

**CORRELATION IN THE SYNTAX OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND THE SYNTAX OF ETSAKO**

BY

**Elijah Ipemosimhe AKHABIGIMHE
ART1600664**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERATURE,
FACULTY OF ARTS,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN.**

JULY 2021

**CORRELATION IN THE SYNTAX OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND THE SYNTAX OF ETSAKO**

BY

**Elijah Ipemosimhe AKHABIGIMHE
ART1600664**

**AN ESSAY SUBMITTED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERATURE
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE
AWARD OF B.A. DEGREE IN ENGLISH AND LITERATURE.**

JULY 2021

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this study was carried out by **Elijah Ipemosimhe AKHABIGIMHE** in the Department of English and Literature, Faculty of Arts, University of Benin, under my supervision.

Dr. A. W. Kayode-Iyasere
Project Supervisor

Date

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated, firstly, to God who inspired me to follow this path for my research work and saw me through and, secondly, to my family members, especially my parents, Mr and Mrs Akhabigimhe, who have done everything possible to instill the nativity, language and tenets of my home of origin in me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To have experienced success up till now, it's by the grace of God. I really appreciate God to have seen me through these years and helped me through this research work. In fact, He is the reason behind my present achievement.

With all sincerity, I offer genuine gratitude to my project supervisor, Dr A. W. Kayode-Iyasere for providing invaluable guidance during the course of writing this project. I am also thankful to my H.O.D., Dr A. P. Mamudu, for his great leadership and his peculiar pattern of leadership through my years in this institution. I will also like to thank the language lecturers, like Dr (Mrs) Jamgbadi etc for their tutelage – I remember the days of Oral Literature and the fieldwork – which made my stay in the university a great adventure and that can never be forgotten. My syntax lecturers, Dr. Bode Steve Ekundayo and Dr. Efosa Legemah, will be forever appreciated for their doggedness towards making sure that we understand every bit of the course even if the course was a dreaded one by many.

I would express my profound gratitude to my parents, Mr and Mrs Akhabigimhe, for their support on every side towards making my understanding of the Etsako language, even if I didn't grow in the village, a deep one. As a matter of fact, I must appreciate my mum for all the attention given me anytime I call for guidance on particular aspects of the language that I didn't understand. They played a vital and invaluable role in this success.

I will be ungrateful if I don't acknowledge my father, pastor and leader, Pastor Kingsley Olori, for the undaunting efforts towards instilling the culture of dedication, consistency and resilience in me. The series of success talks and constant personal grilling have gone a long way to help me through the few years I've spent here in the University of Benin.

To my friends, colleagues and relatives, I really appreciate you for checking up on me to know how far I have gone in the project work and for the constant encouragements. My appreciation goes to the various bodies that contributed to the success of this project which includes the final year brethren in Deeper Life Campus Fellowship (Executives); Deeper Life Campus Fellowship, LT1 Choir; Deeper Life Campus Fellowship, LT1, NAAT Hall, UNIBEN, you're all highly appreciated. Several unique individuals have ensured that I don't rest on my oars at any step of this success journey and I must appreciate you all. Miss Deborah Akhabigimhe, Mr Phillip Azinmagba, Mr Jacob Apemiye, Mr Isaiah Yakubu, Mr Joshua Ademola, Miss Sarah Emiantor, Miss Victory Aliu, Miss Kate Uzoka, Miss Blessed Uwaezuoke, Mr Ayodele Bello, Mr Joseph Omoloye, Miss Ruth Idemudia, Miss Favour Tochukwu, Mr Godspower Okotako, Mr Stephen Danjuma, Mr Korede Adenola, Mr Jeremiah Omoaka, Mr Caleb Okon, Mr Williams Isibor, etc. You are all highly appreciated. May God bless you all.

ABSTRACT

This work examines how the various components of the linguistic elements of the English Language are put together to form words in the Etsako language. A large part of it is its correlation with the word formation process of the English Language. Apparently, the Etsako language has its particular way of word formation but has several factors affecting its formation. Most of these factors are external. This research provides an explication of how these word formation processes correspond with that of the English Language but it does not neglect the various ways the formation processes are violated and also muddled.

2.4.2	Recursion	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.4.3	Promotion and Demotion Processes	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
2.5	All Languages have Structures	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
2.5.1	Factors that Affect Syntactic Structures in Etsako	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
CHAPTER THREE								
3.1	Violation of Syntactic Structures in English and Etsako							
	Languages	-	-	-	-	-	-	23
CHAPTER FOUR								
4.1	Muddling of Laws Governing Word Formation in Speech							
	Production	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION								
		-	-	-	-	-	-	29
	Works Cited	-	-	-	-	-	-	31

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine how syntactic structures of both the Etsako and English languages are formed. Thus, this work provides syntactic explications on how the linguistic elements (such as words) are put together to form constituents (such as phrases and clauses). The process of combination of phrases and clauses that constitute lexical categories in sentences are hereby considered. Ultimately, it will bring to clear terms the similarities between the method of formation of words in the English and Etsako languages respectively.

