

# International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



## A Study of the Phenomenon of Pronominalization in Dangme

[PP: 36-46]

**Regina Oforiwah Caesar**

University Of Education, Winneba, College Of Languages Education  
P. O. Box 72, Ajumako, Central Region  
**Ghana**

### ABSTRACT

This paper explores the phenomenon of pronominalization in Dangme, a language that belongs to the Kwa family group of languages. The paper considers specifically, emphatic, subjective, objective and genitive pronouns among others in the domain of the first, second and third persons. It further discusses the functions of these pronouns in constructions in Dangme. The data for the study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The data were analyzed using categorization and coding. The Government and Binding Theory is employed in the analysis of the data. The data show that pronouns in Dangme have complex structure involving an abstract nominal. It was also realized that whereas the forms for expressing both subjective and genitive pronouns are identical, that of object pronouns are distinct. The study also reveals that the use of possessive pronoun and *he* 'fresh or skin' and an emphatic pronoun plus *nitse* could be combined to form the reflexive pronoun in Dangme. It is to be noted that the reflexive as well as the anaphoric expressions share common feature in terms of number and person.

**Keywords:** *Dangme, Anaphoric, Cataphoric, Reflexive, Reciprocal and Personal Pronouns*

ARTICLE INFO	The paper received on	Reviewed on	Accepted after revisions on
	09/06/2019	20/07/2019	27/09/2019

### Suggested citation:

Caesar, R. (2019). A Study of the Phenomenon of Pronominalization in Dangme. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 7(3), 36-46.

### 1. Introduction

Speaking requires referring to someone or something, a noun, and saying something about it (Arnold & Zerkle 2019:1). A pronoun is a word used in place of a noun. The term pronoun is used in the grammatical classification of words, referring to the close set of terms which can be used to substitute for a noun phrase or a lexical noun (Crystal 1997:312, Offor 2015). There are many types of pronouns. The categories include personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, reflexive pronouns, interrogative pronoun and possessive pronouns. I examine the types of pronouns and some processes of pronominalization in this paper in Dangme.

According to Callaway & Lester (2002:89), pronominalization is the appropriate determination, marking and grammatical agreement of pronouns (he, she, their, herself, it, mine, those, each other one, etc.) as a short hand reference to an entity or event mentioned in the discourse. That is pronominalization refers to relations between some antecedent nominal and a pronoun with which it is co-referential. Avrutin (2013:73) notes that the use of pronouns still requires that the speaker make

references about the listener, which in the case of children, results in an abnormal pattern of pronominalization. Thus, there is the need to study the pronominal system of languages. Postal (1972) argues from the point of view of Chomskian that pronominalization is a process whereby an NP in a noun phrase marker is replaced by some pronominal form, provided (a), such an NP bears a co-referential relation with some other NPs in the phrase marker. (b), that the NP does not violate those constraints \*e.g. Langacker's backwards condition (with respect to the application of 'T' in the phrase marker, where 'T' stands for the necessary transformational rule and (c), that the phrase marker itself is of a certain configuration \*e.g. reflexivization applies in a special simplex), (See also Essien, 1974).

Pronominalization often plays a critical role in making discourse coherent, and the assumption that discourse is well structured, is sometimes critical for the correct interpretation of pronouns (Gordon & Searce 1995:313). Forcadell (2015) explains that information structure requirements are relevant for the analysis of the restrictions on pronominalization in Catalan. Chapin (1970) notes that

pronominalization situations frequently arise in sentences containing relative or subordinate clauses. He explained that if the main clause and the embedded clause contained co-referential noun phrases, one will appear as a pronoun.

Pronominalization is an area that has been studied in some languages. Researches on pronominalization have postulated how pronouns function to show the relationship between an antecedent nominal and a pronoun with which it is co-referential in constructions. For instance, Panagiotidis (2001) studied the internal structure of pronouns and shown that despite their considerable diversity in their surface representation, pronominals can be given a unified representation in syntax. He concluded that pronominality is as a result of radical absence of a noun. Ohso (1976) did a study on zero pronominalization in Japanese. He discussed among other things the NP-pronominal proxemics and grammaticality. He concluded that language seems to be controlled to a great extent by two principles, the principle of maximum differentiation and the principle of minimum effect. He explained further that these principles mean that language is a tool for communication by which people try a wide variety of complicated information in the most economical way. (See also Arnold & Zerkle, 2019). That there is the need to equip language with rules to reduce predictable and recoverable information.

Cushing (1972) did a study on the semantics of sentence pronominalization and Essien (1974) investigated pronominalization in Efik. He adopted Chomskian view as a general term for a number of related processes each of which is explicitly formulated as a rule. He discussed among others simple pronominalization, possessive pronominalization, reflexivization, reciprocal and anaphoric pronominalization and concluded that generally, NPs on which a rule of pronominalization has operated may be deleted under certain conditions of which co-reference is one. Lees & Klima (1963) studied rules for English pronominalization and discussed that the rules for reflexive and simple pronouns pointed out certain peculiarities in the use of reflexives pronouns in *-self* and reciprocal *one another* that might be accounted for by means of grammatical rules. Callaway & Lester (2002:89) examined pronominalization in generated discourse and dialogues. They noted that pronominalization is an important

element in the automatic creation of multi-page texts using natural language generation. They discussed among others anaphoric pronouns, cataphoric pronouns, pronouns lacking textual antecedents, reflexive and reciprocal pronouns, partitive pronouns and concluded that pronominalization is an important element in the automatic creation of multi-paragraph and multi-page texts. Essien's study is relevant to the current study on Dangme which examines possessive, personal, reflexivization, reciprocal, anaphoric and cataphoric pronominalization in Dangme.

Postal (1972) also worked on a global constraint on pronominalization and noted that derivational constraints can be considered with the number of structures which can be referred to, and the properties of the constituents which can be mentioned. He concluded that the *Wh* constraint is a Global Derivational Constraint of the type suggested by Lakoff, the existence of which is claimed in generative semantics and denied by Chomsky. She noted that there are many theoretical possible types of linguistic situations which would be describable by Global Derivational Constraints but not by Interpretive Rules. Chapin (1970) investigated constraints on pronoun-antecedent relationships in complex, co-ordinate and simplex structures of Samoan in three modifications to linguistic theory. He noted that it is a possible language-particular constraint on pronominalization in complex structures that a pronoun and its antecedent must lie within the same 'chain of command' and the rule of pronominalization in co-ordinate structures may in particular language, be mirror-image.

Saah (2014) studied reflexive marking and interpretation in Akan. He looked at the entities that are involved in the discourse situation and those that are affected by the action, event or state described by the verb in the government and binding theory. He concluded that Akan does not seem to have long distance reflexives. Agbedor (2014) examined the syntax of Ewe reflexives and logophoric pronouns in the government and binding theory. He concluded that in Ewe, the logophoric pronoun is in complementary distribution with the reflexive pronoun but differs from the personal pronoun in that the former must be bound within the matrix clause or in an independent clause outside its clause.

