

The Semantics of Copy Pronouns in Goemai (West Chadic)

Birgit Hellwig

1 Introduction

As summarized by Storch (this volume), West Chadic languages frequently make use of a so-called “intransitive copy pronoun” (ICP) (see Frajzyngier 1977 & 1984, Newman 1971, Tuller 1997). Such a pronoun is formally identical to the transitive object pronoun, but it occurs with intransitive verbs, and has the same person and number specification as the intransitive subject (i.e., it “copies” the features of the subject). The ICP is usually described as serving an intransitivizing function (Newman 1971 & 1974: 23-24), but there are alternative proposals suggesting that it serves more of an inchoative function (Frajzyngier 1977, 1984 & this volume).

The ICP is often seen as a characteristic property of Chadic languages. Researchers, therefore, were intrigued when formally similar phenomena were found in a number of Benue-Congo languages spoken throughout Central Nigeria, notably in different Plateau languages. This geographical area is known to form a *sprachbund* or linguistic area, and the presence of such pronouns was thus easily interpreted as a contact phenomenon (Wolff & Gerhardt 1977). However, for a long time, our limited knowledge of the semantics and pragmatic functions of individual pronominal systems made further in-depth comparisons difficult. This situation has now changed with the case studies collected in this volume. Interestingly, these studies strongly suggest that, at least for some languages, the situation is more complex than originally assumed. This concerns especially Benue-Congo languages such as Jukun (Koops, this volume; Storch, this volume), which are spoken at the southern fringes of this *sprachbund*. Formally, their pronominal systems share the fact that an additional pronoun is added to intransitive verbs – a phenomenon termed “copy pronouns” or “serial pronouns” in some contributions to this volume. But semantically and pragmatically, there are considerable differences with the prototypical ICPs attested in West Chadic and Platoid.

This chapter contributes an additional perspective to this discussion: a case study of Goemai, a West Chadic language with no ICPs, but with copy pronouns similar to those in languages such as Jukun. Goemai and Jukun are not related, and it is thus possible to maintain the notion that copy pronoun constructions constitute an areal phenomenon – but this areal phenomenon does not necessarily include the

prototypical ICPs. Furthermore, the Goemai copy pronouns exhibit certain idiosyncrasies that can be used to shed light on their diachronic origins and further developments. It may be possible that the insights gained from these idiosyncrasies can be transferred to Jukun and other Benue-Congo languages.

This chapter is structured as follows: section 2 discusses three types of copy pronouns – the prototypical ICP and its absence in Goemai (section 2.1), concordant-marking of subjects in specific grammatical constructions (section 2.2), and the use of independent possessive pronouns to express unexpected or surprising states-of-affairs (section 2.3). Section 3 summarizes the discussion.

2 Copy pronouns in Goemai: a case study

Goemai is a West Chadic language with approximately 150.000 speakers in the lowlands south of the Jos Plateau and north of the River Benue. The history of the region is characterized by numerous small-scale migrations linked to the formation and expansion of powerful regional states, especially the Kororofa Empire under Jukun rule, and later to several Emirates established in the wake of the Hausa-Fulani *jihad* (Isichei 1982, Yearwood 1981, also Storch, this volume). Of particular interest to this paper is the contact between the Goemai and the Jukun, i.e., between speakers of two non-related languages. The Goemai were integrated politically, culturally and economically within the Jukun Empire of Kororofa (Agi 1982, Unomah 1982). It is very likely that speakers of Jukun languages have shifted towards the ancestral language of the Goemai, and, in fact, speakers of some Goemai dialects today still trace their origins back to the Jukun. This period of intensive contact has left its traces in the present-day political and religious system, where Goemai and Jukun share numerous similarities. It has also influenced the linguistic system – most obviously in the lexicon, but, as argued in this paper, also in some grammatical structures (see Hellwig, forthcoming-a, for details on Goemai grammar).