Derogatory remarks are made on the Etsako language by foreigners. In fact, it did not begin in recent times. It has been since “Etsako” was adopted as a name for the language. Formerly, the name “Kukuruku,” which its meaning was supposedly after a battle cry “ku-ku-ruku,” was prevalent until the name, which was given by the British colonial administration, became derogatory to many. With that began the mix-up in respect to the peculiarity of the Etsako language and her syntax. More importantly, it should be noted that these names given to indigenous languages were got from history and what marked them in ancient times. Therefore, this is what sticks better to the users of the language than the contemporary changes that prescriptivists (those that are bent on a particular language pattern) want to make. As Joseph M. Williams rightly puts it in *Origin of the English Language: A Social and Linguistic History*, “the earliest myths, the

stories of the most primitive peoples about their gods, are a kind of history that explains how the universe and the earth came about – why the sun and the moon, why the animals, why man.” The history each language, especially that of Etsako, has means **the whole world** to them and it will definitely reflect in the syntactic construction of their sentences.

Extensively, this study helps to understand the way syntax works in both the English and Etsako languages respectively and to introduce the most important syntactic concepts and technical terms which will be needed in order to see how syntax works.

1.2 Scope of Study

This study covers the different syntactic structures of both the English and Etsako languages. As a matter of fact, it will explicate the various possible word formation processes that exist in the Etsako language. Then, it will consider how the various tones of Etsako, not considering the phonology of the language, affect the syntactic structures. Meanwhile, the five tones of the Etsako language include “high (v), low (v), and down step (v)” (Elimelech, 1978). Furthermore, it considers the deep syntactic structure of the language. Having drawn a succinct observation from the structure, it takes a brief observation on the syntactic structure of the English language and compares it with that of the Etsako language. Obviously, there will be some highlighted loopholes or differences inherent in both languages.

With detailed exposition, the study will delve into “Why Languages have Syntax,” “Word Order,” “Structure of Sentences” and “The Structure of all Languages.”

It suffices to say that all languages (especially English and Etsako languages) have syntax, although that syntax may look **radically** different from that of English.

1.3 Research Methodology

This research work makes use of a qualitative research method. According to Haradhan Mohajan, “qualitative research is inductive in nature.” It can be said to be a range of data collection and analysis techniques that use purposive sampling and semi-structured, open-ended interviews. It can also adopt the use of focus groups to achieve an overarching result. This qualitative method of research is described as an effective model that occurs in a natural setting and enables the researcher to develop a level of detail from high involvement in the actual experiences.” Here the researcher has a direct conversation and live interaction with the subjects (those s/he gets the facts from). Since it’s a one-on-one activity, the researcher will be able to pull enough data for a quality analysis.

This research method is also flexible and it provides ease of reaching out to our targeted sample quickly. The data used for analysis is drawn from the word formation data that elicits from the conversation of interlocutors in both languages and their reading/interpretation of selected passages and speeches. The selected words and sentences are cross-sectional. The subjects are from the various areas of the Etsako, precisely the Etsako-central community, namely: Fugar, Ekperi, Ogbona, Anegbette, Udochi.

Meanwhile, a lot of relatable materials were culled from the internet to get the views of many writers across the globe especially writers that specialize in the study of the syntax of the English Language, its structure and have established a lot of facts that even relates closely with the Etsako language.

It's noteworthy that my innate knowledge of the language was also brought into play at this point because I had to employ a lot I knew and was taught from the cradle into this research work. In addition, a course that I did in my 200 level, Oral Literature, gave me an introduction to the modalities of a successful qualitative research work and this is what I used to further my research in this area.

1.4 Theoretical Background

1.4.1 Definition of Terms

1.4.1.1 *Correlation*: Correlation is a mutual relationship or connection between two or more things. It can also be said to be the interdependence of variable quantities. From all indications, the term "correlation" is drawn from the mathematical field but the term, as used in this research work, can be referred to as "the degree to which a pair of variables (English and Etsako languages) are linearly related." Correlation is useful here because it can indicate a predictive relationship that can be exploited in practice. Practicing the syntactic structures of both the English and Etsako languages expose the relationship between them.

1.4.1.2 *Syntax*: Tallerman, in *Understanding Syntax (2011)*, explains syntax in just two words which are simply "Sentence Construction." He goes further to expatiate that it is

“how words group together to make phrases and sentences.” He also notes that “though most linguists follow the more recent practice whereby the grammar of a language includes all of its organizing principles: information about the second system, about the form of words, how we adjust language according to context, and so on; some people use the term GRAMMAR to mean the same as syntax where syntax is only one part of this grammar.”