Offor (2015) examined the transformational rules that apply to the syntactic phenomenon of pronominalisation



in the French and Igbo languages. It specifically studied syntactic operations involved in the process of pronominalisation in the two languages in order to highlight the aspects that are universal to the two languages as well as their areas of divergences. He noted that in Igbo, the phenomenon of pronominalisation applies only to the NP syntactic category, while in French, pronominalisation involves basically the replacement of all syntactic categories be they grammatical or functional categories [NP, AdvP, PP, AdjP, CP or IP] as well as their movement. The phenomenon discussed by Offor (2015) is applicable to Dangme with regard to the findings on Igbo where only nominals can be replaced with pronouns.

Lees & Klima (1963), Essien (1974), Panagiotidis (2001), Callaway & Lester (2002:89), Osam (2002) and Saah (2014) studies are relevant to the current study on pronominalization in Dangme.

Dangme belongs to the Kwa group of Niger-Congo Family of Languages (Dakubu, 1987). Dangme is spoken by 748,014 speakers (2000 population census). However, the 2010 population and housing census stipulate that Dangme has a population of 502,816 speakers. Dangme is spoken in two regions of Ghana-Eastern and Greater Accra mainly in South-Eastern Ghana. The people inhabit the coastal area of the Greater Accra Region, east of Accra, and part of the Eastern Region of Ghana. Its closest linguistic neighbours are Ga, Akan and Ewe. Dangme has seven dialects: Ada, Nugo, Kpone, Gbugblaa/Prampram, Osudoku, Sɛ/Shai, and Krobo (Yilo and Manya).

There are several small communities east of the Volta Region for instance, Afegame Wenguam and its environs that trace their origins to Dangmeland; most of these have shifted to Ewe as the language of daily life, but others have not (Dakubu 1966; Sprigge 1969 cited in Ameka and Dakubu 2008:215). Patches of speakers are also found in Nyetoe and Gatsi in Togaland.

The aim of this paper is to study the phenomenon of pronominalization in Dangme. The paper considers specifically, emphatic, nominative, accusative and genitive pronouns in the domain of the first, second and third persons, and also the demonstrative, interrogative, relative and locative pronouns in Dangme. The paper further examines the functions of possessive, reflexive, reciprocal, anaphoric

and cataphoric pronouns in Dangme clauses in the Government and Binding Theory.

1. What is pronominalization in Dangme?
2. Which are the types of pronouns in Dangme?
3. How does pronominalization functions in Dangme constructions?

The findings of the study will add to the relatively limited literature on the grammar of Dangme and also serve as a basis for further research into other areas of the morphology and syntax of Dangme. It is also hoped that the findings of this study will add to the literature on pronominalization universal.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 The Binding Theory**

The Government and Binding Theory was adopted for this study to interpret the Binding Theory used for the analysis on anaphors in this paper. The Binding Theory (BT) hereafter is a theory that deals with the distribution of pronominal and reflexive pronouns in languages. The Binding Theory of Chomsky (1981, 1986, 1995) and Carnie (2013) groups nominal expressions into three basic categories: (i) anaphors (reflexives), (ii) pronominals, and (iii) R-expressions. Anaphors (also called reflexive pronouns) are typically characterized as expressions that have no inherent capacity for reference. Anaphors also refer to reciprocals. According to Haegeman (1994:228), the three principles that govern the interpretation of the established nominal expressions is referred to as the binding theory. Hence, anaphors must invariably depend on some other expression within a sentence for their interpretation.

The expression on which the anaphor depends for its meaning is called the antecedent. The structural relation between a reflexive and its antecedent is accounted for in using c-command. Haegeman (1994:212) claims that a node A c-commands a node B if (1) A does not dominate B; (2) B does not dominate A; and (3) the last branching node dominating A also dominates B. However, he claims that pronominal is an abstract feature representation of the NP that may be referentially dependent but must always be free within a given syntactic domain. It could be deduced from these definitions that an anaphor (reflexive pronoun) must obligatorily have a local or a "nearby" antecedent within a given syntactic unit to which it will refer, whilst a pronominal may, but need not necessarily have its antecedent within the same syntactic domain. Adger (2004:54), on what he calls a/the co-

referentiality hypothesis argues that for “two expressions to be co-referential, they must bear the same phi-features”. According to Adger (2004), “phi-features” is a linguistic term used to describe the semantic features of person, number and gender encoded in such lexical categories as nouns and pronouns. This, he further argues, is a “kind of general interface rule that relates syntactic features to semantic interpretation”. Compare the English sentences in (1) and (2):

- (1) Saki<sub>i</sub> likes himself<sub>i</sub>.  
 (2) Kweiki<sub>i</sub> loved him<sub>j</sub>.

These examples illustrate the (syntactic) distributional difference between an anaphor (a reflexive) and a pronominal. Pronominalization in Dangme is the focus of this paper, specifically on the behaviour of anaphors among others in Dangme. In sentence (1) for instance, *himself*, can only refer to its antecedent, *Saki*, which is found in the same local domain of the clause. In sentence (2) however, the pronominal *him* is free within the clausal domain as it cannot refer to *Kweiki*. It could therefore only have some element that is not within the clause as its antecedent, and not *Kweiki* since pronouns are free within the clausal domain in which they are found. The fact that *himself* can only refer to an entity already mentioned in the discourse, and *him* can refer to an entity outside the clausal domain, means that whilst reflexives are referentially dependent, pronouns are not referentially dependent. The abstract features of reflexives and pronominals make four major distinctions of NP, three of which are overt and the other non-overt. The three NP types, which include anaphors, pronouns, and R-expressions, are not syntactic primitives since they can further be broken down into small components as shown below:

Lexical reflexives [+reflexives, -pronominal]: these are reflexives and reciprocals, e.g. *himself*, *herself*, *themselves*, *each other*, *one another*.

Pronouns [-anaphor, + pronominal]: these are basically pronouns. e.g. *he*, *she*, *it*.

Name (full NP) [-anaphor, -pronominal]: names e.g. *Ohui*, *Kabute*, *Awomaa*.

PRO [+anaphor, -pronominal]

The Binding Theory has three principles, A, B and C. Each one deals with one of the three types of NPs. A binds B if and only if A C-commands B and A and B are co-indexed. Consider the examples below:

- 3.(a). John<sub>i</sub> loves himself<sub>i</sub>.  
 (b). John<sub>i</sub> loves her<sub>j</sub>.

(c). John and Mary<sub>i</sub> feel they<sub>i</sub> should love each other<sub>i</sub> more.

(d) John<sub>i</sub> feels he<sub>i</sub> will keep his<sub>i</sub> distance.

These three overt NP types are accounted for using principles called Binding Principles. Principle A of these principles is concerned with reflexives and reciprocals, Principle B deals with pronominals. Principle C on the other hand concerns itself with names or what have been called full NPs. In Haegeman (1994:228-229), the binding principles which govern the syntactic distribution of overt NP types are stated as follows:

### 2.2 Binding Principle A

The binding principle A states that an anaphor must be bound in its binding domain (Carnie 2013:155). The binding domain is the clause containing the DP (anaphor pronoun, R-expression).

(4). Doris<sub>i</sub> wishes that Jennifer<sub>j</sub> appreciates herself<sub>j</sub>/\*<sub>i</sub>.

In (4), although Doris c-commands ‘herself’ it is in the main clause and herself is in the embedded clause thus, the binding relationship cannot be established inside the containing ‘herself’.

