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Abstract
This work on aspects of simple connectives in Ikwere, an Igboid language spoken in Rivers State was undertaken because the subject matter of connectives in Ikwere has received very little attention. This study was thus carried out to investigate the structure of simple connectives in Ikwere, ascertain the syntactic relevance of connectives in Ikwere and determine the semantic import of these connectives. The work is based on the Òmuanwa dialect of Ikwere Data for the work were obtained through unstructured elicitation interviews with competent language consultants of Ikwere and through participant observation. Data gathered were analyzed using the descriptive method of interlinear morpheme-to-morpheme glossing. Simple connectives in Ikwere were divided into Simple coordinators and Simple Subordinators. Simple coordinators in Ikwere were semantically split into additive, adversative and alternative while simple subordinators were functionally divided into subordinators in noun, relative and adverbial clauses. Our findings revealed that some simple connectives (simple adversatives) in Ikwere are optional as contrastive clauses are better linked without such connectives while some others are homophonous.
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Introduction
The Ikwere language is spoken in four of the twenty-three Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Rivers State of Nigeria. The four LGAs are Òmohua, Ikwere, Obio/Akpor and part of Port Harcourt Local Government Area. Linguistically, Ikwere is classified as an Igboid language of the West Benue-Congo
family of the Niger-Congo Phylum of languages (Williamson 1988, Williamson & Blench 2000). It is related to Echie, Êkpeye, Igbo, Ògba, among others. The language comprises 24 divergent dialects, which are mutually intelligible. However, this paper identifies and analyzes some aspects of simple connectives based on the Òmuanwa variety of Ikwere.

The study of connectives offers little evidence in favour of structural parallelism between hierarchical and non-hierarchical connections in syntax and discourse. Rather, it should be assumed that hierarchical as well as non-hierarchical discourse relations may in principle, be encoded by both coordination and subordination in syntax.

In syntax, hierarchical connection of clauses is traditionally called subordination and the non-hierarchical connection of clauses is called coordination. In line with this tradition, the terms coordination and subordination will be used in this paper as the two main types of connection (conjunction) in syntax. The distinction between linguistic coordination and subordination in languages has been investigated during the last decade by many authors within various research paradigms. A lot of works has been done in the area of coordination and subordination in several languages, however, there is no detailed or particular work on connectives in Ikwere. This work examines simple coordinators and subordinators in Ikwere to bridge the gap in knowledge.

**Aim & Objectives of the Study**

The aim of this study is to investigate simple coordinators and subordinators in Ikwere. Specifically, the work seeks to investigate:

i. The structure of simple connectives in Ikwere

ii. The syntactic relevance of connectives in Ikwere

iii. The semantic import of coordinators and subordinators in Ikwere.

**Methodology**

Data for this work was obtained through unstructured elicitation interviews with six (two males and four females within the age range of 35 to 80) competent language consultants (native speakers). Sentences containing connectives were formulated in English and read to some of the lettered language consultants who in turn provided the Ikwere equivalent of those sentences. In addition to this process, the researchers also used the participant observation method to obtain some aspects of the data. The data were analyzed using the descriptive method of interlinear morpheme-to-morpheme glossing. The descriptive method of data analysis is based on the native speakers’ intuition of their language and does not subscribe to any form of subjective conjecture. The data is represented orthographically and vowel nasalization is signaled by inserting ‘n’ between the consonant and vowel of the affected syllable.

**Literature Review**

1. **Connectives**

A connective is an uninflected function word that serves to join words, phrases or clauses or even sentences. In the same light, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) conceived connectives as the most important means used to establish subordinative and coordinative relations in syntax. For Crystal (1997), connectives refer to a term in grammatical classification of words to characterize words or morpheme whose function is that of linking linguistic units at any level (words, phrases, clauses, sentences). The most obvious types of connectives are conjunctions. Conjunction has been observed as traditionally having the function of joining grammatical structures. In the same vein, Ndimele (1999) described conjunction as a word whose primary function is to connect words, phrases, clauses or sentences. Examples of conjunctions are coordinators and subordinators.
Coordinators and Subordinators

Coordination and subordination involve the connecting of units; but in coordination, the units are on the same syntactic level while in subordination, one of the units is a constituent of a superordinate unit (Greenbaum & Quirk 2005). Coordination can be syndetic, asyndetic and polysynedic. In this paper, we are more concerned with syndetic coordination because it is the more usual and simple form and involves linking or connecting of unit by a coordinating connective such as and, but, or.

