

Date: 2006-07-16

I am beginning today to revise this whole work and to answer the follow-up queries from p. 15. After this, I will look for Part 4, the last part of the questionnaire.

I have decided that, in order to save time and space, each example will consist of 3 lines: the 1st line will be the Lokaa example transcribed phonemically, the 2nd the gloss in a form to give grammatical info, and the 3rd line the translation. The gloss, for example, will give the subject (subj) of the sentence/clause; the verb will be given as ‘he-gathered’, as in the first example below, meaning 3sing. + past-aorist form; obj stands for object, and sometimes you may have obj1 and obj2, which implies that the verb is taking 2 objects arranged in the order they appear in the sentence. Possessive adjectives or pronouns are simply glossed. I have decided that there is no need to put tone on the proper names serving as subject, since their tones or the tones of any other subject nouns have no impact whatsoever on the tone pattern of the verb they control in terms of number, that is, whether the verb is singular or plural, which is vowel harmony related. The perfective clitic *kɛ* will simply glossed ‘has’ for sing. and ‘have’ for plu. The various forms *ímàà*, *bímàà* meaning ‘the, this, these, those’ will be simply glossed as diectic/diect.

Lines in which important corrections are made are asterisked. Explanations in bold are given where requests for them are made, otherwise close to the text being referred to for explanation.

I have gone through Seye’s transcription of what I submitted before in long hand, and I find I have to go through it line by line both to correct the mistakes and to add info requested by you for clarity or to meet your needs for analysis. Now I realise why this work has not been done earlier. It is not easy, and it is time consuming, time which you know I don’t have. But I am here in Paris for 2 weeks more to do my work, and so I will do this work as much as I can in between. The good thing is that I now have all the work in my computer and I can do it little by little until I complete it.

I am really sorry for the delay. But it is perhaps better late than never, as they say. Thanks for your patience.

Alex.

Part 2 An Inventory of Reflexive and Reciprocal Strategies

1. Omini ɔ́-fúká é yèjò
 subj. he-gathered obj.-himself obj.-yams
 ‘Omini gathered yams for himself’

2. Omini ɔ́-kàbà kè
 subj. he-washed-himself has
 ‘Omini has taken his bath/ has had a shower’

3. Bèè̀n bímàà yá-tènì kɛ̀ wò:l íbɛ̀
 subj diectic they-recognized have body their
 ‘Those children recognise themselves’

2.1. Coreference in a single clause

2.1.1 “Primary” reflexive strategy

A1. Omini ó-kàmì wǒ:l lí-wé Poss-Agree Strategy
 subj. he-helped body his
 “Omini helped himself.”

-/wɔ:l liwɛ/ is described by the informant as a classless NP (wɔl) modified by a possessive adjective (liwe) that identifies both the class (li-) and the person number features (here -wɛ) of the antecedent. He takes as evidence for its being two words the possibility of splitting them up with another modifier while maintaining the reflexive interpretation (example forthcoming).

All this is not clear and definitely not correct. wǒ:l, like all nouns in Lokaa, belongs to a class, although this noun does not carry its own class mark, but the possessive adj. lí-wé shows the class of the noun and agrees with it. The point of this strategy is that it is the poss adj that tells us whether the action of the verb is reflexive or not, that is, whether the action of the verb is on the subj or on another obj noun. E.g.

- (i) ò-nèn ímà: ó-kàmì wǒ:l líwé Poss-Agree Strategy
 subj diect he-helped body his
 ‘The man helped himself’
- (ii) yà-nèn bímà: yá-kàmì wǒ:l líbé Poss-Agree Strategy
 subj diect they-helped body their
 ‘The men helped themselves’
- (iii) ò-nèn ímà: ó-kàmì wǒ:l líbé No reflexive action
 subj diect he-helped body their
 ‘The man helped their bodies, and not, e.g. their property’

In exx (i) and (ii), the poss adj shows that the obj nouns are sing and plu respectively, i.e. on the sing subj and plu subj respectively, so the action of the verb is reflexive. But in ex (iii), the obj of the verb is plu, whereas the subj is sing, therefore the action of the verb cannot be reflexive, as it is not on the ‘body’ of the subj. noun, which is sing. So the poss adj agreement is the key to whether the lang. wants the verb to be reflexive or not.

