

Facts Count: An Empiricist Looks at Indirect Objects in Hausa
Author(s): Paul Newman
Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on African Language Structures (1991), pp. 155-165

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Facts Count: An Empiricist Looks at Indirect Objects in Hausa

Paul Newman
Indiana University

There are a variety of different data-intensive approaches that characterize the work of empiricist Africanist linguists. One involves looking at data from large numbers of different languages, sometimes for the purpose of genetic classification or historical reconstruction, sometimes for typological study. The second involves delving into some particular language in depth, usually over long periods of time, and usually with considerable amounts of time spent working in Africa itself. If we can take Bernd Heine's paper presented at this meeting as exemplifying the former approach, I would like here to illustrate the second approach. My purpose is to show how complex and interesting problems can get when one goes beyond generally known surface facts and truly digs into the details of a language.

The specific problem that I shall be discussing is that of Indirect Objects in Hausa. Simple sentences with IOs are shown in 1. (For the range of meanings indicated by IOs in Hausa, see Newman 1982).

(1) Standard IO construction. (Tone marking: Lo is à ; Falling is â ; Hi is unmarked.)

- a. Audù yaa faɗàa wè Leadi làabeaɗi. Audu told Ladi the news.
b. Audù yaa faɗàa maɗà làabeaɗi. Audu told her the news.

As is well known, the IO marker, which I shall be representing by WA, has two different forms depending on whether its complement is a personal pronoun or not, namely,

(2) WA = ma- when attached to a personal IO pronoun, wè or ma, depending on dialect, elsewhere.

1. The particular analytical question that has interested Hausaists for some time has had to do with the status of the IO markers in relation to the preceding verb. Some twenty years ago, Parsons (1971/72) proposed that WA should be thought of as being part of the verb: "Indeed, though it [WA] is always written disjunctively (from the verb), there is a case for regarding it as some sort of verbal suffix or extension . . ." (p. 64). Gouffé (1981:49) adopted this same position but in even stronger terms: "[I] est essentiel de rappeler que la marque /wə/ se comporte comme un morphème enclitique du verbe; plus précisément, elle fonctionne comme un véritable suffixe de ce verbe." The view that WA belongs to the verb has been taken up recently in a number of theoretically oriented works by Halpern (1989), Abdoulaye (1990), Bature (1990), Munkaila (1990), and most especially by Tuller (1984, 1990), for whom this view is central to a number of other analytical questions. The authors differ on the narrow issue of whether WA should be treated as an affix or a clitic, but they all seem to agree that WA "is not a preposition-like particle, but rather an element . . . which [in some way or other] is bound to the verb" (Abdoulaye 1990:15). The enclitic nature of WA is generally argued for on the basis of evidence such as the following: (a) One cannot insert a modal particle between the verb and WA; (b) one cannot move a WA+NP phrase away from its normal syntactic position immediately after the verb; (c) one *can* leave WA

stranded, which is not normally possible with true “prepositions”; and (d) WA is prosodically unstressed, no pause being allowed between WA and the preceding verb.

We thus have an analysis which appears to be empirically well supported and which has been endorsed by Parsons and Gouffé, the two leading Hausaists of our time, plus a number of younger, theoretically sophisticated linguists, including three who are native Hausa speakers. One would think that the matter should be settled. But when one retains one’s scientific skepticism and probes deeper, one discovers that the matter is not so simple.

2. Let us take up some of the factors commonly cited as proof that WA is an intrinsic part of the verb. First there is the matter of the “modal particles”, small words indicating ‘indeed, really, moreover, etc.’ which are often taken as tests of constituency because of their general freedom of placement.

(3) Emphatic “modal particles” (e.g. *dai*, *fa* = *hwa*, *kòo* = *kùwa*, *maa*, *kuma*)

a. *bèi fafàa *maa wà mātatařà ba* He didn’t even tell his wife.

b. *bèi fafàa *maa matà ba* He didn’t tell even her.

From the few examples such as those in 3a and 3b, cited by Tuller (1984), unqualified general statements have been made that one cannot insert a modal particles between the verb and WA. But is this really true?

2.1. The first question is; not allowed by whom? Whereas it may be true of some speakers, it is not true of all. One native Hausa speaker from Kano [MK] with whom I worked recently did reject all attempts to insert a modal particle; but another Kano speaker [MA] accepted them as fine.