Subordination is a non-symmetrical relation holding between two clauses in such a way that one is a constituent or party the order (Quirk & Greenbaum 1973). This is true because a subordinate clause cannot stand alone as a sentence. It begins with a word (subordinator) that makes it dependent upon some other clauses. The main clauses of the sentence, which the subordinate clause is parasitic can stand alone and still be meaningful. For example:

- a. Chika sang country side classics while she prepared dinner.
  - i. Chika sang country-side classics (Main Clause)
  - ii. While she prepared dinner (Subordinate Clause)

Syntactic Features of Coordinators and Subordinators

Quirk & Greenbaum (1973) and Greenbaum & Quirk (2005) discuss the syntactic properties of coordinators. They also showed how each feature applies to subordinators such as subject ellipsis, sequentially fixed clauses, linking of more than two clauses etc.

(I) Subject Ellipsis

When the subject of a preceding clause refers to the same entity with the clause introduced by a coordinator, the latter can be omitted. This contrasts with the subject of the clause introduced by subordinators. See examples (b) and (c):

- b. He shot the thief and (he) caught him
- c. (i) They call because they need your service
  *(ii) They call because need your services

(II) Sequentially Fixed Clauses

Clauses that begin with coordinators are sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause as illustrated in (d). This is in contrast to clauses that begin with some subordinators because they are not sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause as shown in (e).

- d. (i) Eze is crying or he is laughing. OR
  *(ii) Eze is crying, he is laughing
- e. (i) She opted to leave because she was not invited
  (ii) Because she was not invited, she opted to leave.

(III) Linking of More Than Two Clauses

Quirk & Greenbaum (1973) said that and and or can link more than two clauses, and when this is done, all the final instances of these two conjunctions can be omitted, as shown in (f). On the other hand, subordinators and even the coordinator but cannot link more than two clauses.

- f. (i) She came to my house, deceived me and stole my watch.

This is interpreted as:
(ii) She came to my house and deceived me and stole my watch.

**Review of Related Works**

Though the coordinator *nj* was treated in Alerechi & Weje (2013), their work was on numerals and not connectives. There is no work on connectives in Ikwere that we are aware of. We would however, review the work of Joshua (2015). In his work entitled *the syntax of connectives in Gokana and Kana*, Joshua identified two broad categories of connectives in Gokana and Kana. They are simple and derived connectives. The former are primarily connectives while the latter are derived through the process of grammaticalization. He identified three categories of simple connectives which are simple coordinators, simple subordinators and simple conjuncts. Joshua (2015) identified, for example, the connectives *nè* and *vaa* ‘and’ as additive coordinators in Gokana and stated that *nè* ‘and’ is used to link two or more noun phrases (NPs) in a construction and also used in the counting system of the language. Consider examples (g) – (h):

(g)        nèn   mènèn   nè   nèn   tãã
human rich    CONJ    human   poor
‘A rich man and a poor man’.

(h)      òb   nè   enè
ten    conj.    one
‘Eleven’

He opined that *vaa* ‘and’ the other additive coordinator in Gokana is used to link two clauses of equal status into one compound sentence as shown in example (i):

i.  Dumadi      gé    dé   nu    váa    Bura      gé    bé-bé
PN   be-PROG   eat thing   CONJ   PN   be-PROG   fight-fight
‘Dumadi is eating and (at the same time) Bura is fighting’

In all, Joshua (2015) identified five (5) simple coordinators, nine (9) simple subordinators and four (4) simple conjuncts in Gokana and they were described and analyzed functionally and semantically.

**SIMPLE CONNECTIVES IN IKWERE**

Simple connectives are those connectives that underived in nature. They are purely connectives and not derived from some other grammatical category. In Ikwere, simple connectives are divided into simple coordinators and subordinators.