This section presents a case study of copy pronouns in Goemai. Given that Goemai is a West Chadic language, we would expect to find at least some traces of ICPs. This is not the case, and section 2.1 discusses their conspicuous absence. Goemai nevertheless has two sets of copy pronouns: the concordant-marking of certain types of subjects in certain types of tense / aspect / modality constructions (section 2.2), and the use of possessive pronouns to mark unexpected states-of-affairs, termed “mirativity” (section 2.3). That is, copy pronouns in Goemai serve two distinct functions and receive two distinct formal expressions. The Goemai data thus suggest that the heading of “copy pronouns” subsumes at least three distinct phenomena: ICPs, concord-marking and mirativity.

2.1 Intransitive Copy Pronouns (ICPs)

An intransitive copy pronoun is attested – at least in remnants – in a number of Chadic languages, including in particular West Chadic A languages (Hausa, Bole-Tangale, Ron), but also West Chadic B and Biu-Mandara languages. Goemai and its closest relatives of the Angas-Goemai group seem to be the only West Chadic A languages that do not show any evidence for the existence of such pronouns.

Goemai has intransitive verbs, but none of them triggers the use of an ICP (see e.g. the intransitive verb *swò* ‘run’ in 1a). Furthermore, Goemai regularly omits inanimate direct objects of transitive verbs, provided that they are recoverable from the linguistic context. For example, the direct object *là=ńdòe=shàt* ‘a bit of porridge’ is expressed in the first clause of (1b), but does not receive any pronominal expression in subsequent clauses. As a result, a large proportion of transitive verbs occur without any overt direct object in discourse. Notice that only recoverable objects can be omitted. Indefinite or generic reference, by contrast, triggers the use of semantically general nouns such as *bì* ‘thing (= something)’, *gùrùm* ‘person (= someone)’ or *pè* ‘place (= somewhere)’ in object function.

(1a) *muèp swó*
3PL.S run(PL)
‘they ran’¹

(1b) *là=ńdòe=gùrùm b’às là=ńdòe=shàt gðe-kyòklók /*
DIM(SG)=SPEC=person cut.off DIM(SG)=SPEC=porridge NOMZ(SG)-small
póe yì ñ-ńt’í. ñt’í láp yì s’óe.
give CONS BEN-son.of.rabbit son.of.rabbit receive CONS eat
‘Some poor person cut off a little bit of **porridge**, so that (he) gave (**it**) to the son of the rabbit. So the son of the rabbit took (**it**) (and) ate (**it**).’

In addition, Goemai has cognate objects that occur with a subset of verbs. These verbs can be either lexically intransitive (as *muààn* ‘go’ in 2a) or transitive (as *múúr* ‘steal’ in 2b). In all cases, the cognate object occurs in the syntactic function of direct object, i.e., cognate objects allow for exactly the same syntactic operations as other direct objects. However, they differ in that they are always non-referential, and hence cannot be modified by nominal modifiers such as (in)definite expressions, quantifying expressions or modifying expressions. A closer semantic analysis of this construction reveals that its primary function is not to create a

¹ I use an adapted version of the practical orthography developed by Sirlinger (1937). The following symbols may not be self-explanatory: *p’*, *t’*, *k’*, *f’*, *s’*, *sh’* = non-aspirated obstruents; *b’*, *d’* = implosives; *oe* = [ə]; *u* = [u], *o* = [ɔ]. The symbol “/” marks the end of an intonation unit.

transitive expression from an intransitive one, but rather to create an activity expression from a telic one. For example, the verb *mùààn* ‘go’ is telic (and focuses on reaching the goal or endpoint of the motion event). But when it occurs with a cognate object (as in 2a), it focuses on the activity of traveling, which does not entail an endpoint. Speakers implicitly capture this activity reading by translating cognate object constructions into English as ‘be fond of doing’ or ‘always do’.