(4) [MA] a. *sun rufèe fa wà maalàm koofàa* They closed the door for the teacher.

b. *zân sayar fa miki (dà) zanèe* I shall sell you a wrapper.

A Hausa speaker from Niamey easily produced sentences with a modal particle between the verb and WA, and felt that these were quite normal.

(5) [OA] a. *Abdù yaa aikàa hwa mà Laedi wəsiikàa* Abdu sent a letter to Ladi.

b. *Abdù yaa aikàa hwa matà wəsiikàa* Abdu sent her a letter.

c. *naa yi hwa mà Abdù maganàa* I spoke to Abdu. (lit. ‘did to A. speaking’)

d. *naa sayoo hwa miki riigàh hwa* I bought the gown for you.

e. *mun tàmбайi hwa matà kudii* We requested money for her.

f. *naa nèemi hwa mà uwàyeenaa àlھےrii* I sought good things for my parents.

Interesting in this connection is an older example from Abraham (1959:174), which I stumbled on by accident.

(6) *gàrin nànsħii nèe ya hau maa wà* It is this very town which he attacked.

In short, while modal particles between the verb and the IO may not be common, they are not impossible as has been claimed.

2.2. The next question is: which particle? Although it is true that most modal particles cannot be inserted between a verb and WA, it doesn't follow that none can. To generalize from the supposedly ungrammatical examples in 3 to all modal particles is not valid. The evidence shows clearly that the particles are not all of the same status and that *fa* (= *hwa*) is more readily accepted than any of the other particles. Speaker [LD], for example, only accepted *fa*.

(7) [LD] *naa gayàa fa makà* I told you. But not *naa gayàa *dei makà*

Similarly speaker [MA], also from Kano, tended to reject modal particles other than *fa*, although in a few instances he did allow *dei*.

(8) [MA] a. *naa sayar fa wà Audùrìigaa* I sold Audu a gown.

But not *naa sayar *naa wà Audùrìigaa*.

b. *sun yi fa minì aikìi*; *sun yi dei minì aikìi* They did work for me.

[OA], who, as I mentioned earlier, generally felt quite comfortable with modal particles between the verb and WA, had reservations when particles other than *hwa* were used, e.g.

(9) [OA] *yaa kooyar hwa musù dà yàarân* He taught the children for them.

But not *yaa kooyar *koo musù dà yàarân*.

It should be pointed out that *fa* (or *hwa*), the particle most readily accepted, is the only modal particle consisting of a single light syllable. All the others contain two moras. This suggests strongly that the restriction on modal particle placement may depend more on prosodic than on grammatical factors, an interpretation already suggested by Inkelas (1988). As we shall see, other evidence also supports this view.

2.3. The next question is: which verb form? As far as I am aware, none of the authors who have claimed that WA belongs to the verb have explicitly looked at different kinds of verb forms. This, however, turns out to be an important variable, as seen, for example, in the behavior of verbs in different "grades". (These are lexico-derivational classes marked by distinct tone patterns and verb endings, see Parsons 1960; Newman 1987). Speaker [MA], for example, tended to reject a modal particle between WA and a gr. 1 verb, see 10a-b, but generally accepted these in the case of other grades, see 10c-f.

(10) [MA] a. *taa gasàa *fa wà mî jìntà naamàa* (gr. 1) She roasted meat for her husband.

b. *naa karântaa *fa musù wásiikàa* (gr. 1) I read them the letter.

c. *yaa neemoo fa masà mèi aikìi* (gr. 6) He sought a worker for him.

d. *kà rufèe fa wà maalàm koofàa* (gr. 4) Close the door for the teacher.

e. *yaa shaa fa minì kâi* (gr. 0) It bothered me. (lit. 'drank *fa* to-me head')

f. *yaa fitar fa wà yaaròo kayàa* (gr. 5) He took out the thorn for the boy.

Speaker [MA] seemed most comfortable using modal particles with the monosyllabic verbs (gr. 0) and particularly with the gr. 5 “efferential” verbs. The judgments were not, however, totally consistent simply on the basis of grade; thus, for reasons that I cannot explain, [MA] easily accepted sentence 11a but felt that 11b was marginally possible at best, although the verb in both cases was gr. 6.

- (11) a. *yaa zaabuŕoo fa masà* (gr. 6) It jumped up at him.
 b. *?*yaa tataroo fa masà itáacee* (gr. 6) He collected firewood for him.