2.1.2 (no data)

2.1.3 A2 (a) Omini ó-kábái Null Obj Strategy **Very limited verbs**

subj. 3sg-wash himself
 “Omini is washing himself.”

- (b) Omini ó-bàè è kɛ̀ŋkòŋ Dir. Obj-Agree Strategy. **Wide distribution**
 subj. he-cut him knife
 “Omini cut himself with a knife.”

- *(c) Omini ó-nǎí bǔ:ŋ lènèn jè:ná No reflexive construction
 subj. he-did thing of shame
 “Omini did something shameful.”
- (d) Omini ó-kàbì wǔ:l í-wé
 subj. he-destroyed body his
 “Omini destroyed himself.”
- *(e) Wǔ:l í-mò:n í-tùm í-kónnǐ mǔ:n
 bodies our they-very they-hate us
 “We hate ourselves.” (lit. “Our bodies dislike us very much.”)

*** The informant identifies the ‘us’ (dir. object) as a resumptive pronoun. The following is your comment on this example, as lifted from p. 19 or s:**

2.1.3 A2e. This is a very intriguing example because of the fronting and because the agreement seems to me out of the ordinary. Why does “ourselves” give 1pl agreement with the object, but 3pl for the subject, which is apparently pro-dropped here? I would have expected 1st person subject agreement. The topic analysis for verb final constructions that Mark Baker has just written about might apply here, though I have no idea what triggers it in this case. Might the third person agreement be a result of agreement with a topic (a remnant VP topic in Mark’s analysis). So in other words, I want to know about the agreement pattern (would subject agreement with 1pl be *?) and whether topicalization and resumption, if that is what it is, is necessary here - provide an example without it to show what happens. Judging from the next section, it appears that this fronting is something that happens with a certain subclass of psychological predicates (as appears to be suggested by your comment on A4a) - what do you think ?

As you can see from the literal translation, there is no fronting at all. The problem arises because of the verb /kónnǐ/ ‘to be hated’. The way it occurs in Lokaa poses a problem for translation. The person hated is the subject of the verb, while the person hating occurs as object of that verb. Thus, ‘I hate you’ comes out as ‘You hate me’, which really means ‘You are hated by me’, except that I become the object of the verb and you the subject. In the example in question, we are hating our bodies, so our bodies /Wǔ:l í-mò:n / occurs as subject, while ‘we’ now occurs as object /mò:n/. Look at the following example: ‘We hate them’ comes out this way:

/yá-kónnǐ mò:n/
 they-are-hated us
 ‘We hate them’
 bě:n bímà: yá-kónnǐ mò:n
 NP-subj. diect. 3Plu.-Vb-stem Obj.
 children those they-are-hated us
 ‘We hate those children’

‘they-are-hated’ does not translate the verb well, because the verb in Lokaa is transitive. Another example:

m-blá n-kónnǐ yò-nò:n
 subj. 3p-Vb-stem obj.
 dogs they-are-hated chicken
 ‘Chicken hate dogs’

2.1.4 A3 (a) á-jô:n ó-tòṅà òbá à-mèrí
 subj. he-talked with Mary
 “John spoke to Mary.”

***-the /a-/ prefix on /jô:n/ and /meri/ occurs whenever a proper name, functioning as subject of a clause or preceded by òbá, begins with a consonant.**

(b) obia ó-tòṅà ò-báṅṅà wò:l í-wé
 subj. she-spoke it-is-about body her
 “Obia spoke about herself.”

***/ò-báṅṅà/ is a fixed verb that accompanies the verb ‘to talk/ speak’. It simply means ‘about’. The í-wé tells us that Obia is talking about herself, i.e. that the reference is to the subject of the sentence.**

(c) omini ó-yìṅì mèrí-á ò-bá:ṅà wò:l í-wé
 Omini he-told Mary-obj it-is-about body his
 “Omini told Mary about himself.”

*** The anaphoric element cannot be co-construed with Mary, but must refer to the subject, in this case, Omini. The /-a/ suffix identifies the proper name as obj. of the verb.**

(d) omini ó-yìṅì mò:n ò-bá:ṅà wò:l í-mò:n
 subj. he-told us it-is-about body our
 “Omini told us about ourselves.”

(e) bě :n bímà: (ká à-wò:l í-bé) mbè obia ó-kèì
 children those (by bodies their) whom-obj. subj.-Obia she-gave
 “It is the children (themselves) that Obia gave...”