### 2.3 Binding Principle B

The binding principle B states that a pronoun must be free in its binding domain.  
 • Free: Not bound (not c-commanded by and co-indexed with another NP)

5. Claire<sub>i</sub> really likes that Nancy<sub>j</sub> admires her<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>i/k</sub>.

### 2.4 Binding Principle C

The binding principle C states that an R-expression must be free everywhere. There is no mention of a domain because the reference for R-expressions does not change. They simply refer to entities out in the world.

These three principles govern the distributional properties of pronominals and reflexive pronouns in languages.

## 3. Methodology

The language data for the investigation were elicited from primary and secondary sources. From the primary sources, data were drawn from daily conversations with some native speakers of Dangme. This includes listening to longer stretches and discussions on topical issues from natural discourse on Radio Ada, 93.3 FM and ‘Obonu, FM and jotted down notes on identified pronominal constructions for the analysis. In addition, I used question and answer-pairs to elicit data from ten level 400 students studying Dangme at the University of Education, Winneba in February, 2019. As a native speaker of



Dangme, I also provided some of the data for this paper. The data collected were confirmed with other native speakers of Dangme.

**4. Types of Pronouns in Dangme**

Eight types of pronouns are identified in Dangme, and these include demonstrative pronouns, interrogative pronouns, relative pronouns, personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, reciprocal pronouns, possessive pronouns and locative pronouns. Tables 1 and 2 present the pronouns of the categories mentioned above.

Table 1: Personal pronouns in Dangme

Person	Emphatic	Nomination	Accusative	Genitive
1 <sup>st</sup> Singular	Imi/ami 'I'	i 'I'	mi 'me'	ye 'my'
2 <sup>nd</sup> Singular	mo 'you'	mo/o 'you'	mo 'you'	o 'your'
3 <sup>rd</sup> Singular	le 'he/she/it'	e 'he/she/it'	le 'him/her/it'	e 'his/hers/its'
1 <sup>st</sup> Plural	wɔ 'we'	wa 'we'	wɔ 'us'	wa 'our'
2 <sup>nd</sup> Plural	nye 'you'	nye 'you'	nye 'you'	nye 'your'
3 <sup>rd</sup> Plural	mɛ 'they'	a 'they'	mɛ 'them'	a 'their'

All the personal pronouns in Dangme do not have the same nominative and accusative forms as indicated in the table 1, but the possessive pronouns have the same forms as their subject pronouns with the exception of the first person singular which changes from *i* 'I' to *ye* 'my/mine' in the possessive. The possessive forms feature prominently in the formation of reflexives in Dangme. Also, with the exception of the first person emphatic pronoun which changes from *imi/ami* to *mi* in the accusative form, all the emphatic pronouns maintain the form of the object pronouns.

Table 2: Some other pronouns in Dangme

Demonstrative pronouns	Relative pronouns	Interrogative pronouns	Reflexive pronouns: Emphatic	Possessive	Reciprocal pronouns	Locative pronouns
ene ɔ 'this one'	nɛ 'who/that'	meni 'what'	ami/imi nitse 'myself'	e he 'himself'	a sibi 'each other'	hie ɔ 'here'
lo ɔ 'that one'	nɔ nɛ 'who'	meno 'te...nee'	le nitse 'himself'	nye sibi 'yourself'	nye sibi 'one another'	leje ɔ 'there'
ekpa 'another'	nɔ nɛ 'which/that'	ke...kee 'how'	mo nitse 'yourself'	ye he 'myself'	a he 'each other'/ 'themselves'	
	jije 'where'		nye nitseme 'ourselves'	a he 'each other'/ 'themselves'	wa he 'ourselves'	
			mɛ nitseme 'themselves'	nye he 'yourselves'		

**5. Reflexive Pronominalization**

Saha (1987:215) defines a reflexive as 'a linguistic device such as a word, particle or an affix used to convey a grammaticalised notion of animate and inanimate entities interacting with themselves'. Saah (1989, 2007) and Osam (2002) say the reflexives in Akan are morphologically marked with the pronoun *hɔ* which translates literally as 'body' or 'outer surface'.

It is evident from the data in table 2 that the examples of the reflexives used under the possessive form, are the same as those found in the reflexive pronouns. This is similar to what exist in Ewe and Akan. The reflexive pronouns in Dangme are also formed by attaching the morpheme reflexivizer *nitse* 'self' to the emphatic pronoun. A notable thing is that the reflexivizer in Dangme is marked for plural. To form the plural of a reflexive pronoun, the plural morpheme *-mɛ* is attached to the reflexive morpheme, *nitse* 'self'. That is Dangme forms its reflexives by attaching the singular morpheme *nitse* to the first person subject pronoun, and the accusative pronouns as shown in table 2. It is interesting to note also that when the reflexive morpheme *nitse* 'self' is attached to the first person subject pronoun, *imi* 'I,' this pronoun gains a feature of possessiveness as in *imi nitse* 'myself'.

**5.1 Distribution of Dangme Reflexives**

In this section, I discuss the distributional properties of the reflexive pronouns in Dangme. A notable feature in the distribution of reflexives in Dangme is that, in addition to the use of the emphatic pronouns plus *nitse*, Dangme also uses possessive pronoun plus *he* 'body fresh or skin' to form the reflexive. This always has the antecedent as its referent, without which the sentence will be incomplete.

**5.1.1 The use of Possessive Pronoun with the Morpheme *he***

The reflexive pronoun in Dangme is marked morphologically with a pronoun plus a morpheme *he* which translates literally in English as 'body' or 'skin'.

6. Ata<sub>i</sub> ke hwon<sub>y</sub>ɔ ɔ kpa e<sub>i</sub> he.  
Ata take soup DEF pour/smear.PERF 3SG.POSS body  
'Ata has poured the soup on herself.'
7. Ata ke Lawe<sub>e</sub> ke hwon<sub>y</sub>ɔ ɔ kpa a<sub>i</sub> he.  
Ata CONJ Lawe<sub>e</sub> take soup DEF pour/smear.PERF 3PL.POSS body  
'Ata and Lawer have poured the soup on themselves.'
8. I<sub>i</sub> ke hwon<sub>y</sub>ɔ ɔ kpa ye<sub>i</sub> he.  
1SG take soup DEF pour/smear.PERF 1SG.POSS body  
'I have poured the soup on myself.'
9. E<sub>i</sub> ke tɛ<sub>j</sub> fia lɛ<sub>k</sub>.  
3SG take stone throw 3SG.OBJ  
'He/she has thrown a stone at him/her.'
10. \*Ata<sub>i</sub> fia nys<sub>k</sub> he tɛ.  
Ata throw 2SG.POSS body stone  
'Ata threw a stone at yourself.'

In examples (6–8), pronoun plus *he* gives a reflexive meaning since there are NP within the sentences which they refer to. In (6), *e he* 'herself' refers back to *Ata*. In (7), *a he* 'themselves' refers back to *Ata and Lawe* and in (8), *ye he* has a co-referential attribute with *i* 'I'. That is in sentences (6-8), *e he*, *a he* and *ye he* are not referring to some other NPs outside the sentences respectively.