(I) **SIMPLE COORDINATORS**

Simple coordinators are used to express a variety of semantic notions in Ikwere and are thus subdivided according to their semantic implications. These are:

(a) Additive
(b) Adversative
(c) Alternative

A. **Additive Coordinators**

Additive coordinators add something to what has been already stated. In Ikwere, the additive coordinator is represented by *nj* ‘and’, it is used for the addition of units or numbers. Specifically, *nj* links objects and persons. See examples (1) – (4):
1. mè nị ịghé
   1SG CONJ 2SG
   ‘You and I’
2. jị nị ịdè → jị nê ịdè
   Yam CONJ Cocoyam Yam CONJ Cocoyam
   ‘Yam and cocoyam’
3. ę̀lú nị áli → ę̀lú nà áli
   up CONJ down up CONJ down
   ‘up and down’
4. Ngozi nị Chituru
   PN CONJ PN
   ‘Ngozi and Chituru’

Examples (1) and (4) demonstrate that the vowel of the additive coordinator -ị as in nị ‘and’ is unaffected by the vowel of the following word if it begins with a consonant. In contrast, it assimilates completely to the vowel of the following word if it begins with a vowel as shown in (2) and (3). Examples (2) and (3) further show that the vowel of the additive coordinator is subject to the expandedness or non-expandedness feature of the vowel of the following word in terms of the size of pharyngeal cavity. Notice that the additive coordinator consistently is marked with a low tone irrespective of the level of the contiguous tone or whether its vowel is modified or not.

The additive coordinator nị ‘and’ also is used in the numeral system of Ikwere to count complex numerals that involves addition. See examples (5) – (9) taken from Alerechi & Weje (2013, p. 176):

5) ǹrí nị ạbọ → ǹrí nà ạbọ
   ten CONJ two ten CONJ two
   ‘twelve’
6) ọ̀gnú nị isnè
   twenty CONJ five
   ‘twenty five’
7) ọ̀gnú ạŋọ nị ǹrí
   twenty four CONJ ten
   20 × 4 + 10
   ‘ninety’
8) ọ̀gnú isnè nị ǹrí nọ ọtù
   twenty five CONJ ten CONJ one
   20 × 5 + 10 + 1
   ‘hundred and eleven’
9) ǹrí ọ̀gnú nọ ọ̀gnú isnè
ten  twenty CONJ twenty five
20 × 10      +  20   ×  5
‘three hundred’

Examples (5) – (9) show that \( \tilde{n} \) acts as a mathematical process of addition to derive a more complex numeral. This is contrary to the process of multiplication, which is not marked with any overt morpheme or word in the language as in (7) – (9).

The additive coordinator \( \tilde{n} \) also functions to link constructions larger than the word such as phrases. Consider examples (10) – (13):

10) \( \text{Nyé} \tilde{t} \text{íchà} \tilde{n} \tilde{y} \text{é} \tilde{á} \tilde{rn} \tilde{u} \tilde{b} \tilde{i} \text{b} \)
    person teacher CONJ person work farm
    ‘a teacher and a farmer’.
11) \( \tilde{o} \tilde{j} \tilde{r} \tilde{o} \tilde{u} \tilde{j} \tilde{j} \tilde{i} \tilde{n} \tilde{o} \tilde{j} \tilde{r} \tilde{o} \tilde{ú} \tilde{h} \tilde{i} \tilde{h} \tilde{e} \)
    house black CONJ house red-red
    ‘a black house and a red house’
12) \( \tilde{E} \tilde{z} \tilde{e} \tilde{gw} \tilde{e} \tilde{r} \tilde{e} \tilde{r} \tilde{ë} \tilde{m} \tilde{á} \tilde{o} \tilde{g} \tilde{b} \tilde{ë} \tilde{d} \tilde{e} \tilde{à} \tilde{t} \tilde{ó} \tilde{o} \)
    PN take-ASRT-FACT knife small CONJ broom three
    ‘Eze collected/took a small knife and three brooms’.
13) \( \tilde{U} \tilde{r} \tilde{è} \tilde{n} \tilde{à} \tilde{À} \tilde{d} \tilde{n} \tilde{à} \tilde{j} \tilde{n} \tilde{é} \tilde{á} \tilde{h} \tilde{i} \tilde{á} \)
    PN CONJ PN go market
    ‘Ure and Adna went to the market’.

Observe that the vowel of the additive morpheme is always a copy of the initial vowel of the following word but as a syllable peak, it retains its inherent low tone despite the tone of the following word. Examples (10) and (11) show \( \tilde{n} \) functioning as a link between two phrases whereas examples (12) and (13) demonstrate the use of the morpheme in linking independent clauses. While (12) demonstrates the linking of two objects, (13) shows that of two subjects.

