



## Verbs of Seeing in Ékíd

Unyime Imo, UDOEYO <sup>1</sup>, Victoria Sunday, ENANG <sup>2</sup>, Emmanuel Akaninyene, OKON, Ph.D <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Nigerian Languages, College of Education, Afaha Nsit, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup> Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

**Abstract:** This paper examines the verbs of ‘seeing’ in Ékíd, providing their conceptual and extended meanings, including their transitivity, within Ékíd grammar. It adopts a descriptive research design for the collection of data via elicitation method from six competent adult native speakers (three men and three women, between the ages of 50 and 65) of Ékíd, who have resided in Ékíd all their lives. Also, relevant literatures were consulted for the review. This study adopts Palmer’s (1983) generalization, and Leech’s (1990) conceptual meaning views for the analysis of data. Findings show that Ékíd has four verbs of ‘seeing’: *kíd* ‘see/find’, *kííñ* ‘look (at)/see’, *mǒ* ‘able to see’; and *nylññó* ‘peep’, which denote primarily, an act of sighting something/someone with one’s eyes either consciously or unconsciously. Also, findings show that, among these four verbs of ‘seeing’ in Ékíd, *kíd* and *kííñ* have extended meanings (apart from their conceptual meanings); while *mǒ* and *nylññó* do not have extended meanings apart from their primary meanings. Furthermore, the analysis reveals that, *kíd*, *kííñ*, and *mǒ* are transitive, while *nylññó* is intransitive. This study contributes to the syntax and semantics of Ékíd verbs of sensory perception – seeing, which therefore serves as a reference material for further research on other verbs of sensory perceptions in Ékíd, including their pragmatic aspects.

**Key words:** Verb of ‘Seeing’, Transitivity, Conceptual Meaning and Semantic Extension.

### 1. Introduction

The study of human science in the world, has revealed that there are five basic senses of perception (mainly in humans), which are: seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling. Languages of the world have words for the expression of the five senses of perception. For instance, based on several typological linguistic works done on the senses of perception in the languages of the world, it has been discovered that English (as a language), has separate words (verbs) for the five basic senses of perception (Viberg, 1983). Unlike English, not all languages have separate words (verbs) for the five senses of perception. For example, one of the African languages – Avatime (Kwa Niger-Congo language), has one verb – *na* for the four non-visual senses – hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling; and has a separate verb - *mɔ* for the sense of seeing (Putten, 2020).

In some languages of the world, verbs of sensation (perception) have undergone semantic change (semantic extension) such as metaphorical, figurative, or literary usage. In other words, some verbs of sensation in some languages of the world have meaning extension; thus, their basic or conceptual meanings are extended semantically to cover a variety of meanings in languages; and are thus influenced by the culture of the languages. For example, English, is a typical example of the languages that have verbs of sensation with semantic extensions, which are discussed in the aspect of literature review of this paper. It is important to know about the verbs of sensory perception of

languages; to know about the linguistic features of such verbs; to know the linguistic differences and similarities that may exist among languages (especially, related languages). In line with this, this paper investigates the verbs of sensory perception, *seeing* in Ékíð, with the view to provide relevant data and findings from Ékíð, in relation to the body of the existing literature in this aspect of linguistic research, to promote the linguistic growth and sustenance of Ékíð grammar.

### 1.1. Ékíð Language

Ékíð is the name of a language likewise the name of the speakers of the language. Ékíð is spoken as the main and dominant local language in Eket Local Government Area (LGA) (and in Esit Eket LGA) of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria, which occupies the South-Central portion of Akwa Ibom State, with a population of about 172, 557 (male: 88,635; female: 83,922) according to the 2006 result of the National Population Census. Ékíð language is closely related to Ibibio, Efik, Anaang, Oro and Ibuno languages. It has dialectal differences with Ibibio and other Lower Cross languages, and there is unidirectional intelligibility between Ékíð and Ibibio. Ékíð language has two varieties: Ékíð and É̀sìd Ékíð, spoken in Eket and Esit Eket LGAs respectively.

Genetically, according to the linguistic classification of languages, Ékíð belongs to the Lower Cross subgroup family of the Delta group of the Cross River sub-branch of the New Benue-Congo branch of the Niger-Congo sub-family (Williamson, 1989). According to Connell (1994), the Lower Cross group spans three Nigerian states in this coastal region - Rivers, Akwa Ibom and Cross River, as well as the international frontier to the Isangele sub-division of South-Western Cameroon. More recent classification has placed Ékíð in the Lower Cross group of the Cross River sub-branch of Proto Benue-Congo of the Niger-Congo phylum (Williamson & Blench 2000).