(f) obia ó-ká: ṅwènè ká ṅgèṃ ṅwé
 subj. she-saw book at back her
 “Obia saw a book behind her.”

(g) omini ó-déí wò:l í-wé ṅwènè ímà:
 Omini 3sg-buy body poss-3sg book the
 “Omini bought the book for himself.”

*** The following is your comment on this, lifted from p.20 or so:**

2.1.4 A3g. Is this strategy only possible for either direct objects, where this is a DO by virtue of the dative construction? Is there a dative alternation here (e.g., with an overt benefactive preposition), and if so, would the result be just the pronoun inside the PP? **No, this construction does not allow an overt benefactive prepositional phrase> The only other way of saying the same thing is to introduce another verb, like this:**

omini ó-déí ṅwènè ímà: ò-kè: wò:l í-wé
 subj. he-bought DO-book deict. he-gave DO-body his

‘He bought that book for himself’

More example:

omini ó-déí m̀bú lú jí
 subj. he-bought DO-goats DO-food
 ‘Omini bought food for the goats’

omini ó-déí b́é lú jí
 subj. he-bought DO-them DO-food
 ‘Omini bought them food’

omini ó-déí ýé lú jí
 subj. he-bought him food
 ‘Omini bought himself food’

The only reason I know that ýé means ‘himself’ is because it agrees with the subj. in number. But wò:l í-wé in this position is more emphatic than just saying ýé.

A4 (a) obia wò:l í-wé í-tùm í-dè wé
 subj.-body her it-very it-endears her (dir. obj.)
 “Obia likes herself” (lit. “Obia, her body much endears her.”)

*** This is the same structure that appears in A2e, and appears to be limited to predicates like ‘like’ and ‘hate’. /obia/ is an obligatorily dislocated NP indicating the owner of the body. obia kòfè kówé Obia leg her means ‘Obia her leg’, which translates as ‘Obia’s leg’. When two NPs are placed side by side, and the first is a proper noun, the proper noun is identified as the owner of the second NP.**

(b) obia ó-gón wò:l í-wé blò:l
 subj. she-put body her fear
 “Obia scared herself.” (lit. “Obia put fear into her body.”)

(c) obia ó-kà:yì wò:l í-wé yègá:gá:
 subj. she-give body her trouble
 “Obia is worrying herself.” (lit. “Obia gives her body trouble.”)

***wò:l í-wé is first obj., while yègá:gá: is second direct object.**

2.1.5 (no new strategies)

A5 (a) í-ká: wò:l í-m̀í
 I-saw body my
 “I saw myself.”

(b) á-bè: ò k̀êṅk̀òṅ

you-cut you knife (you is 1st dir. obj., knife 2nd dir. obj.)
 “You cut yourself with a knife.”

* **Your comment is lifted here:**

2.1.5 A5b. The use of DO-agree here seems like it could be a matter of an inherent reflexive. Is there a difference in the choice of DO-agree vs. Poss-agree if the act of cutting oneself is intentional, (e.g., “John carefully cut himself” (e.g., to appear gravely wounded when he was not) as opposed to slipping and cutting himself on the knife he was holding? What would happen for A5b if you translated it with the Poss-agree strategy? Is the DO-agree strategy used for inherent reflexives (verbs that cannot have a non-reflexive object, like English “John perjured himself”?, see section xx). This seems related to the inalienable gestures with possessives, like A15c - what do you think?

There is emphasis when you use the Poss-agree strategy, as we saw in the example I have just commented upon, but no intention is ever implied. What tells you that a verb is used reflexively is when there is DO agreement with the subj. NP when a DO is present OR when the verb itself is inherently reflexive as in kábá ‘to wash oneself’ in the next example.

(c) nè yó -kábà
 fut. we-wash
 “We will wash (ourselves).”

* **The final low tone on the verb is part of the future marking, along with the /nə/ particle/clitic. The verb is intrinsically reflexive.**

(d) bǎ: kǎ:m wò:l í-bà:
 imper-subj help body your (The presence of bǎ: is for emphasis).
 “Help yourselves”

* **The poss. adj. í-bà: tells us that the action of the verb is reflexive, because it agrees with the subj. which is 2nd Person Plural).**

2.1.6 (a) no new strategies

A6 (a) omini ó-yǐ:mé kɛ wo:l li-we
 subj. he-know has body his
 “Omini knows himself.” (lit. “Omini has known his body.”)