Tallerman explains ‘syntax’ as a term also used to mean “the study of the syntactic properties of languages.” In other words, “syntax refers to functional categories and not individual words/lexis.” “The four generative capacity of natural language syntax, what matters is not the particular words that are used, but the categories that they represent and how these categories can relate structurally to ensure sentential cohesion” (Culy 1996).

Syntax is one of the branches in linguistics which more than just explains about structure and grammar. Crystal (in Srijono 2006: 63) defines Syntax as “the study of the rules governing the way words are combined to form sentences. Syntax is the system of rules which underlines sentence construction in human language.” By Syntactic Structure, one can explain the function of each word in a sentence.

1.4.1.3 Structural Grammar Approach: This theory, according to Malcolm Tatum, “is a means to analyzing written and spoken language. It is concerned with how elements of a sentence such as morphemes, phonemes, phrases, clauses and parts of speech are put together.” What matters in using this theory is how the elements of a sentence work

together. As a matter of fact, “the relationships between the elements typically have a greater meaning than any of the single elements.” Using the syntactic structural term, the “elements” are also referred to as “constituents.” Through the study of this theory, clarity is improved in communication.

This theory that deals with the selection and arrangement of sentence elements developed in the early 20th century (1930 - 1950). The father of this theory is generally considered to be Ferdinand de Saussure. Using this theory, once one “has the absolute meaning of the sentence, he can look beyond it to implied meaning if desired.”

Tatum goes further to explain the processes involved thus: “As babies, people learn how to make the basic sounds of their language, which enables them to express the rudimentary needs and wants. This expands into words, and finally, children master the basics of sentence construction and learn how to use specific words in a particular fashion. The more sounds and words a child learn, and the better he gets at putting them together, the more complex ideas he can convey.”

Therefore, the Structural Grammar Approach works excellently at correlating the syntax of both languages in a way that makes users understand the functions and implied meaning of each element/constituent in the sentence.

1.5 Review of Related Literature

The research has gone beyond the knowledge of the languages in question. It has gone into knowing the system of word formation in those languages. Precisely, the languages in question here are English language and Etsako language.

The basic assumption of this model is “that languages have no rules at all in anything like the traditional sense – there are Universal principles and an array of options as to how they apply (parameters)” (Chomsky 1995a: 338). It is further assumed that “there is a single computational system (CHL) for language and only limited lexical variety in its application to different languages” (cf. Chomsky 1995a: 388). These assumptions may have a comfortable support but it must be clearly noted and even agreed that each language has its structure of sentence formation and this will, in many ways, thwart the conventional rules governing sentence construction in general. These are the exceptions that fixed users of the language refer to as “violations.” These “violations” form the Grammar of these languages. Take a look at this: “A grammar is a model (= systematic description) of those linguistic abilities of native speakers of a language which enable them to speak and understand their language fluently.” (Radford 1988)

It is worthy of note that the syntax of Etsako language draws a large cue from that of the English language. This can be substantiated from the fact that all languages, even though they have their syntactic structures, have an underlining syntactic root. That is, there is a form of syntax (word and sentence construction) that is common to all languages. While the Etsako language, according to Elimelech (1978), has five tones

which are high (v), low (v), falling high (v), rising (v) and downstep (v), the variants are offshoots of the English language and they add more spices to the Etsako language. Nevertheless, the similarities in both languages are too sacrosanct to be neglected.

Many scholars have **not only** delved into how words are stringed but also succinctly branched into how these words function in their various categories within the sentence. One of those scholars is Culy (1996) who draws my attention to the fact that “one of the properties of a natural language is that it is sets of strings of words.” He also says “syntax refers to the functional categories and not individual word/lexis.” I, therefore, will follow Culy (1996) to posit that “for a generative capacity of natural language syntax, what matters is not the particular words that are used, but the categories that they represent and how these categories can relate structurally to ensure sentential cohesion.”

Another notable scholar, Chomsky (1989), argues that “the inventory of functional categories [of a language in communication process] is universally fixed.” The need, therefore, arises to verify first the existence of the functional category of Determiner in Etsako.

In Maggie Tallerman’s *Understanding Syntax (1998)*, we know that Grammar is a whole body and Syntax is only one part of it. Among other scholars, he is the one that simplified the definition of syntax to be just “sentence construction.” Here, he stresses it that context has to be put into consideration when stringing words to form sentences.

Chomsky (1957) and Givon (2009) relates to us that the various fields in a sentence are called **constituents** and that they may be in words, phrases, clauses or sentences. Furthermore, “these constituents are combined and arranged in grammatical ways...” The grammaticalness of these constructions, whether simple or complex, are hovered around the context.

