The Simple Sentence Structures in Mandarin Chinese and Nigerian Pidgin English: A Comparative Analysis

Ebele Nwamaka Anajemba [1]
Maxwell C. Ebenyi [2]

Department of Linguistics[1]
Department of Chinese Studies[2]
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka[1][2]
en.anajemba@unizik.edu.ng[1]

Abstract

This study undertakes a comparative analysis of simple sentence structures in Mandarin Chinese (MC) and Nigerian Pidgin English (NPE). Its aim is to analyse the syntactic patterns of simple sentences of both languages by identifying areas of similarities, differences and their implications for users of both languages. Comparative analysis was adopted to describe and examine corpus drawn from grammar texts of both languages as well as through native speaker elicitation. Findings indicate marked structural similarities, most notable a shared Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order and an analytic grammatical nature with minimal inflectional dependencies. These are indicated as robust causes of positive transfer, potentially simplifying the use of both languages. The study also indicates significant syntactic divergences. One of the strongest contrasts is placement of Tense Aspect Markers (TAM): MC uses post-verbal particles le, guo, while NPE utilizes invariant pre-verbal markers don, dey. Negation strategies varied as MC adopts multiple markers based on situation whereas NPE

maintains invariant single pre-verbal no and different question formation strategies also contribute to structural contrasts. In conclusion, the differences identified are predicted as difficult areas and possible sources of negative transfer. The research provides practical recommendations for language users, with emphasis on focused interventions in areas of predicted difficulties.

Keywords: Mandarin Chinese, Nigerian Pidgin English, Simple Sentences, Similarities, Differences

1. Introduction

Mandarin Chinese (MC) with native speakers located mainly in mainland China, Taiwan, and Singapore, belongs to the Sinitic languages which traces its origin to Old Chinese just like other modern Chinese varieties. It has a rich history that extends more than three millennia back, evolving from Old Chinese (c. 1250 BCE) to Middle Chinese (Tang Dynasty), before consolidating into Modern Standard Mandarin during the Qing Dynasty. During the 12th and 13th centuries, the Han region of China was occupied majorly by the non-Han groups and this brought about the loss of the complex ending consonants found in the Middle Chinese. After the fall of the Qing dynasty in 1911, there was a need for a national language in China in order to unify the country. Beijing language was chosen as the phonetic foundation in 1913, but in 1955 after the founding of the People's Republic of China, the language was further standardized and promoted as Putonghua (Common Speech) in order to increase literacy and national cohesion. It was formally standardized in 1956 and adopted as China's only official medium of administration, education, and national media. Mandarin has dominance in northern and southwestern China but serves as a second language in all Chinese provinces. MC as an

international language is rapidly spreading globally through Confucius Institutes (Ramsey 1987, Norman 1988 & Chen, 1999). In the 15th Century, the Nigerian Pidgin English was introduced as a linguistic bridge during the Portuguese trade activities along the West African coast. However, the influence of the British dominated that of the Portuguese when many words from the English language became mapped onto the grammatical structures of local languages such as Edo, Efik and Yoruba. Faraclas (1996) notes NPE is a "creoloid" that developed from a nautical jargon used by sailors and traders and later stabilized as it moved inland. It continues today as Nigeria's de facto national lingua franca, spoken by over 120 million individuals along coastal cities like Lagos and Port Harcourt, along the Niger Delta, and increasingly up to northern city centers (Mafeni, 1971).

MC is an analytic language; its grammatical organization is a representative of the absence of inflected morphology, the word order is based on grammatical relationship, while its system of grammatical particles indicate tense, aspect, and modality. MC is regarded to be generally topic-prominent rather than being subject-prominent as most Indo-European languages are. Its words usually do not inflect to signal grammatical functions such as person, number, case, or tense, rather the fixed word order and independent function words perform such functions. MC is a tonal language with four basic tones and one neutral tone, which are phonemic and critical in the distinction of meaning. The overall syntax of Mandarin is highly dependent on constituent order. A key typological feature of MC is the topic-prominent nature which distinguishes it from many other languages. However, MC still adopts the SVO word order similar to many languages. The fixed SVO pattern for simple sentences is the foundation. However,

specific grammatical particles and verbs are used to manipulate this order for specific semantic and pragmatic effects. The position of these particles (e.g., post-verbal *le* 了 for perfective aspect) is crucial for their function.