(b) omini ó-nìkè:yǐ wò:l í-wé kòbí
 Omini 3sg-HABgive body poss-3sg fault
 “Omini habitually criticizes himself.”

(c) omini ó-tǔ:m ò-sò wò:l í-wé kèkpò:mé
 Omini 3sg-very 3sg-like body poss-3sg praising
 “Omini very much likes praising himself.”

* **Your comment lifted from below:**

2.1.6 A6c. This looks like a control structure, insofar as two verbs are involved, but the position of the poss-agree structure is to the left of the subordinated verb (or nominal). If it is control, then presumably the infinitive (or nominalized verb) has an empty PRO subject that is the intermediate antecedent for the poss-agree form. By contrast, this

example does not look like it permits the same analysis as A6b, which is plausibly like a dative structure with “fault” as the transferred theme. Whether it is control or not, it is still odd that the Poss-agree form is to the left of the last verb. Would the word order be the same if we had “Mary” in the position of “body-poss” or is it the reflexive itself that is causing this word order? You may choose to hold off on these comments until A9g. **/kèkpò:má/ is functioning here as a verbal adj. and adj. always come after the noun they qualify. Thus, lújí kèjî: means ‘food eating’ as in ‘He likes eating food’ becomes ‘He likes food eating’ ótǔ:m ò-sò lújí kèjî: . So any noun, including Mary, will have to come before the verbal adj.**

(b) no new strategies

A7 (a) wě:n wǎnwà:n:yá ó-kpé:ná ò-ká wò:l lí-wé
 boy every 3sg-look 3sg-see body poss-3sg
 “Every boy saw himself.”
 -a more unambiguous example of SVC’s in Lokaa

(b) bàně:n bímà: èbě: yá-yíní wò:l lí-bé ò-bá:ηà omini-á
 women those all 3pl-tell body poss-3pl 3sg-is about omini-obj
 “All the women told themselves about Omini.”

(c) fìsà wǎnwà:n:yá ó-yíní omini-á jě:n lé-wé
 teacher every 3sg-tell Omini-obj name poss-3sg
 “Every teacher introduced himself to Omini.” (lit. “Every teacher told Omini his name.”)

(d) bě:n bídǐ yá-kà:mì wò:l lí-bé ńjǔúnǐǔ
 children some 3pl-tell body poss-3pl alone
 “Some children help themselves only.”

(c) no special forms for honorifics

A8 (a) yá-ká: wò:l lí-bé
 3pl-see body poss-3pl
 “They saw themselves.”

A9 (a) omini ó-bǐ obia wò:l lí-wé lí-tùm lí-dè wé
 Omini 3sg-say obia body poss-3sg 3sg-very 3sg-like 3sg
 “Omini said that Obia loves herself.” (lit. “Omini said that (as for) Obia, her body much endears her.”)

-same construction we see appearing in A2e and A4a

(b) omini ó-wóí obia wò:l lí-wé tǎ lí-dè wé
 Omini 3sg-want Obia body poss-3sg that 3sg-please 3sg
 “Omini wanted Obia to love herself.” (lit. “Omini wanted (for) Obia her body that it please her.”)

* **Your comment:**

A9a-b) These examples are interesting in that it is not clear how clause boundaries are playing a role here. The a,b examples turn out to have a verb in the lower clause that induces fronting of the reflexive in simple sentences (as in A2e and A4a) and these do not appear to have complementizers, which, it seems, are otherwise present (correct me if I am wrong) for examples with “praise”. Would the presence of a complementizer be * here? Where would it go if it is possible?

This structure looks like fronting or cleft. It is like that because of the verb ‘like’ and it will be the same for ‘hate’. Obia has to come at the beginning of the second clause to ensure that the reference to the ‘body’ for the reflexive is to her and not to Omini. So the wé which is DO in Lokaa is actually subj. in English, and the person doing the liking is Obia. There is no conjunction in Lokaa to mark off the end of the main clause from the subordinate one. The interposing of the NP Obia would ordinarily have been the subject of the subordinate clause, except that with this particular verb the subject in English is rendered as obj. in Lokaa. By putting Obia at the beginning of the clause, it is taken that it is the subj. and the DO is referring back to that subj. I think Seye comment that the reflexive unit is apparently found in Spec-CP in these cases is probably correct.

