

EXPLAINING HAUSA FEMININES\*

Paul Newman  
Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden

The formation of feminine words in Hausa is explained in terms of three distinct processes: (a) Derivation (marked by {-nyàa}), i.e. the change from masculine (male) to feminine (female); (b) Inflection (marked by {-aa}), i.e. the expression of a gender feature provided by concord rules; and (c) Overt Characterization (also marked by {-aa}), i.e. the historical addition of an overt gender marker to inherently feminine nouns. The process of overt characterization (= "hypercharacterization") explains why almost all feminine nouns in Hausa now end in -aa when historically they can be presumed to have occurred with all five final vowels. It also accounts for the presence of an overt feminine suffix on nouns that cannot be considered derived. A clear distinction between the separate suffixes {-nyàa} and {-aa} leads to a straightforward, regular description of feminine forms, in terms of segmentals as well as tones. Finally, it is shown how the analysis of "secondary verbal nouns" (deverbative nouns) can be simplified if seemingly diverse forms are treated as related masculine/feminine pairs.

1. Introduction

It is well known that most feminine nouns in Hausa end in -aa . In some cases the -aa is an integral part of the lexical item, e.g. rìigáa 'gown', táagàa 'window'; in others, it is part of what Parsons [1961] calls a "feminative" suffix, e.g. gàrkúwáa 'shield', záakányàa 'lioness'.<sup>1</sup> Masculine nouns normally end in one of the

---

\*This paper was stimulated by ideas and observations in a recent paper presented by Russell Schuh [1978], to whom I am most grateful for discussion and constructive criticism (not all of which I have heeded). It is also the outgrowth of a broader comparative study of gender in Chadic and Afroasiatic being carried out with the support of a National Science Foundation grant no. BNS77-16841, awarded to the Center for Applied Linguistics. I would like to thank Claude Gouffé for comments and corrections on an earlier draft of the paper.

<sup>1</sup>For the most extensive study of gender in Hausa, see the series of articles by Parsons [1960-61-63].

other four vowels, e.g. bírìi 'monkey', zóobèè 'ring', kúurùu 'pony', kéésòò 'grass mat'. Some masculine nouns also end in -aa, e.g. wátàa 'moon', bàkàa 'bow', but these are generally treated as non-systematic exceptions.

In an important study of West Chadic vowels, Schuh [1978] notes that in Chadic languages, there is normally no fixed correlation between the grammatical gender of words and their phonological shape.<sup>2</sup> He concludes that the association between final -aa and feminine gender now found in Hausa is not an old feature, but rather is the result of a relatively recent innovation.<sup>3</sup> In Proto-Hausa, feminine nouns presumably occurred with all five final vowels (and perhaps with consonant final nouns as well). Without going into the details as to how feminine nouns came to end in -aa Schuh suggests that one contributing factor was the addition of the feminine derivational suffixes.

In this paper, I would like to carry forward the study of Hausa feminines, taking as basic Schuh's assumption of the earlier independence of canonical shape and gender. First, I shall clarify the morpho-syntactic process by which feminine nouns came to have feminine endings. Then I shall account for the present and previous phonological shape of these words.

---

<sup>2</sup>Schuh is correct in emphasizing this lack of correlation as a Chadic norm, probably reflecting the original situation in Proto-Chadic. Nevertheless, there are a number of present-day Chadic languages apart from Hausa which independently have established a (partial) correlation between gender and phonological shape, e.g. Gashua Bade [Schuh 1977], Mokulu [J. Lukas 1977], Pa'a [M. Skinner 1977].

<sup>3</sup>This idea was put forward earlier on other grounds in an interesting paper by N. Skinner [1975]. Although I accept Skinner's proposal that the Hausa feminine suffix is ultimately derived from a form containing an element /t/, in light of the shallow time depth treated in the present paper, I shall go ahead and describe the suffix simply as -aa.

## 2. Morpho-syntactic Processes

Three main processes were involved in the development of Hausa feminine forms: (a) Derivation, (b) Inflection, and (c) Overt Characterization.

2.1. Derivation ( $N_{[+m]} \rightarrow N_{[+f]}$ ). Male and female counterparts of the same animate being can be indicated either by using separate words, e.g. *dóok̀ì/góod̀íyáa* 'horse/mare', or by deriving one form from the other, e.g. *záak̀ì/záakányàa* 'lion/lioness'. In accordance with universal linguistic principles, Hausa normally derives the word for the female from a word indicating the male, although a few examples of derived male forms can be found. The derivational shift from male to female is automatically accompanied by a corresponding gender shift from masculine to feminine. It should be emphasized that in pairs such as *záak̀ì/záakányàa*, the feminine form is conceptually as well as morphologically derivative.

The feminine derivational suffix is  $\{-nyàa\}$ , its two surface manifestations being *-nyàa* and *-nìyáa*. This suffix is *not* the same as the feminative endings *-(i)yaa* and *-(u)waa*, with which it has always been confused. The derivational suffix  $\{-nyàa\}$  is essentially non-productive in present-day Hausa. The following list is therefore complete (allowing for accidental omissions or unrecorded dialect variants):

(1)	m.		f.
servant	<i>báràa</i>	→	<i>bárányàa</i>
hartebeest	<i>dár̀ì</i>	→	<i>dárányàa</i>
gazelle	<i>kááb̀oo</i>	→	<i>káábányàa</i>
rat	<i>kúusùu</i>	→	<i>kúusányàa</i>
boy	<i>yáar̀òo</i>	→	<i>yáarínnyàa</i>
ring	<i>zóobèe</i>	→	<i>zóobányàa</i>
thief	<i>ḃàráaẁoo</i>	→	<i>ḃàráunìyáa</i>
goblin	<i>dòodóo</i>	→	<i>dòodánnyàa</i>
infant	<i>jínjír̀í</i>	→	<i>jínjír̀nnyàa</i>

