

## A Contra-Systemic Study of Clausal Coordination in *Daily Trust* and *Alaroye* Newspaper Columns

Adewole Alagbe PhD and Usman Muhammed Bello

[aadewolealagbe@gmail.com](mailto:aadewolealagbe@gmail.com); [udfodio4real@gmail.com](mailto:udfodio4real@gmail.com)

Nasarawa State University, Keffi

### Abstract

Linking clauses within short or long sentences can be very technical. This is because the semantic output of the linkage may not equate the meaning of the individual clauses when they are not linked. This paper, therefore, examined clausal coordination in *Daily Trust* and *Alàróyé* newspaper columns written in English and Yoruba respectively. The central coordinators, **and**, **but** and **or** in the case of *Daily Trust*, and **tabi** and **ati** in the case of *Alàróyé*, were focused upon. All the columns were written by a single individual for each of *Daily Trust* and *Alàróyé*. The data were gathered between January 2, 2015 and February 20, 2015. Instances of coordination were randomly selected across the columns. The data were analysed based on the meta-function of Systemic Functional Grammar. Findings showed that an alternative coordinator (**tàbí**) often has an additive role (**àtí**) in *Alàróyé*, and that an adversative coordinator (**but**), in the case of *Daily Trust*, could be neutral in that the meaning, ideas or proposition in the conjoins were not themselves contrastive or adversative. Coordination of full independent clauses was rare in *Alàróyé* but replete in *Daily Trust*. In the two texts, ellipsis in conjoins created cohesion of not only lexical units but also that of meaning. However, in coordination of dependent clauses, subordinators were, sometimes, not ellipsed in the two conjoins in the case of Yoruba-medium text whereas ellipsis of the subordinator in the second conjoin was often employed in the English-medium text.

**Keywords:** *Contra-Systemic, Clause, Coordination, Conjoin, Coordinators*

### Introduction

Language is one of the means through which human behaviour can manifest. That is to say, it is a behavioural act. This does not mean that it is the hallmark of behaviour. Of course, people can behave without resorting to the use of language: for example, they can play the guitar or cook the dinner. However, people frequently behave partly with the assistance of language as, for example, when one greets someone else by shaking hands with the person and at the same time saying 'Hello', or when one offers to help with the washing up of clothes by asking 'Can I give you a hand?' Whenever language is involved, we are dealing with verbal behaviour. It is an instrument through which humans express their emotions, feelings, contentment, and even their anger. No matter what behaviour is being expressed, language is systematically structured. In the words of Mark Newson, Marianna Hordos, Daniel Pap, Krisztina Szecsenyi, Gabriella Toth, Veronika Vincze (1), '... language ... is first and foremost a system that enables people who speak it to produce and understand linguistic expressions. The nature of this system is what linguistics aims to discover'. The present study is situated within a branch of linguistics known as syntax.

Syntactic examination can take various forms since syntax, as a branch of study, is a wide terrain of research. However, the focus of this present study is on the techniques and technicalities of coordination in *Daily Trust* and *Alàróyé* newspaper columns. The back page columns of *Daily Trust* and *Alàróyé* newspapers have been selected for study. Clausal and phrasal build-ups are very often considered in the study of syntax. However, tiny elements such as coordinators and subordinators are less often examined especially in a syntactic analysis of a text. It is against this background that this research has a keen interest in the contrastive examination of coordination of clausal items in the back page columns of *Daily Trust* and

*Alàróyé* newspapers. Attempts will be made to unravel the functions of conjoins and the semantic implications of coordinators. Above all, the general implication(s) of coordination within its sentential framework will also be revealed.

### **The Concept of the Clause**

Jong-Bok Kim and Peter Sells view a clause as ‘a complete sentence-like unit, but which may be part of another clause, as a subordinate or adverbial clause’ (11). Halliday and Matthessien (10) words, ‘the central possessing unit in the lexicogrammar’. Thomas Bloor and Meriel Bloor (11), the clause is the major unit of grammatical analysis. It has a special place in expressing meaning. This makes Angela Downing and Philip Locke (5) asserts that ‘The clause or simple sentence is the basic unit that embodies our construal of representational meaning and interpersonal meaning. David Morley’s definition of the clause is unambiguous. He notes that ‘a clause, in meaning terms, typically expresses a single proposition ... (but, grammatically,) consists of one or more phrases. Morley’s definition is adopted for the study because it does not only emphasise the semantic importance of the clause, it also reveals its grammatical property.

A clause in Yoruba is not essentially different from that of English. A Yoruba clause also possesses the units which may be found in an English clause. In the clause, *Ademola se ounje laaro* ‘Ademola cooked some food in the morning’, the subject, predicator, object and adverbial are present. Yoruba uses mono-clausal and multi-clausal sentences (Oluseye Adesola 11). An example of the Yoruba monoclausal (simple) sentence is the declarative sentence as in the example below.

Àdẹ rà àpó

Ade buy bag ‘Ade bought a bag’

The multi-clausal sentences could be a compound sentence conjoined with a conjunction /disjunction or a complex sentence in which one sentence is embedded under another one.