NPE is paradigmatically analytic and has no inflectional morphology. It does not inflect verbs for tense, number, or person nor mark nouns for plurality or case. Grammatical relations are encoded by strict word order, invariant pre-verbal markers for Tense, Aspect, and Modality (TAM) and particles. This is a direct result of its creole nature because it derived from a reduced contact language to a full linguistic system. NPE has the complete range of sentence types necessary to facilitate sophisticated communication. The simple sentence in NPE is built around a single verb phrase and a subject (Faraclas, 1996). The overall syntax of NPE is largely SVO, but with pragmatic flexibility that allows for fronting of elements for emphasis. Its most defining syntactic feature is the use of invariant pre-verbal markers such as *don* (perfective), *dey* (progressive), and *go* (future) for TAM. These markers are crucial for interpreting the sentence's temporal and aspectual meaning.

In spite of the spread of MC and NPE in cross-linguistic communication, a detailed comparative investigation of their syntactic structure has not been undertaken. Various studies concentrate on Chinese and European Languages such as English, French, or German (Packard, 2000) while NPE is largely contrasted with Standard English mostly as deviance from British English (Deuber, 2005). This study however is set to fill this gap especially as many speakers of NPE are already in contact with Chinese nationals for different economic activities.

This study aims to conduct a systematic analysis of simple sentence structures of both languages by pointing out their similarities and differences, with particular attention to the precise positions of lexical elements within sentences. Findings from this research are expected to be highly beneficial to users of both languages, especially translators and interpreters. The consciousness will help users minimize negative transfer.

2.   Related Literature

Scholarly materials related to the study are reviewed especially those bordering on simple sentences, types and patterns as well as empirical reviews from previous works.

2.1   Simple Sentence

A simple sentence consists of one clause with a single subject and a single predicate. The predicate can be a verb, an adjective, or a noun phrase. Crystal (2017) defines a simple sentence as that which consists of a single independent clause, a subject and a predicate and expresses a complete thought without any subordinate clauses. He states that though a simple sentence has only one clause, it can be expanded with modifiers, objects or complements. It is the most basic unit of grammar serving as the foundation for all other sentence types. Scholars such as (Emenanjo 2015,Andersen 2014, Jian 2011) explain that the simple sentence is used when presenting a limited amount of information to declare a direct statement, display a simple list, give concise directions or ask a question expresses a single idea which can be divided into two major parts: the subject and the predicate. Simple sentences types in Chinese include the declarative, the interrogative, and the imperative (Teng 2017, Sun 2006, Yip and Rimmington (2006). The most common patterns are as follows:

2.2   Declarative Sentence

A declarative sentence is a type of sentence that states, describes or explains facts, opinions or assertions with an indicative tone. It is a sentence that declares or asserts something, typically ending with a full stop. Declarative sentences can be either affirmative or negative (李德津& 程美珍: 2008). MC declarative sentences are governed by the S → (NP) VP, in which an NP precedes a VP. This structure is foundational as it is highly consistent and forms the basis for more complex sentence patterns. This sentence type forms the foundation of syntactic analysis in MC because they occur more frequently than others. Elugbe (1991) notes that unlike English that demands complex auxiliary verbs, NPE's declaratives are lean and strictly a Subject + Predict structure.

2.3   Interrogative Sentences:

According to Sun (2006:172), interrogatives are generally characterized as a way to request information from listeners. In MC, there are four main types of interrogatives, plus a derived tag question type. These include; the Wh-word question, the disjunctive question, the A-not-A question, and the particle question.

2.4   Imperative Sentences:

An imperative sentence is used to express a command, order or request, or to give a warning, suggestion or advice. These commands may often be expressed with a bare verb; it can go without a subject and can be composed of one word or a phrase (Teng, 2017).