The coordinator \( \tilde{n} \) ‘and’ also can be used to add units or objects to an existing list. This also involves connecting more than two persons as examples (14) and (15) illustrate:

14) \( \tilde{O} \tilde{n} \tilde{y} \tilde{g} \tilde{à} \tilde{r} \tilde{à} \tilde{U} \tilde{r} \tilde{è} \tilde{é} \tilde{k} \tilde{è} \tilde{t} \tilde{è} \tilde{,} \tilde{é} \tilde{h} \tilde{n} \tilde{i} \tilde{w} \tilde{è} \tilde{o} \tilde{z} \tilde{i} \tilde{à} \tilde{n} \tilde{í} \tilde{k} \tilde{w} \tilde{à} \)
    3SG give-FACT PN basket, axe, broom CONJ drum
    ‘S/He gave Ure the basket, axe, broom and drum
15) \( \tilde{M} \tilde{é} \tilde{,} \tilde{g} \tilde{è} \tilde{n} \tilde{ú} \tilde{U} \tilde{c} \tilde{h} \tilde{é} \)
    1SG 2SG CONJ PN
    ‘you, Uche and I’

Observe from the data in (14) and (15) that when the items to be linked are more than two, they are conjoined by a comma until the last item, which is then linked by the coordinator \( \tilde{n} \).
B. Adversative Coordinator

The adversative coordinator in Ikwere is expressed with mà nị ‘but that’, which is optional and can thus be ellipted in the surface structure of the sentences where it should occur. Consider examples (16) – (19).

16) Ézè bịa ọrọ (mà nọ) ọ mà à-hnụ ụm
PN come house but that 3SG AUX-NEG PT-see 1SG
‘Eze came to the house but he did not see me’.

17) Ọ jnè à-zụ ụjị (mà nọ) ọ mà à-hnụ ụá
3SG go PT-buy yam but that 3SG AUX-NEG PT-see 3SG
‘S/He went to buy yam but s/he did not see it.’

18) Ọ nyęgà-rà m įwà (mà nị) m mà m è-gwè-rè ụá
3SG give-FACT 1SG money but that 1SG AUX-NEG 1SG PT-take-ASRT 3SG
‘S/He gave me money but I didn’t collect it’.

19) M chọgà m è-zní ányàrnà (mà nị) yá (nịm) chọgà è-tnè ẹjiri
1SG want 1SG PT-sleep sleep but that 3SG(self) want PT-dance dance
‘I want to sleep but s/he wants to dance’.

Note that in anticipation of the third person singular pronoun ọ in (16) and (17), the vowel i in nị completely assimilates to the vowel of the pronoun. Thus, mà nị ọ ‘but that s/he’ can be read as mà nọ ọ in fast speech. From examples (16) – (19), it is observed that the original item for the adversative coordinator is mà ‘but’, but it cannot occur in isolation. The parentheses in the examples indicate that the adversative coordinator is optional. However, if it must be used in a construction, it must co-occur with the complementizer nị, whose English equivalent, in this context, is ‘that’. This is so because the deletion of the complementizer in a finite clause makes such a clause ungrammatical as shown in (20):

20) *Ọ jnè à-zụ ụjị (mà) ọ mà à-hnụ ụá
3SG go PT-buy yam but 3SG AUX-NEG PT-see 3SG
This obligatory presence of the complementizer is peculiar to just constructions exemplifying the use of the adversative coordinator mà nị. We therefore argue from the foregoing that the simple adversative coordinator in Ikwere is by and large not necessary in presenting contrasting statements or constructions. Thus, contrastive clauses are better linked without the adversative coordinator mà nị ‘but that’.

C. Alternative Coordinator

This kind of coordinator offers a choice between two things or a list of things from where one of the possible alternatives can be made. Ikwere records two alternative coordinators marked with the phrase mà ọ bụ ‘or it be’ and sị ọ bụ ‘or it be’, whose English equivalent is ‘or’. They are used to provide a list from which the choice for a particular command to obey and particular information required, respectively, are made. While mà ọ bụ is used when the alternative choice to be made requires carrying out a specific command, Alerechi (2009:90) observes that sị ọ bụ is used when the choice demands to provide specific information for any of the alternative items queried. In
other words, mà ɔ bu ‘or’ is used for commands, whereas si ɔ bu ‘or’ is used for alternative questions. Examples are given in (21) – (24).