(2a) [gwá]_S t'óng mùààn [mùààn]_O yì=à?
 SGM.LOG.AD.S:CONS IRR go(SG) going(SG). CONS=INTERR
 ‘(he₁ said to him₂) so he₂ will be traveling?’

(2b) wái [ú]_S múúr [múúr]_O
 SAY goat steal stealing
 ‘(he said) that the goat is fond of stealing’

All available data thus suggest that Goemai does not disprefer intransitive expressions. In this respect, it differs not only from other West Chadic languages, but also from the neighboring Jukun languages: West Chadic languages tend to use ICP constructions (thereby avoiding intransitive expressions), and Jukun languages tend to use cognate object constructions for the same purpose. And although Goemai makes extensive use of cognate objects, this construction has a lexical aspect function – not a transitivizing function.

The absence of an ICP in Goemai is unexpected from a West Chadic perspective. It is possible that this absence is linked to an interesting proposal made by Zygmunt Frajzngier (1977, 1984 & this volume). He shows that some present-day Chadic languages use the ICP to create inchoative or non-stative expressions. If his proposal holds true, there is a good reason for Goemai not to have any ICPs: Goemai predominantly lexicalizes verbal concepts as state changes, including inchoative state changes from the semantic fields of position (such as *shùùr* ‘get into a squatting posture’), property (such as *f'yér* ‘become big’), motion (such as *sù* ‘start to run’) and experience (such as *rèng* ‘become astonished’). Since these verbs are inherently inchoative, they do not need to be overtly marked for the inchoative function. By contrast, Goemai has only very few inherently stative verbs (my database of 570 verbs contains only 17 stative verbs). Example (3a) illustrates such a stative verb, the verb *t'ó* ‘lie’, with progressive aspect marking: in this aspectual construction, such stative verbs obligatorily receive a non-progressive habitual interpretation. Goemai has only one limited inchoative derivation: five locative verbs (including *t'ó* ‘lie’) occur in a formally and semantically defined type of serial verb construction that creates inchoative expressions (illustrated in 3b) (Hellwig 2006). Notice that this construction does not make use of ICPs or copy pronouns.

- (3a) à bì gòe-sá tóe músú d'è ñ-t'ó yì
 FOC thing NOMZ-make EMPH cat exist PROGR-lie(SG) PROGR
 ñ-s'étbá
 LOC-bush NEG
 '(this) is the reason why the cat never lies in the bush'

- (3b) yit-sáám máng k'úr mú? K'úr [t'á t'ó]_{SVC}
 eye/face-sleep take(SG) tortoise INTERR tortoise fall(SG) lie(SG)
 'The tortoise became sleepy, right? The tortoise lay down.'

The preference for state-change verbs over stative verbs may well be a contact phenomenon that spread from Benue-Congo languages such as Jukun into Goemai and possibly other Chadic languages (Hellwig, forthcoming-a: chapter 4; Hellwig, forthcoming-b). It is tempting to speculate that the absence or scarcity of the prototypical ICP in the southern part of the *sprachbund* could be linked to this widespread lexicalization pattern. However, further semantic case studies (both on the lexical aspect of verbs and on the semantics of copy pronoun systems) would be needed to verify or falsify this speculation.

2.2 Concordant marking of subject pronouns

Goemai has a number of constructions that require certain subject pronouns to be marked more than once. This phenomenon is analyzed as a form of concordant marking, which is illustrated in more detail in this section.

The most common verb form in Goemai is the verb unmarked for tense, aspect or modality. All subject pronouns in this construction occur only once, and they precede the verb. They can be realized in either free or dependent forms: the free form is an independent phonological word (as in 4a), while the dependent form is a proclitic that attaches to the initial boundary of the verb phrase (as in 4b). For reasons of emphasis, free and dependent forms can co-occur. In this case, the free form usually occurs in its own intonation unit, and as head of a noun phrase. Notice that this is the only case where a pronoun can be modified by a nominal modifier (e.g., by the modifying construction in 4c).