Empirical Studies

Anajemba and Okewole (2024), "A Morphosyntactic analysis of MC and Yoruba Languages," is a syntactic analysis that identifies similarities and differences in word order and grammatical marking of both languages. The methodology applied is descriptive where direct side-by-side comparison of certain lexical and syntactic properties were carried out. Findings show that Mandarin relies on fixed word order, while the tonality and rich inflectional morphology (in some grammatical relations) of Yoruba establish a different set of syntactic constraints.

Aremu, (2005) on the Expression of Tense and Aspect in Nigerian Pidgin English, gives an in-depth empirical account of the grammatical markers used in NPE to express Tense, Aspect, and Modality. The study potentially based on corpus evidence and native speaker elicitation, diligently documents the position and distribution of pre-verbal markers such as *don, dey,* and *go*. He argues that this is not an oversimplification of English but a rule-governed, systematic component of the creole grammar, likely the result of West African substrate languages' TAM systems. The work here is founded on key empirical data supplied by this research since it offers a specific, precise characterization of NPE's TAM system to compare directly with that of Mandarin Chinese.

Smith, (2019) compares SVO and SOV expression of possession in English and Japanese. It highlights the contrastive structural features such as genitives for English and postposition for Japanese which share underlying semantic concepts. The study demonstrates a strict approach towards contrastive analysis. It identifies common function and subsequently contrasts particular linguistic mechanisms employed to express such.

Anajemba (2016), "Contrastive analysis of Chinese and Igbo interrogative sentences," analyzes the interrogative sentence patterns in Mandarin Chinese and Igbo language. Data were elicited from existing texts and consultants for both the Languages. Adopting the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), similarities and differences between the interrogative structures were noted. The disparities however signal obstacles which can be encountered by Igbo L1 Chinese as an L2 learner. Findings show that the two languages have the distinct strategies of expressing interrogations. These differences consist of the position of the interrogatives, the negative markers in the VP of the two languages. Predictions were based on the possible challenges that an Igbo L1 learner of Chinese would encounter. It concludes that having prior knowledge of these differences would help the Igbo L1 Chinese researchers as well as the Chinese teachers to be properly guided towards assisting in teaching and learning the Chinese language.

Despite this body of literature, there remains a huge research gap. Whereas there has been comparative research on Mandarin and other languages (e.g., English, Yoruba), no comprehensive analysis has hitherto been done on the simple sentence patterns of Mandarin Chinese and Nigerian Pidgin English. The current study aims to fill that gap.

2.5 Simple Sentence Patterns in Mandarin and NPE

	MC	NPE
1.	我笑。 Wǒxiào. 1SG laugh. 'I am laughing'	I　　dey　　laugh. 1SG AUX.PROG laugh 'I am laughing'
2.	他们　跑了。 Tāmenpǎo le.	Dem don run 3PL　PAST run

	3PL run PFV. "they ran."	'they ran'
3.	这两车走了。 Zhèliángchēzǒu le. DET CL car go PFV 'This car has gone'	Di car don go. The car AUX.PERF go. The car has gone."

Source: (cf: Sun: 2006, Yip &Rimmington: 2006, Ross & Ma 2006, Elugbe&Omamor 1991, Aziza 2015)

i) Subject-Verb-Object (SVO)
SVO is the default word order with transitive verbs and constitutes the most common declarative sentence pattern in MC and NPE

	Mandarin	**NPE**
4.	我 吃 饭。 Wǒchī fan. 1SG eat food. 'I am eating food.'	Di mẹndẹm de wọk DET men PROG be work "The men are working"
5.	他看了电影。 Tākànle diànyǐng. 3SG watch PERF movie. 'He watched a movie.'	I don buy di book. 3SG AUX.PERF buy DET food. 'He has bought the book.'
6.	他们要买新的 Tāmenyàomáixīn de 3PL need buy new POSS 'They will buy a new one'	Dem go buy anoda one. 3PL AUX.FUT buy another one. 'They will buy another one.'

Source: (cf: Sun: 2006, Elugbe&Omamor 1991, Aziza 2015)

ii)   Subject-Adjective:

In Mandarin, an adjective can also function as a predicate in its own right without an independent copula verb like 'to be'. It is usually followed by a degree adverb like hěn 很 (very) or bù 不 (not). An adjective in NPE can function as a predicate, often preceded by an intensifier for emphasis.