### 1.2. Statement of the Research Problem

Some works have been done on the phonetic/phonological, orthographic, literary and syntactic aspects of Ékíð by some scholars such as Eyo (1998), Udoyo (2004), Urua et al. (2005), Udoyo & Wilson (2006), Udoeyo (2018), and Udoeyo & Inyang (2018). However, to the best of my knowledge, there is nothing yet done on the syntactic and semantic aspects of verbs of sensory perception in Ékíð. Thus, this work focuses on the aspects of Ékíð syntax and semantics with the view of examining the verbs of sensory perception, 'seeing', to determine their conceptual meanings, extensional meanings, and transitivity.

### 1.3. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- (i) To examine the verbs of 'seeing' in Ékíð.
- (ii) To examine the transitivity potency of verbs of 'seeing' in Ékíð.
- (iii) To determine the conceptual and extended meanings of verbs of 'seeing' in Ékíð

### 1.4. Significance of the Study

This study is significant in the sense that, it provides a detailed analysis of the verbs of 'seeing' in Ékíð, which include the transitivity, conceptual meanings, and extended meanings of the verbs of 'seeing' in Ékíð. This work also provides substantial data from Ékíð grammar and with the existing literature to anyone who might work in this area on Ékíð language.

### 1.5. Scope of the Study

This work focuses on the syntactic and semantic aspects of Ékíð verbs of *seeing*. Also, it is limited to the use of basic constructions (such as declarative, imperative, and interrogative sentences) to determine the transitivity of the verbs of *seeing* in Ékíð. In addition, semantically, it focuses on the conceptual/denotative and other extended meanings of the verbs of *seeing* in Ékíð.

## 2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

In this section, we present the two semantic approaches of meaning, adopted to analyze the research data; and review the relevant literature on verbs of *seeing* in English.

## 2.1. Semantic Approaches of Meaning

For the analysis of data in this work, this work adopts semantic approaches of meaning as its general framework. The approaches of meaning used in the analysis of the research data are, conceptual approach of meaning and generalization approach of meaning.

**2.1.1. Conceptual Approach:** This approach deals with the conceptual meanings of words. Conceptual meaning is one of the meanings of words which was classified by Leech (1990). Conceptual meaning is the central or primary meaning of a word which is normally stable and not affected by contextual coloring or emotional overtones/feelings by either the speaker or hearer (Omego, 2011; Udoh et al., 2019). It is also known as the denotative, cognitive, logical, central, or even the primary meaning of a word (Udoh et al., 2019). According to Chaer (1994, p.292), denotative meaning is regarded as a central or core meaning of lexical item. For example, the word 'thin', has a denotative meaning which means, 'having a smaller size of body and not covered with much flesh'.

**2.1.2. Generalization Approach:** According to Palmer (1988), in generalization, a word achieves a more general meaning as the meaning of a word expands when it is used in a different field. Therefore, it has a new meaning that is different from its original meaning. Thus, generalization involves a change from a word's original meaning to another meaning which is meaning extension. The meaning extension a word undergoes could be connotative (figurative/metaphorical), broadening or literary. For example, the words: 'pig' figuratively means 'dirtiness'; 'tortoise' means 'craftiness' (Anagbogu et al., 2010, p.223). Also, the verb 'touch' metaphorically means 'examine/check' in the sentence: "Go and touch those clothes to see if they are still wet". Semantic extensions refer to all those extended meanings (whether physical or metaphorical) of words. Thus, semantic extension of verbs has to do with the extended meaning of verbs from their central/primary/original meanings to other meanings, as discussed in the literature review.

## 2.2. Related Literature Review

### 2.2.1. Verbs of 'Seeing'

Languages of the world do have different verbs for the sense of perception of *seeing*. The verbs of *seeing* are verbs that are used to encode meaning to the sensory organ of perception – the eye, which involves the visuality of the eye in contact with entities. For instance, in English, verbs of *seeing* include *see* and *look*. The verbs *see* and *look* in English, have different ways of usage in grammatical constructions, to denote or express different meanings such as, conceptual, metaphorical, literary meanings, etc. The following sentences are from Filmore (2000):

(1) John *saw* his girlfriend

(2) John *looked* at his girlfriend

In example (1), the sentence denotes an unintentional or unconscious action performed by the perceptor (subject) – *John*. Thus, 'john' is a passive preceptor. The verbs 'saw' (past tense of *see*), is conceptual in meaning, which means a physical perception of something/someone with the eyes. In example (2), the verb – *look*, denotes an intentional or conscious focus on an object of perception – *his girlfriend*, by the preceptor – *John*. Thus, the subject 'John', is active, by looking consciously at his girlfriend with his eyes (Filmore, 2000). The meaning of 'look' is thus conceptual according to Leech's approach of conceptual meaning in Leech (1990).