- (4a) hèn màn Jôs tún nineteen-fifty-one
 1SG.S know <PLACE.NAME> since 1951
 'I have known Jos since 1951'

- (4b) **mòe=màn bá**
 1PL.S=know NEG
 'we don't know (it)'
- (4c) [**mén mòe-mòek'wò**]_{NP} / **mòe=zèm bí ñdòe=kùt bá (...)**
 1PL.I NOMZ(PL)-<PLACE.NAME> 1PL.S=like thing SPEC=talking NEG
 'we who are of Kwande, we don't like any problems (...)'

The subject pronouns fall into two sets (as summarized in table 1) that differ with respect to their realization possibilities: pronouns of set 1 are obligatorily realized as free forms (as *hěn* '1SG' in 4a), and pronouns of set 2 are obligatorily realized as dependent forms (as *mõe* '1PL' in 4b). For both sets, the respective other form occurs only in emphatic contexts (as in 4c). It is very likely that the two sets differ in age. Set 1 pronouns probably originated fairly recently in nouns: Frajzyngier (1993: 118) shows for Mupun that its cognate LOG.AD pronouns were grammaticalized from human nouns; and Burquest (1973) explicitly comments on the nominal behavior of the cognate 3SG and 3PL forms in Angas. The set 2 pronouns, by contrast, do not have any obvious nominal origin: 2SG, 1PL and 2PL all have Chadic pronominal cognates; and the LOG.SP pronouns may go back to inherited demonstrative pronouns (Frajzyngier 1993: 118).

Table 1: *Two sets of subject pronouns*

	Category	Free Form	Dependent Form
Set 1	1SG	<i>hěn</i>	<i>ń=</i>
	3SG	<i>ní</i>	<i>ní ~ Ø=</i>
	3PL	<i>muěp</i>	<i>muěp ~ uěp=</i>
	SGM.LOG.AD	<i>gwă</i>	—
	SGF.LOG.AD	<i>pă</i>	—
	PL.LOG.AD	<i>nwă</i>	—
Set 2	2SGM	<i>gõe</i>	<i>gõe=</i>
	2SGF	<i>yõe ~ yĩ</i>	<i>yĩ=</i>
	1PL	<i>měn</i>	<i>mõe=</i>
	2PL	<i>gwěn</i>	<i>gũ=</i>
	SGM.LOG.SP	<i>jĩ</i>	<i>jĩ=</i>
	SGF.LOG.SP	<i>dõe</i>	<i>dõe=</i>
	PL.LOG.SP	<i>dwěn</i>	<i>dũ=</i>

Pronouns from the two sets differ syntactically in a number of multiverb constructions, e.g., in some types of serial verb constructions (but not in the inchoative serial verb construction illustrated in example 3b in section 2.1 above). In such constructions, set 1 pronouns behave like lexical nouns and precede the

first verb only (as in 5a). Given their presumed origin in nominal expressions, such a syntactic behavior is not surprising. Set 2 pronouns, by contrast, optionally precede the first verb, and obligatorily precede each following verb (as in 5b).

(5a) **muèp** búk kàt sóól (...)
 3PL.S return(PL) find metal/money
 'they return (and) find money (...)'

(5b) (**mòe**)=bùk **mòe**=kát t'éng (...).
 (1PL.S)=return(PL) 1PL.S=find tree
 'we return (and) find a tree (...)'

Multiverb constructions have given rise to different tense / aspect / modality (TAM) and modal constructions. In these constructions, the two pronominal sets retain their respective syntactic positions – thus resulting in single marking for set 1 pronouns, but concordant marking for set 2 pronouns. For example, the modal verb *b'óót* 'gain expertise in, become able to do' adds an obligatory second verb phrase by means of the sequential particle *gòe*. This sequential verb phrase always has the same subject specification as the modal verb. In the case of set 1 pronouns, this pronoun occurs only once (as in 6a). But in the case of set 2 pronouns, this pronoun is repeated (as in 6b). The same pattern is attested for other modal and phasal verbs: *mén* 'forget', *màn* 'know', *tàngòedé* 'begin', *s'óe ñkyèm* 'continue'.