(1) cont.	m.		f.
blind person	màkáafò	→	màkáunìyáa
orphan	màráayàa	→	màráinìyáa
man	mùtùm	→	mùtúunìyáa = mùtúmniyáa
chief	sárkíi	→	sàràunìyáa
age-mate	zúmùu	→	zúunìyáa = zúmniyáa
wizard	bóokáa	→	bóokányàa (= bóokáa)
grandchild	jíikàa	→	jíikányàa (= jíikàa)
evil person	múgùu	→	múgúnàa (= múgùwáa)
fool	wáawáa	→	wáawányàa (= wáawáa)
monkey	bírìi	→	bírínàa
boar	gyáadóo	→	gyáadányàa
fish	kíifíi	→	kíifányàa
antelope	màazóo	→	màazányàa
lion	záakìi	→	záakányàa

As can be seen, the function of this suffix is to form the female counterpart of animates (humans and animals). There are only a few exceptions: *kíifányàa*, which denotes a 'large fish' (perhaps originally a female fish), and *zóobányàa*, which is equivalent in meaning to *zóobèe*. The pair *kádée/kádányàa* 'shea-tree' (equivalent in meaning) only appears to be an exception, since the feminine form does not contain the suffix *-nyàa*, but rather is formed from a now nonexistent root *\*kadan-* plus the suffix *-yaa* (cf. the pl. *kádaanee*). It is possible that the pair *zóobèe/zóobányàa* has a similar explanation. The omission of the pair *sâa/sâanìyáa* 'bull/cow' from the list is purposeful (see discussion later in section 3.1.3).

2.2. Inflection ( $DN_{[\alpha gen]} \rightarrow DN_{[+f]}$ ). Adjectival nouns—"dependent nominals" in Parsons' terminology—obligatorily agree in number and gender with their head nouns, whether used predicatively or attributively, e.g.

- (2)  $\text{bàkàa}_{[+m]}$   $\text{sáabóo}_{[+m]}$   $\text{nèe}$  'the bow is new'  
 $\text{rìigáa}_{[+f]}$   $\text{sáabúwáa}_{[+f]}$   $\text{cèe}$  'the gown is new'  
 $\text{móotóocíi}_{[+pl]}$   $\text{sàabàbbíi}_{[+pl]}$   $\text{nèe}$  'the cars are new'

Note that the gender agreement is with the specified grammatical gender of the head noun and not its surface manifestation, e.g.  $\text{kàakáa}_{[+m]}$   $\text{tsóofóo}$   $\text{nèe}$  'grandfather is old', vs.  $\text{kàakáa}_{[+f]}$   $\text{tsóofúwáa}$   $\text{cèe}$  'grandmother is old'.<sup>4</sup> As far as the inflectional marking for gender is concerned—plural marking falls outside the scope of this paper—the masculine form has a  $\emptyset$  suffix (i.e. is unmarked) while the feminine form contains a suffix  $\{-aa\}$ , with the surface manifestations  $-aa$ ,  $-(i)yaa$ , and  $-(u)waa$  (to be described later in section 3.2). Both the  $[+m]$  and  $[+f]$  forms are inflected from the same base, e.g.

- (3)
- |                                      |         |  |   |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--|---|
| $\text{sáabóo}_{[\alpha\text{gen}]}$ | 'new'   | $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{sáabóo} + \emptyset_{[+m]} \\ \text{sáabóo} + aa_{[+f]} \end{array} \right.$ | $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} /sáabóo/ \\ /sáabúwáa/ \end{array} \right.$ |
| $\text{fárfi}_{[\alpha\text{gen}]}$  | 'white' | $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{fárfi} + \emptyset_{[+m]} \\ \text{fárfi} + aa_{[+f]} \end{array} \right.$   | $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} /fárfi/ \\ /fáráa/ \end{array} \right.$     |

Although the inflected masculine form and the underlying base are (almost always) the same, it is important for the understanding of Hausa gender to keep them apart. The inflected feminine form is not built on the masculine form, as generally asserted, but on an underlyingly genderless base. Adjectival (Dependent Nominal) inflection consists in the overt marking of the feature  $[+f]$  added by the grammatical concord rules; it does not involve a change from one gender to another. It is thus an entirely different process from the  $\text{záakìi}/\text{záakányàa}$  derivation, the essence of which is the alteration of a  $[+m]$  semantically male form into a  $[+f]$  semantically

---

<sup>4</sup>Syntactically, gender in Hausa is actually considerably more complicated than I make it sound here, cf. Schachter [1966].

female form.<sup>5</sup>

2.3. Overt characterization ( $N_{[+f]} \rightarrow N_{[+f]} + \text{fem. suffix}$ ). Hausa has a large number of words containing a feminative suffix which do not, however, have masculine counterparts, e.g. *gàrkúwáa* 'shield', *túnkìyáa* 'ewe, sheep', *tóolìyáa* 'tuft', *mínjírìyáa* 'electric catfish', *kíbìyáa* 'arrow', etc. In the standard analyses of Hausa, these are treated as "feminatives", which are derived from masculine words that have since been lost, e.g. *gàrkúwáa*<sub>[f]</sub> < \**gàrkó*<sub>[m]</sub>, *túnkìyáa*<sub>[f]</sub> < \**túmki*<sub>[m]</sub> etc. (cf. Parsons [n.d.]). This analysis, however, raises some difficult questions—up to now never faced—namely, what would have been the nature of this derivational process, so often involving words for inanimates, and why should such a large number of the postulated masculine forms have disappeared? The answer is that Hausa feminatives are *not* derived from masculine words. Rather, their explicitly feminine phonological/morphological shape is due to the addition of a feminine suffix to words that were already grammatically feminine! The process was not derivation, but rather "overt characterization" (called "hypercharacterization" by Malkiel [1957-58]). It is true that *gàrkúwáa* and *túnkìyáa* are historically derived from \**gàrkó* and \**túmki*;<sup>6</sup> but these starred forms were already [+f] *before* the

---

<sup>5</sup>Although *múgùwáa* and *múgúnýàa* now function somewhat interchangeably as feminine forms of *múgùu* 'evil (psn)', the former would originally have only been the inflected form of the adjective (dependent nominal), while the latter would have only been a derived feminine (female) word corresponding to the male (masculine) form 'evil man'.