Also, in English, Viberg (2008, p.124), gave a similar view of Filmore (2000) on the verbs of *seeing*, 'see' and 'look'. He viewed the verb 'see', as a verb of experience; while the verb 'look', as an activity verb in the following constructions:

(3) Peter *saw* the birds

(4) Peter was *looking* at the birds (Viberg 2008, p.124)

From the constructions provided by Viberg (2008, p.124) above, Viberg (2008) describes the subject 'Peter' in example (3), as a passive observer, who perceived the birds with an uncontrollable state of

his eyes (i.e., unconscious/intentional perception); while the subject ‘Peter’, in example (4), is an active agent, who consciously/intentionally focused his eyes on the birds (i.e., under controllable state). The meanings of the verbs, *see* and *look*, are conceptual in line with Leech’s approach of conceptual meaning (Leech, 1990). Viberg (2008), also states that the subjects in both examples are the ‘Experiencer’; and that the verbs employ animate entities as subjects, and the verbs are classified as ‘Experienced-based verb’ due to their semantic roles. Furthermore, Viberg (2008), classified the verb ‘look’, as a ‘Phenomenon-based verb’ which refers directly to what is perceived (the phenomenon, which is the stimulant (subject)), as shown in example (5):

(5) Peter *looked* happy

In addition, Viberg (2008), presented a semantic grid of verbs of perception in English, as shown in table (1):

**Table 1: The Basic Grid for Verbs of Perception in English**

Sense modality	Activity	Experience	Phenomenon-based
NEUTRAL	Examine	Perceive notice	Seem
SIGHT	look at	See	Look
HEARING	listen to	Hear	Sound
TOUCH	Feel Touch	Feel	Feel
TASTE	Taste	Taste	Taste
SMELL	smell (at) sniff	Smell	Smell

Source: Viberg (2008)

In table (1), according to Viberg (2008), vertically, the words are displayed according to sense modality; horizontally, three major classes of verbs are distinguished based on semantic roles. “Experience”, refers to uncontrollable state or achievement; “Activity”, refers to controlled circumstance (i.e., a process a perceiver controls); while the “Phenomenon-based” refers directly to what is perceived (phenomenon).

In English, apart from the conceptual meaning of the verb ‘see’, ‘see’ has other extended meanings, according to Palmer’s approach of generalization (Palmer, 1988), such as: *to understand (figurative); to realize, to predict; to determine; etc.*, as shown in the following examples:

(6) Do you *see* what I mean? *See* here means ‘to understand’.

(7) They’re blind to the damage they do, but someday, they’ll *see*. *See* here means, ‘to realize’.

(8) The oracle *saw* the destruction of the city. *Saw* here means, ‘predicted’

(9) I’ll come over later to *see* if I can fix your computer. *See* here means, ‘to determine’.

### 2.3. Gap filled in the Literature Review

The verbs of “seeing”, are not only semantically classified (as by Viberg (2008) in English); but also, can be classified syntactically based on their transitivity potency. Thus, to know if they are: transitive; intransitive; or both transitive and intransitive. For instance, in example (3) by Viberg (2008), the verb ‘see’ is transitive, which takes on a direct object *birds*; in example (4), the verb ‘look’ is also transitive, by taking on an oblique object *birds*, which is marked by the preposition *at*; thus, *birds*, is the object complement of the proposition *at*. In example (5), the verb ‘look’, is intransitive, which doesn’t take on any object, but followed by subject complement *happy*.

Having undergone the review, this study, determines the transitivity potency of verbs of ‘seeing’ and ‘touching’ in Èkíḍ, including their conceptual and extended meanings, and the conceptual features of

the entities involved in the analysis. In considering the transitivity potency of verbs of ‘seeing’ and ‘touching’ in Èkìd in the analysis of data, let’s throw a little light on transitivity.

#### 2.4. Transitivity

According to Crystal (1992, p.344), transitivity is a category used in the grammatical analysis of clause/sentence constructions to define the types of relationship between a verb and the presence or absence of object elements. Also, Hopper and Thompson (1980, p.251), states that, transitivity is traditionally understood as a global property of an entire clause, such that an activity is ‘carried-over’ or ‘transferred’ from an agent to a patient; and transitivity in the traditional view thus necessarily involves at least two participants..., and an action which is typically EFFECTIVE in some way.