	Mandarin	**NPE**
7.	这　个　房子　很大 Zhègefángzihěndà. This CL house very big. "This house is very big."	Di motodey big. The car AUX.PROG big. "The car is big."
8.	你　不　好。 Nǐbùhǎo. 2SG not good "You are not well."	Di boy no fine DET boy NEG beauty "That boy is not handsome."

Source: (cf: Sun: 2006, Yip &Rimmington: 2006, Ross & Ma 2006)

iii)   Existential Sentences

They are used to indicate the existence or location of something. In MC, the verb有- *yǒu* (to have/exist) is commonly used for such functions. NPE uses markers like *de* or *dey* to express existence or location, similar in function to the English *'there is/are'*.

	Mandarin	**NPE**
9.	桌子　上　有　一个杯子。 Zhuōzishàngyǒuyígebēizi. Table　LOC exist　a　CL cup. 'There is a cup on the table'	Eget two dog weydey inside house. 3SG get two dog that　be inside house. 'There are two dogs in the house'
10.	房子里有两只狗。 Fángzilǐyǒuliángzhīgǒu House LOC have two CL dog 'There are two dogs in the house.'	Eget two dog weydey inside house. 3SG get two dog that　be inside house. 'There are two dogs in the house'

Source: (cf: Sun: 2006, Aziza 2015)

iv)　Topic-Prominent Structures

In topic-prominent sentences, the topic is an ordinary constituent that identifies the setting. It occurs at the beginning of the sentence, followed by the comment.

	Mandarin	**NPE**
11.	那　本书我看　过。 Nàběnshūwǒkànguo. That CL book 1SG read EXP. "As for that book, I have read it."	Na who give yu di money? FOC INT give 2SG DET money 'Who give you that money?'
12.	今天　的　作业他做 完了。 Jīntiān de　　zuòyètāzuòwán le. Today POSS　homework 3SG do finish PERF. 'As for today's homework, he finished it.'	Na today　A　go come FOC　today　1SG come 'I will come today'

Source: (cf: Sun: 2006, Yip &Rimmington: 2006, Ross & Ma 2006, Elugbe&Omamor 1991, Aziza 2015)

v)   Emphatic and Reduplicative Structures

MC and NPE frequently uses reduplication of words, particularly adjectives and adverbs, for emphasis or intensification, a common feature in many languages (Sun 2006, Elugbe&Omamor 1991).

	MC	NPE
13.	给我看看。 Gĕiwŏkànkan Give 1SG look look 'Let me see'	I vex well-well. 3SG angry very-very. 'He was very angry'
14.	你慢慢说 Ni man manshuo. 2SG slow slow talk ' Talk slowly.'	A wan make yu talk am now-now! 1SG want 2SG talk DET now now 'Say it now'

Source: (cf: Sun: 2006, Elugbe&Omamor 1991, Aziza 2015)

2.6   Theoretical Framework

The analysis is descriptive, where both languages' similarities and differences are identified, categorized, and explained. The findings are used to discuss the potential for positive and negative transfer, which is the core of conclusions of this study. Comparative Analysis is the systematic approach adopted for this study. The core assumption of CA is to determine where there is correspondence and contrast between two language systems and analysing the results of the comparison as it affects language users which of-course is the objective of this study. Although originally applied for predicting learning difficulties in second language acquisition, principles of systematic contrast are still a valuable

tool for unveiling typological results and directing the investigation of translation and interpretation.

## 3.	Methodology

By using comparative design, this study meticulously defines, classifies, and clarifies the corresponding similarities and differences between the two language systems. The primary data collection tool used is grammar texts from both languages. This is appropriate for theoretical comparative analysis where focus is placed on written grammatical rules and structures. The data provide authentic and standardized examples of basic sentence composition, TAM markers, and other significant syntactic forms.

## 4.	Data Presentation and Analysis

The syntactic patterns of both languages are compared by focusing on word order, grammatical particles, and TAM markers. It therefore highlights the similarity and differences in their simple sentence patterns before concluding with the implications for users of both languages.