(c) omini ó-bàlà è obia t̀̀ ó-kp̀̀:̀̀m̀̀ ẁ̀:l ̀̀í-wé
 Omini 3sg-thought 3sg Obia that 3sg-praise body poss-3sg
 “Omini thought that Obia should praise her body.” (lit. ?)

Seye’s Comment: will question further about this sentence, particularly after the modal, the presence of 3sg in matrix clause, and the tonal variation on the complementizer.

***Your comment:**

Now with A9c) we see a complementizer with a different tone than the examples that follow and with the curious presence of 3sg after the verb, as Seye points out. Is the complement of “think” taking a focus construction or cleft of some kind? Suggestions? The c-e examples take a full clause without an infinitive or nominal verb and appear to be pro-drop - comment if you see any reason to doubt this is so.

The presence of 3sg in the matrix clause makes the verb reflexive because Omini was thinking to himself. The tone on the 3sg is dictated by the preceding tone of the verb. The tone on t̀̀ is always L; any other tone mark on it, as in the following two examples, is wrong.

The verb bà.lá ‘to think/ remind’ is a transitive verb that normally takes 2 DOs. In the above ex. the è is the first DO, and the clause is the second DO. So if I were to say ‘I am yhinking of you’, it will be rendered as ‘I am thinking myself you’. The clause here ‘Obia...’ is replacing ‘you’ in the structure. The tones in the subordinate clause are determined by t̀̀ syntax.

(d) omini ó-j̀̀ì obia t́́ ó-kp̀̀:̀̀m̀̀ ẁ̀:l ̀̀í-wé
 Omini 3sg-tell Obia that 3sg-praise body poss-3sg
 “Omini told Obia to praise herself.” (lit. “Omini told Obia that she
 praise her body.”)

(e) omini ó-wó:yí t́́ ó-kp̀̀:̀̀m̀̀ ẁ̀:l ̀̀í-wé

Omini 3sg-want that 3sg-praise body poss-3sg
 “Omini wanted to praise himself” (lit. “Omini wanted that he praise his body.”)

(f) omini ó-yò:yì ètēm ò-bí obia nè ó-kpò:mè wò:l lí-wé
 Omini 3sg-kept heart 3sg-say Obia fut 3sg-praise body poss-3sg
 -it is unclear to me how this ought to be glossed. will question
 informant further.

(g) omini ó-pú obia ò-kpò:mè-ì wò:l lí-wé
 Omini 3sg-hear Obia 3sg-praise-prog? body poss-3sg
 “Omini heard Obia praising herself.”
 -progressive is likely marked by low tone on subj agr morpheme as well as /i/ suffix

2.2.1

A10 (a) ntoga ò-bá abam ìsé:n. íwà ó-ká: isufa
 Ntoga 3sg-say Abraham yesterday. 3sg 3sg-saw Isufa.
 “Ntoga spoke to Abraham yesterday. He saw Isufa.

(b) abam mìn kǐ:ŋg? í-ká-é¹ ká èplá
 Abraham ? ? 1sg-see-3sg in market
 “Where is Abraham? I saw him in the market.

(c) yó-ká:-ò. á-kè mò:n kè
 1pl-see-2pl. 2pl-see 1pl part.?
 “We saw you. Did you see us?”

2.2.2

-Lokaa has subject and object pronominal forms, and, for singular objects, offers the choice between strong and weak forms. The subject form can be used for emphasis as a dislocated object. The examples illustrate the clitic form of the object pronoun and the focused pronoun.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Object</u>
1 st sg: àmí	mǐn/-N̄
ó-kà-m kè 3sg-see-1sg part. “He has seen me.”	ámí, ó-kà-m kè 1sg 3sg-see-1sg part. As for me, he has seen me.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Object</u>
pl: àmó:n	mò :n
2 nd sg: àwú	wó/-ò

¹ The schwa deletes when the suffix is/begins with a vowel. Thus, /ŋkə-ɔ/ → [ŋk-ɔ]. this process will hold throughout, although I refrain from noting it further in the interest of economy.

ó-kà-ò kè
3sg-see-2sg part.
“He has seen you.”

àwú, ó-kà-ò kè
2sg 3sg-see-2sg part.
“You, he has seen.”

pl: àbǎ:

bà

3rd sg: ñwè

wé/-è

ó-kà-è kè
3sg-see-3sg part.
“He has seen him.”