Nwachukwu (1983b) and Uwalaka (1988), argue that a distinction can be made between verbs which can take objects and those that cannot. In this way, they view transitivity with respect to verbs which can or cannot take objects. With respect to this, Ndimele (2010, pp.139 - 143), summarizes the transitivity potency of some verbs in Echie from the following examples:

(10) **Ezè ghùrù anụ**

(Eze kill-PT meat)

‘Eze killed an animal’

(11) **a. Ezè èriele**

(Eze pr-eat-OVS-perf)

‘Eze has eaten’

**b. Ezè èriele ji**

(Eze pr-eat-OVS-perf yam)

‘Eze has eaten yam’\

(12) **Ezè rìàrà òria**

(Eze kill-FT sickness)

‘Eze was ill’

(13) **a. Epè àchhaala**

(orangr pr-ripe-OVS-perf)

‘The orange is ripe’

**b. Uwè ya chha uchha**

(shirt 3sPs be-white whiteness)

‘His shirt is white’

(14) **a. Ezè gbara egbè**

(Eze shoot-FT gun)

‘Eze fired a gun’

**b. Ezè gbàrà Ngozhi egbè**

(Eze shoot-FT Ngozhi gun)

‘Eze shot at Ngozhi’

**c. \*Ezè gbàrà anu**

(Eze shoot animal)

**d. Ezè bìàrà**

(Eze come-FT)

'Eze came'

From the above examples, Ndimele (2010), gave the following observations about the behaviour of the verbs in Echie:

- (i) The verb *-gbu* 'kill' in (10), obligatorily requires an animate agent and an affected object. Verbs that behave like *-gbu* 'kill' are rated very high on the scale of transitivity.
- (ii) The verb *-ri* 'eat' can allow an animate agent as well as an affected covert as in (11a) or overt object as in (11b). Verbs like *-ri* 'eat' will not be rated as high as *-gbu* 'kill' on the transitivity scale.
- (iii) The verb *-gba* 'shoot' in (14a) takes an animate agent and an inherent complement. It can also allow an affected object as in (14b) if its inherent complement is present. On the transitivity scale, *-gba* 'shoot' is superior to *-achha* 'ripen' and *-ria* 'be sick', but not as high as *-gbu* 'kill' or *-ri* 'eat'.
- (i) A verb such as *-ria* 'be sick' in (12) takes a goal subject and an inherent complement which is not an affected object. Verbs in this category will be low on the transitivity scale.
- (ii) The verb *-chha* 'ripen' in (13), can optionally allow an inherent complement, rather than an affected object. It is placed a bit lower than *-ria* 'be sick' on the transitivity scale.
- (iii) The verb *-bia* 'come', in (14d) allows neither an affected object nor an inherent complement. It is therefore rated lowest on the transitivity scale.

Ndimele's analysis of transitivity of verbs in Echie, shows that verbs in languages can be examined to determine their degree of transitivity; to know whether they are transitive, intransitive or ambitransitive (both transitive and intransitive).

**3. Research Design/Sources of Data**

The research design that was used in this study is the descriptive research design which involves the use of both primary and secondary sources. The primary source involves collection of data by elicitation method from six competent adult (three men and three women, between the ages of 50 and 65) native speakers of Ékíd, who have resided in Ékíd all their lives; while the secondary sources comprise relevant textbooks, journal articles, related research projects and articles from the internet for effective literature review. This research employed the necessary fieldwork materials for data collection.

**4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion of Findings**

In this session, the data obtained for this study are presented and analyzed, including discussion of findings. The data presented are analyzed using Leech's approach of conceptual meaning of words and Palmer's approach of generalization, to determine the conceptual and extended meanings of verbs of *seeing* in Ékíd. Also, the analysis includes the transitivity of verbs of *seeing* in Ékíd.

**4.1. Verbs of 'Seeing' in Ékíd**

In Ékíd, the verbs of 'seeing' are of four types, whose meanings are conceptual or denotative. They are:

- (i) kíd 'see, find'.
- (ii) Kííñ 'look, see, watch'.
- (iii) Mòó 'able to see'.
- (iv) nyλññó 'peep'.

The verbs of ‘seeing’ in *Ékíd* presented above, are presented by different morphemes, but their conceptual meanings denote contact with the eyes, though different points of view. Let’s first consider their usages and transitiveness (one after the other).

**4.1.1. *Kíd* ‘see, find’:** In *Ékíd*, the verb *kíd*, conceptually refers to the act of perceiving something/someone with the eyes. Thus, *kíd*, highlights the sense of vision which connects a perceptor with the object of perception. *kíd* can be of two interpretations: ‘see’ and ‘find’. Let’s consider some examples of constructions that show the use of *kíd* ‘see’ in *Ékíd*, which are as follows:

(15) a. *Ànyé á-máá-kíd ñwèd ádà*

He 3sg. pst see book the

‘He saw the book’

b. *Ébú á-máá-kíd ñwèd ádà*

Goat 3sg. pst see book the

‘The goat saw the book’

c. *Ànyé á-máá-kíd Èmèm*

He 3sg. pst see Emem

‘He saw Emem’

d. *Ébú á-máá-kíd Èmèm*

Goat 3sg. pst see Emem

‘The goat saw Emem’