Independent evidence for the special status of gr. 5 comes from speaker [LD], who allowed *fa* between the verb and WA both with gr. 1 and gr. 5 verbs. When a different modal particle, *dai*, was tried, it was totally rejected with the gr. 1 verb, but treated as questionable but possible with the gr. 5 verb.

- (12) [LD] a. **naa gayàa dai makà* (gr. 1) I told you.
 b. *?naa gayar dai makà dà Audù* (gr. 5) I greeted Audu for you.

The examples in 13 illustrate another matter.

- (13) [OA] a. *muntambayan (*hwa) matà kufii* (HiHi D-form) We asked for money for her.
 b. *naa neeman (*hwa) mà uwàyeena àlbeeĩi* (HiHi D-form) I sought good things for my parents.
 c. *kùhutám míni (dàc cikin) ðaakii*, but not **kù hutah hwa míni (dàc cikin) ðaakii* (HiHi D-form) Get out of my room!
 d. *kù hutám míni dà kaayán* or *kù hutah hwa míni dà kaayán* (gr. 5) Take out the goods for me!
 e. *yaa kooyah hwa mà Abdù yàar àn* (gr. 5) He taught the children for Abdu.

Speaker [OA] from Niamey freely accepted the use of the modal particle *hwa* between a verb and WA, but even she wouldn't allow it with one particular verb type, namely the distinct pre-dative “D-form” that replaces grade 2, 3, and 7 verbs before IOs. This form, which is characterized by HiHi tone and an ending *-am* or *-aĩ* (which normally forms a geminate with the immediately following consonant), is phonologically (almost) identical to gr. 5 verbs. However, as seen in 13a-c, this D-form cannot be separated from the IO by *hwa*; to do this, one has to use a non-extended gr. 2 form (see examples cited earlier in 5). Insertion of a modal particle between a gr. 5 verb and the IO, on the other hand, is fully allowed, see 13d-e. The reason this is important is that Parsons (1971/72), and others following him (e.g. Frajzyngier 1985), have argued that the special HiHi D-forms were nothing other than gr. 5 verbs used in a special context. The difference in modal particle use seen clearly in examples 13c and 13d adds further evidence in favor of my view (Newman 1977, 1983; supported by Munkaila 1990) that these D-forms are synchronically and etymologically totally distinct from the gr. 5 verbs.

2.4. The next question is: what kind of IO? Up to this point, we have been using the cover symbol WA, as if it didn't matter whether the surface IO were *wà* (or *mà*) plus a noun or *ma-* plus a pronoun. This is in line with all the previous studies on

the status of WA, where the distinction between the two kinds of IOs has been totally ignored. In actual practice, most of the examples cited have been of *wà* plus a noun, but the assumption has been that all of the arguments presented in favor of WA being attached to the verb would hold in the case of pronoun IOs as well. Again we find that a critical variable has been neglected. Speaker [LD], for example, only allowed modal particle insertion if the IO was pronominal:

- (14) [LD] a. *naa gayàa fà makà* I told you. But not **naa gayàa fà wà* Audù
I told Audù.
b. *kà zubar̃ fà mi m̀ dà mâi* Pour out the oil for me. But not **kà zubar̃ fà wà*
Audù dà mâi Pour out the oil for Audù.

This restriction held partially in the case of [MA]. Thus in 15a with the gr. 6 verb, use of the modal particle was limited to the sentence with a pronoun IO, whereas in 15b with the gr. 5 verb, both types of IOs were allowed.

- (15) [MA] a. *yaa neemoo fà masà mâi aikii* He sought a worker for him.
But not **yaa neemoo fà wà bàtũũr̃eè mâi aikii* He sought a worker for the
European.
b. *yaa fitar̃ fà masà/wà yaarò kayàa* He took out the thorn for him / for the
boy.

I should mention here that from a historical perspective, one would expect the noun and the pronoun IOs to behave differently. The simple synchronic statement presented earlier and commonly repeated in pedagogical grammars and elsewhere that WA has the two allomorphs *wà* and *ma-*, implying that they are phonological variants of one another, ignores the fact that historically they are unrelated morphemes with distinct historical origins: the marker *wà* most likely derives from a preposition-like particle, perhaps **gà*, whereas *ma-* originally was a formative used in independent possessive pronouns (Newman 1982).