In addition, *le* in (9) does not have a reflexive pronoun.

It is observed that in questions (9-10), the pronouns *le* and *nyε* do not refer back to *e* and *Ata*.

It is realized that the reflexive and its antecedents agree in person and number. The reflexives in (6) is the third person singular, third person plural in (7) and first person singular in (8). However, the pronoun in (10) does not agree in number with the subject NP. The subject NP, *Ata* is singular and the pronoun plus the *nyε he* 'yourself' is plural. Thus, the structure is not interpreted as involving entities interacting with themselves. Although *e* and *le* in (9) agree in number, they cannot be said to have referred back to each other.

### 5.1.2 The use of Emphatic Pronoun with the Morpheme *nitse* (Emphatic Reflexives)

Emphatic reflexives are constructions containing a full noun phrase and a co-referential pronoun in the same case.

11. Imi<sub>i</sub> nitse ne i<sub>i</sub> ba hiε ∅.  
1SG.EMPH self FOC 1SG come.PST here  
'I came here by myself.'
12. Mo<sub>i</sub> nitse ne o<sub>i</sub> ba.  
2SG.EMPH self FOC 2SG.OBJ come.PST  
'You came by yourself.'
13. Le<sub>ε</sub> nitse ne e<sub>i</sub> de.  
3SG.EMPH self FOC 3SG.OBJ say.PST  
'He said that himself.'
14. Wɔ<sub>i</sub> nitseme ne wa<sub>i</sub> ha le.  
1PL.EMPH self.PL FOC 1PL.OBJ give 3SG.OBJ  
'We gave it to him/her ourselves.'
15. Nyε<sub>i</sub> nitseme ne nyε<sub>i</sub> pee.  
2PL.EMPH self.PL FOC 2PL.OBJ do  
'You have caused it yourselves.'
16. Me<sub>i</sub> nitseme ne a<sub>i</sub> ke wɔ.  
3PL.EMPH self.PL FOC 3PL.OBJ give us  
'It was they themselves who have given it to us as a gift.'
17. Ata<sub>i</sub> nitse ne e<sub>i</sub> gbe na a.  
Ata EMPH FOC 3SG kill.PST cow DEF  
'It was Ata himself who slaughtered the cow.'
18. Maamle<sub>i</sub> nitse le e<sub>i</sub> ba ngo bo ∅.  
Maamle self FOC 3SG INGRE take cloth DEF  
'Maamle herself came for the cloth' or 'it was Maamle herself who came for the cloth.'
19. Adime<sub>i</sub> ye∅ le<sub>i</sub> nitse e<sub>i</sub> he no.  
Adime eat.HAB 3SG.OBJ self 3SG.POS body-fresh top  
'Adime takes good care of himself.'
20. \*Adime<sub>i</sub> ye∅ le<sub>i</sub> nitse ne e<sub>i</sub> he no.  
Adime eat.HAB 3SG.OBJ self FOC 3SG.POS body-fresh top  
'Adime takes good care of himself.'

The emphatic reflexives in (11-19) occurred in the domain of the subject. In (11-13), the first, second and third person singular emphatic pronouns; *Imi* 'I', *mo* 'you' and *le* 'he/she/it' have co-referential attributes with the subject pronouns, *i* 'I', *o* 'you' and *e* 'he/she/it'. The referents of the emphatic pronouns are preceded by *nitse* 'self' and the focus marker *ne* in (11-13). In (14-16), the plural subject emphatic pronouns; *wɔ* 'we', *nyε* 'you' and *me* 'they' agree in number with their referents; *wa* 'we', *nyε* 'you' and *a* 'they'. Similarly, the reflexizer, *nitseme* also agrees in number and

person with the pronouns they are attached with and their antecedents and referents.

It is observable in (17-19) that the subjects are full NPs; *Ata*, *Maamle* and *Adime*. *Ata* and *Adime* have co-referential attribute with *e* 'he/she' which agrees in number and person with the full NPs. As in (11-16), the reflexiver, *nitse* 'self' and the focus marker *ne* or *le* have occurred in between the subject NP and their referents in (17-18). In (19), however, the subject NP, *Adime*, has a complement which is represented by the third person object pronoun *le* 'him' which occurred after the verb *ye∅* literally means *eats* 'takes' in the clause. It is realized that unlike in the subject NP of (11-18) where the reflexiver, *nitse* 'self' and the focus marker *ne* or *le* precedes the referent of the subject NP, in (19), the focus marker is not required as seen in the ungrammatical construction in (20). The constructions in (11-19) are subject oriented.

I discuss the functions of the object pronoun in the emphatic reflexive clause in (21-23) which are object oriented.

21. Hye mo<sub>i</sub> nitse o<sub>i</sub> he no ne e hi.  
Look 2SG self 2SG.POS body-fresh top that 3SG good  
'Take good care of yourself.'
  22. Yiw<sub>i</sub> ome a bua jɔ me<sub>i</sub> nitseme a<sub>i</sub> he nge leje ∅.  
Girls DEF.PL 3PL.POS happy 3PL.OBJ self.PL 3PL.OBJ body-part at there  
'The girls are happy with themselves there.'
  23. A<sub>i</sub> de nyε<sub>i</sub> ke nyε po nyε<sub>i</sub> nitseme nyε<sub>i</sub> he pie.  
3PL tell 2PL that 2PL guide 2PL.POS self.PL 2PL.POS body-part fence  
'You have been told to take good care of yourselves.'
- The object pronouns in (21-23) as seen in the subject pronouns in (11-19) have their referents occurring within the same clause. The object pronoun and the reflexiver agree in number and person. As in the subject complement clause in (19), the focus marker is not required in the emphatic reflexive constructions in (21-23). The second person singular object *mo* 'you', the third person plural object, *me* 'them' and the second person possessive pronoun, *nyε* 'your' follow after the verb phrases; *hyε no* 'take good care', *bua jɔ* 'is happy' and *po he pie* 'guide/protect' in (21-23).

Dangme reflexive pronouns sometimes function as anaphors since their antecedents occur in the same clause as the reflexive.

24. Dede<sub>i</sub> pia le nitse<sub>i</sub> e he<sub>i</sub>.  
Dede blame.PST 3SG self 3SG.POSS body-fresh.  
'Dede blamed herself.'
25. Ate<sub>i</sub> pee le nitse<sub>i</sub> e he<sub>i</sub>.  
Ate do 3SG self 3SG.POSS body  
'Ate caused himself.'
26. Tsatsu<sub>i</sub> he ye kaa Saki<sub>j</sub> buo le nitse<sub>j</sub> e he<sub>j</sub>.  
Tsatsu believe that Saki respect.HAB 3SG self 3SG body  
'Tsatsu<sub>i</sub> believes that Saki<sub>j</sub> respects himself<sub>j</sub>.'
27. Tsaatse<sub>i</sub> ha Adeta<sub>j</sub> bua jɔ le<sub>j</sub> nitse<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> he<sub>j</sub>.  
Father make Adeta happy 3SG.OBJ self 3SG.POSS body  
'Father<sub>i</sub> made Adeta<sub>j</sub> to be happy with himself<sub>j</sub>.'