(16) \**Èkpàd á-máá-kíd ñwèd ádà*

Bag 3sg. pst see book the

‘He saw the book’

(17) \**Ànyé á-máá-kíd*

He 3sg. pst see

‘He saw’

In example (15), it is observed that the verb *kíd* ‘see’, is a transitive verb, which takes on the noun phrases (objects of perception (direct objects)) – *ñwèd* ‘book’ [+ANIMATE]; *Èmèm* ‘Emem (personal name)’ [+ANIMATE]. Semantically, the subjects, *ànyé* ‘he’ [+ANIMATE] and *Ébú* ‘goat’ [+ANIMATE], are the perceptors that perceive the objects, *ñwèd* ‘book’ and *Èmèm* ‘Emem (personal name)’ with their eyes. This explains how the perceptors got in contact with the objects by their eyes. That is, the perceptors *ànyé* and *ébu*, are passive observers (i.e., agents that got in contact with the objects *ñwèd* and *Èmèm* (experiencers) via their eyes unintentionally); thus, the verb *kíd* is classified as an experience verb (cf. Viberg, 2008). In example (16), it is observed that the subject, *èkpàd* ‘bag’ is [-ANIMATE], which has no eye to sight something (the object, *ñwèd ádà* ‘the book’), which thus renders the construction ungrammatical. Also, in example (17), it is observed that the construction contains no object; which ends with the verb *kíd* ‘see’; thus, making it incomplete (ungrammatical) and questionable, to seek an answer to what the subject, *ànyé* ‘he’ [+ANIMATE], saw. This affirms the fact that the verb *kíd* ‘see’, is transitive, which absolutely do take on object(s) as seen in example (15).

Also, the verb *kíd* ‘see’, as a transitive verb, is not only monotransitive (as seen in example (15)), but can also be ditransitive, in constructions with single subjects (c.f. 18 & 19, and in constructions with two subjects (cf. 20), as shown in the following:

(18) *Ànyé á-máá-kíd ñwèd ada m̀m̀m̀ èkpàd ádà*

He 3sg. pst see book the and bag the

‘He saw the book and the bag’

(19) Ànyé á-máá-kíḍ Èmèm òmè Ènò mé ufà?

He 3sg. pst see Emem and Eno at home

‘He saw Emem and Eno at home’

(20) Èmèm òmè Ènò é-má- é-kíḍ èkè émò mé ufà?

Emem and Eno 3pl. pst 3pl. see mother their at home

‘Emem and Eno saw their mother at home’

In addition, the verb *kíḍ* ‘see’, can occur with a subordinate clause, which can be used for a direct or immediate perception to indicate that the preceptor/perceiver witnessed the event described in the subordinate clause as shown in example (21).

(21) Ànyé á- máá-kíḍ émò dáñá é- sùk- é- díá òdídíá

He 3sg. pst see them as 3pl. prog. 3pl. eat food

‘He saw them as they were eating food’

On the other hand, the verb ‘*kíḍ*’ in *Ékíḍ*, can also be referred to as ‘find’ (like in English), which means to discover something/someone being searched for or to locate. This meaning still conceptual; that is, it is an act of perceiving something/someone with the eyes after being searched for. For example, we have:

(22) Ànyé á-máá-kíḍ òwèd ádà

He 3sg. pst find book the

‘He found the book’

In example (22) above, the preceptor’s eyes focus consciously on the object of perception, in which the verb – *kíḍ* ‘find’ is described as locative verb.

Furthermore, the verb *kíḍ* ‘see/find’ in *Ékíḍ*, also has extended meanings; thus, meanings that differ from its conceptual meanings as presented and analyzed as follows:

➤ **The Semantic Extension of *kíḍ* ‘see’ in *Ékíḍ*:** The verb – *kíḍ* ‘see’ in *Ékíḍ*, has the following extended meanings:

(i) *Kíḍ*, as ‘to witness or experience’. For example, we have:

(23). Ànyé á- máá- kíḍ úfìn mé ùdùà

He 3sg. pst. see hardship in market

(He *saw* hardship in the market)

‘He *experienced* hardship in the market’

In example (23), it is observed that the verb *kíḍ*, has changed from the state of ‘seeing/finding something or someone’ to the state of ‘experiencing a situation’. Thus, the conceptual meaning of *kíḍ* ‘see, find’, is extended metaphorically/literally to mean ‘to experience’.

(ii) *kíḍ*, as ‘to understand’. For example, we have:

(24) Ànyé á- kíḍ sé Èmèm á- sùk- á- táñ

He 3sg. see what Emem 3sg. prog. 3sg. say

(He sees what Emem is saying)

‘He understands what Emem is saying’

In example (24), it is observed that the verb *kíḍ* [see, find], is figuratively used to mean ‘to understand’



(iii) *Kíd*, as ‘to realize’: In *Ékíd*, the verb *kíd* [*see or find*], can also be used figuratively as ‘to realize something’, which is different from its sense of visual perception, as seen in example (38).