(6a) **pà** t'óng b'óót gòe shìn sh'it ñndè
 SGF.LOG.AD.S IRR gain.expertise(SG) SEQ do work LOC.ANAPH
 à?
 INTERR
 '(he₁ asked her₂) would she₂ be able to do this work?'

(6b) gùrùm=hòk yì / t'òng **jì**=b'óót
 person=DEF SAY IRR SGM.LOG.SP.S=gain.expertise(SG)
jì=gòe shìn.
 SGM.LOG.SP.S=SEQ do
 'the person₁ said, he₁ would be able to do (it)'

A comparable pattern is attested for different TAM constructions, e.g., in the resultative construction: set 1 pronouns occur once (in 7a), while set 2 pronouns are repeated (in 7b).

(7a) ní wá kàm
 3SG.S return.home(SG) RESULT
 'he has returned home'

(7b) ðù=yòk ðù=kám
 PL.LOG.SP.S=return.home(PL) PL.LOG.SP.S=RESULT
 '(he₁ said) they₁ have returned home'

Table (2) summarizes all grammaticalized constructions that require concordant marking of set 2 pronouns.

Table 2: *Grammatical constructions that trigger concordant marking*

Category	Form	Presumed Origin
Absolute tenses	<i>dők</i> 'PAST.REM', <i>dyén</i> 'PAST.YEST', <i>d'ín</i> 'PAST.CL', <i>d'á</i> 'FUT.CL'	V ₁ ('??') in SVC
Irrealis	<i>t'óng</i>	V ₁ ('sit') in SVC
Conditional	<i>d'á ~ lá</i>	V ₁ ('??') in SVC
Habitual	<i>d'á ~ lá ... t'óng</i>	Conditional clause + Irrealis
Progressive	locative verb + <i>t'óng ... yì</i>	Main locative clause + irrealis-marked consequence clause
Anterior	<i>lát</i>	V ₂ ('finish') in SVC
Resultative	<i>kàm</i>	V ₂ ('stay') in SVC
Modal / Phrasal categories	modal / phasal verb + <i>gòe</i>	Sequential clause

Notice that Goemai has constructions that did not grammaticalize from multiverb constructions, e.g., the obligative construction. Interestingly, these constructions do not allow for concordant marking (as illustrated by means of the set 2 pronoun *mõe* '1PL' in 8).

(8) mõe=gòe sàm kúút ñ-yíl
 1PL.S=OBLIG descend just LOC-ground
 'we should just descend to the ground'

Concordant marking is a grammatical phenomenon, i.e., it is not driven by discourse-pragmatic factors. There are similarities with ICPs in cases like (7b) where the subject of an intransitive verb seems to be marked twice, or possibly even in the case of modal verbs as in (6b). A closer analysis, however, reveals that these similarities are only superficial. The following properties make the phenomenon of concordant marking very different from the phenomenon of ICP:

(i) Concordant marking is independent of either the transitivity or the lexical aspect of the participating verbs. For example, (9a) shows concordant marking in the environment of the transitive verb *póe* 'give away', which retains its direct object *k'áràm* 'mat'.

(ii) The repeated pronoun occurs in its subject form, not in its object form. Segmentally, the two forms are often identical, but different suprasegmental constraints allow us to distinguish them. Example (9b) features two juxtaposed clauses that allow the object pronoun of the first clause to be followed directly by the subject pronoun of the following clause, illustrating one type of suprasegmental differences.

(iii) Although the repeated pronoun follows the first element, it forms not only a grammatical word but also a phonological word with the second element: it is a proclitic that attaches to the second element (either to a verb in a multiverb construction or to a grammaticalized TAM particle).