<sup>6</sup>All of the reconstructed forms in this paper are given with a short final vowel. Synchronically, the unmarked length of final vowels in Hausa could be said to be long. However, as independently concluded by Greenberg [1977:103] and Schuh [1978], the final vowels of Hausa nouns must originally have been short. They suggest that the long vowels one now finds reflect a former deictic element, identified more specifically by Schuh as a previous reference marker \*-i. On the original shortness of the final vowel, I am in agreement; but I would suggest that the explanation for the length will be found in the broader process of gender characterization rather than in a specific deictic morpheme.

feminine suffix was added. The function of the suffix was not to change gender, but rather to provide the word with an overt shape such that it was explicitly characterized as feminine.<sup>7</sup> As argued by Schuh [1978], Hausa formerly should have had feminine nouns ending in vowels other than -a, gender not being explicitly marked. The overtly characterized "feminatives" in present-day Hausa, instead of entailing the former existence of corresponding masculine nouns, provide valuable internal evidence of grammatically feminine nouns with the full range of final vowels postulated on comparative grounds to have been possible, e.g.

- (4) zúucìyáa < \*zúktì<sub>[f]</sub> 'heart'  
 sáafíyáa < \*sáafé<sub>[f]</sub> 'morning'  
 gàrkúwáa < \*gàrkó<sub>[f]</sub> 'shield'  
 rúudúwáa < \*rúudú<sub>[f]</sub> 'woman's load of utensils'  
 cf. kàazáa < \*kàazá<sub>[f]</sub> 'chicken'

Interestingly, though not surprisingly (cf. Martinet [1956]), the ending adopted by Hausa to characterize its feminine nouns was not the derivational suffix {-nyáa}, with its associated semantic properties, but rather the (originally) semantically empty inflectional suffix {-aa}. The historical characterization rule, like the synchronic inflectional rule, probably applied obligatorily to all feminine nouns.<sup>8</sup> Doublets such as tállée<sub>[m]</sub> = tállíyáa<sub>[f]</sub> 'soup pot' or léékúú<sub>[m]</sub> = léékúwáa<sub>[f]</sub> 'summit' thus represent dialect or stylistic variation in the underlying gender specification and not optional application of the characterization rule. Before the overt characterization of feminines, \*tállé<sub>[m]</sub> = \*tállé<sub>[f]</sub> would have been comparable

---

<sup>7</sup>For examples of overt characterization outside of Chadic, see Malkiel [1957-58] for Romance and Ibrahim [1973] for Semitic.

<sup>8</sup>Feminine words without the feminine ending, with which one must include words with final short -a (!), e.g. gòggó 'paternal aunt', màagé 'cat', ùngúlú and jígàl 'vulture', áyàbà 'banana', must have come into the language at a later date. The word màcè 'woman' is an exception. Presumably it was so well marked semantically that it did not have to be overtly characterized for its feminine gender.

to the now-found  $sàndáa_{[m]} = sàndáa_{[f]}$  'stick', the contrast being in the underlying grammatical gender, not in the surface morphological form.

Since there was not a comparable process of characterization affecting masculine nouns, they have remained with all five etymologically inherited final vowels, e.g.

- (5)  $ráamìi_{[m]}$  'hole';  $géefèe_{[m]}$  'edge';  $káfóo_{[m]}$  'horn';  
 $túuruu_{[m]}$  'stocks';  $bákáa_{[m]}$  'bow'.

From a historical point of view, masculine words with final -aa in Hausa are entirely normal—an important point emphasized by Schuh [1978]—and synchronically they are more numerous and include more basic words than one is usually led to believe. Nevertheless, an association does now hold in Hausa between final -aa and feminine gender such that aa-final masculine nouns could be said to be "mischaracterized". Because of this, there has been analogical pressure for such nouns to change their gender, e.g.  $fáatàa$  'skin',  $ʔískàa$  'wind',  $yáatsàa$  'finger', all of which were originally masculine but which have switched to feminine in at least some dialects. In the case of  $kíshírwáa_{[f]}$  'thirst', presumably derived from  $kíshì(n) rúwáa_{[m/pl]}$  'thirst of water', and  $gíiwáa_{[f]}$  'elephant' (<  $*gíiwán_{[m]}$ ),<sup>9</sup> both of which accidentally appear to contain the feminative suffix -waa, the gender change affected all dialects. How many other aa-final words there are that switched from masculine to feminine at an early period without leaving a trace, we cannot know. But in the case of the aa-final masculine words that have not changed, their highly marked nature is good evidence that the gender of these words is an old, conservative trait, dating back to Proto-Hausa and beyond.

---

<sup>9</sup>According to my analysis,  $gíyèe$  'male elephant/epithet for a chief' represents a derived masculine form, necessitated by the gender change of  $gíiwáa$  from [+m] to [+f], i.e.  $gíyèe < gíiyèe < gíiwèe_{[m]} < gíiwáa_{[f]}$ . If  $gíyèe$  were the unmarked underlying form, as usually claimed, the corresponding feminine should have been  $??gíyyàa$ , not  $gíiwáa$ .



2.4. Common gender nouns. A consideration of common gender nouns is important since they illustrate the overlap between overt characterization as a historical phenomenon and derivation as a synchronic process. They are also important for understanding the development of Hausa feminatives since it is possible that overt characterization began with the marking of the feminines of these common gender words before it spread to the inherently feminine words.