21) Gwè-ré ú↓bné mà ɔ bu òyikpà!
   Take-ASRT pear but it be corn
   ‘Collect pear or corn!’

22) Zù áznù mò ɔ bu ánq!
   buy fish but it be
   ‘Buy fish or meat!’

23) Mò ɔ dà á-biá mò ɔ dì-à, kpó ɔ!
   but 3SG AUX/FUT PT-come but 3SG be-NEG call 3SG
   ‘Whether s/he will come or not, call him!’

24) Ò gbà-gà ásò si ɔ bu ɔ jìnè-gà jìnè?
   3SG run-PROG race or 3SG be 3SG go-PROG walk
   ‘Is s/he running or walking?’

25) Ò ri miñí só ɔ bu ò ri ñrì só ɔ ri áznù?
   3SG eat water or 3SG be 3SG eat food or 3SG eat fish
   ‘Did s/he drink water or did s/he eat food or did s/he eat fish?’

Examples (21) and (24) demonstrate the use of the alternative coordinator phrases mà ɔ bu ‘or’ and si ɔ bu ‘or’ in imperative and interrogative sentences, respectively and they can be modified in normal and fast speech. Thus examples (22) and (25) demonstrate that the vowels -à and -ì in mà and si, respectively, can assimilate completely to the vowel of the following third person singular pronoun ɔ ‘it’ within the phrase in normal speech. Examples (23) further show the deletion of bu ‘be’ in fast speech, while the last alternative coordinator in (25) illustrate a successive deletion of both the pronoun ɔ ‘it’ and bu ‘be’ and the leftward spread of the expanded feature of the vowel of the verb root to the vowel of the alternative coordinator si. Notice also that the alternative coordinators always are marked with a low tone.

It is observed also that apart from the first clause, the entire constituents of the subsequent clauses of an alternative question can be deleted except the alternative coordinator and the contrastive constituent. This deletion is only possible if the verbs are identical in the two clauses. Consider example (26):

26a) Ò ri miñí só ɔ bu ñrì só ɔ bu áznù?
   3SG eat water or 3SG be food or 3SG be fish
   ‘Did s/he drink water or food fish?’

Example (26a) demonstrates the deletion of the subject and verb of the subsequent clauses in (25) as they are repetitions of the subject and verb of the initial clause.

If the verbs are not identical in the two clauses then such deletion as seen in (26a) is not tenable. See example (26b):

26b) Ò ri miñí só ɔ bu ɔ gbà miñí
3SG eat water or 3SG be 3SG fetch water
‘Did s/he drink water or fetch water?’

(II) SIMPLE SUBORDINATORS

These are subordinators used to join sentence elements of unequal rank or status. They are simple because we are dealing with the underived form. Simple subordinators in Ikwere are functionally classified into subordinators in noun clauses, relative clauses and adverbial clauses.

(a) Subordinators in Noun Clauses

The subordinator which introduces noun clauses is the complementizer ụn ‘that’. ụn functions as a subordinator when it is attached to the verb ụs ‘say’ and ìká ‘tell’ in the main clause. See example (27):

(i) Ògè ụs ụn ndá à-biá ìká ọrọ műá
PN say that 3SG AUX-FUT PT-come 3SG house today
‘Oge said that he will come home today’.

The morpheme ụn is homophonous as it serves a dual function in Ikwere. It is an additive coordinator as already exemplified in 3.1 and in reported speech, it functions as a subordinator which introduces noun clauses when it is preceded by the verb ụs ‘say’.

(b) Subordinators in Relative Clause

The subordinator that introduces relative clauses in Ikwere is ìká ‘that’. This subordinator is optional in constructions where it is used. Its omission does not make the construction ungrammatical. It is also possible to find relative clauses in Ikwere with no overt subordinator introducing the relative clause. Consider the examples in (28) – (29) taken from Alerechi (2016):

(28a) Nkítá - tà Èmè āmụ bụ ìká m
Dog RC bite PN bite be PRT 1SG
‘The dog that bit Eme is my own’.

(b) Nkítá ụn ìká tà Èmè āmụ bụ ìká m
Dog that bite PN bite be PRT 1SG
‘The dog that bit Eme is my own’.

(29a) Ò mè ānhé áí ché-lë
3SG do thing 3PL think-NEG
‘s/he did a thing that we did not expect’.