Michael H. Markel, in his *Technical Writing: Situations and Strategies (1984)*, bursts our bubble by enunciating that there is resilience in syntactic constructions. That is, “a sentence made up of several constituents is a resilient unit with no syntactic limits to its length or complexity once the minimal requirements of subject and predicate have been met.”

Through Francis (1957), I learnt that Syntactic Structures are in types. From my deduction, these types in which the syntactic structures of languages can appear contribute to their peculiarities.

An article published on *Glottopedia Discovering Linguistics* discusses the possible variation a sentence construction can adopt. These variations contribute to the peculiarity and indispensability of every language. Francis, in this article, expatiates the variety of **Promotion** and **Demotion**. He hereby quotes Van Valin’s definition of Promotion (in the process of sentence construction).

1.6 Thesis Statement

In an attempt to produce grammatically correct speeches, users of the Etsako Language violate and sometimes muddle the laws governing word formation in the speech production of individual languages.

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 Correlating Etsako Syntactic Structure with English Syntactic Structure

Syntactic structure can be said to be the study of the rules whereby words or other elements of sentence structure are combined to form grammatical sentences. The four types of Syntactic Structure include (i) Structure of Predication, (ii) Structure of Modification, (iii) Structure of Complementation, (iv) Structure of Coordination (Francis, W. Nelson, 1958: 292).

Native speakers of any language, no matter the dialect, already know the grammar of that language perfectly. It's not that one knows (consciously) a few prescriptive rules but that one knows (unconsciously) the much more impressive mental grammar of their own language. It applies to all native speakers of a language.

At the age of around seven, children have a fairly complete knowledge of the grammar of their native languages. Learning our native language happens without outside intervention and the resulting knowledge is inaccessible to us. All normally developing children in every culture learn this native language or languages to perfection without any formal teaching.

Consider children's learning to walk. They may do their best to get this done without their parent's guidance. That still does not make their parents happy with the way they slouch along or scuff the toes of their shoes on the ground. They may tell the child to stand straight, or to stop wearing out their shoes. The child's way of walking is not the issue here. The issue is that it does not tally with the programmed idea the parents have in

their mind which they consider as “aesthetic” and “classy.” In the same way some people have the idea that certain forms of language are more beautiful, or classier, or are simply ‘correct.’ As a matter of fact, no language is better than the other. Each language is unique in its own way and has its own linguistic basis. It’s pitiable that some people cast aspersions on other languages based on the “accent” or “dialect” of the interlocutors. This transfer of judgement is also made on the form of the language. Hence, the discrimination made on various languages. We may then think that some forms are undesirable, that some are ‘good’ and some ‘bad.’ For a linguist, however, dialectal forms of a language don’t equate to ‘bad grammar.’

With the use of linguistic examples, we will observe the correlation in the syntax of the languages observed in this research work. First off, languages do not all look the same, and examining just one language and its immediate relatives doesn’t show how much languages can differ. As Williams (1975) has rightly said, to teach us about today [a language], the historian [syntactician] must arrange and shape the past [other language] to make it relevant to the present [the language in question].

In the word order of both Etsako and English languages, observe this:

- 1a. Omosi no sotse (Etsako)
- b. The girl that’s beautiful (translation)
- c. The beautiful girl (English)

The above phrase, as translated in English, is a Structure of Modification especially in a sentence like:

The beautiful girl danced in the hall skillfully.

The underlined phrase “The beautiful girl” is a Structure of Modification. The constituent “girl” is the headword of the noun phrase where the constituent ‘the’ and ‘beautiful’ respectively are modifiers.

The world’s languages have many interesting and important syntactic features. Though English has some of these features, it does not have all of them. Apart from English language, we study other languages to discover the range of constructions and features they contain – in order to find out about their LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY. The second reason for looking at examples from other languages is that linguists want to discover the common properties that languages share – the homogeneity or sameness. One of the most important discoveries of modern linguistics is that languages don’t vary from each other at random, but remarkably alike. Certain features occur in all languages. For instance, every language distinguishes a word class of NOUNS (words like tree, liquid, expression and student) from a word class of VERBS (words like liquefy, learn, enjoy and grow), although some languages have no major word classes. To discover this kind of information, linguists need to examine a representative sample of languages from different language families and different geographical areas.

Although specific constructions are not universal, all the languages use a replica of the same basic universal tools of grammar. Each language has a word list or LEXICON which all its speakers share, and that word list always contains words from several different clauses. All languages combine these words into phrases and sentences,

and can manipulate the order of the phrases for various purposes – perhaps to ask questions, or to emphasize different parts of a sentence, or to show who’s doing what to whom. This is syntax.

As a syntactician, the first task I learn is to make use of examples from other languages (English and Etsako).