1. Àdẹ rà àpó sùgbón Olú ko mò  
Ade buy bag but Olu not know ‘Ade bought a bag bought but Olu did not know’

2. Olú sò pé Àdẹ rí bàbà oun  
Olu say that Ade see father him ‘Olu said that Ade saw his father’

Clauses are sometimes linked together. This is technically referred to as coordination or subordination. While the latter involves clauses of unequal ranks, the former is the act of connecting two ideas of equal weight and importance. Coordination refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements. The units linked in coordination are referred to as conjoins (Randolph Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum). The elements that link these units are called coordinators.

Coordinators are not merely used to link grammatical units. They also signal some meaning. Quirk and Greenbaum (257) identify possible implications or functions of central coordinators. *And* generally is additive but it may also indicate; that the event in the second clause is a consequence or result of the event in the first: that the event in the second clause is chronologically sequent to the event in the first: that the second clause may be a comment on the first; or that the first clause is a condition of the second.

As for the coordinator *or*, four semantic implications are also identified by Quirk and Greenbaum (258). The first is that it may have an exclusive implication, denoting that only one of the possibilities can be realized at a time as in *You can either eat rice or you take coffee*. The

second is that it may be inclusive such that the realisation of a combination of all the alternatives is possible as in *You can eat rice or you take coffee or you take both*. The third is that *or* may be used to restate or correct what is said in the first conjoin as in *He ruined his ambition or (rather) he ruined his career*. The last implication is that in which *or* may imply a negative condition. These four implications are also adopted for this study.

The third coordinator concerned about this study is *but*. Generally, *but* denotes contrast. This contrast may be realized in two ways. First is that the contrast may be because what is said in the second conjoin is unexpected in view of what is said in the first as in *Jane is very brilliant but she fails all her examinations*. Second is that the contrast may be a restatement in affirmative terms of what has been said or implied in the first conjoin. These implications of *but* are adopted for this study.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study draws insight from systemic functional grammar but the approach to the study is contrastive analysis. The former is the basis for our data analysis. The latter, on the other hand, makes it possible to contrast the systems, in terms of coordination, of the clauses in *Daily Trust* and *Alàróyé* newspapers.

Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) refers to an approach to the study of grammar that is radically different from the traditional view in which language is a set of rules for specifying grammatical structures. In SFG, language is a resource for making meanings and hence grammar is a resource for creating meaning by means of wording. Halliday and Matthiessen assert that:

A systemic grammar is one of the class of functional grammars, which means (among other things) that it is semantically motivated, or 'natural'. In contradistinction to formal grammars, which are autonomous, and therefore semantically arbitrary, in a systemic grammar every category ... is based on meaning: it has a semantic as well as a formal, lexico-grammatical reactance. (3)

In SFG, 'the clause' rather than 'the sentence' is the unit of analysis. In systemic theory, a clause is a unit in which meanings of three different kinds are combined. Three distinct structures, each expressing one kind of semantic organization, are mapped onto one another to produce a single wording. These semantic structures are referred to as Meta-functions:

(i) **The interpersonal meta-function** is concerned with the interaction between speaker and addressee, the grammatical resources for enacting social roles in general, and speech roles in particular, in dialogic interaction, that is, for establishing, changing, and maintaining interpersonal relations. The building blocks of this semantic function configure as Subject, Finite, Predicator, and Complement. This meta-function is not so much related to this study.

(ii) **The ideational meta-function** is concerned with 'ideation', grammatical resources for construing our experience of the world around and inside us. A clause in its ideational function is a means of representing patterns of experience. This is what people employ to make sense of their experience of what goes on around them and inside them: these goings on (processes) are sorted out in the semantic system of the language and expressed through the grammar of the clause. This aspect of the theory is adopted for our study since conjoins will exhibit some ideas.

(iii) **The textual meta-function** is concerned with the creation of text with the presentation of ideational and interpersonal meanings as information that can be shared by speaker and listener in text unfolding in context. This aspect is also adopted for the study because coordinators are items which integrate one conjoin into another.

Contrastive Analysis (CA) is the approach to this study. The primary goal of contrastive analysis is to predict linguistic difficulties experienced during the acquisition of a second

language. It suggests that difficulties in acquiring a new (second) language are derived from the differences between the new language and the native (first) language of a language learner. According to Robert Lado (1-2), the contrastive analysis hypothesis entails:

that individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture, both productively when attempting to speak the language ... and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language ... as being practiced by natives ... in the comparison between native and foreign languages lies the key to ease the difficulty in foreign language learning.

CA necessarily rests on the assumption that languages are comparable (Robert Stockwell, Donald Bowen and John Martin, 262—264, 283); in particular, that there is some common (semantic and grammatical) contents which are (differently) expressed in different languages. This assumption is *prima facie* self-evident, and vouched for by the possibility of translation. In corroborating this assertion, Margaret Berry also claims that:

The fact that meanings are the things least likely to differ while forms (grammar) are the things most likely to differ means that the concept of realization in contrastive studies provides useful link between the similar and the dissimilar. (49)

This indicates that there will always be some similarities and dissimilarities in the form and meaning of two or more different languages and it is against this background that we have decided to contrast the use of coordinators and subordinators in English-medium and Yoruba-medium newspaper columns.