Syntactically, Hausa has only two genders, masculine and feminine. Lexically, however, nouns fall into three classes: masculine, feminine, and "common",<sup>10</sup> i.e. animate nouns whose gender is determined by the sex of the referent rather than being an inherent property of the lexeme as such. Examples of common gender nouns are *kàakáa*<sub>[com]</sub> 'grandparent', for which one can specify [+m] 'grandfather' or [+f] 'grandmother', and *jàakíi*<sub>[com]</sub> 'ass', for which one can specify [+m] *jàakíi* 'he-ass' or [+f] *jàakáa* 'she-ass'. Morphologically there are two classes of common gender nouns, those that are epicene, e.g. *kàakáa* 'grandparent', *ṗàutáa* 'youngest child', *wàadáa* 'dwarf', *gáuláa* 'fool', *sá'áa* 'age-mate', and those that have a distinct feminine form. The non-epicene common gender nouns include dependent nominals used as main nouns, e.g. *tsóofóo*<sub>[m]</sub>/*tsóofúwáa*<sub>[f]</sub> 'old man (father)/old woman (mother)' (< *tsóofóo*<sub>[com]</sub> 'old person'), as well as various independent nominals, e.g. *sáakòo*<sub>[m]</sub>/*sáakùwáa*<sub>[f]</sub> (< *sáakòo*<sub>[com]</sub>) 'next younger sibling', *shéegèe*<sub>[m]</sub>/*shéegiyáa*<sub>[f]</sub> 'bastard', *kúurùu*<sub>[m]</sub>/*kúurùwáa*<sub>[f]</sub> 'pony', *jàakíi*<sub>[m]</sub>/*jàakáa*<sub>[f]</sub> 'ass'. It has been customary to treat forms such as *sáakùwáa*, *shéegiyáa*, etc. as derived feminine forms on a par with forms such as *bárányàa* 'female servant' (< *báràa*<sub>[m]</sub> 'servant'). Historically speaking

---

<sup>10</sup>The term "common gender" is taken from Parsons [1960:120]. My use of the term differs from his, however, since he limits it to synchronically epicene nouns.

this is wrong. The feminine form *sáakùwáa* 'younger sister', for example, comes not from the masculine word *sáakò*<sub>[m]</sub> 'younger brother', but from the underlying common gender noun *sáakò*<sub>[com]</sub> 'younger sibling' by semantic specification. The morphological process is not derivation—the suffix {-nyàa} is never added—but overt characterization. At a deeper level, pairs such as *sáakò*/*sáakùwáa* are thus parallel to pairs such as *kàakáa*<sub>[m]</sub>/*kàakáa*<sub>[f]</sub>. Morphologically the pairs look different because of the way in which the -aa suffix is realized, but grammatically there is no difference.<sup>11</sup> At an earlier historical period, moreover, before the overt characterization of feminines, words such as *sáakò* would also have been epicene, i.e. \**sáakò taa fítá* 'younger sister went out' would have been as normal as *kàakáa taa fítá* 'grandmother went out'.

Because of the morphologically unequal nature of most of the common gender m/f pairs (due to the overt characterization of the feminines), the original system of sex-neutral common gender words seems to be giving way to a masculine-unmarked/feminine-marked system. With this change in orientation, the epicene words become "undercharacterized", the response being the creation (still sporadic) of new derived forms using the true feminine derivational suffix, e.g. *jíikányàa* 'granddaughter', *bóokányàa* 'female wizard', *wáawányàa* 'female fool', from the originally epicene, common gender words *jíikaa*, *bóokáa*, and *wáawáa*.

### 3. The Form of Hausa Feminines

All descriptions of Hausa note that feminines are formed in some way by the addition of -aa, (i)yaa, and (u)waa; but apart from this, little is said. Taylor [1959:9] states, "beyond

---

<sup>11</sup>By eliminating the surface distinction between epicene words such as *kàakáa* and paired words such as *sáakò*/*sáakùwáa*, we are led to the discovery that almost all kin-terms in Hausa are common gender, sex of the referent not being reflected in the basic terminology.

saying that the feminine endings are -waa and -yaa , no precise rules can be given." Even Parsons, who is seldom at a loss for comprehensive rules, leaves the various forms of the feminine to a great extent unexplained, concluding "the distribution of the various shapes of the feminine suffix is somewhat arbitrary" [Parsons 1963:181]. As far as tone is concerned, the only good attempt to account for the form of feminines is by Leben [1971], a study to which I shall return.

The failure to account for the phonological shape of the feminines in a regular way is directly connected with the failure to distinguish the derivational suffix {-nyàa} from the (originally) inflectional ending {-aa}. The usual assumption has been that the -nìyáa in, for example, màkáuñiyáa 'blind woman' and the -ìyáa in, for example, túnkìyáa 'sheep' are allomorphs of the same morpheme. "In addition to the regular shape -(i)yaa/(u)waa, the feminine suffix exhibits two other, less common shapes [-niyaa/-nuwaa and -nyaa], both containing an additional nasal element" [Parsons 1963:180]. As soon, however, as one separates the two morphemes from each other, the difficulty in explaining their various phonological shapes immediately diminishes, both in terms of segmentals and in terms of tone. This is not to say that exceptions and irregular items do not exist; but the major patterns and rules can be shown to be highly regular, and not in the least arbitrary. It should be emphasized that the formation rules to be described are not specified for time, i.e. they are synchronic rules in the case of the still operative inflection of dependent nominals, for example, while they are historical rules in the case of the overtly characterized feminine independent nominals.

3.1. Derivational suffix {-nyàa}.<sup>12</sup> The feminine derivational suffix {-nyàa} has two allomorphs, -nyàa and -nìyáa.

3.1.1. The short variant -nyàa. This variant is added to nouns of the form CVCV. The addition of the suffix is accompanied by (a) the imposition of a HHL tone pattern on the derived form, regardless of the tone of the simple noun, and (b) the general, but not exceptionless, change in the vowel preceding the suffix to /a/, e.g.