2.5. The examples in 16 point up something else of interest.

- (16) [MA] a. *sun sayoo fà miǹ riigaa* They bought me a gown.
But not **sun sayoo fà mĩn riigaa*
b. *yaa aukar̃ fà miǹ* It happened to me. But not **yaa aukar̃ fà mĩn*
c. *sun saacèè fà makà kuĩn* They stole the money from you.
But not **sun saacèè fà mĩa kuĩn*

In Hausa a number of the indirect object pronouns, all of which underlyingly are CVCV, have reduced monosyllabic variants. When the reduced forms are used, the modal particle is not allowed. For example, in 16a the modal particle was accepted with the full form *miǹ* but not with the short form *mĩn*. This again illustrates the prosodic character of the restrictions on modal particle use.

2.6. At this point, I need to be explicit about the nature of the native speaker judgments that I have drawn on, a factor that doesn't show up in written examples where particular sentences are simply marked either as grammatical or ungrammatical. In the first place, in studying modal particle use, there was much

greater indecision by individuals and more inconsistencies from speaker to speaker than is normally the case. Second, when modal particles were at issue, Hausa speakers often could not make a firm judgment just by looking at a sentence, something that is normally possible with other morphological and syntactic constructions. Rather, they had to repeat the sentences to themselves, whereupon they could decide not so much whether the particular sentences were right or wrong, but whether they *sounded* natural or not.

3. Let's turn now to the position of the IO. As all Hausaists know, this is totally fixed, the IO occurring immediately after the verb before the DO, as seen in all of the examples presented so far. Whereas it may be true that IO word order is indeed fixed in Standard Hausa, this is not the case for all dialects. In the Bauchi dialect (information from Gital 1987 and Zaria 1982) noun IOs behave differently from pronoun IOs—a common Chadic characteristic (Newman 1982) - and occur separated from the verb after the DO, a syntactic order that would be impossible if WA were truly a part of the verb.

(17) Position of noun IO *after* the DO (Bauchi dialect)

- a. Mūsaa yaa wankè riigaa wà Sule Musa washed the gown for Sule.
- b. Mūsaa yaa wankèe masà riigaa Musa washed the gown for him.
- c. taa gasàa naamaa wà mi jìntà She roasted the meat for her husband.
- d. taa gasàa masà naamaa She roasted the meat for him.

The position of the noun IO seems to be due to an extraposition rule. Note in 18 that if the complement of wà is not in place, i.e. if wà is stranded, then it must stay next to its verb host and cannot be moved.

- (18) a. mi jìntà nee ta gasàa wà naamaa It was her husband she roasted the meat for. Not *mi jìntà nee ta gasà naamaa wà
- b. yaaròn dà sukà naamaa wà hòotoo The boy that they showed the photo to. Not *yaaròn dà sukà naamaa wà hòotoo wà

Looking at other non-standard dialects turns up other examples of displaced IOs that are not possible in SH. As shown in 19, the normal means of IO focus is by fronting not the phrase as such but rather the noun or pronoun IO, the marker wà being left behind.

(19) Focus fronting (Standard Hausa)

- a. Laadi akà wankoo wà riigãr It is Ladi they washed the gown for.
Not *wà Laadi akà wankoo riigãr
- b. ita akà wankoo wà riigãr It is her they washed the gown for.
Not *matà akà wankoo riigãr

Much to my surprise, [OA], and other Hausa speakers from Niger, permitted the sentences in 20 in which mà + NP is fronted just like a prepositional phrase. The redundant WA after the verb (= mà or màa) was considered optional but preferred.

(20) Focus fronting ([OA] Niamey dialect)

- a. mà Laedi ankà wankoo (mà) rligāf It is Ladi they washed the gown for.
 b. mà ita ankà wankoo (mà) rligāf It is her they washed the gown for.
 c. mà Musa ta dahwàa mà/mâa àbinci It is Musa she cooked the food for.
 d. mà ni ta dahwàa mà/mâa àbinci It's me she cooked the food for.

It's hard to know at this point exactly what significance to place on these unusual findings from Bauchi and Niamey, areas located on the southeast and northwest fringes of Hausaland; but one can't simply discount dialectal evidence just because it is inconvenient for one's analytical viewpoint. It is worthwhile remembering here Parsons' own comments regarding his study of the Hausa verbal system (Parsons 1971/72:207): "I am, however, aware of the limitations of my treatment of the Hausa verb, viz. that it is a treatment of the verb as used only in the standard form of Hausa as spoken and written in Nigeria . . ." He then urges dialect studies which should "shed much light on the history of the Hausa language and lead to a more comprehensive and diachronic statement of its verbal system than the present synchronic and geographically limited one" (p. 208).