(9a) d'à gú=póe k'áràm gù=lát (...)
COND 2PL.S=give mat 2PL.S=ANT
'when you have finished giving away the mat (...)'

(9b) pòe jí jì=muààn.
give SGM.LOG.SP.O SGM.LOG.SP.S=go(SG)
'(he₁ said) let him₁ go (lit. give him, he goes)'

It is possible that a similar type of concordant marking is responsible for the origins of some of the copy pronouns attested in the Jukun languages, notably the ones that occur in modal and completive constructions (see Koops, this volume; Storch, this volume). For Goemai, we are in the fortunate position to link the presence of copy pronouns to their wordhood (as highlighted by the language-internal division into set 1 and set 2 pronouns) and their source constructions (notably to serial verb constructions that are still productive in the present-day language). For Jukun, there is no comparable language-internal evidence. But both Storch and Koops suggest that these constructions involve – synchronically or diachronically – more than one verb, thus resembling the Goemai source constructions to some extent. Notice, however, that there are formal and semantic differences across the two language

families. In Goemai, the copy pronouns always take the form of subject pronouns, one of them preceding the verb, and the other the grammaticalized TAM morpheme. Some Jukun languages, by contrast, make use of other pronominal forms and other syntactic positions. In Kuteb, for example, the copy pronoun is identical to the possessive pronoun, and it follows the TAM morpheme (the perfective marker in this case). In terms of their semantic categories, there is overlap in that both Goemai and Jukun use copy pronouns in completive-type constructions. In addition, Goemai – but not Jukun – uses them for encoding other aspectual categories, irrealis modality, and tense: the reason for these semantic differences is presumably that these TAM categories can be traced back to multiverb constructions in Goemai, but not in Jukun. That is, even if we assume the existence of comparable source constructions, the development in the different language families (and within the different Jukun languages) must have occurred independently, involving the development of copy pronouns in the environment of different source verbs. If we accept this scenario, there is a possibility for language contact only in the sense that similar templates triggered similar (independent) grammatical developments across the two families.

2.3 Possessive pronouns: expressing an unexpected state-of-affairs

Goemai has a second copy pronoun construction that makes use of possessive pronouns. Different from the phenomenon of concordant marking discussed in section 2.2, this construction is not obligatory: it is used to convey an unexpected state-of-affairs, very similar to the function discussed by Storch (this volume) and Koops (this volume) for Jukun. Goemai has a number of different possessive constructions, and the two constructions relevant to the discussion are summarized in table (3). The first set probably constitutes the older set: it is very likely that it contains old Chadic pronominal suffixes, which have become fused in present-day Goemai with a non-reconstructable root. The second set, by contrast, is transparently derived from the present-day possessive pronouns, which cliticize to the noun *bì* 'thing'.²

² This second set is formally similar to the mirative pronouns in Jukun (Storch, this volume). Given the extensive contact between the two languages, this similarity is very intriguing.

Table 3: Possessive pronouns

Category	Free Possessive Pronouns	Possessive Noun Phrases
1SG	m̀m̀à̀n	b̀ì=nóe
2SGM	m̀m̀à̀k	b̀ì=góe
2SGF	m̀m̀ìk ~ m̀m̀ìt	b̀ì=yóe
3SG	m̀m̀ùk	b̀ì=múk
1PL	m̀m̀è̀n	b̀ì=mén
2PL	m̀m̀ùk	b̀ì=gwén
3PL	m̀m̀uè̀p	b̀ì=muép
SGM.LOG.SP	m̀m̀ù̀n	b̀ì=jí
SGF.LOG.SP	m̀m̀à̀t	b̀ì=dóe
PL.LOG.SP	m̀m̀ù̀t	b̀ì=dwén
SGM.LOG.AD	–	b̀ì=gwá
SGF.LOG.AD	–	b̀ì=pá
PL.LOG.AD	–	b̀ì=nwá

The free possessive pronouns are a subtype of nominals, and occur in all syntactic functions and with all nominal modifiers available to nouns. For example, the possessive pronoun in (10) occurs as the direct object of a transitive verb, and it is modified by the definite article. Similarly, the second set is a possessed noun phrase that can occur in all syntactic positions and with additional nominal modifiers.