Whereas CA was basically formulated in the area of foreign or second language learning, it is now applied to any form of comparison of two or more languages whether learning is involved or not. It may also be applied to the comparison of two or more texts (which have primarily been written in the same language or different languages) at whatever level. The basic practice of CA, therefore, is first to write a description of a particular subject of each language or each text to be compared (i.e. descriptions of the phonology, morphology and syntax). One can, then, compare these two or more subsets noting the differences and similarities.

### **Methodology**

The research design for this study is content and contrastive analysis. It is content analysis because coordinated constructions in Daily Trust and *Alàróyé* columns are used. It is contrastive because the coordination in the two texts is contrasted. Columns of back pages of Daily Trust and *Alàróyé* are chosen for the study. Whereas the former is an English-medium newspaper, the latter is a Yoruba-medium newspaper. The newspaper columns used fall between January 2, 2015 and February 20, 2015. There is no particular technique used in selecting the data; they are arbitrarily/randomly selected except that the interest is only on two columnists (one for each of Daily Trust and *Alàróyé*).

Instances of coordination are randomly selected across the newspapers. Three central coordinators (**and**, **but**, **or** for Daily Trust, and **tàbí** and **àtí** for *Alàróyé*) are focused upon. Where there are different types of coordinators within a sentence, only the coordinator in focus (or the one to be focused upon) is boldened. Four types coordination are examined: coordination of full independent clauses; independent clauses with ellipsis; full dependent clauses; and dependent clauses with ellipsis. Where there is mixture of full dependent clauses and dependent clauses

with ellipsis in a sentence, it is identified as full dependent clause if this type is up to fifty percent in the construction. Otherwise, it is classified as dependent clauses with ellipsis.

### **Coordination of Full Independent Clauses**

Instances of coordination of full independent clauses abound in all Daily Trust columns used for this study. Coordination of this type occurs with additive, contrastive as well as alternative coordinators. However, the individual coordinators have varying implications. This means that, for instance, an additive form of coordinator is used to denote different semantic implications with reference to the content and context of the independent being coordinated. Instance of coordination of full independent clauses in texts include:

3. On behalf of al-Qaida, Nasser al-Ansi, one of its leaders, claimed responsibility for the attack on the office of the French magazine Charlie Hebdo in Paris; and he said the attack was carried out in retaliation for the satirical magazine's publication of images depicting the prophet Mohammed [SAW]. (January 16, 2015)
4. The heroes were chose and they answered the call. (January 16, 2015)
5. It sound (sic) all too pious and appealing, **but** it will not hide the fact that the behaviour of these people do greater damage to Islam than to all colonialism has been able to achieve. (January 16, 2015)
6. The truth is that in Islam, you can never kill the innocent; **and** there is perhaps no more grievous sin than that; **and** there is not going to be any exception to this rule under any circumstance... (January 16, 2015)
7. The problem is still that of ignorant followers- untrainable and untreatable ignorance- but this time the scholars are not incapable or Islamic. (January 16, 2015)
8. About the only reason Christians support Israel, for instance, is simply because it is opposed by Muslims; **but** this is clearly an unscientific method for basing support or opposition. (January 2, 2015)
9. None of the above foreign policy goals have been enhanced, **and** all of them may have been directly or indirectly subverted.
10. He who controls the purse controls the purpose; and he who controls the purpose controls everything- and everyone. (January 9, 2015)
11. The threat they issued the nation over the election result is an eloquent commentary of their sick state of mind; and the ultimatum they issues (sic) to General T. Y. Danjuma is the confirmatory test proving why they must indeed be arrested without further delay... (February 6, 2015)
12. The authorities must stamp it out or, in the end, the people will decide that justice lies only in their taking the law into their own hands. (February 20, 2015)
13. The insurgents didn't hunt them because they offered no resistance to them and they therefore escaped unhurt. (February 20, 2015)

As can be seen in each of the above examples, coordination of full independent clauses allows for multiple ideas, propositions or messages to be linked together. This helps in a systematic organization of thoughts. The individual conjoins in each of the above examples are capable of standing apart from the other(s). However, it cannot be said that the semantic result will be immaterially different. It is this that subjects the coordinators to different semantic implications. In (iv), the propositions or ideas inherent in the two conjoins are Nasser al-Ansi's claiming of a responsibility of an attack and giving the justification for the attack. The coordinator, **and**, links these two ideas together such that it makes it known the second action is not performed in isolation of the first. That is, it is also the same time that al-Ansi 'claimed

responsibility for the attack' that the justification for the attack was given. Hence, the idea in the second conjoin is not essentially different from that in the first.

In (v), two propositions are also linked by an additive coordinator, **and**. Similarly, both propositions have the capacity stand apart, forming different sentences. However, since the idea is to demonstrate that an action or a proposition precedes or follows another, then coordinating the two is found to be more appropriate.

In (vi), there are two coordinators. But it is the adversative coordinator that is the concerned here. This is because the additive coordinator consists of an ellipsis. Thus, from the perspective of adversative coordinator, two ideas are joined although the first conjoin has two sub-ideas. The coordinator signifies that, in view of what is expressed in the preceding conjoin, the second clause is not expected. The second conjoin contains a complex clause unlike the first, which is a compound of two simple clauses. In (vii), the coordinator signifies pure addition in that the two subsequent conjoins are built upon the first. Similarly, the two subsequent clauses contains anaphora (**that** in the second conjoin and **this** in the third). This anaphora makes the semantic function of the coordinator to be more explicit. In the fifth item above, one can see a situation where an adversative coordinator does not contrast the second conjoin with the first per se. While it shows that certain scholars were 'incapable' at some time earlier, this information cannot be readily retrieved from the earlier conjoin. Rather, such information can be found in a preceding sentence which reads thus: "... Islam problem was the handiwork of ignorant followers and incapable scholars". This shows that the coordinator, **but**, has the tendency or potency to, at least in terms of meaning, connect with not only the nearer preceding conjoin but also the farther one.