4. One of the major reasons given for rejecting the idea of WA as an autonomous preposition-like word, especially in the case of earlier scholars such as Parsons and Gouffé, was that phonologically it was attached to the preceding verb, i.e. the extended verb made up of the stem + WA prosodically constituted a single word. In Newman (1982) I raised some questions about the tonal behavior of WA if thought of as a verb attachment, and more recently Bature (1990:18-19) has shown clearly that verb+WA does not constitute a phonological word for purposes of imperative tone assignment.

Here I would like to present some new, previously unreported information about the dialect of Maradi which further shows that WA prosodically constitutes a separate word and is not an integral part of the verb. It is worth mentioning here that unlike Bauchi and Niamey, which could be considered marginal, untypical dialects, Maradi constitutes a part of traditional, core Hausaland.

The Maradi rule that relates to the status of WA is an optional, but apparently preferred, tone rule that simplifies falling tones to Lo when immediately preceded by a Hi.

(21) Maradi contour tone simplification: F (= HÛL) → L/H_____.

The operation of this very natural rule is illustrated in 22.

- (22) [MLA] a. yaa cikà sòo He filled the bucket. kàawoo sòo Bring the bucket!
 b. gishirii dè mâi Salt and oil. gishirii koo mâi Salt or oil.
 c. yà sâa shì He should put it. yaa sàa shì He put it.

There is, however, an important restriction on the rule: it only applies to monosyllabic words. If the falling tone is on some syllable in a polysyllabic word, the rule does not apply, e.g.

- (23) kiihîn The fish. Not *kiihîn; raanâi The day. Not *raanâi;
yaa shânyee He drank it up. Not *yaa shânyee

It follows, of course, that if WA were lexically and phonologically integrated into the verb, as has been argued, this tone rule would not be applicable. But look at what happens. The 2nd masculine singular IO pronoun *maka* has a contracted form *mâa* with falling tone. When preceded by a Lo tone, as in 24a, the falling tone remains. When preceded by a Hi tone, however, *mâa* simplifies to *màa* with Lo tone in accordance with the general rule affecting monosyllabic words, see 24b.

- (24) a. *naa gayàa mâa làabaarîi* I told you the news.
 b. *naa aikoo màa takaãdaa* I sent you a letter.

The rule operates similarly with a homophonous form *mâa*, which exists as an IO particle in Northern dialects in addition to the more well-known markers *wà/mâ*. [There is also a variant *wâa*, found in Bature (1990), but never previously reported in the literature, which is used by some Kano speakers in phrase final position.] (The short vowel allomorph *mà* is generally preferred when there is an immediately following noun IO; when the IO marker has been stranded, *mâa* is much preferred.) As seen in comparing 25b and 25c, we again find that *mâa* undergoes the tone rule, i.e. it is treated like a monosyllabic word and not like the last syllable of a polysyllabic verb.

- (25) a. *sun gayàa mà Sulè = sun gayàa mâa Sulè* They told Sule.
 b. *yaaròn dà sukà gayàa mâa* The boy they told it to.
 c. *Sulè sukà aikoo màa* It was Sule they sent it to.

5. *Analysis.* What I have shown is that the claim that the indirect object marker WA is attached to the verb, which has been repeated for some twenty years on the basis of minimal and narrow evidence, suddenly begins to crumble as soon as one starts to investigate Hausa facts more carefully, looking at more variables, more speakers, and more dialects. From the work that I have done, I think it is clear what is *not* the answer. What *is* the correct analysis requires considerably more study. Let me at this point, however, just provide a proposal of what I think is the best way to approach the matter.

The essential first step is to separate pronominal from non-pronominal IOs. Pronominal IOs make use of a distinct pronoun paradigm characterized by *ma-* (the vowel of which undergoes anticipatory assimilation) + a bound CV pronoun + HiLo tone (i.e. *mi:nà* 'to me', *maka* 'to you (masc.)', *musù* 'to them', etc.). There is no reason to believe that this *ma-* is (or ever was) a part of the verb in any sense of the term. Gouffé (1981:48) has written, "Le syntagme /*ma-tâ*/, au sein duquel /*tâ*/ se comporte comme un enclitique de /*ma*/, est lui-même enclitique du verbe: en effet, après celui-ci, une pause n'est pas . . . admissible . . ." I would contend, to the contrary, that the IO pronouns are quite distinct from the verb phonologically and morphologically and, moreover, that their interpretation as separate words is fully in keeping with the intuition of native Hausa speakers.