### 4.1	Declarative sentences

Facts are attested by the evidence that the fixed word order of MC is dominantly Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order. MC lacks the inflectional morphology for marking grammatical functions. Therefore, change of word order can thus lead to an extreme change in meaning or grammatical function of the sentence. Tense and aspect are strongly associated with this SVO word order, conveyed through post-verbal or sentence-final particles and adverbs. While NPE's SVO structure is distinct in how it handles tense and aspect. Instead of post-verbal particles, NPE uses invariant pre-verbal markers, as shown below:

	MC	NPE
15.	我吃饭。 Wǒchīfàn 1 SG eat meal 'I eat a meal'	Dem dey play ball 3 PL AUX.PROG play ball 'They are playing football'
16.	他吃了苹果。 Tāchī le pínguǒ 3SG eat PERF apple 'She ate the apple'	I don chop apple 3SG AUX.PERF eat apple 'S/he has eaten apple'
17.	我们会看电影。 Wǒmenhuìkàndiànyǐng 1PL able watch television 'We will watch television'	She go go market 3SG AUX.FUT go market 'She will go to the market'
18.	我们在读书。 Wǒmenzàidúshū 1PL PROG read book 'we are reading a book'	Di boy dey read book DET boy PROG read book 'The boy is reading'

The data above confirm that both MC and NPE show a dominant SVO word order. Grammatical roles are defined by this fixed order, as MC lacks inflectional morphology. The sentences illustrate how tense and aspect are conveyed through particles and adverbs. The post-verbal particle *le* 了 in (16) marks the perfective aspect, indicating a completed action, modal particle 会 hùi in (17) expresses future. The pre-verbal adverb *zài* 在 in (18) marks the progressive aspect, indicating an ongoing action. These particles are essential to MC's analytic grammar and their placement is a key feature of its syntactic structure.

However, the NPE data has a different system for expressing tense and aspect which is different from MC's. NPE uses invariant pre-

verbal markers such as *dey* for the progressive aspect in (15 &18), *don* for the perfective aspect (16), and *go* for the future tense (17). These auxiliaries are a defining characteristic of NPE and stand in direct contrast to the post-verbal placement of aspect particles in MC.

4.2   Interrogatives

We examine different strategies both languages undertake to form questions, with a close look at word order and the use of some question-forming words and particles. MC and NPE employs different strategies to create questions, as uncovered by the data below:

i.   Polar Questions/Question Tag

	MC	NPE
19.	你去吗？ Nǐqù ma? 2SG go INT 'Are you going?'	Yu dey go? 2SG PROG go 'Are you going?'
20.	我们走吧？ Wǒmenzǒuba? 1PL leave INT 'should we leave?'	Shebi youdey go? INT 2SG AUX.PROG go? 'You going, right?'
21.	他吃了，你呢？ Tāchī le, nǐ ne? He eat PFV 2SG INT 'he has eaten, and you?'	You dey go, abi? 2SG AUX.PROG go INT? 'you are going, aren't you?'
22.	你今天会来吗？ Nǐjīntiānhùilái ma? 2SG today able come INT 'Are you coming today?'	Abi, yudey come today? INT 2SG be come today 'Are you coming today?'

The data in (19-22) show that MC uses the particle *ma* 吗 , *ba*吧, *ne*呢 when added to the end of a declarative sentence to convert it into a yes/no question whereas NPE uses the tag words *Shebi/Abi*often used at the sentence initial and final positions, usually used when a speaker seeks for confirmatory or an agreement response.

ii.   not-A /Intonation Questions

	MC	NPE
23.	他去不去？ Ta qùbúqù? 2SG go NEG go 'is he going?'	Yu dey go? 2SG AUX.PROG go 'Are you going?'
24.	他不会说汉语？ Tāpiaoliangbúpiaoliang? 2SG beauty NEG beauty speak 'Is she beautiful?'	I fine? 3SG beauty 'Is she beautiful?'

In (23-24), a verb-not-verb construction in MC functions as a yes/no question without an additional particle, whereas NPE engages in the change of pitch to ask such questions that demand a yes/no answer.

iii.   Wh-Questions

	Mandarin	NPE
25.	你说什么? Nǐshuōshénme? 2SG speak what "What did you say?"	Wetin you dey do? What 2SG AUX.PROG do? 'What are you doing?'