(25) Úsù kìań, àfè à- yáá- kíd ké sé àfè à- ké- né í- kí- fó -ké

Day one, you 2sg. fut. see that what you 2sg. pst. do 3sg. pst. good Neg

(One day, you will see that what you did wasn’t good)

‘One day, you will realize that what you did wasn’t good’

(iv) *Kíd*, as ‘to predict or foresee’: The meaning of *kíd* from its conceptual meaning of physical perception, can be extended to the mental perception to mean ‘to predict or foresee’, which has to do with the mind, imagination, or dream. For example, we have:

(26) Ákù-ábàsi á- máá- kíd m̀kpó ábáńá úkwô mé ‘Nigeria’

Priest 3sg. pst. see something about flood in Nigeria

(The priest saw something about flood in Nigeria)

‘The priest predicted something about flood in Nigeria’

(v) *Kíd*, as ‘to visit or meet’. For example, we have:

(27) a. Èmèm á- máá- ká á- ké- kíd ànyé

Emem 3sg. pst. go 3sg. pst. see him

(Emem went and saw him)

‘Emem went and visited/met him’

b. Ká ké Kíd ákpúnwùkà àfè mé ídáń

Go and see elder sister your in village

(Go and see your elder sister in the village)

‘Go and visit/meet your elder sister in the village’

(vi) *Kíd*, as ‘observe’. For example, we have:

(28) a. Àfè à- má- kíd m̀bré ádá?

You 3sg. pst. observe event the

‘Did you observe the event?’

**4.1.2. Kíń ‘look, see’:** In *Ékíd*, *kíń* means, to try to see something/someone; or pay attention to something/someone with one’s eyes. In this meaning, the perceptor focuses attention directly to the object of perception with eyes. Thus, the preceptor is active because, he/she consciously focuses his/her eyes on the object of perception. The verb – *kíń*, is an activity verb. Also, in *Ékíd*, *kíń* ‘look/see’ is a transitive verb, which takes on a noun phrase as its direct object in both declarative and imperative constructions. It is important to note that the subjects of the verb *kíń* ‘look/see’, are animate because, the verb *kíń* ‘look/see’, conceptually has to do with a contact with the eye(s); whereas the objects of the verb *kíń* ‘look/see’, can be either animate or inanimate. Examples are:

(29) a. Ànyé á- máá-kíń émó

He 3sg. pst look them

‘He looked at them’

b. Ànyé á- -kíń étú áńìkè

He 3sg. look tree that

‘He is looking at that tree’

(30) a. Kíń ánwé áńìm

look/see person this

‘Look at/see this person’

**b.** kííñ ñwèd ésí (mó)

Look/see book his (here)

‘look at/see his book (here)’

In the examples above, it is observed that the verb – *kííñ* ‘look at, see’, is transitive; and that its usage in declarative and imperative constructions are grammatical. Whereas the verb – *kíd* ‘see, find’ in *Ékíd*, cannot occur grammatically in an imperative construction that denotes its conceptual meaning as a verb of vision (as shown in example 31), except in an extended form (as shown in example 32):

(31) \*kíd ñwèd ánim

See book this

‘See this book’

(32) Kǎ ké Kíd ákpúnwùkà (àfè) mé ídǎñ

Go and see elder sister your in village

‘Go and visit/meet your elder sister in the village’

In example (31), it is seen that the verb – *kíd* ‘see’ cannot occur in an imperative construction, except its meaning is semantically extended to mean something else like, ‘to visit’ or ‘to meet’, as illustrated in example (32).

➤ **The Semantic Extension of *kííñ* in *Ékíd*:** The verb – *kííñ* ‘look (at)’ in *Ékíd*, has extended meanings which are literary, apart from its original meaning. Thus, the verb – *kííñ* ‘look (at)’ in *Ékíd* has the following literary meanings:

(i) *Kííñ*, as ‘check/examine/findout’. For example, we have:

(33) Kǎ ké kííñ mé àfòñ ániñkè á- sád

Go and see if clothe that 3sg. dry

(Go and see if that clothe has dried)

‘Go and check/examine/findout if that clothe has dried’

(ii) *Kííñ*, as ‘to determine’. For example, we have:

(34) Yàk ñ- kííñ mé ñ- yá- kǎd ñ- kǎ ùdùà

Let 1sg. see if 1sg. fut. can 1sg. go market

(Let me see, if I could go to the market)

‘Let me determine if I could go to the market’.

(iii) *Kííñ*, as ‘to stir at something/someone’. For example, we have:

(35) Kù uñ- kííñ mǐ ñtédè

Don’t 2sg. look me like that

(Don’t look at me like that)

‘Don’t stir at me like that’.