- (6) zàakìi (HL) 'lion' → zàakányàa  
 màazóo (LH) 'antelope' → màazányàa  
 bírìi (HL) 'monkey' → bírínýàa

The feminine form múgúnýàa (< múgùu) 'evil woman', is unique in shortening the initial vowel. This is a peculiarity of this word, not this derivational process, as seen from the fact that the shortening also takes place in other derived forms, e.g. mùgùntáa 'wickedness', mùgùntà 'become evil'.

3.1.2. The long variant -nìyáa. This variant, the tones of which result from the application of the general LL tone raising rule [Leben 1971], is added to triconsonantal nouns of the form C<sub>1</sub>VC<sub>2</sub>VC<sub>3</sub><sup>V</sup>. The final V is dropped when the suffix is added and the resulting syllable final C<sub>3</sub> weakens in accordance with Klingenberg's laws [1927/28]. The tone pattern is H/L HLH, the initial tone usually preserving the initial tone of the base, e.g.

- (7) ãàráawò 'thief' → ãàráunìyáa  
 jínjíríi 'infant' → jínjířnìyáa  
 màkáafò 'blind man' → màkáunìyáa

---

<sup>12</sup>Leben [1971] treats -nyàa as a reduced form of -nìyáa, which he interprets as being composed of a derivational suffix -nì plus the feminine marker -aa. For purposes of this paper I am taking -nyàa as basic and am assuming that the vowel in the longer form is epenthetic. No difficulty in the total analysis, however, would be posed by treating the forms the other way.

In two cases, the feminine form is derived from a base that is different from the now-occurring masculine form:

- (8) sàrkí 'chief', sàráunìyáa<sub>[f]</sub> < \*sàràakí<sup>13</sup>  
 dòodóo 'goblin', dòodánnìyáa<sub>[f]</sub> < \*dòodóonò

The only exception to the formation rules for derived feminines is zúunìyáa = zúmniyáa 'female friend', where from the masculine form zúmùu, one would have expected \*zúmínyàa, a dialectal form that does in fact occur.

3.1.3. Analyzing specific lexical items. The recognition that the surface forms of the derivational suffix {-nyàa} are almost entirely regular, both as concerns the segmentals and the tone, enables us to tell the difference between words that have this suffix and others that only appear to do so. For example, whereas túkúnyàa 'pot' could be analyzed as túkú+nyàa, its variant form túkúnyáa (the older form on which the plural is based) could not, because the tones are wrong. The correct break is túkún-yaa (see Parsons [1963:181n]). Similarly, tàfáǎnúwáa 'garlic' must be analyzed as tàfáǎn+úwáa since the ending -núwáa cannot qualify as a variant of the derivational suffix, both the tones and the /-uw-/ being wrong. This raises the interesting question of the analysis of the word sáanìyáa 'cow'. While it has generally been assumed that this is composed of sâa 'bull' plus the suffix -nìyáa (cf. Abraham [1959:30], J. Lukas [1968:106]), there are a number of problems with this interpretation. First, it is extremely unusual from a Chadic point of view for the basic word for 'bovine' to be a masculine gender, male referent form. Second, this analysis is inconsistent with the existence of the dialect form sáanùwáa (= sáanìyáa), which contains an ending that cannot be accepted as an allomorph of the derivational suffix. Third, the monosyllabic

---

<sup>13</sup>This base is still found in present-day Hausa in the word sàràakíi 'a member of a royal household'.

form *sâa* with falling tone suggests the former presence of a second consonant in the root. Finally, the plural form *sháanúú* is difficult to explain if one takes *sâa* as the underlying singular. As a solution to these problems I would endorse an idea mentioned by Parsons [n.d.], but never developed by him, namely that historically speaking *sáanìyáa* is not derived from *sâa*, but rather is built on a common gender base *\*sáan(è)*, the nasal having been preserved in the feminine and plural but lost in the masculine (cf. Schuh [1976]). The processes involved in the formation of the feminine would thus have been sex specification plus overt characterization, not derivation, and the suffix would have been *-ìyáa* (or *-ùwáa*, according to the dialect), not *-nìyáa*.

3.2. Feminine ending {-aa}. The feminine ending {-aa} (with copy tone) is used with nominals that are synchronically inflected or specified as well as with inherently feminine nouns that historically underwent the process of overt characterization. In the former cases, the base upon which the feminine is built is still visible; in the latter case, the base has to be reconstituted on internal or comparative grounds. The surface allomorphs of the ending are *-aa*, *-yaa*, *-waa*, *-iyaa*, and *-uwaa*, with various tones (see Parsons [1963]). Both the segmental forms and the tones are fully determined by the phonological shape of the base (apart from a small, problematic class, described in section 3.3.1); exceptions are rare.

The segmental shape of the ending is accounted for by three general rules (the first two of which could be collapsed into one) plus some minor adjustment rules. The first rule specifies whether the *-aa* is preceded by a transition glide (TG) or not. The second specifies whether the TG is Y or W. The third specifies whether the TG is long or short.

3.2.1. Rule 1. If the base ends in *-a(a)* or Hi tone *-í(i)*,

the suffix is added directly without a transition glide; otherwise, a TG is inserted. The directly added suffix (like the TG + suffix) replaces the final vowel of the base, e.g.

- (9) fáríi + áa → fáráa<sub>[f]</sub> 'white'  
 jàakíi + áa → jàakáa<sub>[f]</sub> 'she-ass'  
 \*gwámí<sub>[f]</sub> + áa → gwámáa<sub>[f]</sub> 'cudgel'

With dependent nominals and common gender nouns, the vowel replacement in the feminine is evident because the related form with -íi is still present. With independent nominals of the form ...Cáa, there is usually no way to tell the difference between feminine nouns that originally ended in -í and now end in -áa because of overt characterization, and those in which the final -áa is etymological. The final -áa in gwámáa 'cudgel' is secondary, as shown by the coexisting masculine form gwámíi, as is the -áa in lúgùbáa 'ripe fruit' (< \*lúgùbí), cf. the variant lúbùiyáa (< \*lúbì). Conversely, the vowel-shifted plural form kàajíi supports the interpretation of the -áa in kàazáa 'chicken' as etymological. In the case of wútáa 'fire' (< \*wútí<sub>[f]</sub> < \*wátí<sub>[f]</sub>), comparative evidence for a final -í can be cited, cf. Proto-Bole \*wasi [Schuh 1978]. But on the whole, the two classes are indistinguishable synchronically and very difficult to sort out historically.