Constructions (24) and (25) are made up of a single clause each. The reflexive pronoun, *nitse*, in each of the sentences is bound by the subjects of the sentences. In (24), the reflexive pronoun is bound by *Dede* and in (25) it is bound by *Ate*. The reflexive in (24) and (25) are subject oriented. Examples (26) and (27) are made up of two clauses each, the main clause and the embedded clause. The main clauses in (26) and (27) are *Tsatsu he ye* 'Tsatsu believes' and *Tsaatse ha* 'father made' and the embedded clauses are *kaa Saki buo le nitse e he* 'that Saki respects himself' and *Adeta bua jo le nitse e he* 'Adeta is pleased with herself' respectively.

The reflexive *le nitse* has its antecedents as the subject of the independent clause in (26). However, the reflexive cannot refer back to the subject of the main clause in (27) because they are not co-referential. The examples in (26) and (27) have their antecedents as the subjects of the embedded clauses, *Saki* and *Adeta* respectively. It is observed in examples (24–27) that the third person singular possessive pronoun *e* 'his' preceded the body-part word *he* 'skin' in each of the sentences to refer back to the subjects in the clauses.

28. Tee<sub>i</sub> slo Amaki<sub>j</sub> nge le nitse<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> no yami he.  
Tee advise.PST Amaki about 3SG self 3SG.POSS up going about  
'Tee<sub>i</sub> advised Amate<sub>j</sub> about the progress of himself/herself<sub>j</sub>.'
29. Yohupee<sub>i</sub> tsoo Adu<sub>j</sub> ni ke ko le nitse<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> he.  
Yohupee teach.PST Adu thing.PL to concern 3SG self 3SG skin  
'Yohupee<sub>i</sub> taught Adu<sub>j</sub> things about herself<sub>j</sub>.'
30. Tekpe<sub>i</sub> de Padi<sub>j</sub> le nitse<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> he nihi.  
Tekpe tell.PST Padi 3SG self 3SG.POSS skin thing.PL  
'Tekpe<sub>i</sub> told Padi<sub>j</sub> things about himself<sub>j</sub>.'
31. Siadeyo<sub>i</sub> gbe le nitse<sub>i</sub> e<sub>i</sub> to ke ha e<sub>i</sub> huse<sub>j</sub> o.  
Siadeyo kill.PST 3SG self 3SG.POSS goat take give 3SG.POSS friend DEF  
'Siadeyo<sub>i</sub> slaughtered her owni goat for her friend<sub>j</sub>.'

Ambiguity is identified in the interpretation of sentences (28-30). In sentence (28), the reflexive *le nitse* 'himself/herself' can refer back to either *Tee*, the subject or *Amaki*'s progress as indicated in the construction *e no yami*. Similarly in example (29), *le-nitse e he* 'herself' can either refer to *Yohupee* or *Adu* to mean that *tsoo ni ke ko le-nitse e he* 'taught things about herself' could refer to either of them. In the same vein, *de Padi le-nitse e he nihi* 'told *Padi* things about himself' could mean that *Tekpe* told *Padi* things about he (*Tekpe*) or about *Padi* himself. However, in (31), the reflexive *le-nitse* refers back to *Siadeyo* and not the friend, *e huse o*.

32. Siadeyo<sub>i</sub> gbá le<sub>i</sub> nitse<sub>i</sub> e<sub>i</sub> he ma.  
Siadeyo slap.PERF 3SG Self 3SG.POSS body-flesh slap  
'Siadeyo slapped part of her body herself.'
- 33.\* Siadeyo<sub>i</sub> gbá le<sub>i</sub> nitse<sub>i</sub> a<sub>j</sub> he ma.  
Siadeyo slap.PERF 3SG self 3PL.POSS body-flesh slap
34. Kateme<sub>i</sub> pláá me-nitse-me<sub>i</sub> a<sub>i</sub> he.  
Kateme hurt 3PL Self-PL 3PL.POSS body-flesh  
'Kate and friends hurt themselves.'

We observe from example (32) to (34) that sentences (32) and (34) are grammatical because, *Siadeyo*, the antecedent has a referent, a third person singular possessive pronoun, *e* 'she' which agrees in number, gender and person with the syntactic subject, *Siadeyo*. A similar plural example is in (34) where the syntactic plural subject *Kateme* has its reflexive pronoun being pluralized, *me-nitseme* 'themselves' and the third person plural possessive marker is co-referential with the subject NP. Example (33) is however, ungrammatical because the object *a he* 'their body flesh' does not agree with the NP feature of *Siadeyo*, the antecedent in number, person and gender. Consider other distribution of Dangme reflexives in (35–39):

35. W<sub>o</sub><sub>i</sub> nitse-me<sub>j</sub> wa<sub>i</sub> ma tsu ko ha wa<sub>i</sub>  
Our self-PL 2PL build room INDEF give 2PL.POSS  
he.  
body-part  
'We (ourselves) built a house for ourselves.'
36. Wa<sub>i</sub> ma tsu ha w<sub>o</sub><sub>i</sub> nitse-me<sub>i</sub> wa<sub>i</sub>  
2PL build.PERF room give 2PL.OBJ self-PL 2PL.POSS  
h  
body-flesh  
'We built a house for ourselves.'
37. W<sub>o</sub><sub>i</sub> nitse-me<sub>i</sub> wa<sub>i</sub> he le wa<sub>i</sub> ma  
2PL self-PL 2PL.POSS body-flesh FOC 2PL build.PERF  
tsu ha  
room give  
'It was (we) ourselves who built a house for ourselves.'
- 38.\* W<sub>o</sub>-nitse-me<sub>j</sub> le ma tsu ha wa<sub>i</sub> he.  
2PL.POSS-body-flesh-PL FOC build.PERF house give our body-flesh  
'We built for ourselves.'
- 39.\* W<sub>o</sub>-nitse-me<sub>i</sub> ma tsu ha wa<sub>i</sub> he.  
Our-self-PL build.PERF house give 2PL.POSS body-flesh

Example (35) is grammatical since the anaphoric expression *w<sub>o</sub>-nitseme* 'ourselves' has *w<sub>o</sub>* 'we' as the antecedent of *nitseme* 'selves' which shares a common feature in terms of number. One interesting thing to note about the Dangme example in (35) is that there is the introduction of a second person plural pronoun *wa* 'we' immediately after the reflexive pronoun. This pronoun is co-referential with the reflexive pronoun and the possessive pronoun. The grammaticality of sentence (36) expresses that the reflexive pronoun can occur at both pre-subject and pre-object position in a sentence in Dangme.