Sometimes, the conjoins linked by a coordinator are in parallel configuration as in the case in (xi) or near parallel configuration as in (x). At other times, the additive coordinator depicts the second conjoin as a mere addition to the first as is the case in (xii). An adversative coordinator is sometimes used to imply a negative condition as in (xiii). In other words, the second conjoin simply reveals the negative result of failing to carry out the action in the first conjoin. As can be seen in (xiii), the two conjoins contains modal verb (**must** and **will**). The first of the two indicates an obligation of paramount importance while the second gives the negative future action that may trail the failure to do the obligation.

In *Alaroye*, on the other hand, instances of coordination of full independent clauses are very rare. One instance of such is, however, identified:

14. a. Làrà ohún tí á ní sò pé ko sí ohún tí òlòrún ko lé sè niyì, **tàbí** ní bíí òdún méjì sèyín, tá ní yoo sò pé òbàsánjò yìí àtí Bòlá yoo ní nńkán tí wón yoo màà bà àrà wón sè... (Àpá Kéjìlà)  
b. Part of something that we are saying that not is something that God not \_  
do is this, **or** \_ by year two past, who would say that Obasanjo this and Bola would have something that they would be \_ each other do  
c. This is part of what is believed to be impossible **or** who could believe that Obasanjo and Bola could relate together...

Apparently, at ideational level, the two conjoins. in the above Yoruba text, are not linked per se although they are linked grammatically. This contrasts with the general English principle of coordination which requires that conjoins must match each other in terms of form and meaning. The coordinator, **tàbí**, itself introduces a surprise but not in view of what is expressed in the first conjoin but rather in view of making the first conjoin more definitive. In other words, the coordinator, **tàbí**, does not actually imply that there are two alternatives but that

the second conjoin expresses a specific idea, derivable from the first conjoin, which expresses a general one.

At textual level, the coordinator serves as a medium through which two superficially unrelated conjoins are effectively linked. The coordinator makes us identify the relationship between two otherwise unrelated conjoins.

### **Coordination of Independent Clauses with Ellipsis**

There are also numerous instances of coordination of independent clauses with ellipsis in the preceding or subsequent clause in all *Daily Trust* columns used for this study. This ellipsis often makes the conjoins more integrated into each other than a situation whereby each of the conjoins contains full independent clauses. Cases of coordination of independent clauses with ellipsis are:

15. You lose the freedom of expression in at least four instances- when your freedom damages the rights and reputation of others; when it endangers national security, as we saw what they have done to Julian Assange of Wikileaks; when it threatens public order **or** when it goes against public morals. (January 16, 2015)
16. It cannot be justified on the grounds of the maintenance of Nigeria's territorial integrity, or the protection of any rights of our citizens, or the promotion of international trade or on the grounds of the defence of any moral or ethical values dear to the Nigerian nation-state. (January 2, 2015)
17. ... Nigeria is no longer a Frontline state for liberation, or for making common cause and fellowship with the world's oppressed...(January 2, 2015)
18. ... charity began at home- and promptly ended there. (January 9, 2015)
19. ... he decided to award the lion's share- more than half- of all available resources not to Igbo land but to his home zone- the South-South. (January 9, 2015)
20. It is not just to any particular area but the entirety of the country that is a victim of mismanagement... (January 9, 2015)

In each of the items above (16-21), one or more items in one or more of the conjoins have some their parts consciously omitted. This, however, does not make the clauses less important. In (16), there is the use of an alternative coordinator, **or**. It earlier operates as asyndetic but eventually occurs sydentically. The coordinator shows that at least one of the alternatives is enough to make an individual lose freedom of expression. The subject, predicator and direct object (**You (S), lose (P), the freedom of expression (O)**) have been ellipited in each of the conjoins. Consequently, since all the conjoins are similar in terms of **S, P, and O** except for their temporal adverbials, the adverbials become the visible elements in the conjoins.

In (17), there is the use of an alternative coordinator which indicates that there can be no justification based on any of the alternatives. In this instance, there are five conjoins. The second and the third contain an ellipsis of a substantial part of the clause (**it cannot be justified on the grounds of**). Hence, the second and the third conjoins appear like *of*-prepositional complements. In the fourth conjoin, the ellipsis is shortened so the conjoins appear like an *on*-prepositional phrase having an adverbial function whereas the fifth conjoin appears like an *of*-prepositional complement. A similar situation is found in (xviii) where the second conjoin contains an ellipsis of a substantial part of the clause (**S, P, C**); indeed it is a *for*-prepositional phrase functioning as a post-modifier in a noun phrase. However, the coordinator itself does not indicate one of the two propositions or ideas in the conjoins is tenable. Rather, it is both of them that are tenable.