3.2.1.1. Locational/instrumental nouns. A particularly interesting case of a former \*-í now disguised as -áa is that of the locational nouns derived from verbs, e.g. má<sup>2</sup>áunáa 'place where grain is sold' (< <sup>2</sup>áunáa 'to weigh, measure'), májéemáa 'tannery', máfákáa 'shelter', má<sup>2</sup>áikátáa 'factory, place of work'. These nouns are generally described as being formed by the addition of the morpheme má..<sup>2</sup>áa (occasionally ...íi) as contrasted with the derived instrumentals formed with the morpheme má..<sup>2</sup>íi, e.g. má<sup>2</sup>áuníi 'scales, measuring device', mábúudíi 'opener', mátséefíi 'comb'. The tacit assumption is that the former are feminine

because they end in  $-áa$ , the latter are masculine because they end in  $-íi$ . Two related, but separate derivational morphemes are thus assumed for the two types of nouns.

It seems clear to me, however, that there is only one morphological construction for the two semantic groups, this being the construction formed by the addition of  $*má..í$ . The  $...áa$  construction of locational nouns is due to overt characterization. The critical difference between  $*má^páuní_{[f]}$  'weighing place',  $*májéemí_{[f]}$  'tannery' and  $*má^páuní_{[m]}$  'scales',  $*mábúudí_{[m]}$  'opener', would originally have been one of grammatical gender, not of form, locationals being feminine, instrumentals being masculine. Locational nouns ending in  $-íi$  in present-day Hausa, such as  $másáukíi_{[m]}$  'lodging place',  $má^pájíyíi_{[m]}$  'storeroom', and  $máshígíi_{[m]}$  'ford' would thus represent unexplained exceptions in gender assignment rather than in morphology.<sup>14</sup>

The above reconstruction, originally arrived at on internal grounds, completely matches Schuh's interpretation of the synchronic situation in Bade, a somewhat distantly related language in the West Chadic branch. In Bade, derived locational, instrumental, and agential nouns (the latter not treated in this paper) all make use of exactly the same construction,  $ma-$  + verb root + vowel ending. There are, however, differences in gender: "Lukas [R. Lukas 1967/68] is probably right that the 'locatives' are always feminine. A better way to say it would be that when used locatively, the  $ma-$  derived form has feminine gender.... Most of the instrument nouns do seem to take masculine gender, though there are a few exceptions...." [letter of October 29, 1978]. In the Gashua dialect of Bade, which in certain respects seems to retain older forms, the final vowel ending of  $ma-$  derived nouns, including locational nouns, is the high vowel  $-u$ , to be compared with the Hausa  $-í(i)$ , cf.

---

<sup>14</sup>Perhaps the mistake is in considering these as locational nouns; a ford, for example, could easily be conceived of as a thing (like a bridge) rather than a place.



Gashua Bade *mádàltú* 'dye-pit' with Hausa *márináa* (< \**máriní*<sub>[f]</sub>) 'dye-pit'.

3.2.1.2. Feminines of a(a)-final words. In the case of a(a)-final bases, it is immaterial from a synchronic point of view whether one describes the feminine ending as having a  $\emptyset$  allomorph, or whether one adds the suffix *-aa*, which vacuously replaces the stem-final vowel (my preference). In either case, the result is the same: a feminine which on the surface is identical to the base and to the corresponding masculine form, e.g.

(10)	<i>kúrmáa</i> <sub>[m]</sub>	<i>kúrmáa</i> <sub>[f]</sub>	'deaf (psn)'
	<i>ʔàutáa</i> <sub>[m]</sub>	<i>ʔàutáa</i> <sub>[f]</sub>	'youngest child'
	<i>kùmáamàa</i> <sub>[m]</sub>	<i>kùmáamàa</i> <sub>[f]</sub>	'feeble (psn)'
	<i>sáʔàa</i> <sub>[m]</sub>	<i>sáʔàa</i> <sub>[f]</sub>	'age-mate'

Parsons [1963:179-80] claims that words ending in Lo tone *-à(a)* also form feminines by adding *-iyaa* (tone not indicated). Although there are some real examples (e.g. *jàkáadàa/jàkáadìyáa* 'consul') and some apparent examples (e.g. *tsákà/tsákíyàa* 'center'), the claim that *-iyaa* is a normal, regular allomorph of the feminine marker with *à(a)*-final nouns cannot be accepted. The word *tsákíyàa*, for example, is an overtly characterized form of \**tsákì*<sub>[f]</sub> from which the adverbial *tsákà* is derived (cf. *jíkà*, the adverbial form of *jìkíi* 'body'). Similarly, *káshíyàa* 'underneath' is not derived from *kàsà* 'down', but from \**káshì*<sub>[f]</sub>, which is also the source of the adverbial form. In the case of *díyáa* 'daughter', usually assumed to be derived from *dáa* 'son', the identity of the *-ìyáa* and the feminine ending is accidental, it really being part of the stem, cf. Ngizim *díyì wákà* 'fruit' = 'offspring of tree'. The real cases of *-ìyáa* being added to *a*-final nouns, almost all of which are recent loanwords (e.g. *jàkáadàa* 'consul', *líkítà* 'doctor', *ʔìngármàa* 'stallion') represent an innovative development whereby the ending *-ìyáa* (formerly an automatically conditioned allomorph of the inflectional ending *-aa*) is being upgraded into a

productive derivational suffix.<sup>15</sup>

3.2.2. Rule 2. All feminine words, except those described above require a transitional glide between the base and the suffix -aa. If the base ends in e, or in i with Lo tone, the TG is Y (-y- or -iy-); if it ends in o or u, the TG is W (-w- or -uw-). The Y or W replaces the final vowel of the base, e.g.