In (36) we observe that the second person pronoun *wa* 'we' occupies the subject position and is co-referential with the reflexive at pre-object position. While in example (35), *w<sub>o</sub> nitseme<sub>j</sub>* 'ourselves'

appears at the pre-subject position which is co-index with the subject pronoun, *wa<sub>j</sub>* ‘our’, is the grammatical object of the sentence in (36). Although, *wɔ nitsemɛ<sub>j</sub>* ‘ourselves’ is in pre-object position, refers back to the object *wa<sub>j</sub>*. *Wɔ nitsemɛ<sub>j</sub>* ‘ourselves’ however, serves as the semantic subject of sentences (35) and (37). With the insertion of the focus marker *ɛ* in example (37), the object NP, *wɔ nitsemɛ wa he* ‘we ourselves’ has moved from its canonical position to the sentence initial position. The syntactic subject, *wa* ‘we’ followed the focus marker and the verb of ‘have’ *ha* ‘give’ which comes after the direct objects ended sentence (37). The focus marker gives prominence to the recipients of the action *ha* ‘give’ that is *wɔ nitsemɛ wa he* ‘we ourselves’. Examples (38) and (39) are considered ungrammatical since they do not have the syntactic subject *wa* ‘we’ which should refer back to the reflexive pronoun at pre-subject position. However, reflexive pronoun can occur as syntactic subjects but not objects in Dangme. Consider example (40-44):

40. *Wɔ<sub>j</sub> nitsemɛ<sub>j</sub> wa<sub>j</sub> ma tsu ha wa<sub>j</sub> he.*  
Our self.PL 1PL build house give 1PL body-flesh  
‘We (ourselves) built a house for ourselves.’
41. *Nye nitsemɛ<sub>j</sub> nye<sub>j</sub> bo ɛ nye<sub>j</sub> jua*  
You self.PL 1PL.POSS cloth FOC 1PL sell PERF  
‘You yourselves sold your cloth.’
42. *Mo<sub>j</sub> nitse o<sub>j</sub> be o<sub>j</sub> pue.*  
Your self you time you waste.PERF  
‘You have wasted your own time.’
43. *Dooyo<sub>1</sub> plaa ɛ<sub>1</sub> nitse<sub>1</sub> e<sub>1</sub> nane.*  
Dooyo hurt 3SG.OBJ self 3SG leg  
‘Dooyo has hurt herself.’ (her own leg)
44. *Dooyo<sub>1</sub> plaa e<sub>1</sub> nane.*  
Dooyo hurt 3SG.POSS leg  
‘Dooyo hurt her leg.’

Sentences (40-42) have reflexive pronoun *wɔ-nitsemɛ*, ‘ourselves’ *nye-nitsemɛ* ‘yourself’, *mo-nitse* ‘yourself’ at the left periphery of their respective sentences functioning as the syntactic subjects of the sentence. These reflexive pronouns are however followed by possessive pronouns that have the same feature in terms of number and gender. In (43), the reflexive *ɛ-nitse* ‘herself’ is not the object but has the third person singular possessive pronoun *e<sub>j</sub>* ‘her’ as its referent. Thus *e<sub>j</sub>* ‘her’ is the object of the sentence. Sentence (44) does not contain any reflexive pronoun. Although (44) is grammatical, it falls out of the domain of reflexivization. The subject complement, *e<sub>j</sub>* ‘her’ has the feature [POSS]. It refers back to its antecedent subject NP. *Dooyo*.

The next section deals with the distribution of reflexive pronouns as stipulated by the binding principle A and B.

45. *Batsa<sub>i</sub> ya he e<sub>j</sub> lo ɔ*  
Batsa go.PERF buy PREF 3SG.POSS fish/meat  
‘Batsa bought his or somebody’s fish/meat.’
46. *Batsa<sub>i</sub> ya he ɛ-nitse<sub>i</sub> e<sub>i</sub> lo ɔ.*  
Batsa go.PERF buy PERF himself 3SG.POSS fish/meat DEF  
‘Batsa bought (himself) his fish/meat.’
47. *Otume<sub>i</sub> fie me-nitsemɛ<sub>i</sub>*  
Otume Sack.PERF themselves  
‘Otu and others have sacked themselves.’
48. *Neene<sub>i</sub> fie me<sub>i</sub>*  
Neene sack.PERF 3PL OBJ  
‘Neene has sacked them.’
49. *Toloo<sub>i</sub> tsua muo ha e<sub>j</sub> yayo.*  
Toloo dig hole for his/her mother  
‘Toloo dug a hole for her/somebody’s mother.’

In (46) and (47), it is noted that those sentences are grammatical because the antecedents, *Batsa<sub>j</sub>* and *Otume<sub>j</sub>* have their referents *e<sub>j</sub>* and *me-nitsemɛ<sub>j</sub>* within the sentences. It is however, observed that the referent *e<sub>j</sub>* to the antecedent, *Batsa<sub>j</sub>* in (45) and *e<sub>j</sub>* to *Toloo<sub>j</sub>* in (49) can refer to other entities the speaker has some previous knowledge about but not mentioned in the syntax. The reflexive pronoun as mentioned earlier is bound within its clausal domain and it becomes ungrammatical when the reflexive lacks an antecedent within the clause in which it occurs.

### 5.1.3 Locality constraints

50. A *Akumtu<sub>i</sub> muo ɛ-nitse<sub>i</sub> e<sub>i</sub> he.*  
Akumtu laugh PERF 3SG.POSS his body-flesh  
‘Akumtu laughed at herself.’
- B *Akumtu<sub>i</sub> susu kaa Saki muo ɛ-nitse<sub>i</sub>*  
Akumtu think/IMPERF that Saki laugh PERF himself
- e<sub>j</sub> he.*  
his body-flesh  
‘Akumtu thinks Saki laughed at himself.’
- C *Saki<sub>i</sub> susu kaa Akumtu<sub>j</sub> muo ɛ-nitse<sub>i</sub>*  
Saki think Imperf that Akumtu laugh PERF herself
- e<sub>i</sub> he.*  
her body-flesh  
‘Saki thinks that Akumtu laughed at herself.’

Sentence 50(A) has its referent closer to the antecedent. The reflexive is locally bound. Sentence 50(B), is locally constraint since the antecedent, *Akumtu* has its referent *ɛ-nitse* ‘herself’ occurring after *Saki*. This explains why the antecedent, *Akumtu* is far away from its reflexive pronoun *ɛ-nitse*. Sentence 50(C) just like sentence 50(A) has its antecedent *Akumtu* not far away from the reflexive *ɛ-nitse* ‘herself’. Thus, the reflexive is said to be locally bound.

### 5.2 Reciprocal Pronominalization

‘One another’ or ‘each one’ is used to mark pronominalization in English. Dangme however, has separate morphemes *a he* or *a sibi* ‘each other’ and *nye sibi* ‘one another’ are used to express reciprocal expressions. A reciprocal must have its antecedent within





the clausal domain as illustrated in the sentences below:

51.  $A_i$  naa  $a_i$  he kaa nihi ne  $a_i$  se be.  
3PL see 3PL.OBJ self as people who 3PL important surpass  
'They see themselves as very important people.'
52. Wa tsaatseme gbe a he ke gbe ni tsumi o nya.  
Our father.PL kill 3PL self to finish things work DEF PRT  
'Our fathers worked themselves (each other) out to complete the work.'
53. Jokuwei<sub>i</sub> ome fiaa  $a_i$  he te.  
Children DEF.PL throw.PERF their self stone  
'The children threw stones at each other.'
- 54.\* Joku<sub>e</sub> o fiaa  $a_i$  he te.  
Child DEF throw.PERF 3PL.POSS body-flesh stone  
'The child threw stones at each other.'
55. Ajo ke Abl<sub>a</sub> suo  $a_i$  sibi saminya.  
Ajo and Abl<sub>a</sub> loves 3PL.POSS another very much  
'Ajo and Abl<sub>a</sub> love each another very much.'
56. Detse o ke jata a wo  $a_i$  sibi  $a_i$  he gbye nge pu o mi.  
Hunter DEF CONJ lion DEF put one another BODY-PART fear in forest DEF inside  
'The hunter and the lion scared each other in the forest.'
57. Nyumu o ke e yo<sub>i</sub> o hye  $a_i$  sibi  $a_i$  he mi ne  $a_i$  muo helii  
man DEF and 3SG.POS wife DEF look each other face inside and 3PL smile give  
ha  $a_i$  he.  
each other  
'The man and his wife looked at each other's face and smiled at each other.'
58. Nye<sub>i</sub> ko wo nye<sub>i</sub> sibi he munyu.  
2PL IMP.NEG put 2PL each other BODY-PART case  
'Do not report one another.'
59. Hawi ome yeo bua  $a_i$  sibi nge no tsua no mi.  
Twins DEF.PL eat.HAB help each other in thing all thing inside  
'The twins help each other in all things.'
- 60.\* A sibi Ajo ke Abl<sub>a</sub> suo saminya.  
3PL.POSS another Ajome and Ablame loves very much
- 61.\* Ajo ke Abl<sub>a</sub> suo e<sub>i</sub> sibi saminya  
Ajo and Abl<sub>a</sub> loves 3SG.POSS another very well

It is observable in the examples in (51-61) that reciprocals just like reflexives require antecedents within the clause structure as argued out by Haegeman (1994:207) that a reflexive and its antecedents share their referent, the reciprocal pronouns and its antecedents share their referent in terms of number and gender. This explains why sentence (60) and (61) are ungrammatical. In (54), the referent, *a he* 'each other', which has the feature plus plural, has its antecedent *joku<sub>e</sub>* 'child' in the singular form. This explains that the 'child' *joku<sub>e</sub>* does not agree in number feature with its referent, *a he* 'each other'. The ungrammaticality of sentence (61) arises as a result of the ununiformed feature in the antecedent and its referent as in (60). *Ajo ke Abl<sub>a</sub>* is a co-subject which has the PL feature, plural. Its antecedent *e sibi* 'his/her another' is not acceptable since *e* 'he/she/it' denotes a singular number, the phrase is ungrammatical. The grammaticality of sentences (52-53) and (55-59) is due to the fact that the antecedents and their referents agree in number. For example, in (51-53) *a* 'they', *wa tsaatseme* 'our fathers' and *joku<sub>e</sub>* 'children' agree in number with *a he* 'each other'. In the same way, in (55-59) the co-joined subjects *Ajo ke Abl<sub>a</sub>* 'personal names', *detse ke jata a* 'the hunter and the lion' and *nyumu o ke e yo o* 'the man and his wife' agrees with *a sibi* 'one another' and the *nye* 'you.PL' in number. Sentence (60) is ungrammatical. This explains while as stated

earlier, reciprocal just like reflexives do not occur as subjects of sentences.

### 5.3 Anaphoric Pronominalization

Anaphoric pronouns have referents. They are of two forms; short-distance and long-distance. The short distance anaphoric pronoun occurs within the same sentence whilst the long distance anaphoric pronoun occurs in a previous sentence. Consider the following examples in Dangme:

62. Akene a de ke joku<sub>e</sub> o hi<sub>o</sub> o tsoo kaa e pue.  
Because 3PL say.PST that child DEF sickness DEF bad PRT, means that it worse.  
'Because it has been said that the child's condition of health is bad, means it has become worse.'
63. E nge mi kaa kpatsa bi<sub>i</sub> ome laa wawse lse se  $a_i$  nye  
3SG is true that kpatsa members PL.DEF sing.HAB ADV though but 3PL able  
we blo hiami tso ejakaa  $a_i$  be sika.  
NEG path go.PROG much LINK 3PL NEG.have money  
'It is an undeniable fact that the Kpatsa troupe sings very well but they are unable to travel because of lack of resources.'

It is observable that *e* 'it' in (62) is the referent of *joku<sub>e</sub> o hi<sub>o</sub> o* 'the child's sickness'. *E* is classified as a short distance anaphoric pronoun because it occurs within the same clause whilst a 'they' in (63) is classified as a long distance anaphoric pronoun since it occurred in the second clause of a compound sentence. Its antecedent, *kpatsa bi* 'the *kpatsa* troupe' however, appeared in the first clause of the compound sentence. *Joku<sub>e</sub> o hi<sub>o</sub> o* 'the child's sickness' agrees in number with the referent *e* 'its'. In the same way, *a* 'they' agrees in number with *kpatsa bi* 'the *kpatsa* troupe' which is in the initial clause of the sentence.

### 5.4 Cataphoric Pronominalization

Cataphoric pronouns are those pronouns which occur before their referents in linear flow of text within the same sentence, where the pronoun is either at a lower structural level or is part of a fronted circumstantial clause or propositional phrase which could have appeared after the referent (Quirk et al. 1985).

64. Loko  $e_i$  ke  $e_i$  gbeo  $e_i$  sukoo o nya a, Sogbojo; tsake  
Before 3PL said 3PL finish.HAB 3SG.POS school DEF end PRT Sogbojo change  
e subai.  
3SG.POSS character.  
'By the time he had completed his formal education, Sogbojo had put on a new leaf.'
65. Bene  $a_i$  ke  $a_i$  jeo ngmo o mi ke ba su o we o mi  
When 3PL say.PST 3PL leave.HAB farm DEF inside to AUX come home DEF inside  
o po to apaatseme<sub>i</sub>  $a_i$  he kpotokpoto.  
PRT fatigue catch up labourers 3PL.POSS body-flesh excessively.  
'By the time they left the farm to the house, the labours were very tired.'

In (65), the third person plural, *a* 'they' have occurred twice before its referent, *apaatseme* 'the labourers'. *E* 'he' and *e* 'his' refer forward to *Sogbojo<sub>i</sub>* and agree in number with the antecedent. In a similar vein, *a* 'they' refers forward to *apaatseme* 'the labourers'. *Apaatseme*, agrees in number with *a* 'they'.

## 6. Conclusion

The paper sought to discuss the phenomenon of pronominalization in

Dangme in the Government and Binding Theory. Pronominalization has been identified as an important element in the syntax of Dangme, which occurs as a result of the absence of a noun in a simple or complex construction. It plays a critical role in the marking of discourse coherent and the structure of constructions as in other languages. This paper studied the types of pronouns in Dangme and identified that the pronouns agree in number and person when they occur in a clause in Dangme. The paper discussed among other things the concept of reflexivization, distribution of reflexive pronouns, locality constraints in reflexive pronouns and also the functions of reciprocal, anaphoric and cataphoric pronouns in Dangme.

As in other languages, the data have shown that Dangme has personal pronouns in the domain of first, second and third person. These are in the categories of emphatic, nominative, accusative and genitive pronouns. In addition, Dangme has demonstrative, interrogative, relative and locative pronouns. The data show that pronouns in Dangme have complex structure involving an abstract nominal. It was also realized that whereas the forms for expressing both subjective and genitive pronouns are identical, that of object pronouns are distinct.