ñwè, ó-kà-è kè
3sg 3sg-see-3sg part.
“As for them, he has seen them.”

m̀ and àmí ókè m̀ kè – he has seen me

Ami, okè m̀ kè – as for me,

he saw me.

ò and áwù ókè ò kè - he has seen you

Áwú, okè ò kè – you he has seen

È and ñwè

M̀ò̀n and àmóón Dislocated pronouns.

Bà and àbàá

Bè and mbè

2.2.3 Null arguments?

Omini ó-yĩimé ké óbì

1st and 2nd can employ form without needing an antecedent, but the 3rd needs a salient antecedent.

2.3 Reciprocal conference

1. Agreement – pronoun
2. Verbs which are independently reflexive or a null form.
3. Wò̀l liwé to refer to subject.

2.3.1. wool liwé can have a reciprocal meaning

Bè̀n bímàà yakóó bé

Bè̀n bimàà yákóó wò̀l íbè

Idi-idi / bídĩ-bídĩ

For reciprocals – each/bidi-bidi

Bè èn bímàà yábèṅèṅè yédù /lexical entry

Boys the they-gave- blows
Each other

1. Bè èn bímàà bídĩ-bídĩ yàà yí.
one-another yàà pú.

Dè é n yá/néṅéṅè
To do nṅ – to do
nṅéṅè

2. mechanism for reciprocity
(a) néṅ to do
néṅéṅé to do to each other
(b) bǎ to cut
bèṅéṅé to cut each other.
(c) kpééné to look at
kpééné to look at each other

A 11 (a) (i) Bàn ěn bímàà yákpéénéí
Women the they-look-at-each-other
‘The women are looking at one another.

(ii) Bàn ěn bímàà yákpéén I bidi-bidi
they-are-looking-at
“The women are looking at each other (as individuals).”

(b) Bè èn bídĩ yákói mbè bídĩ.
Children some they-wash those others.
The children washed one another.

(c) yaè èn yáwái bídĩ-bídĩ lètú
people they-comb each-other head
“The people combed each-other’s hair.

(d) yákpéṅéṅé íkpé (Reciprocal)

Bidi-bidi yakpéṅéné ikpe

(e) Bën bímàà yáfongènè òifè (Reciprocal)
Bën bímàà yáwóóné bíḍi-bíḍi infè

(f) Bíḍi-bíḍi yátóó akokónà kè ètém.
One another they-carried anger in the market
They were angry at each other.

A12 (a) yànàn bímàà yákèṅènè oyiné.
They spoke to each other about bill.

(b) yàsèèn bímàà yánéṅéné bé óyiné
The visitors spoke to each other.

(c) yabool yánéṅéné bé yayiné
The chiefs they-did themselves stories
They told themselves stories

(d) yáyòṅènè líkólè ké líkèè libè.

A13 (a) yókéṅéné
We met (saw) each other.

(b) yáyéńi tè yákàmànà wòòl libàà

(c) Nè yó kábà

(d) yánitùm yákèṅènèi kòbi.

(e) Bèén sòósòò yáwónéńi m̀fè.

2.4.1 Possessives, alienate and inalienable.

A15 (a) Omini ódòòyike ònikpá ńwé
Omini lost has shoes his

(b) Omini ógábi kobóó
omini he-lifted hard

(c) Omini óbè è kènkhèṅ ké kóbóó
He-out him knife on hand.

(d) Omini ókpééné ké kòbóó kówé sámmm
 omini he-looked at hand his carefully.

2.4.2 Reflexives in nominals

A16 wòól kèpú sè omini kén I obia
 ètéém ébúrwè è Ké
 Lúkàkpài jé Omini lókàbi Kè Òbia ètéém.

A17 Ójiné wé Omini óóai òbáájà
 Wòòl liwé
 Tisà ówe ètéém.
 Speech which Omini did about body his pleased to teaches his heart

3.1 Marking

Y1: A translation of the French example into Lokaa will be

Yákèì wòòl íbé kòbí
 They-gave bodies their fault
 ‘They blamed themselves’

Yakəjəne kòbí
 They criticized each other

Y2: òmìní ñwè okpei wòòl íwé ìmààn
 NP-subj EMPH. PRO he-pays body his money
 ‘It is Omini who pays himself.’