The pre-noun marker *wà/mâ* is also not an integral part of the verb, i.e. it is not a true verbal suffix as sometimes described. The labelling of *wâ* as a bound *clitic* also doesn't fit with the facts presented here. A better way is to view the situation in terms of a *process*, cliticization, rather than in terms of a rigid category, clitic. With this small, but important adjustment, what we can say is that *if wâ* (or *mâ* for

that matter) ends up on the surface immediately next to the verb (i.e. the verb hasn't been deleted, a modal particle hasn't been inserted, or the *wà* + NP phrase hasn't been moved), *then* *wà* tends to attach itself prosodically to the preceding verb. How much pressure there is for the cliticization to take place and at what stage in the derivation appears to vary from dialect to dialect and speaker to speaker. One must understand, however, that *wà* starts out as a free particle and may end up as such. That is, *wà* attachment is a late phonological phenomenon having nothing to do with lexical word formation or syntactic constituency.

There is, by the way, one verb in the language where the marker *wà* (but not pronominal IOs) has truly been incorporated, namely the verb *baa/bâa* 'to give to', compare 26a and 26b. This one case is instructive since it can be contrasted with all the other cases in the language where *wà* still exists as a distinct (if sometimes phonologically dependent) particle. Interestingly, the historical incorporation of *wà* in this word has become lexically so fixed (and so invisible!) that many Hausa speakers are now beginning to use the overt marker with one or another form of this verb, see 26c.

(26) Verb-*wà* fusion.

- a. *sun bâa yaaròn fensîr̃* (*bâa* < **baa wà* or **bai wà*) They gave the boy a pencil.
 b. *sun baa shì fensîr̃* They gave him a pencil.
 c. *sun bâa wà (= baa wà) yaaròn fensîr̃* They gave the boy a pencil.

6. *Conclusion.* Parsons, the world's leading expert on the Hausa language, has complained at various times that one of the problems with a well-known language like Hausa is that we think that the facts have already been described and thus we fail to look into all the nooks and crannies for details; we overlook phonetic matters of a subphonemic nature, and we fail to pay attention to the considerable individual and dialectal variation that exists. In this paper, I have tried to show that by looking beyond the received knowledge about Hausa as found in standard textbooks, we discover that the situation with regard to indirect objects is much more complex and much more varied than we had ever imagined. If the new facts discovered pose analytical problems for the theoretically oriented linguist, then I as an unrepentant empiricist have done my job.

* * * * *

Postscript

While the focus of this paper has been on the IO markers, recent studies have raised important questions about the nature of the pre-dative verb. Both Bature (1990) and Abdoulaye (1990) have used the term "applicative" in describing the attachment of WA to the verb. Although I do not accept the specifics of their analyses, their papers have stimulated me to go back and expand on an idea that I first proposed almost twenty years ago (Newman 1973), namely, that some pre-dative verbs do require an applicative suffix. The applicative element is not, however, WA, but rather a "tone integrating" suffix *-aa* hidden in what look like basic gr. 1 verbs. This is shown in the examples in 27, where the gr. 2 verb 'to tell' appears to switch to a simple gr. 1 form in pre-dative position, but actually has added an applicative

extension in the environment of the IO. (The vowel alternation before the pronoun DO is due to other causes that can be ignored for our purposes here.)

- (27) [i] *an fàci làabaarìi* They related the news.
[ii] *an fàdee shì* They related it.
[iii] *an fadàa masà/wà Musa* They related (it) to him/Musa.

If we think carefully about what happens with gr. 2 verbs, it allows us to explain a nagging problem concerning the length of the final vowel of gr. 1 verbs. This vowel undergoes alternations in syntactically determined frames as illustrated in 28.

- (28) [i] *an dakà hatsii* They pounded corn.
[ii] *an dakàa shi* They pounded it.
[iii] *an dakàa masà/wà Musa* They pounded (it) for him/Musa.