In dealing with the personal pronouns, it was realized that with the exception of the first person singular pronoun which changed its form from *I* 'I' to *ye* 'my', the possessive pronouns have the same form as the subject pronouns. Also, with the exception of the first person emphatic pronoun which form is *imi/ami* 'I', instead of *mi* 'me' in the accusative case, all the emphatic pronouns have the form of the object pronouns.

It came up that Dangme forms the reflexives in two ways: the use of an emphatic pronoun plus *nitse* 'self' and the use of a possessive pronoun and a body fresh/skin word, *he*. I have observed that the antecedents have their referent which they agree with in number. The data have shown that in the formation of the reflexive in Dangme, *he* 'body fresh/skin' word does not occur at the left periphery of the clause as a referent to any NP in a clause. On the contrary, the emphatic pronouns and *nitse* 'self' can be co-referential to both subject and object and can occur at the periphery of the clause. Unlike in the body fresh word *he*, where plural is marked only on the possessive pronoun that precedes it, it was realized that in the use of the emphatic

pronouns and *nitse*, *nitse* is also marked for plural with the morpheme *-mε*. The data confirms that as in other languages, there is a link between the relationship of an antecedent nominal and a pronoun with which it is co-referential in a sentence in Dangme. It is evident from the data that the examples of the reflexives discussed in the possessive form in Dangme, are similar to those found in Ewe, (Agbedor 2014) and Akan, (Osam 2002; Saah 2014).

In dealing with the reciprocals where unlike in English, Dangme creates a distinction between pronouns use to mark the reciprocal, *a he* or *a sibi* 'each other' and *nye sibi* 'one another'. The data have shown that *a he* or *a sibi* 'each other' and *nye sibi* 'one another' cannot occur as syntactic subjects but objects.

In forming anaphoric expressions, the data have shown that the referent occurs after the NP in the clause whilst in the expression of the cataphoric form, the pronouns occur before their referents in linear flow of text within the same sentence. Anaphoric expressions have two forms; the short distance and the long distance as in the literature. It was realised that per the Government and Binding principles, the pronoun-antecedent relations, lie within the same chain of command. That is the reflexives and reciprocals in Dangme display properties of the theory of Government and Binding. The findings of this study will serve as a basis for further studies on pronouns in Dangme and also add to the study on pronominalization in general.

#### Abbreviations Used

A	-	Binding Principle A
B	-	Binding Principle B
C	-	Binding Principle C
CONJ	-	Conjunction
DEF	-	Definite Article
FOC	-	Focus
HAB	-	Habitual Aspect
INGRE	-	Ingressive Verb
NP	-	Noun Phrase
PERF	-	Perfect
PST	-	Past Tense
PL	-	Plural
PRO	-	Pronoun
ISG	-	First Person Singular Pronoun
2SG	-	Second Person Singular Pronoun
3SG	-	Third Person Singular Pronoun
ISG.POS	-	First Person Singular Possessive Pronoun
2SG.POS	-	Second Person Singular Possessive Pronoun
3SG.POS	-	Third Person Singular Possessive Pronoun
ISG.POS	-	First Person Singular Possessive Pronoun
1SG.OBJ	-	First Person Singular Object Pronoun
IPL	-	First Person Plural Pronoun
2PL	-	Second Person Plural Pronoun
3PL	-	Third Person Plural Pronoun
1PL.OBJ	-	First Person Plural Object Pronoun
3PL.OBJ	-	Third Person Plural Object Pronoun
Indices:		
i	-	Subject pronoun
j	-	Direct object pronoun
k	-	Indirect Object Pronoun



## References

- Agbedor, P. K. (2014). *The Syntax of Ewe reflexive and logo- phonic pronouns. Humanities Series No.3: 51-65.* Mary Esther Kropp Dakubu, Joshua Y, Abu, Ama de-Graft Aikins, Kwadwo Ansah Koram, C. Charles Mate-Kole & Eric Sampane - Donkor. (eds.). UK: Ayeibia Clarke Publishing Limited.
- Arnold, J. E. & Zerkle, S. A. (2019). Why do people produce pronouns? Pragmatic selection vs. Rational models. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*. DOI: [10.1080/23273798.2019.1636103](https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2019.1636103)
- Avrutin, S. (2013). *Development of the syntax-discourse interface*. U.S.A. Springer-Science +Business Media, B. V.
- Callaway, C. B. & Lester, J. C. (2002). Pronominalization in generated discourse and dialogue. *Proceedings of the 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Association for computational Linguistics (ACL)*, Pheladephia, July, 2002, pp: 88-95.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chapin, P. G. (1970). Samoan pronominalization. *Language*, Vol. 46, No.2, part 1. pp: 366-378.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cushing, S. (1972). The Semantics of sentence pronominalization. *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 9, No.2. pp: 186- 208.
- Essien, O. E. A. (1974). *Pronominalization in Efik*. A Ph.D thesis submitted to the University of Edinburgh.
- Forcadell, M. (2015). Catalan pronominalization and information structure: The role of primary accent. *Catalan Review*. Vol. 29:1-22.
- Gordon, P. C. & Scarse, K. A. (1995). Pronominalization and discourse coherence, discourse structure and pronoun interpretation. *Memory & Cognition*. 23(3), 313-323.
- Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lees, R. B. & Klima, E. S. (1963). Rules for English pronominalization. *Language*. Vol.39, No. 1. Pp:17- 28.
- Offor, N. O. (2015). A comparative study of the phenomenon of pronominalization in French and in Igbo. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 182-187. DOI: [10.18178/ijll.2015.1.3.35](https://doi.org/10.18178/ijll.2015.1.3.35).
- Ohso, M. (1976). A study of zero pronominalization in Japan. Ohio State University dissertation.
- Osam, K. (2002). Reflexive marking and related functions. *Journal of Asian and African Structure*, 64:141-151.
- Panagiotidis, P. (2001). Pronoun and the transitive determiner hypothesis. In *PLUM 8. Chisarik, E. & Sitaridon, I. (eds.)*. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Postal, P. M. (1972). A global constraint on pronominalism. *Linguistic Inquiry*. Vol.3, No.1. pp: 35-39.
- Saah, K. K. (1989). Reflexivization in Akan. *Journal of West African Languages*. xix, 2: 15- 28.
- Saah, K. ( 2007). Anaphora in Akan. In M. E. Kropp Dakubu, G, Akanlig-Pare, E. Kweku. Osam and Kofi K. Saah (eds.). *Studies in the Languages of Volta Basin* 4. 2: 23-35.
- Saah, K. K. (1987). *Reflexive Parameters in Akan*. A paper read at meeting of Linguistics. Circle of Accra, 19<sup>th</sup> May.
- Saah, K. K. ( 2014). Reflexive marking and interpretation in Akan. *A Legon Reader in Ghanaian Linguistics*. Mary Esther Kropp Dakubu, Joshua Y, Abu, Ama de-Graft Aikins, Kwadwo Ansah Koram, C. Charles Mate-Kole and Eric Sampane – Donkor (eds.).
- Saha, P. K. (1987). Reflexivization in American English. *Journal of American Speech*. 62. 3:2. 11- 234
- Quirk, K. R. & Greenbaun, S. (1985). *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.