(iv) *Kííñ*, as ‘to look after’. For example, we have:

(36) M̀bó?, kííñ áyú ádà ñ- nò

Please, look after child the 1sg for

‘Please, look after the child for me’.

(v) *Kííñ*, as ‘to watch’. For example, we have:

(37) Àfè à- mǎ- kííñ m̀bré ádà?

You 3sg. pst. watch event the

‘Did you watch the event?’

It should be noted that, apart from the verbs ‘kíd’ and ‘kííñ’ in *Ékíd*, the verbs ‘mǎ’ and ‘nylññó’, do not undergo semantic change in their conceptual meanings. Also, the verb ‘kííñ’ in *Ékíd* (unlike in English), cannot be used to express complement of the subject (stimulant) as shown in example (38):

(38) \*Ènò á- kííñ ínìí

Eno 3sg. look happy

‘Eno looks happy’

**4.1.3. Mǎ ‘able to see’:** The verb – *mǎ*, denotes an ability of seeing something/somebody; or a state of seeing something/somebody clearly with one’s eyes. It is transitive (cf. 39 c), and often used in declarative and interrogative constructions, but not in imperative construction. Examples are:

(39) a. Ànyé á- k̀d á- mǎ m̀kró

He 3sg. Aux 3sg. see something

‘He can see something’

b. Ànyé á- sí- mǎ m̀kró

He 3sg. use see something

‘He used to see something’

c. Àm̀ì m̀- mé -mǎ m̀kró áníñkè

I 1sg. have see something that

‘I have seen that thing’

(40) Ànyé á- k̀d á- mǎ sé éwèd áníñkè?

You 3sg Aux 3sg see what write there

‘Can he see what is written there?’

(41) \*Mǎ m̀kró áníñkè

see something that

‘See that something’

**4.1.4. Nylññó ‘peep’:** The verb – *nylññó* ‘peep’, denotes an act of looking at something/somebody through a narrow opening in order not to be seen or noticed while looking. It is usually intransitive. Thus, it occurs without an object of perception. For example, we have:

(42) Ànyé á-ké-nylññó mé ádú mé íbibènè ádà

He 3sg. pst peep through hole on wall the

‘He peeped through the hole on the wall’

Unlike in English in which the verb ‘peep’, can occur transitively with a direct object of perception, *nylññó* ‘peep’ in *Ékíd* cannot occur as shown in example (43):

(43) \*Àfè à- mǎ- nylññó m̀bré ádà?

You 3sg. pst. peep event the

‘Did you peep the event?’

In example (43), it is obvious that in *Ékíd*, the verb *nylññó* ‘peep’ cannot occur transitively with a direct object of perception; it thus makes the sentence ungrammatical.

In addition, ‘nylññó’, can take on the verb ‘kííñ’ as its counterpart to result in serial verbs construction as shown in example (44):

- (44) *Nylññó kííñ, ñsě ké émò é né mé àtò ádà*  
peep look, what are they 3pl. do in place that  
‘Peep and look, what are they doing there?’

#### 4.2. Results and Discussion of Findings

In section 4.1, we presented and analyzed the verbs of *seeing* in *Ékíd*, which are:

*kíd* ‘see, find; *kííñ* ‘look (at), see; *mǒ* ‘able to see’; and *nylññó* ‘peep’;

In the analyses, we illustrated their transitivity, central (conceptual/denotative) meanings, and extended (literary/metaphorical) meanings. On the aspect of verbs of *seeing*, the analysis has shown that the four verbs of *seeing* in *Ékíd* (*kíd*, *kííñ*, *mǒ* and *nylññó*), syntactically, three are transitive verbs, while one is intransitive, as shown in table (2) below:

**Table 2: The Transitivity of Verbs of *Seeing* in *Ékíd***

Transitive	Intransitive
<i>kíd</i> ‘see, find <i>kííñ</i> ‘look (at), see <i>mǒ</i> ‘able to see’;	<i>nylññó</i> ‘peep’

The analysis also shown that the two verbs of *seeing* in *Ékíd*, ‘*kíd* and *kííñ*’, have other meanings (extended meanings) apart from their conceptual (primary/original) meanings pertaining to visual perception (cf. 4.1.1); whereas ‘*mǒ*’ and ‘*nylññó*’, do not have, as shown in table (3):

**Table 3: Meaning Extension of Verbs of *Seeing* in *Ékíd***

Verb (Conceptual Meaning)	Extended Meaning
<i>kíd</i> ‘see, find	to witness or experience; to understand; to realize; to predict or foresee; to visit/meet; to observe.
<i>kííñ</i> ‘look (at), see	check/examine/find out; to determine; to stir at; to look after; something/someone.
<i>mǒ</i> ‘able to see’	Nil
<i>nylññó</i> ‘peep’	Nil

Also, from the analysis, in *Ékíd*, the verb *kííñ* ‘look (at), see’ cannot be used to express complement of the subject (stimulant) (cf. 51).