Item (19) offers a different semantic implication of an additive coordinator where it signifies pure addition; the second conjoin behaves like an appendage to the first, almost like an after-thought. Here, only the subject (**charity**) is ellipped in the second conjoin. In (20), the adversative coordinator has a very powerful undertone. This is because the coordinator itself can be done away with if the phrase ‘not to Igboland’ is avoided. However, using the phrase and the coordinator indicates that there seems to be a misplacement of priority or a misjudgement or misplacement of value. The following implications can be drawn from the coordination of the clause in (20) above:

- a. it is expected that ‘the lion’s share’ would be awarded to Igboland.
- b. There is a betrayal of some kind.
- c. The ‘lion’s share’ was awarded to the South-South unduly, somehow not expected, at least not in disregard for Igboland.

Item (21) shows a situation where an adversative coordinator may be seen as neutral in that the meaning, ideas or proposition in the conjoins are not themselves contrastive. The second conjoin is simply a restatement, in affirmative terms, of what has been said or implied negatively in the first conjoin. The subject and the predicator (**it** and **is** respectively) are the ellipped items in this instance.

In each of the above-cited coordination (of independent clauses with ellipsis) instances, ellipsis allows the conjoins to be well integrated into one another. This is so because the clausal remnant (after the ellipsis) requires the ellipped item(s) for clear meaning to be derived. The ellipsis in the conjoins is important because it allows for economy of words without prejudicing the meaning. Additionally, the coordinators themselves are amenable to different semantic implications depending on their context of use.

On the other hand, instances of coordination of independent clauses with ellipsis are replete in *Alaroye*. Yoruba coordinators provoke some meanings similar and different from the English coordinators as the following instances suggest.

21. a. Kí Egbón Ségùn **àtí** Bólá ló ànfááni yì, kí wón fí gbá Yorùbá silẹ... (Àpá Kéjìlà) <sup>1</sup>  
b. let brother Segun and Bola use opportunity this to they use take Yoruba down  
c. Brother Segun **and** Bola should employ this opportunity to liberate the Yoruba people...

Here, ideationally, the coordinator links the subjects of two independent clauses giving the impression that two individuals partake in the same event at the same time. Hence, the event is suspended to the second clause. The implication of this is that the coordinator, **àtí**, has the tendency to delay the idea of a clause to a later part especially when two subjects are co-actors. This implies that real event of the first conjoin can be ellipped so that the one in the second conjoin takes care of it since there is only one event in the true sense of it except that two people take part in it. This is similar to what is obtained in the English text where the verbal group of the first conjoin is usually ellipped when it is also the same with the verbal group in the second one.

The coordinator textually allows the ideation in the two clauses to be well-linked. This is made possible by through the use of anaphora in the second conjoin. The coordinator first links two items (*Egbón Ségùn* and *Bólá*) to which the anaphoric reference item, *wón*, refers. This, therefore, shows that the synergy of the two individuals is required for the actualisation of the event in the second conjoin.

23. a. Alààfín **àtí** Àrẹ̀mọ́ ló n pàtán fún Ross,...,( Àpá Kéjìlà).  
b. Alaaafin and heir use telling story for Ross  
c. Alaaafin and his heir told Ross.



This expresses a similar situation as the above in that, ideationally, the event in the first conjoin (*Alààfín*) can only be retrieved in the second conjoin (*ló n pàtán fún Ross*). But at textual level, it is different from the above. This is because the coordinator, *àtí*, here, does not actually indicate that the event identified in the second conjoin is co-executed by the coordinated subjects (*Alààfín* and *Àrẹ̀mọ̀*). It may as well be individually performed.

24. a. ... kìn nì yoo sẹ̀lẹ̀ sí àwọn òmò kèkèkèké *àtí* àwọn mèkúnnú ómọ́ káárò-oo-jíírẹ̀ (Àpá Kẹ̀wà)  
b. ... what is will happen to those children little and those poor people Yoruba  
c. ... what would happen to little children **and** the less privileged among the Yoruba people.

In this case, the coordinator, *àtí*, carries with it some elements of the meaning of the initial conjoin and, then, ideationally complements the sense of the second conjoin. To put it in a plain language, the verbal group of the second conjoin can be traced to the first conjoin. The conjoins, here, match each other in form and meaning.

The coordination of the two conjoins also fulfils a textual role. The coordinator links two prepositional complements. Whereas the first conjoin contains its verbal group (*kìn nì yoo sẹ̀lẹ̀ sí...*), the second conjoin does not. This does not, however, render the second clause meaningless. The ellipsis of the verbal group in the second conjoin makes the construction textual since the ellipsed item can be retrieved from the first conjoin. Similarly, the adjectival group (*ómọ́ káárò-oo-jíírẹ̀*) in the second conjoin has, indeed, also been ellipsed from the first conjoin. Therefore, there is a double-way ellipsis in this construction; two ellipses which can be retrieved from the alternate conjoins. This intertwine ellipsis makes the construction highly textual.

25. a. ... á oo sí mò ohún tó bá yẹ ka sẹ́ *àtí* ìgbá to yẹ ka sẹ́ wón. (Àpá Kẹ̀wà).  
b. ... we will \_ know something that \_ do **and** when is right to do them  
c. ... we would know what we should do **and** when to do it.