26.	你是谁？ Nǐshìshéi? 2SG be INT 'Who is that?'	Hu be dat? INT be DET 'Who is that'?
27.	他在哪儿？ Tāzàinaer? 3SG LOC INT Where is he?	Wieayu de? INT 2SG be 'Where are you?'
28.	这个字怎么写？ Zhègezìzěnmexiě? DET CL word INT write 'How do you write this character'	How yugógò? INT 2SG go go 'How are you going?'
29.	你在哪里工作？ Nǐzàinálìgōngzuò? 2SG LOC INT work Where do you work?	Wichpleswi de go? Int Place 1PL PROG 'Where are we going?'
30.	你为什么学中文 NǐwèishénmexuéZhōngwén? Why do you study Chinese?	Wetinmekdẹmchọp di fud? INT make 3PL eat DET food 'Why did they eat the food?'
31.	谁说你呢？ Shéishuónǐ ne? INT speak 2SG PART 'Who is talking about you?	Hu travu? INT travel 'Who travelled?'

From the data (25-31), both languages use different Wh-question words for interrogative purposes which are considered a similarity; however their syntactic positions differ as shown above. For the MC data, the Wh-words can occur in any position (initial, medial and final), however that of NPE is restricted to mostly the sentence initial position.

4.3   Imperative Sentences

How each language forms commands and prohibitions is shown below:

	MC	NPE
32.	吃饭！ Chīfàn! eat meal! 'Eat!'	Lef am! Leave 3SG.OBJ! 'Leave it!'
33.	请坐！ Qǐngzuò! Please sit! 'Please sit!'	Comot! Leave! 'Get out!'
34.	别吃！ Biéchī! NEG.IMP eat! 'Don't eat'	No vex! NEG get-angry! 'Don't be angry!"
35.	不要说话！ Bùyàoshuōhuà! NEG.IMP speak-word! 'Don't talk!'	No talk! NEG do 3SG.OBJ! 'Don't speak!'
36.	吃吧！ Chība Eat IMP 'You can eat'	Make you carry IMP 2SG carry 'Carry!'
37.	说吧！ Shuōba Speak IMP 'You can speak'	Make you chop IMP 2SG eat 'You can eat!'

The imperatives as in (32-37) show that subjects are omitted in both languages, and in the negation of such commands specific markers are adopted in (34-35) – 别*bié* /不要*bùyào* for MC and *no*

for NPE uses. The particle 吧*ba* when used after command turns the sentence into suggestive instead of an outright command. In NPE when the command is indirect, there is an insertion of *make* before Subject hence the data in (36-37).

5　　Findings

The study shows some similarities in the simple sentence patterns of both languages which is considered as positiveaspect however, there are some differences which also would be challenging to users of the languages. The table below summarizes the findings of the study.

		MC	NPE
Similarities	Word Order	Canonical SVO	Canonical SVO
	Analytic Nature	inflectionally non-morphological	inflectionally non-morphological
Differences	TAM Marker	Post-verbal placement	Pre-verbal placement
	Reliance on Context for Ellipsis	Omits the subject or object when their referents are clear	Does not omit subjects of sentences
	Negation Strategies	Negation system is polysemous, with different markers 不 bù没méi, 别bié employed for different contexts.	Negation system is simple and uniform, with one unvarying pre-verbal marker *no* for all contexts

	Question formation	*A-not-A* pattern and the *ma* particle usage, Wh-question marker can occur in any position	Use of intonation in yes/no questions, questions tags *shebi/abi*, Wh-question markers at sentence initial position

Users of both languages can leverage on the principle of shared SVO order and analytic nature for positive transfer while the parametric variations as shown in the Table above such as contrasting TAM and negation strategies compose potential structural conflict areas anticipated from users of both languages which could result in negative transfer. An MC speaker engaging in the use of NPE may consistently produce such errors as *I chop don* instead of *I don chop*, transferring their L1's post-verbal marker placement verbatim and vice versa.

