkpó óró idígé mbùbèhè ìdèm èsíe
   'that thing is not his personal affair'

where reflexive interpretations are highly improbable. Clearly ìdèm
ìmè, ìdèm fò and ìdèm èsíe in (52) are possessive in form and
meaning. This interpretation of the reflexive-like forms in (52) is
clearly applicable to the same forms in (43) and explains the grammatical-
cality of (44), where these elements are not coreferential with the
subjects of the sentences.

Finally, the tone pattern on ìdèm indicates that ìdèm is in
fact a possessor nominal, much like èbòt 'goat's' in the phrase èslìm
èbòt 'a goat's tail' in (53c) below. It should be pointed out that
in Efik, tones are used not only to distinguish lexical items but also
to indicate certain syntactic relationships or functions. Now let us
consider the following examples:

(53) a. ènyò ñ ètò 'a tree's top'
   b. èbè éyèn 'a daughter's husband'
   c. èslìm èbòt 'a goat's tail'

where the tones on ètò, èyèn and èbòt are high-low. "Inherent"
tones on these lexical items are high-high, as (54) show.

(54) a. ètò 'a tree'
   b. èyèn 'a daughter'
   c. èbòt 'a goat'

That is the tones on ètò, èyèn and èbòt are ordinarily high unless
they are affected by some grammatical process or processes.

Now consider the tones on ìdèm in (43) (and also (44)). They are
exactly like the tones on ètò, èyèn and èbòt in (53), namely high-
low (unless the high tone is slightly lowered by a preceding downstepped
high as in (43a)). "Inherent" tones on the lexical item ìdèm 'body' or
'self' are high-high, as these examples show.
Like the "inherent" tones on étó, ébó and éyén, the "inherent" tones on idém can be affected by some grammatical processes. Note that the tone pattern on idém in the reflexive sentences such as those in (30) and (45) indicates a different grammatical relationship from that indicated by the tone pattern on idém as a possessor nominal in (43) and (44).

The syntactic, semantic and the tonal arguments given above strongly support our analysis of the sentences in (43) as possessive rather than reflexive sentences. The difference between (43) and ordinary possessive sentences such as those in (1) in Section 1 is that the possessive sentences in (43) have two possessor NP's namely idém and a personal pronoun whereas those in (1) have only one possessor NP, namely the personal pronoun. Accordingly, (43) are derived from (56), omitting the details.

(56) a. 

Diagram: (This is a simplified representation of the sentence structure.)
(56) b.

As (56a) and (56b) are proper analyses for possessive pronominalization, the rule will apply in the two structures deriving (43a) and (43b) respectively.

REFERENCES