The above construction exhibits coordination of two independent clauses with ellipsis. It is the recovery of the ellipsed item that would reveal that there are two independent clauses. The meaning inherent in the construction can be fully derived by relying on the sense of the coordinator, *àtí*. On the first look, it appears that two subordinators (*ohún tó bá yẹ ka sẹ́ + ìgbá to yẹ ka sẹ́ wón*) are linked. However, these two items perform the grammatical function of the direct object of the verb, *mọ̀* in the matrix clause. A deep examination of the construction, therefore, shows that the construction consists of two independent clauses which have their parts to be similar but which have the remaining parts different.

At textual level, the coordinator, *àtí*, links two dependent clauses and make them connect to the remaining part of the construction. The implication of this is that the coordinator makes it clear that it is important for the two sub-ideas in the two conjoins to accompany each other. That is, *ohún tó bá yẹ ka sẹ́* (what we should do) is not solely independent of *ìgbá to yẹ ka sẹ́ wón* (when to do it).

26. a. ... Alààfín yoo wó Ìbádán nírán tí títí àwọn Èkítì yoo fí rẹ̀yìn rẹ̀, *tàbí* tí Ìbádán yoo fí borí Èkítì (Àpá Kòkànà)  
b.... Allafin will look Ibadan \_ until they Ekiti will \_ overcome it, **or** till badan will \_ overcome Ekiti.  
c. Alaaafin would look away until Ekiti would conquer Ibadan **or** Ibadan would conquer Ekiti.

Ideationally, the above construction demonstrates that some particles of meaning need to be taken from the initial part of the construction in order to successfully derive the meaning of the second conjoin. Hence, the second conjoin would indicate that Alaaafin deliberately looked

away until the Ibadan warriors emerged victorious but the entire construction would mean that any of the two possibilities suit him. This is similar to what is obtainable in the English text where the coordinator, **or**, often shows that one of the alternatives can be realized at a time.

The coordinator also fulfils some textual role. In making alternatives available, an ellipsis in the second conjoin makes the two conjoins appropriately linked since elements of the second conjoin can be derived from the first conjoin. In an English text, it is not the case that ellipsis in either of two conjoins in a disjunction is derived; it can only be retrieved. This means that what is ellipsed in a Yoruba text is often inferred from the first conjoin whereas it is often directly retrieved in an English text.

### **Coordination of Full Dependent Clauses**

Apart from linking independent or superordinate clauses, coordinators are also used to link dependent clauses, which themselves function as an integral part of superordinate clauses. In this case, the conjoins can either be full dependent clauses or dependent clauses with ellipsis. The latter shall be examined shortly subsequently. When the conjoins are full dependent clauses, the conjoins appear to express some kind of parallelism. Instances of coordination of full dependent clauses are:

27. “You can’t provoke, you can’t insult the faith of others, you can’t make fun of faith”, Pope Francis said. (January 16, 2015)
28. They hide behind freedom of expression, which is the right of every individual to hold opinions without their interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of formation. (January 16, 2015)

The clauses enclosed in quotation marks in (27) function as the direct object of the verb, **said**, otherwise they would have been independent clauses themselves. There are three clauses in the quotation marks asyndetically coordinated. The first of the conjoins contains an ellipsis of the direct object of the verb, **provoke**, which is realized in the second conjoin. The second and the third conjoins are full dependent clauses.

In (xxviii), the conjoins are sub-clauses functioning within a larger or superordinate sub-clause. The superordinate sub-clause is the relative clause. While the conjoins are non-finite clause, the super-ordinate clause, within which they appear, is finite. The conjoins function as post-modifier in an NP. The three subsequent conjoins (to seek, receive and impart information) individually contains ellipsis of ‘which is the right of every individual’. In addition, the first the first two (**to seek** and **receive**) of the three subsequent conjoins also contain ellipsis of their direct object, which is realised in the third conjoin (**information and ideas through any media and regardless of formation**).

There are also instances of coordination of full dependent clauses in *Alaroye*. The coordinators in such instances have some behaviour similar to and, at the same time, different from the ones employed in Daily Trust columns. The following instances illustrate this claim.

29. a. n kò fẹ́ kó jẹ́ àjòsé tó wà lààrìn wọn yìi kò kòjá kí wọn lé Jonathan lẹ̀, tábí kí wọn jẹ́ gbájòbá fún Buhari. (Ápá Kéjìlà)
- b. I don’t want it \_be relationship \_ is between them this is not beyond that they pursue Jonathan
- c. I don’t want their relationship to go beyond ousting Jonathan **or** enthroning Buhari.

In this case, the coordinator, which appears to be alternative in type, at ideational level, is indeed additive. Rather than show that one of the two possibilities can be achieved, it shows that the two events are expected to be (or not to be) fulfilled. In fact, the second conjoin is simply a

restatement of the first. At textual level, the coordinator integrates the two conjoins such that the second conjoin appears like the opposite of the first. That is, the coordinator makes the two conjoins complementary.

30. a. ... pé Ibadàn kí ísẹ́ ilú tó lẹ́bá **àtí** pé ilú áwòn jágúnjágún Àlààfin nì ... (Àpá Kéjìlà)  
b. ... that Ibadan is not town that has king and that town they warriors Alaafin is.  
c. ...that Ibadan did not have a king **and** that it was a town from where Alaafin warriors came...