#### 5. Conclusion

This study investigated the verbs of ‘seeing’ in *Ékíd*. It provides data and analysis on the four verbs of ‘seeing’: *kíd* ‘see/find’, *kííñ* ‘look (at)/see’, *mǒ* ‘able to see’; and *nylññó* ‘peep’ in *Ékíd*. The analysis has shown that the verbs of ‘seeing’ in *Ékíd* employ animate entities as subjects, and animate/inanimate entities as objects of perception, which help to determine their transitivity (be it transitive or intransitive). The analysis also shown that verbs of ‘seeing’ in *Ékíd*, do have extended meanings apart from their conceptual meanings; though not all do have extended meanings (such as *mǒ* ‘able to see’ and *nylññó* ‘peep’).

Having undergone this research, this study contributes to the literature on the syntax and semantics of *Ékíd* verbs of sensory perception – *seeing*, which therefore serves as a reference material for further research on other verbs of sensory perceptions in *Ékíd*.

**REFERENCES**

1. Anagbogu, P., Mbah, B., & Eme, C. (2010). *Introduction to linguistics*. (2nd ed). Amaka Dreams.
2. Chaer, A. (1994). *Linguistik umum*. Rineka Cipta.
3. Connell, B. A. (1994). The lower cross languages: A prolegomena to the classification of the Cross River languages. *The Journal of West African languages*. xxiv (1),3-46.
4. Crystal, D. (1992). Glossary. In Bright, W. (Ed). *International encyclopedia of linguistics* 4 (pp. 273 - 348). Oxford University Press.
5. Eyo, F. A. (1998). (*Nkih Ekid*). *A handbook of Ekid proverbs*. Asconsult Services.
6. Filmore, C. (2000). The framenet project. Internet document. <http://www.icsi.berkelev.edu/framenet>.
7. Hopper, P. J., & Thompson, S. A. (1980). Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56:2, pp.251 - 299.
8. Leech, G. N. (1990). *Semantics: the study of meaning*. Penguin Books.
9. Ndimele, O-M. (2010). *A concise grammar & lexicon of Echie*. National Institute of Nigerian Languages
10. Nwachukwu, P. A. (1983a). Transitivity. In Nwachukwu, P.A (Ed). *Readings on the Igbo verbs* (pp. 61 – 77). Africana-Feb Publishers.
11. Omego, C. (2011). *Linguistic semantics*. Accuracy Prints.
12. Palmer, E. R. (1988). *A linguistic study of English verbs*. Longman.
13. Putten, S. V. (2020). Perception verbs and the conceptualization of the senses: The case of Avatime. *Linguistics*, 58(2): pp. 1 - 38. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0039>.
14. Udoh, I., Anyanwu, N. & Osuagwu, E. (2019). *Fundamentals of linguistics*. Fruities' Publications.
15. Udoeyo, U. I. (2018). Aspect of the Syntax of Ékíḍ. M. A. Thesis. Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages: University of Uyo.
16. Udoeyo, U. I. & Inyang, K. S. (2018). Conditional Sentences in Ekíḍ. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria (JOLAN) Supplement*, Vol. III (pp. 126 – 138).
17. Udoyo, A. S. (2004). 'The phonology of Ekid'. M.A. Thesis, University of Calabar.
18. Udoyo A. & Wilson, D. (2006). *The orthography of the Ekid language*. Concept publications.
19. Urua, E., Udoyo, A., & Edet, U. (2005). A phonological sketch of Ekid. *USEM, Journal of Language, Linguistics and Literature* Vol. 1 (pp. 27 – 53).
20. Uwakala, M. A. (1988). *The Igbo verb: A semantico-syntactic analysis*. Afro-Pub.
21. Viberg, A. (1983). 'The verbs of perception: a typological study'. In B. Butterworth, B. Comrie and O. Dahi (Eds.) *Explanation for language universals* (pp. 123 – 162). Mouton de Gruyter.
22. Viberg, A. (2008). 'Swedish verbs of perception: from a typological and contrastive perspective'. In John Benjamins (Ed). *Languages and cultures in contrast and comparison* (pp. 123 -172). Amsterdam.
23. Williamson K. (1989). Benue-Congo Overview in Niger-Congo Languages. In J. Bendor-Samuel (Ed). p. 246 – 274. University of American Press.
24. Williamson, K. & Blench, R. (2000). Niger-Congo. In D. Nurse and B. Heine (Eds). *African Languages: An Introduction* (pp 11 – 12). Cambridge University Press.