- (10) hèn m̀n m̀m̀ùk=hòk âi
 1SG.S know NOMZ.3SG.POSS=DEF INTERJ
 'I know his own, hey'

In addition, both sets of pronouns are used to describe an unexpected or surprising state-of-affairs.³ Examples (11a) and (11b) illustrate this use with intransitive verbs. In both cases, the speaker uses the possessive forms to present a fact as surprising. In (11a), it is the discovery that a character from a story has become fat while the rest of his community is starving. And in (11b), it is the fact that the

³ So far, it has not been possible to determine a semantic difference between the two sets.

speaker managed to stay alive despite all the hardships he faced. Storch (this volume) uses the label “mirativity” to describe a comparable function in Jukun.

- (11a) à nd'àng mòe=nd'è t'òng móe=rás yì /
 FOC how 1PL.S=exist PROGR 1PL.S=become.thin(PL) PROGR
 gòe=làng nímàk t'òng
 2SGM.S=hang/move(SG) NOMZ.2SGM.POSS PROGR
 góe=dóól yì?
 2SGM.S=become.fat PROGR
 'how (come) we are getting lean, (while) you keep on getting fat in your own way?'
- (11b) hén=láng bì=nóe muáán yì /
 1SG.S:CONS=hang/move(SG) thing=1SG.POSS go(SG):CONS CONS
 hén gòemé
 1SG.I one
 'and so I am alive (lit. move) in my own way and walk around, I alone'

In their mirative use, the possessive forms occur in adverbial function⁴ – not in object function. As such, they can, for example, follow the object of a transitive verb (as in 12a and 12b). Notice that Goemai has a number of particles that indicate the final boundary of a verb phrase, i.e., particles that immediately follow an intransitive verb or a (di)transitive verb plus its direct object(s), but precede an adverbial. If such a particle is present, the possessive form occurs following it (e.g., following the consequence clause particle *yì* in 12a).

- (12a) jí=dóe kàt [ní]_O yì [m̀m̀ù̀n]_{ADV}
 SGM.LOG.SP.S:CONS=come find 3SG.O CONS NOMZ.SGM.LOG.SP.POSS
 à shíní
 FOC today
 '(he₁ said) so he₁ unexpectedly encountered her here today (lit. he₁ came (and) found her in his₁ own way)'

⁴ Goemai tends to keep its word classes syntactically distinct, but there are a few documented cases where an erstwhile noun now occurs in adverbial function, too. One case in particular is similar to the possessive forms discussed in this section: the noun *lú* 'settlement' has given rise to the adverb *lú ~ lóe* 'home', which obligatorily occurs in a possessed form, e.g., *lú=nóe ~ lóe=nóe* 'my home'.

(12b) t'át ñdè / là góe=dóe gòe=ná [sh'ím]_o
 day/time one/other COND 2SGM.S=come 2SGM.S=see lizard

[bì=góe]_{ADV}

thing=2SGM.POSS

'another day, when you unexpectedly come across a lizard (...) (lit. when you come (and) see a lizard in your own way)'

The mirative function illustrated in this section is similar to the use of copy pronouns in Jukun. The structures, however, differ: Goemai uses possessive forms, while some Jukun languages use subject pronouns, and others complex forms consisting of the conjunction 'with' plus a pronoun.