In this instance, the coordinator, **àtí**, at ideational level, is merely additive. This signifies that the second conjoin is simply an addition to the first. But at textual level, the coordinator fosters a parallel relationship between the two conjoins. This gives the reason why the complementizer, **pé**, appears at the beginning of each of the conjoins. The two instances below exhibit a behaviour similar to and different from that found in Daily Trust columns.

31. a. ... tí áwòn ọ̀mọ̀ Ibadàn kò mò bì wòn yoo sẹ̀gún áwòn ọ̀mọ̀ Kùrunmì **tábí** wòn ko ní lé sẹ̀gún wòn, ... (Àpá Kẹ̀sàn-àn)  
b. ... when they children Ibadan do not know if they will conquer they children Kurunmi or they will not \_\_ conquer them  
c. ... when the Ibadan warriors never knew whether they would conquer the Kurunmis **or** not...  
32. a. ... kí wòn toó lé fí ọ̀bá kànjẹ́ **tábí** kí wòn toó lé jẹ́ bàlẹ̀ nìbẹ́. (Àpá Kòkànlà)  
b. ... before they will \_\_ king enthrone **or** before they will \_\_ a head installed  
c. ... before any king could be crowned **or** a village head could be installed there.

Ideationally, the coordinator, here, indicates that only one of the alternatives can be realized at a time. One thing noticeable, at textual level, is that the subordinating items (**wòn**) in the two conjoins are never ellipted in the Yoruba text whereas ellipsis of the subordinator in the second conjoin is often employed in an English text. The reason is that ellipsis of the item in the second conjoin in a Yoruba text is often employed in a colloquial or an informal discourse whereas it appears more formal to ellipt it in a formal English. The last instance of coordination of full dependent clauses reveals a situation similar to the one found in Daily Trust columns.

33. a. ... íyẹn sí tí sàlàyé itàn to wà nílẹ̀ fúnún, **àtí** bí ọ́un tí sẹ́ bá Láwání sẹ̀pàdẹ́ ... (Àpá Kòkànlà)  
b. ... that has \_\_ explained story that exists on the ground to him **and** how he has \_\_ Lawanin meeting  
c. ... who had told him the existing story, **and** how he had met with Lawani...

The coordinator here semantically implies that the second conjoin is a mere addition to the first. However, the textual role played by the coordinator allows this meaning to be realized. The second conjoin contains an ellipsis of 'íyẹn sí tí sàlàyé' which is retrievable from the context. This ellipsis makes the two conjoins to be properly integrated so that the coordinator is responsible for the retrieval of the ellipted items.

### **Coordination of Dependent Clauses with Ellipsis**

There are other situations whereby the dependent clauses being coordinated contain ellipsis. The ellipsis may occur at the subject or object position. Sometimes, it might even be at the level of subordinators. At the same time, the ellipsis occurs in the preceding or subsequent conjoin. Cases of coordination of coordination of clauses with ellipsis are:

34. Whatever those who oppose them say, this cherished freedom of expression can never be freedom to insult **and** offend, but it has been made to target Islam and religion in general. (January 16, 2015)  
35. It is not about freedom of expression or anything of the sort; it is all about weakening the faith of those who have refused to take religion for granted **or** accept that being educated consists in treating religion as a joke. (January 16, 2015)

36. It was now left with the shame of a subservience and absolute cluelessness by a leader whose predecessor could ignore and even publish US President Gerald Ford's overbearing letter to an Africa that had come of age... (January 2, 2015)

Item (34) demonstrates an instance of coordination of non-finite dependent clauses. It is important to mention that it is the non-finiteness that demotes the clauses to the level of dependent clauses. The second conjoin consists of the ellipsis of the indicator of non-finiteness (**to**). Both conjoins are functioning as post-modifiers to 'freedom'. This is a case of rankshifting since a clause is ordinarily higher than a noun phrase but, in this situation, the two (non-finite) clauses are kept below a noun phrase.

In (35), we find that the two conjoins are relative clauses both being finite. The second conjoin lacks an overt relative pronoun, which is also supposed to be the subject of clause. A large part of the predicator, too, has been ellipted including the operator, **have**. Whereas the first conjoin contains a set of two verbs; one functioning traditionally as the predicator in the clause and the other, non-finite, functioning as the direct object of the lexical verb, **refused**, in the conjoin; the second conjoin contains one verb followed by a *that*-clause. It is easy to identify which of the two verbs in the first conjoin coordinates with the verb in the second conjoin (**accept**). Since **accept** is a bare non-finite verb in this context, then, logically it coordinates with **take** in the first conjoin since it is also a bare non-finite verb. A similar situation is also found in (36) where **ignore** and **publish** coordinate with each other since they are both bare non-finite verbs.

There are also instances of coordination of dependent clauses with ellipsis. In the instances below, as indicated by the arrow, there is ellipsis in the first conjoin and, at other times, in the second conjoin.