- (11) kàréé +TG +áa → kàr-y-áa 'bitch'  
 shúudíi +TG +àa → shúud-ìy-áa 'blue'  
 káatòò +TG +àa → káat-ùw-áa 'huge'  
 kútúruú +TG +áa → kútúr-w-áa 'leper'

Given this rule, we can determine whether the historically earlier final vowel of overtly characterized feminatives was a front vowel (indicated E) or a back vowel (indicated O) although not necessarily which, e.g.

- (12) tsáarkìyáa 'bow string' < \*tsáarkè<sub>[f]</sub>, i.e. \*tsáarkì or \*tsáarkè (but not \*-u, \*-o, or \*-a)  
 shàamúwáa 'stork' < \*shàamò<sub>[f]</sub>, i.e. \*shàamú or \*shàamó (but not \*-i, \*-e, or \*-a)

The presence of a Y or W transition glide in itself gives no information as to whether the original final vowel was i vs. e, or u vs. o (with one exception to be described below). Nevertheless, in a number of cases, it is possible to determine the precise vowel on the basis of comparative or internal evidence, e.g.

- (13) túnkìyáa 'sheep' < \*túmkì<sub>[f]</sub>, cf. Proto-Bole \*támki  
 zúucìyáa 'heart' < \*zúktì<sub>[f]</sub>, cf. adverbial form zúucí  
 sáafíyáa 'morning' < \*sáafé<sub>[f]</sub>, cf. " " sáafé  
 gàsíkìyáa 'truth' < \*gàské<sub>[f]</sub>, cf. " " gàséké

---

<sup>15</sup>Cf. *dáalíbìyáa* 'female student' (< *dáalìbíi*), with the innovative derivational use of the -ìyáa suffix, with the synonymous regularly formed feminative *dáalìbáa*.

(13) cont.

gàrkúwáa	'shield'	<	*gàrkó <sub>[f]</sub>	, cf. plural form gàrkíi
(this pattern not used with úu-final nouns)				
múudúwáa	'python'	<	*múudú <sub>[f]</sub>	} Height of final vowel deducible from height of immediately preceding long vowel (see Newman [1979])
tóotùwáa	'pulp'	<	*tóotò <sub>[f]</sub>	
kúugìyáa	'hook'	<	*kúugi <sub>[f]</sub>	
sóoshìyáa	'stripped corn head'	<	*sóosè <sub>[f]</sub>	

Since final -í(i) nouns with Hi tone form feminines by adding -aa directly without a transition glide, the final vowel of nouns that end in -íyáa can be presumed to have been \*-é, not \*-í, e.g.

(14) wàlkíyáa	'lightning'	<	*wàlké <sub>[f]</sub>	(not ??*wàlkí)
tsáamíyáa	'tamarind'	<	*tsáamé <sub>[f]</sub>	(not ??*tsáamí)

In considering words such as tsíryáa 'parakeet' vs. bárwáa 'quail', or gábányàa 'a wasting disease' vs. kàtántánwàa 'snail shell', Parsons concludes that "the distribution as between -y- and -w... appears to be arbitrary" [1963:179]. Synchronically this might be true; but historically, there is no mystery: the choice of -y- vs. -w- is completely determined by the nature of the underlying final vowel, as just described, i.e. tsíryáa, cínyàa 'thigh', etc. all come from words of the form ...CE while bárwáa, yúnwàa 'hunger', etc. all come from words of the form ...CO. Viewed this way, even synchronically aberrant pairs such as kánèè/kánwàa 'younger brother/younger sister' lend themselves to a simple explanation if one assumes that the feminine was formed in a regular manner from a base \*kánò, which underwent a sporadic vowel change in forming the masculine counterpart. Other examples are \*gàjéerò 'short' → gàjéeré<sub>[m]</sub>/gàjéerùwáa<sub>[f]</sub> and \*kàdángárò 'lizard' → kàdángárèè<sub>[m]</sub>/kàdángárùwáa<sub>[f]</sub>.

3.2.3. Rule 3. If the penultimate syllable of the underlying base is heavy (see Newman [1972]), the transition glide is long, i.e. -iy- or -uw-; if it is light, the TG is short, i.e. -y- or -w- (there being a few exceptions with longer words), e.g.

- (15) béebée + Y + áa → béeb-íy-áa 'mute'  
 kàréé + Y + áa → kàr-y-áa 'bitch'  
 húntúú + W + áa → húnt-úw-áa 'naked'  
 kútúruú + W + áa → kútúr-w-áa 'leper'  
 máayèè + Y + áa → \*máay-ìy-áa → màyyáa 'sorcerer'

The rule equally holds for historically characterized feminatives, e.g.

- (16) \*cíibì + Y + àa > cíib-ìy-áa 'navel'  
 \*tsánÈ + Y + àa > tsán-y-àa 'cricket'  
 \*káinÓ + W + áa > káin-úw-áa 'floating plant'  
 \*bárÓ + W + áa > bár-w-áa 'quail'  
 \*kúwÒ + W + àa > kúw-w-àa 'shouting'

To properly account for the occurring surface forms, Rule 3 requires the addition of two adjustment rules. (a) If the addition of the short TG results in an abutting sequence of stop + semivowel, an epenthetic vowel with Hi tone (í or ú) is automatically inserted. For purposes of this rule, /f/, which in Hausa fills the /p/ slot, and /s'/ (orthographic ts), which historically comes from \*c', must be counted as stops. Note that the syllable final \*T > ɿ̃ rule must apply before the epenthetic vowel insertion rule, i.e. \*záT-yáa 'skink' > záɿyáa, not ??záTíyáa.