2.2 Why Do Languages Have Syntax?

Speakers manipulate sentences in all sorts of ways because they are trying to convey different meanings. With syntax, speakers can express all the meanings that they have to pass across. In exceptional cases, the speaker can alter the basic word order of a sentence for emphasis on the meaning of what he is about to pass across because the most important thing in a conversation is for the listeners, in fact every interlocutor, to understand one another. The speaker may not invariably change meaning but will change pattern of approach for understanding purposes.

2.3 Word Order

In English, the WORD ORDER is pretty fixed. As a matter of fact, syntax express Word Order. As earlier noted, every language is peculiar. Therefore, “possible variations” are peculiar to the languages also. Meanwhile, they are overtly impossible in the English language. The English language is tied to the “basic, neutral word order” and may account the variety of other languages in the same word order as ungrammatical and, probably, non-syntactic. Invariably, English has a fixed basic word order while some other languages have flexible word. Following the syntactic structures, Structure of

Coordination consists of equivalent grammatical units. This structure is often joined by conjunctions such as “and,” “or,” and “but.” Therefore, the conjunction joining constituents or clauses in a sentence of coordination is coordinating conjunction or coordinator. This structure of coordination appears in sentences which have the conjunction as the coordinator to join the clause or word.

Forms of syntactic structure coordination consist of simple structures of coordination, series structures of coordination, elliptical structures of coordination, split structures of coordination and correlative structures of coordination. Word Order in linguistics, also known as “sentence pattern” typically refers to the order of the Subject (S), the Verb (V) and the Object (O) in a sentence. In English, the most basic word order of a typical sentence is Subject + Verb + Object (SVO).

To English speakers, this seems obviously the only logical arrangements. Meanwhile, other languages have their different word order/sentence patterns. The term Word Order could mean something broader but so far this is the extent of its meaning. Various language analysts have investigated the varieties of word order in the languages of the world, starting in 1963 with Joseph Greenberg in Stanford University. They’ve particularly streamlined their investigation to the limited range of differences in the word order among the different languages.

The Syntactic Rules of all languages are STRUCTURE DEPENDENT. Also, Grammatical sentences are the science of linguistics. Sometimes, psychological factors can interfere with grammaticality judgements. Word Order can be further subdivided.

2.3.1 Basic Word Order

Basically, SVO (Subject + Verb + Object), SOV (Subject + Object + Verb), VSO (Verb + Subject + Object) are the most common word orders. It is possible to determine a basic word order for most languages, although some are argued to be free Word Order languages. Languages differ in variants permitted and what they are used for. Other basic word orders include SOV, VOS, OVS, OSV etc.

2.3.2 Marked vs Unmarked

When we say a word or sentence is “marked,” we simply refer to how words are formed to make it “convey a special meaning” while the word “unmarked” is used to refer to words with no special meaning. That is, in its ordinary sense. English and Etsako users can string their words to be either “marked” or “unmarked” depending on the meaning they want to convey in their sentences.

2.4 Structure of words that form Phrases, Clauses and Sentences

The order of words as identified above can, therefore, appear in different structures. Some of these structures include are significant to the understanding of the sentence as some of them depend on contexts. They will be discussed briefly.

2.4.1 Embedded clause

This is a clause that is used in the middle of another to give the reader more information about the sentence.

- I wonder [if Lee will arrive late] – English
- I gba [ti Lee o ra te va] – Etsako

- The claim [that she doesn't like Charis] is very convincing – English
Oni ugba [hi lo a mo uyemi Charis] o vugu me alo – Etsako
- [Whenever Jonathan and Blessed arrive] we'll set off – English
[Erege ni Jonathan lagi Blessed e va kpo] ma raa kpa – Etsako
- [That we've no coffee left] isn't my fault – English
[Hi maa mo Coffee ke] o a ki emo me – Etsako
- Blessed couldn't run – English
Blessed omati na – Etsako
- Jonathan thought that Blessed couldn't run – English
Jonathan o lo Blessed omati na – Etsako

2.4.2 Recursion

The repeated sequential use of a particular type of linguistic element or grammatical structure.

Example 1;

- I said that Jonathan thought that Blessed couldn't run – English
I yo Jonathan o lo Blessed omati na – Etsako

Example 2;

- Syntax is fun – English
Syntax o mi – Etsako
- Elijah thinks that syntax is fun – English
Elijah o lo syntax o mi – Etsako

- Jeremiah suspects that Elijah thinks that syntax is fun – English

Jeremiah o gbalo hi Elijah o lo syntax o mi - Etsako

Note:

(i) No longest sentences in any language

(ii) All languages have an infinite number of sentences

It is also noteworthy that syntax expresses the following:

2.4.3 Promotion and Demotion processes

The syntactic variations can involve simply reordering the elements of a sentence but the changes that comes from reordering the elements of a sentence can have a very significant effect on the sentence and the result can be so radical. In syntax, promotion is a change of grammatical relations (or a valency change) by which an argument comes to assume a high-ranking position on a grammatical relations hierarchy. The opposite of a **promotion**, according to this context, is a **demotion**. Promotion is what happens if an object (or internal argument) becomes the subject (or external argument) with all the usual properties of subjects due to some morphological or syntactic operations. From a syntactic angle, promotion is a “change of “grammatical relations (or a valency change) by which an argument comes to assume a higher-ranking position on a grammatical relations hierarchy.” In this context, the opposite of **promotion** is **demotion**. If an object (or internal argument) assumes the position/slot of the subject in a sentence (or external argument) with all the usual properties of subjects in accordance to some morphological or syntactic operation, we say we have achieved **Promotion**.

According to Van Valin (1980:316), “the term ‘promotion’ will have to be used to refer to a change in the syntactic status of an NP such that it becomes accessible to one or more grammatical processes which it could not otherwise undergo, for example, relativization.

The most common form of promotion is when there is the change of object to subject position which then results in a passive construction. Forming the passive of “break,” we arrive at “broken.” Therefore, the object (or internal argument) is promoted to become the subject.

Promotion and Demotion processes are exemplified in “Passive” and “Active Counterpart” form.

➤ Passive:

And he is greatly disturbed by the information he got from his first son, Ben, a lieutenant in NASA – English

O vhugu lo udu emi lo so emo omo oseose natso, Ben, udugbi oya emi NASA – Etsako

➤ Active counterpart:

The information he got from his first son Ben, a lieutenant in NASA unsettles him – English

Emi lo so emo omo oseose natso Ben, udugbi oya emi NASA o vhugu lo udu – Etsako

Note in the above examples that Object is promoted to Subject position, and Subject is demoted to by-phrase or deleted altogether. Verb changes form.

2.5 All Languages have Structure

It should be duly noted that **all languages have their specific structures**. This means that language doesn't just consist of a string of words, but that words group together to form phrases, and the phrases group together to form larger phrases (clauses) and sentences. Linguists describe this phrases-within-phrases pattern as HIERARCHICAL STRUCTURE.

There are five major components that constitute the structure of language and they include (i) phonemes (ii) morphemes (iii) lexemes (iv) syntax and (v) context. All these components, when stringed, create meaningful communication.

All languages have grammar (the set of rules a language obeys for creating words and sentences), and native speakers of a language have internalized the rules of their language's grammar. Every language also has a lexicon, or the sum total of all the words in that language. These rules of the languages act as a framework for meaningful communication. This makes it easy for humans to convey an infinite number of concepts. An example of syntax coming into play in language is "Cynthia walked the dog" versus "The dog walked Cynthia." The order of words is not arbitrary - in order that a sentence relate the intended meaning of the speaker, it must be stringed around a certain order (word order). As it has been said, every language has a different set of syntactic rules, but all languages have some form of syntax. The minutest form of a sentence is the noun

phrase (which is made up by just a noun or a pronoun) and the verb phrase (which can be a single verb). Meanwhile, expressions from other word classes can be added to the sentence to provide further meaning. Word Order matters in English, although in some languages, order is of less importance. An example is this:

1. The boy drank the water.
2. The water drank the boy.

The above sentences do not mean the same thing even though they contain the exact same words. In Etsako, word order doesn't matter for general meaning – different word orders are used to emphasize different parts of the sentence. As a matter of fact, the different parts of the sentences are strung around the contexts with which they are made.

2.5.1 Factors that Affect Syntactic Structures in Etsako

As noted earlier, all languages have their structures. Even if every language shares a basic structure that is culled from the English structure, there are exceptions. So, in Etsako, the (i) tone of the voice, (ii) body language also contributes to the way the words are constructed. Examples of Etsako expressions that convey this include:

1. Onomosi nu mie li, loo dwi ekpa gi me obi i yoyo

You see that girl; she is the one that brought my bag for me where I was
(the speaker emphasized on the girl and made the listener understand the indispensability of the girl's helping hand in the process of carrying out the action).

2. Oni ekpa na o di ana re obo natsi onomosi li

The bag was brought by that girl

(the speaker was plain here and no emphasis is placed on any part of the sentence)

P.S. The first sentence began with a rising tone and that is one of the factors that affect sentence construction in languages.

Invariably, for effective communication to take place in that atmosphere that has been affected, it has to be between interlocutors that have deep understanding of the language. In other words, the sentence may not be understood by an ordinary listener.