It is probably fair to say that most Hausaists assume that the underlying form of the verb has a long final vowel and that there is a rule shortening the vowel before noun direct objects. This is explicitly argued in Leben and Bagari (1975), for example. In Newman (1979) I suggested, primarily on historical grounds, that the traditional analysis was fallacious and that the underlying form of the verb was short. As critics have pointed out, my analysis required having lengthening in a number of different environments instead of having a single shortening rule. I am now prepared to reaffirm that, although having a number of different lengthening rules is uneconomical, this is in fact the correct explanation, i.e. the long vowels in 28[ii] and those in [iii] are due to totally different processes. The lengthening before pronoun DOs is due to a regular, morphophonemic rule that lengthens the final vowel of all verbs before object pronouns. The apparent lengthening before IOs results not from the modification of an underlying stem vowel, but rather from the addition of the same applicative suffix *-aa* that we saw added to the gr. 2 verb in 27[iii]. This is schematized in 29.

- (29) [i] *dakà* Historically underlying form.
[ii] *dakà* → *dakàa* by pre-pronoun vowel lengthening rule.
[iii] *dakà* ⇒ *dakàa* by addition of applicative morpheme *{-aa}*.

Thus, although the verb forms in *dakàa shi* and *dakàa masà* look identical, morphologically they are not the same. The former is monomorphemic, the latter is dimorphemic. In the case of *fàdee shì* and *fadàa masà* it is easy to see that there has been a change in grade, i.e. that an applicative suffix has been added; in the case of grade 1 verbs, the change between basic verb and verb + applicative is disguised; nevertheless, I would contend that morphosyntactically the two cases are parallel.

REFERENCES

- Abdoulaye, Mahamane Laoualy. 1990. Advancement and ascension to object in Hausa. Unpublished M.A. thesis, SUNY, Buffalo.
- Abraham, R. C. 1959. *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: University of London Press.
- Bature, Abdullahi. 1990. Prosodic constituency and Hausa verbs. Unpublished ms., Stanford University
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1985. "Causative" and "benefactive" in Chadic. *Afrika und Übersee* 68:23-42.
- Gital, Garba Mohammed. 1987. Typology of dative ordering: a case study of Bausanci dative movement in Hausa dialectology. M.A. thesis, Bayero University (Kano).
- Gouffé, Claude. 1981. Remarques sur quelques propositions récentes concernant l'orthographe du haoussa. *Bulletin des études africaines de l'Inalco* 1(1):43-57.
- Halpern, Aaron. 1989. Divorcing morphological and phonological sub-categorization. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the LSA.
- Inkelas, Sharon. 1988. Prosodic constraints on syntax: Hausa 'fa'. In *Proceedings of the Seventh West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)*, ed. by H. Borer, pp. 375-89. Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Leben, William R., and Dauda M. Bagari. 1975. A note on the base form of the Hausa verb. *Studies in African Linguistics* 6:239-48.
- Munkailla, Muhammad M. 1990. *Indirect Object Constructions in Hausa*. Ph.D. thesis, SOAS, University of London.
- Newman, Paul. 1973. Grades, vowel-tone classes and extensions in the Hausa verbal system. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4:297-346.
- _____. 1977. Chadic extensions and pre-dative verb forms in Hausa. *Studies in African Linguistics* 8:275-97.
- _____. 1979. The historical development of medial /ee/ and /oo/ in Hausa. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 1:172-88.
- _____. 1982. Grammatical restructuring in Hausa: indirect objects and possessives. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 4:59-73.
- _____. 1983. The efferential (alias 'causative') in Hausa. In *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*, ed. by Ekkehard Wolff and Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg, pp. 397-418. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- _____. 1987. Hausa and the Chadic languages. In *The World's Major Languages*, ed. by Bernard Comrie, pp. 705-23. London: Croom Helm.
- Parsons, F. W. 1960. The verbal system in Hausa. *Afrika und Übersee* 44:1-36.
- _____. 1971/72. Suppletion and neutralization in the verbal system of Hausa. *Afrika und Übersee* 55:49-97, 188-208.
- Tuller, Laurice. 1984. Datives in Hausa. *NELS* 14:447-60.
- _____. 1990. L'hypothèse inaccusative et les verbes de "degré 3" et de "degré 7" en haoussa. *Linguistique Africaine* 5:95-126.
- Zaria, Ahmadu Bello. 1982. *Issues in Hausa Dialectology*. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.