37. a. ... éébù tí wón sí máá n bú **átí** ọ̀rò àlùfànsà tí wón màà nsò kí í sẹ̀ eyì tó fì bèè bá mí nínú mù. (Àpá Kẹ̀wà)  
b. ... abuse that they \_\_\_ abuse **and** saying ungodly that they \_ say is not which \_\_\_ me \_ well  
c. ... the uncomplimentary remarks they give **and** the impolite statements they make do not go down well with me.
38. a. Bí ééyàn bá n wo bí Okúnrin Jonathan yíí tí n sẹ̀jòbá rẹ̀ **átí** áwón jẹ̀gùdù jẹ̀rà tí wón yíí ká,... (Àpá Kẹ̀wà)  
b. If someone \_ \_ look how Mr Jonathan this is \_ governing his **and** those criminals that surround him.  
c. If one examines Jonathan's administration **and** the corrupt individuals that surround him,...
39. a. ... ibẹ̀ ni ilé-àsẹ̀ fún gbogbo ilẹ̀ Yorùbá **átí** gbogbo ọ̀bá  
b. ...there is house power for all land Yoruba **and** all kings  
c. ... it is the ancestral home of the Yoruba **and** of all (Yoruba) kings.

As the above constructions show, each of items (37-39) demonstrates ellipsis in either the first conjoin (as in 37) or in the second conjoin (as in 38 and 39). Ideationally, the coordinator in (37) and (38) has an additive function but the one in (39) performs more than additive function. Although the second conjoin appears to have ordinarily been captured in the first conjoin since all Yoruba kings are normally of Yoruba race, carving out the second conjoin from the first is merely to give it some weight.

### Conclusion

This study has established that individual coordinators in Daily Trust and *Alàróyẹ* are variedly used with respect to their semantic functions. There are instances where an alternative coordinator (**tàbí**) has an additive role (**átí**) in *Alàróyẹ*, and where an adversative coordinator (**but**) may be seen as neutral in that the meaning, ideas or proposition in the conjoins are not

themselves contrastive. Coordination of full independent clauses is rare in *Alàróyé* but replete in *Daily Trust*. The rarity of coordination of full independent clauses in *Alàróyé* is owed to the fact that syndetic coordination largely embraces ellipsis in either of the conjoins in Yoruba. In the two texts, ellipsis in conjoins creates cohesion of not only lexical units but also that of meaning. However, subordinators are, sometimes, not ellipted in the two conjoins in the case of Yoruba-medium text whereas ellipsis of the subordinator in the second conjoin is often employed in the English-medium text. The reason is that ellipsis of the item in the second conjoin in a Yoruba text is often employed in a colloquial or an informal discourse whereas it appears more formal to ellipt it in a formal English text. In addition to this, our analysis has shown that conjoins match one another in terms of function and meaning. From the foregoing, we can conclude that coordination is a veritable tool by which ideas, thoughts, meanings or propositions may be neatly woven together resulting in compactness or economy most of the time while the coordinators may essentially affect the meaning of the entire construction. Second learners of either Yoruba or English need to be taught the technicalities of clausal coordination in the language. Knowledge of this will enhance adequate capturing of ideas and thoughts appropriately.

#### **Works Cited**

##### **Primary Sources**

- Adamu, Adamu. 'A new low for the Clueless'. *Daily Trust*. January 2, 2015. Print.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 'Budget and spoils of war'. *Daily Trust*. January 9, 2015. Print.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 'Vous etes Charlie?'. *Daily Trust*. January 16, 2015. Print.  
 Òmò òdò Agbá. 'Bì ijòbá Òyò sẹ dálágbará nílẹ̀ Yorùbá lèèkéjì (Àpá Kèsàn-àn)'. *Alàróyé*. January 06, 2015. Print.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 'Bì ijòbá Òyò sẹ dálágbará nílẹ̀ Yorùbá lèèkéjì (Àpá Kẹ̀wà)'. *Alàróyé*. January 13, 2015. Print.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 'Bì ijòbá Òyò sẹ dálágbará nílẹ̀ Yorùbá lèèkéjì (Àpá Kòkànlà)'. *Alàróyé*. January 20, 2015. Print.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. Bì ijòbá Òyò sẹ dálágbará nílẹ̀ Yorùbá lèèkéjì (Àpá Kéjìlà)'. *Alàróyé*. January 27, 2015. Print.

##### **Secondary Sources**

- Adesola, Oluseye. *Yoruba: A Grammatical Sketch*. n.p. Web. Web. 25 July, 2016.  
 Berry, Margaret. *Introduction to Systemic Linguistics 2: Levels and Links*. London: Billing and Sons. 1977. Print.  
 Bloor, Thomas and Meriel Bloor. *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.  
 Downing, Angela and Philip Lock. *English Grammar: A University Course*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.  
 Halliday, Michael and Christian Matthiessen. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Fourth Edition. Oxon: Routledge, 2014. Print.  
 Kim, Jong-Bok and Peter Sells. *English Syntax: An Introduction*. Center for the Study of Language and Information. 2007. Web. 25 July, 2016.  
 Lado, Robert. *Linguistic Across Cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957. Print.  
 Morley, David. *Syntax in Functional Grammar: An Introduction to Lexicogrammar in Systemic Linguistics*. London: Patson Prepress Limited, 2000. Print.  
 Newson, Mark, Marianna Hordos, Daniel Pap, Krisztina Szecsenyi, Gabriella Toth, Veronika Vincze. *Basic English Syntax with Exercises*. Hungary: Konzorcium, 2006. Web. 25 July, 2016.  
 Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1973. Print.  
 Stockwell, Robert, Donald Bowen and John Martin. *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. Web.