(b) Ò mè ānhé áí ché-lë
3SG do thing that 3PL think-NEG

Example (29b) is grammatical but rarely used, indicating that relative clause construction is gradually losing its overt marker in the language. Thus, the parentheses in example (30) demonstrate that it is optional in the language.

30) Òkwú, kwú (kè) ọlú zù bì aṅwnà
Hen (that) PN buy lay egg
‘The hen that Ọlu bought laid the egg’. 
(c) **Subordinators in Adverbial Clauses**

Depending on their function, the subordinators introducing adverbial clauses are grouped into five in Ikwere. They introduce adverbial clauses of time, condition, cause and purpose.

(i) **Adverbial Clause of Time**

The subordinator that introduces clauses of time in Ikwere is *hnè* ‘before’. *Hnè* introduces adverbial clauses of time in the perfect verb form. The subordinator has the freedom to occur at sentence-initial or sentence-medial positions as given in (31):

\[(31a) \text{Hnè} \quad \text{mé} \quad \text{kè} \quad \text{è-jì} \quad \text{rúdû} \quad \text{ò} \quad \text{lá-lá} \quad \text{(sentence-initial)}\]

\[\text{Time-before 1SG that PT-take reach 3SG go-PERF}\]

‘Before I could get there he had gone’.

\[(b) \text{Ô lá-lá} \quad \text{hnè} \quad \text{mé} \quad \text{kè} \quad \text{è-jì} \quad \text{rúdû} \quad \text{(sentence-medial)}\]

\[3SG \text{ go-PERF time-before 1SG that PT-take reach}\]

‘He had gone before I could get there’.

Example (31a) shows the adverbial subordinator in sentence initial position, while (31b) shows it in medial position. Note that the occurrence of the adverbial either in initial or medial position, does not alter the tonal pattern of the sentence.

(ii) **Adverbial Clauses of Cause**

The subordinator that introduces adverbial clauses of cause in Ikwere comprises two lexical items *ní* ‘in’ and *i̇hní* ‘cause’ as in *ni i̇hní*, giving the meaning equivalent in English as ‘because’. See examples (32) – (33):

\[(32) \text{Ô} \quad \text{znù} \quad \text{ó} \quad \text{shní} \quad \text{ní i̇hní} \quad \text{ní} \quad \text{ôgnúgnû} \]

\[3SG \text{ steal steal in cause food hunger}\]

‘S/he stole because of hunger’.

\[33) \text{Ô} \quad \text{ghà} \quad \text{àghàlàghálá} \quad \text{ní i̇hní} \quad \text{ójó} \]

\[3SG \text{ lie lie in cause fear}\]

‘S/he lied because of fear’.

When the adverbial clause is moved to sentence-initial position, there is an introduction of the complementizer *kè* ‘that’ to the main clause as shown in (34) – (35):

\[(34) \text{Ní i̇hní} \quad \text{ní} \quad \text{ôgnúgnû} \quad \text{kè/kò} \quad \text{ó} \quad \text{znú} \quad \text{ôshní} \]

\[\text{In cause food hunger that 3SG steal}\]

‘Because of hunger s/he stole’.

\[(35) \text{Ní i̇hní} \quad \text{ójó} \quad \text{kò} \quad \text{ó} \quad \text{ghà} \quad \text{ôghà (àghàlàghálá)}\]

\[\text{In cause fear that 3SG lie lie}\]

‘Because of fear, s/he lied.’

Examples (34) and (35) demonstrate that in anticipation of the expandedness or non-expandedness feature of the vowel of the verb root, the third person singular pronoun harmonizes with either *o* or *ọ*, respectively. This assimilation further spreads leftward in such a way that the vowel of the connective *kè* copies the vowel of the pronoun to become either *kò* or *kọ* as in (34) or (35), respectively. It is
observed also that the low tone of ọ́ ‘s/he’ in (32) and (33) changes to a high when the adverbial is moved to sentence initial position as in (34) or (35), respectively.