CHAPTER THREE

3.1 Violation of Syntactic Structures in English and Etsako Languages

Peter Haggort. & J Cogn Neurosci (2003) opine that “syntactic violations consisted of a mismatch in grammatical gender or number of features of the definite article and the noun in sentence-internal or sentence-final noun phrases (NPs).” More than have been identified in the previous chapters to be the syntactic structures of the English language, it is noticed that other languages – especially the language of consideration, Etsako language – violate most of these structures. In as much as it is noted that all languages have their syntactic structure, these violations have a way of impeding the free flow of construction by the users of both the English and Etsako languages. The various word formation processes are violated, as indicated in the previous chapter, by the tone of the interlocutors, promotion process, demotion process, word order, recursion, embedded sentences, sentence structure, marked vs unmarked sentences etc.

In this research, it is the understanding by the users of the language that matters and how the interlocutors can understand one another. Even if they violate the typical word formation processes of the English language, they have the innate understanding of the way the various sentences should be adequately constructed.

An example is this:

1. I will be with you shortly (English)
2. I ra di o bu yo re gwa (Etsako)

From the above sentences the Etsako language does not have the exact words for each English interpretation but the interlocutors understand one another which makes for effective communication process. Meanwhile, the knowledge some users have of the rules governing word formation in the English language affect their word and sentence formation in Etsako language. An indigene of Etsako who was brought up in the West will, even if he has a knowledge of the language, apply the laws of the English language when forming sentences in the language. In fact, such a person will be more careful than those that are indigenes of Etsako, live there and even grow there.

The fluency with which an indigenous speaker who grew in the Etsako speech environment will have is entirely different from that of one that grows outside. This buttresses Chomsky's claim that "Everyone is born with the capacity to develop and learn any language." The capacity to learn any language sometimes overrides the ability to efficiently produce the language according to the normal way of sentence formation. Therefore, the user of the language needs to gain mastery of both languages if he must not have any interference.

One of the reasons there is violation is that, according to Chomsky, "Language rules are influenced by experience and learning, but the capacity for language itself exists with or without environmental influences."

It is noteworthy that, at some point, syntactic violations may affect auditory processing in non-syntactic ways. In other words, one that does not understand the syntactic form an interlocutor used in constructing his sentence may lack understanding

of the information he is trying to pass across which means communication has not taken place between the interlocutors. For example, if an indigenous speaker of Etsako language says to another that does not know the syntactic structure of the language:

“A dwi opia no yo vha ya me lari o no a pioto, oo ra mi obi lo za ra ko’ka.”

The listener would interpret the sentence literally but the speaker has employed the use of proverbs in the latter part of the sentence even if the first few words were literal. The interpretation in English goes thus:

“Go and bring that Cutlass for me because he who does not clear the grass will not find a space to plant his Maize.”

In the above example, that violation by the speaker may affect the auditory processing of the listener if he does not have a grounded knowledge of proverbs in Etsako language.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 Muddling of Laws Governing Word Formation in Speech Production

In order not to mix things up, “Word Formation” has to do with **Morphology** while our area of concentration is “The Laws Guiding Word Formation” which has to do with **Syntax**. As noted in Chapter 2 when enunciating “Why Languages have Syntax,” SVO, SOV, VSO are the most common basic word orders. It was also noted in the same chapter that all languages have structures but each draw cue from the English language structure.

The following are examples of sentences containing the basic word orders and syntactic structures (SVO, SOV, VSO, SVOA etc.):

1. SVO [Subject + Verb + Object]

	Subject	Verb	Object
English	I	Drank	Tea
Etsako	I	Wi	Amenoto

2. SVOA [Subject + Verb + Object + Adverbial]

	Subject	Verb	Object	Adverbial
English	He	Drove	Me	Home
Etsako	O	Gwa	Me	Yelo

3. VSO [Verb + Subject + Object]

	Verb	Subject	Object
English	Go!	He	Retorted
Etsako	Yakia!	O	Fa

4. SOV [Subject + Object + Verb]

	Subject	Verb	Object
English	Bello,	the food,	ate
Etsako	Bello,	Oniema,	lole

Note: The pattern, SOV, is rare in the English language but has a correspondence in the Etsako language.

Other word orders, which may be also referred to as Sentence Patterns, that are used in both English language and Etsako language vary widely. Some users of the Etsako language gain so much mastery of the language that they begin to muddle the laws governing both languages. Little wonder the prescriptivist theory applies to both languages but with different parameters. While a native speaker of the Etsako language, particularly an aged man or woman in the village, corrects an incorrectly constructed sentence in the indigenous way, the English speaker does his best to string his words and sentences around the rules governing the English language. Apparently, one will have to

conflict with the other because each party will claim to have gained mastery of their language.

In as much as this happens, muddling of the syntaxes of both languages is inevitable because each one has their peculiarity and one that has tasted of both languages will misappropriate them except he has gained full mastery and knowledge of both languages. At this point, one that has gained mastery of both languages has to be cautious enough to codeswitch in the various applicable speech communities or environments.