Based on the above findings, the study therefore recommends that users of both languages, especially translators and interpreters must look beyond literal (word-for-word) translation, and concentrate on contextual translation. For instance, the placement of a marker can change the entire meaning or nuance of a sentence as evidenced in the use of the perfective aspect marker 了 *le* in MC which marks a completed action, and as such must be correctly conveyed in the NPE situation.

6. Conclusion

Through the application of comparative analysis, MC and NPE simple sentence structures have been discussed. The outcome gives a detailed complex relation of both striking structural similarities and fundamental differences. Despite the shared SVO word order

and analyticity being a solid foundation for language usage, the contrasting rules for TAM marker placement, negation, and question formation pose predictable challenges. This research is a valuable resource for translators, interpreters, language instructors, and curriculum developers. Based on the findings, the study therefore recommends that users of both languages, especially translators and interpreters must look beyond literal translation, and concentrate on the contextual translation. For instances, it is vital to remember that the placement of a marker can change the entire meaning or nuance of a sentence as evidenced in the use of the perfective aspect marker *le* in MC which marks a completed action, and as such must be correctly conveyed in the NPE situation.

7.　　Suggestions for Further Studies

This study is considered an attempt into the comparative analysis of both language structures as we only examined the simple sentences. It therefore calls for more specific and in-depth investigations into the complex sentence structures, for detailed analysis. We also encourage corpus-based study so that there would be quantitative evidence for the syntactic structures of both languages as this would provide a stronger empirical foundation for findings.

References

Anajemba, E. N. 2016. Contrastive analysis of Chinese and Igbo interrogative sentences.*European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature* 3(2).32–43.

Anajemba, E. N. & F. Okewole. 2024. A structural analysis of Mandarin Chinese and Yoruba simple sentences. *Awka Journal of Linguistics and Languages* 16.170–190.

Andersen, S. 2014. Sentence types and functions. Online:
https://www.sjsu.edu/writingcentre..

Aremu, L. 2005. The expression of tense and aspect in Nigerian
Pidgin English.*Journal of West African Languages*
32(1).123–145.

Aziza, R. O. 2015. Aspects of the syntax of Modern Nigerian
Pidgin.In Ruth Kramer et al. (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of
the 44th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 11–16.
Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Online:
www.lingref.com, document #3122.

Chen, P. 1999. *Modern Chinese: History and sociolinguistics*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deuber, D. 2005. *Nigerian Pidgin in Lagos: Language contact,
variation and change in an African urban setting*. London:
Battlebridge.

Elugbe, B. O. & A. P. Omamor. 1991. *Nigerian Pidgin:
Background and prospects*. Ibadan: Heinemann
Educational Books Nigeria PLC.

Elugbe, B. O. 1995. Nigerian Pidgin: Problems and prospects. In
A. Bamgbose et al. (eds.), *New Englishes: A West African
Perspective*. Ibadan: Monsure Publishers.

Emenanjọ, N. E. 2015. *A grammar of contemporary Igbo*. Port
Harcourt: M & J Grand Orbits.

Faraclas, N. G. 1996. *Nigerian Pidgin*. London: Routledge.

Jian, K. L. 2011. *Chinese syntactic grammar: Functional and
conceptual principles*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing,
Inc.

李德津&程美珍. 2008. *A practical Chinese grammar for
foreigners: Revised edition*. Beijing: Beijing Language and
Culture University Press.

Mafeni, B. 1971.Nigerian Pidgin. In J. Spencer (ed.), *The English Language in West Africa*, 55–112. London: Longman.

Norman, J. 1988. *Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Packard, J. L. 2000. *The morphology of Chinese: A linguistic and cognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ramsey, S. R. 1987. *The languages of China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ross, C. & J. Ma. 2006. *Modern Mandarin Chinese grammar: A practical guide*. London: Routledge.

Smith, M. S. 2019. *Introducing language and cognition: A map of the mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sun, C. 2006. *Chinese: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teng, W. H. 2017. *Yufa! A practical guide to Mandarin Chinese grammar*.2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Yip, P. C. & D. Rimmington. 2006. *Chinese: An essential grammar*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.