(iii) Adverbial Clauses of Condition

The subordinator that introduces the adverbial clauses of condition in Ikwere is ọ́ bù-rú hné ‘if it be that’ meaning ‘if’ or ‘in case’. It sometimes can be reduced to hné ‘if’ or be completely omitted from the adverbial clause in the sentence and still be grammatical without any meaning change. Consider examples (34) – (35):

34a) Chị-bnàyá úwò ní ọ́ bù-rú hné élú zwè
   bring-enter cloth 1SG 3SG be-ASRT if rain fall
   ‘Bring in my cloth in case (if) it rains’.

b) ọ́ bù-rú hné élú zwè chị-bnàyάnị m úwò ní
   3SG be-ASRT if rain fall bring-enter-for 1SG cloth 1SG
   ‘In case (if) it rains, bring in my cloths.’

35a) i då à-kwná áj{kwná hné i i gné-né ntní
   2SG AUX-FUT PT-cry cry if 2SG NEG listen-NEG ear
   ‘You will cry if you don’t listen.’

b) i i gné-né ntní i då à-kwná áj{kwná
   2SG NEG listen-NEG ear 2SG AUX-FUT PT-cry cry
   ‘If you don’t listen, you will cry’.

c)* Hnè i i gné-né ntní i då à-kwná áj{kwná
   If 2SG NEG listen-NEG ear 2SG AUX-FUT PT-cry cry

Examples (34a) and (34b) demonstrate that ọ́ bù-rú hné ‘if’ or ‘in case’ can occur both in sentence-medial and initial positions, respectively. When ọ́ bù-rú hné is reduced to hné, hné is read with a low tone instead of a high and only occurs in sentence-medial position as in (35a). Contrary to the full subordinator of adverbial clause of condition, which can occur in sentence-initial position as in (34b), the presence of hné in sentence-initial position renders the construction ungrammatical as in (35c) and also can be omitted completely in the sentence and remain grammatical as in (35b).

(iv) Adverbial Clauses Of Purpose

Certain subordinator is used to express the reason certain action occurred. Thus, the connective that introduces the adverbial clauses of purpose in Ikwere is kè hné ‘so as to’ or ‘so that’.

36a) Ézè ghà ọgh hà kè hné wè dè è-nye-hnásí já jwai
   PN lie lie so that 3PL AUX-FUT PT-give-more 3SG money
   ‘Eze lied so as to be given more money’

(b) kè hné wè dè e-nye-hnasí a jwai kè Ézè ghà ọghà
   so that 3pl AUX-FUT PT-give-more 3sg money that PN lie lie
   ‘So as to be given more money, Eze lied’.
Observe the introduction of kè to the main clause when the subordinator kè hné occurs sentence-initially. This is also the case when the subordinator occurs sentence-initially in adverbial clauses of cause as shown in 3.2.3.2. As has been observed earlier, the vowel of the additive morpheme is always a copy of the initial vowel of the following word but as a syllable peak, it retains its inherent low tone despite the tone of the following word.

**Conclusion**

This paper analyzed simple connectives in Ikwere. Simple coordinators in Ikwere were semantically split into additive, adversative and alternative while simple subordinators were functionally divided into subordinators in noun, relative and adverbial clauses. Our findings reveal that the simple adversative coordinator mà nj in Ikwere is by and large not necessary in presenting contrasting statements and constructions. Thus, contrastive clauses are better linked without the adversative coordinator. This kind of optionality is also observed in the subordinator that introduces relative clauses marker kè in Ikwere. In this light, relative clause constructions are gradually losing their overt markers in the language. Our analysis also revealed that assimilation and vowel harmony are notable features that affect the form of some connectives in Ikwere. We also found out that nj is a homophonous item as it represents both an additive coordinator and also serves as a subordinator that introduces noun clauses in Ikwere. Another item hné was also treated as a homophone introducing adverbial clauses of time and condition. It becomes obvious from this study that some simple connectives in Ikwere are optional while some are homophonous in nature. The study then recommended that further investigation be carried out to examine some connectives that are not simple but could be termed as being complex or derived.
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### Abbreviations

- **ASRT** = Assertive,   
- **AUX** = Auxiliary verb,   
- **CONJ** = Conjunction,   
- **1SG** = First person singular  
- **2SG** = Second person singular  
- **3SG** = Third person singular  
- **2PL** = Second person plural  
- **3PL** = Third person plural  
- **FUT** = Future  
- **NEG** = Negation  
- **PERF** = Perfective  
- **PN** = Personal name  
- **PRT** = Particularizer  
- **PT** = Participle  
- **PREP** = Preposition  
- **PROG** = Progressive  
- **RC** = Relative Clause,  
- ↓ = down step