Y3: òmìní ñwè okpei Ubi-a ìmààn
 himself he-pays Ubi money
 ‘It is Omini who pays Ubi (money).’

NOTE:

The reciprocal reflexive is conveyed by the verbal suffix -jə̀nè, while the simple reflexive is conveyed by wòòl ‘body/bodies’ in the appropriate possessive pronoun referring to the NP subject of the sentence or clause in which it occurs.

3.2. Productivity.

3.2.1. The -ɲɛ̀nɛ̀ strategy is ‘extremely productive’ in that it can be attached to virtually any simple verb to convey the meaning of reciprocity.

The wò̀l + Poss. Pronoun Strategy

wò̀l ímì	‘my body’
wò̀l íwù	‘your body (singular)’
wò̀l íwé	‘his body’
wò̀l ímò̀n	‘our body’
wò̀l íbàà	‘your body (plural)’
wò̀l ìbé	‘their body’

is equally productive in that it can be used with most verbs of action, especially those of ‘doing’ and ‘giving’.

List of 21 verbs reciprocal reflexives:

kèé	‘give’		
bèé	‘cut’		
tèé	‘sing’		
ji	‘eat’	‘eat each other’s food’	
témé	‘push’	→ téméné	‘to push each other’
ǹí	‘kill’	‘from both sides’	
bénéné	‘to help each other to lift a load’		
yemi	‘wake up’		
kàami	→ kàmáná	‘to assist each other’	
ké	‘see’		
wá	‘drink’	wáɲáná	‘to drink with each other’
yèél	‘call’	yèɲɛ̀nɛ̀	
púwé	‘hear’		
tòón	‘give away’		
tá	‘shoot’	táɲáná	
táá	‘investigate’	táɲáná	
kóóm	‘wait’	kòmɛ̀nɛ̀	
ǰinné	‘borrow’	ǰɲéné	
tóí	‘refund’		
jèè	‘say’	ǰɲéné	‘say to each other’
tóí	‘refund’		
fòóɲ	‘write’	fòɲánáí	

The person agreement portion –mì, -mòòn, etc. refers back to the NP-subj of the sentence, the possessor of the body. This agreement is comparable to what you have in the Greek example. It agrees with the antecedent NP in person and number.

3.6. Insertion with verb morphology

3.6.1. What happens in Lokaa is that the form of - ηένέ is modified somewhat on account of vowel harmony and phonological rules. Examples:

Yàdéǵm bíǵmàà yátúηένέ ← túηένέ ‘collide’
 people those they-collide with each other
 ‘those people collided head-on’

Yàdéǵm bíǵmàà yámánáná ← máná ‘hold’
 They-held-hands-together
 ‘Those people held themselves together with their hands’

Yàdéǵm bíǵmàà yápòηένè ← pòòη ‘abuse’
 They-abuse each other

Yàdéǵm bíǵmàà yáfένένέ ← fένέ ‘add’
 They-combined (to do something)

3.6.1 The Verb ‘to run’ túkέ cannot be used with this strategy.

3.6.2 Verbs denoting actions that cannot be done reflexively are in compatible with this strategy.

3.6.2.1. Tense: Past, present, future

Mood: Indicative; subjunctive for temporal and conditional clauses;
 interrogative; imperative.

Aspect: Present continuative; perfective and imperfective. Examples of this are found in my thesis.

3.6.2.2. The difference between B3 and B4 verbs:

B4 verbs can take 2 arguments, whereas B3 verbs cannot. One of the arguments in B4 is wòòl líbέ which will render the sentence reflexive.

3.7. Non-Coreference Uses

The ηένέ strategy is always reciprocal. The wòòl liwέ strategy is not reflexive if there is no second NP- object.

The verb kábá ‘to wash’ has an implicit reflexive meaning and will not take either strategy.

X3 These sentence cannot be meaning in Lokaa. The two Lokaa strategies cannot fit here for testing.

4.1 Clause-mate Co-construal

4.1.1 Verb class restrictions

4.1.1.1 Canonical Transitives

C1(a) à-Bob ókóé

Bob saw X

(b) yànéén ímàà yákóé X

woman that she-saw X

‘That woman saw

(c) áwólí X –á kòfè

you(PL) picked X

(d) yátòòḡá X

‘they praised’

4.1.1.2