Among toddlers, muddling happens often because the toddler struggles to apply the formal English rules he is taught in his school to the indigenous language he is being taught at home and if he spends more time in school than home, he tends to muddle the syntax of English with that of Etsako because that is what he is used to. The good part of this is that whatever the interlocutor that has gained mastery of the Etsako language says, the toddler understands but cannot speak it as efficiently as the native speaker because s/he juggles between both languages.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

As discussed in the preceding chapters, the subject of correlation in the study of the English and Etsako languages is an interesting one that needs a lot of attention and it has been addressed through this research work in a way that it relieves many users of the language of the shame that always accompanies using their indigenous language in the public spaces. In fact, this topic has given enough parameters to hold on to when they proudly use their language.

This topic has solved the problem of wrongly stringing words according to the basic syntactic structures. My attention was drawn to the topic when I discovered that many users of the language try to correlate both language syntax (word formation) but always hit bricks because they muddle them and most times, violate basic rules governing word and sentence formation.

The Word Order, Promotion and Demotion Processes, Structure of the Languages, etc. have a wonderful impact in both languages. In fact, both the Etsako and the English languages share a whole lot of similarities in the language structure and formation processes just like every other language. As noted earlier in this chapter, the sentence patterns of both languages are similar and even the exception seem to exist, but rarely, in the English language.

In conclusion, English and Etsako syntaxes are largely similar and stem from the same root which makes users of both the English and Etsako languages form sentences seamlessly.

Works Cited

- Abney, Stephen. *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspects Ph.D Dissertation, M.I.T.*, 1987.
- Amfani, A. “*A Syntax of Vision: Form the Standard Theory to the Minimalist Program and Beyond (A Case Study of Agreement Relations)*” Paper presented at the *15th Annual Conference of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria. Uthman Dan Fodio University. Sokoto, Nov. 3 – 7, 1997.*
- Atibrarian. (Ed.) *Etsako People*. 15 July 2021, 11:33 a.m. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org>.
- Carnie, Andrew. *Syntax (A Generative Introduction)*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2002.
- Clark, Dorothy. and Choy, Penelope. *Basic Grammar and Usage*. Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 1978.
- Clause, Chris. “*Noam Chomsky’s Theories on Language.*” August 2021, www.study.com.
- Fiveash, McArthur, and Thompson William Forde. *Syntactic and Non-syntactic Sources of Interference by Music on Language Processing*. December 2018, researchgate.net.
- Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. *The Dynamics of Composing: Making Plans and Juggling Constraints*. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg [Eds.], *Cognitive Processes in Writing* (pp. 31 – 50). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 1980.
- Gorlinski, Virginia. (Associate Ed.) *Edo People*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Edo-people>, 2021.
- Haggort, Peter. and Neurosci, Cogn. *Interplay between Syntax and Semantics during Sentence Comprehension: ERP Effects of Combining Syntactic and Semantic Violations*. National Library of Medicine, 2003.
- Hutchinson, Tom. and Water, Alan. *English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- John, Algeo. *The Origins and Development of the English Language (6th edition)*. Wadsworth publishing, 2009.
- Markel, Michael. *Technical Writing: Situation and Strategies*. St. Martin’s Press. 1984.

- Okhaishie n' Avhianwu., & Aha Idokpesi., *The Words of Afemai Fathers Explained [Volume II]*.
- Okonita, Joshua. (Ed.) *Afemai People*. 17 July 2021,
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Afemai_people.
- Omonews. (Ed.) *Etsako Central*. 10 July 2021,
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Etsako_Central.
- Quirk, Randolph. and Greenbaum, Sidney. *A University Grammar of English*. Longman Publishing Group, 1973.
- Sipahutar, Reina. A., Pangarituan, Tagor and Sihombing, Partohap. "Syntactic Structure Analysis of the Third Semester Students of English Department of FKIP UKN Pematangsiantar (A Government Binding Perspective)." *JETAFL Publishing*, December 2017, pp. 72 – 87.
- Spencer, Andrew. *Morphological Theory*. Blackwell, Oxford, 1991.
- Tallerman, Maggie. *Understanding Syntax (Third Edition)*. London: Arnold, 1998.
- Tatum, Malcolm. "What is Structural Grammar?" InfoBloom, 2011,
<https://www.infobloom/what-is-structural-grammar.htm>
- Trask, Larry. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. Routledge Books, 1993.
- Trudgill, Peter. *Dialects*. Routledge Books, 1994.
- Valin, Van. and Robert, D. Jr. *On the Distribution of Passive and Antipassive Constructions in Universal Grammar*. *Lingua* 50: 303-307. Elsevier, 1980.
- Williams, Edwin. *Argument Structure and Morphology*, *The Linguistic Review* 1. pp. 81-114, 1981b.
- Williams, Joseph. *Origins of the English Language: A Social and Linguistic History*. The Free Press, 1975.