3 Conclusion

This chapter has presented a case study of copy pronouns in Goemai. Goemai is a rather unusual Chadic language in that it does not have the expected "intransitive copy pronoun" (ICP) (with its prototypical function of creating intransitive or inchoative expressions). Instead, it has two distinct types of copy pronouns: obligatory concordant-marking of some subjects in some TAM constructions, and optional marking of unexpected states-of-affairs through possessive forms. That is, it uses copy pronouns in contexts that are similar to those attested in the non-related Jukun languages. This situation makes Goemai of particular interest to any areal discussion on copy pronouns, as it suggests that there are at least two distinct areal patterns. The distribution of the prototypical ICP seems to be restricted to more northern languages, both from within Chadic and Plateau, while copy pronouns used for concordant-marking in specific TAM constructions and for expressing unexpected states-of-affairs or mirativity surface in the southern part of this region – and are attested in both Chadic and Jukun.

Abbreviations

ANAPH	anaphora	M	masculine
ANT	anterior	NEG	negative
BEN	benefactive	NOMZ	nominalizer
COND	conditional	O	object (pronoun)
CONS	consequence	OBLIG	obligative
DEF	definite	PAST.CL	close past
DIM	diminutive	PAST.REM	remote past
EMPH	emphasis	PAST.YEST	yesterday past
F	feminine	PL	plural

FOC	focus	POSS	possessive
FUT.CL	close future	PROGR	progressive
INTERR	interrogative	S	subject (pronoun)
I	independent pronoun	SEQ	sequential
INTERJ	interjection	SG	singular
IRR	irrealis	SPEC	specific-indefinite
LOC	locative	SVC	serial verb construction
LOG.AD	addressee logophoric	V ₁	first verb
LOG.SP	speaker logophoric	V ₂	second verb

References

- Agi, J.O. 1982. The Goemai and their neighbours: An historical analysis. In E. Isichei (ed.), *Studies in the History of Plateau State, Nigeria*, pp. 98-107. London – Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Burquest, D.A. 1973. *A Grammar of Angas*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Frajzyngier, Z. 1977. On the intransitive copy pronouns in Chadic. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 7: 73-84.
- Frajzyngier, Z. 1984. On the Proto-Chadic syntactic pattern. In J. Bynon (ed.), *Current Progress in Afro-Asiatic Linguistics*, pp. 139-159. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Frajzyngier, Z. 1993. *A grammar of Mupun*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Hellwig, B. 2006. Serial verb constructions in Goemai. In A.Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, pp. 88-107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hellwig, B. Forthcoming-a. *A Grammar of Goemai (a West Chadic language of Nigeria)*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hellwig, B. Forthcoming-b. Lexical aspect and verb serialization. In T. Schumann et al. (eds.), *Endangered Languages in Contact: Nigeria's Plateau Languages. In Honour of Ludwig Gerhardt*.
- Isichei, E. (ed.) 1982. *Studies in the History of Plateau State, Nigeria*. London – Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Newman, P. 1971. Transitive and intransitive in Chadic languages. In V. Six, N. Cyffer, E. Wolff, L. Gerhardt & H. Meyer-Bahlburg (eds.), *Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen: Ein Querschnitt*, pp. 188-200. Hamburg: Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung.

- Newman, P. 1974. *The Kanakuru language*. Leeds: Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds.
- Sirlinger, E. 1937. Dictionary of the Goemai language. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tuller, L.A. 1997. Les ICP en Tchadique. In A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.), *Les pronoms: morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, pp. 213-229. Vincennes: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Unomah, A.C. 1982. The lowlands salt industry. In E. Isichei (ed.), *Studies in the History of Plateau State, Nigeria*, pp. 151-178. London – Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Wolff, E. & L. Gerhardt. 1977. Interferenzen zwischen Benue-Kongo- und Tschad-Sprachen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement 3: 1518-1543.
- Yearwood, P.J. (ed.). 1981. *Jos Oral History and Literature Texts*. Vol. 1: Mwahavul, Ngas, Mupun, Njak. Jos: Department of History, University of Jos.