- (17) kág-wáa (< \*kágÓ) → kágúwáa 'shrub'  
 tság-yáa (< \*tságé) → tságíyáa 'hematuria'  
 dáK-wàa (< \*dáKÒ) → dáKúwàa 'type of candy'  
 báts-yàa (< \*bátsÈ) → bátsíyàa 'oribi'<sup>16</sup>

(b) If the final consonant of the base is a semivowel, the transition vowel of the long TG elides and shifts its tone to the left, e.g.

---

<sup>16</sup>There are no examples of LH words with the epenthetic vowel. I have no idea whether this is an accidental gap or whether it reflects some kind of restriction in the proto-language.

- (18) gáay-ùwáa (< \*gáayò) → gáay-wáa /gâiwáa/ 'mudfish'  
 máay-ìyáa (< \*máayè) → máay-yáa /mâyýáa/ 'sorcerer'

The process is carried a step further in the following example, producing what looks to be a simple vowel replacement:

- (19) dányée + áa → dány-íyáa → dány-yáa → dányáa<sub>[f]</sub> 'fresh'

There are a couple of examples of the transition vowel also being elided when preceded by a nasal, e.g.

- (20) kyáan-ùwáa (< \*kyáanò) → kyáan-wáa /kyânwáa/ 'cat'  
 káan-ùwáa (< \*káanò) → káan-wáa /kânwáa/ 'hunger for meat'

Note that the contrast between kânwáa and kânwàa 'younger sister', which on the surface is one of tone consists at a deeper level in a contrast in the length of the initial vowel, i.e. \*káanò vs. \*kânò respectively. Similarly, the underlying forms for gâiwáa 'mudfish' and tsíiwàa 'insolence' have the same tone pattern but differ in the length of the initial vowel, i.e. \*gáayò vs. \*tsíyò .

3.3. Tone. On the surface, feminatives display a wide array of tone patterns. At a deeper level, the specification requires only two major rules, originally presented by Leben [1971], and adopted here with minor additions and extensions: (a) a morphological rule specifying the suffix -aa (and any preceding transition vowel) as having copy tone, i.e. taking its tone from the tone of the final vowel of the base before that vowel is deleted; and (b) a general phonological rule changing a sequence of final LL to LH if the final vowel is long. The base itself generally remains unchanged. In this respect, the {-aa} ending is different from the {-nyáa} derivational ending, which, like other derivational morphemes in Hausa, has an associated tone pattern that overrides the underlying tone of non-derived forms, e.g.

- (21) hún<sup>́</sup>túu + úwáa → hún<sup>́</sup>túwáa 'naked'  
 bàakóo + úwáa → bàakúwáa 'stranger'  
 kàréé + yáa → kàryáa 'bitch'  
 \*kánò + wàa → kánwàa 'younger sister'  
 fàríi + áa → fàráa 'white'  
 shúudíi + ìyàa → shúudìyàa → shúudìyáa 'blue'  
 gúrgùu + ùwàa → gúrgùwàa → gúrgùwáa 'lame'

The same tone rules are presumed to have applied to the overtly characterized feminatives, the form of the base thus being provided by internal reconstruction, e.g.

- (22) \*tóolé + íyáa > tóolíyáa 'tuft'  
 \*gàrkó + úwáa > gàrkúwáa 'shield'  
 \*tsíré + yáa > tsíríyáa 'parakeet'  
 \*kúrò + wàa > kúrùwàa 'beetle'  
 \*wútí + áa > wútáa 'fire'  
 \*túm<sup>̀</sup>kì + ìyàa > túnkìyàa → túnkìyáa 'sheep'  
 \*múudú + ùwàa > múudúwàa → múudúwáa 'python'

The HHL feminatives, such as kíbìyàa 'arrow' might at first sight look tonally aberrant. They are, nevertheless, completely regular, given the analysis of the í/ú preceding the semivowel as an epenthetic vowel inserted *after* the copy tone assignment (see section 3.2.3 above), e.g.

- (23) \*kíbĒ + yàa > kíb<sup>̀</sup>yàa → kíbìyàa 'arrow'  
 \*gáfĒ + yàa > gáf<sup>̀</sup>yàa → gáfìyàa 'bandicoot'  
 (cf. \*gáafĒ + ìyàa > gáafìyàa → gáafìyáa 'embroidery pattern')  
 \*tsákò + wàa > tsákwàa → tsákúwàa 'gravel'  
 \*shákò + wàa > shákwàa → shákúwàa 'hiccough'

The HHL feminatives of the form CVCVnyàa constitute real exceptions to the tone rules. The plural of the word túkúnyàa 'cooking pot', for example, shows that the tones of the base must be all Hi (i.e. \*-túk(ú)nĒ) and thus that the feminine ending

-yáa must also have been Hi, as seen in the common variant *túkúnyáa*. The explanation for the HHL form is most likely interference from the derivational suffix *-nyàa*. Note that the variation between HHH and HHL is generally limited to nouns ending in *-nyaa* but not, for example, *-ryaa*. One can assume, therefore, that with all *CVCVnyaa* nouns that allow a HHH variant, it is this tone pattern which is basic and reflects the etymological tone of the base, and that the HHL pattern is secondary, being due to morphological confusion. In some cases, one might want to reconstruct an earlier HHH even when there is no such attested variant, e.g. *káwányàa* 'small ring' < \**káwányáa* (?), cf. the plural *kawàanee*.

3.3.1. A problematic tone class. There is one class of feminatives that is not accounted for by the tone rules: the small LHL class, e.g. *tsàakíyàa* 'agate', *tàagíyàa* 'cap', *kàacíyàa* 'circumcision', *kòoshíyàa* 'ladle'. The first syllable is typically heavy and usually with long *aa*. There is also a class of potential underlying forms for which corresponding feminatives have not been provided, namely LL nouns. Although this is now a rare pattern for Hausa, it may have been quite normal earlier, before the lengthening of final vowels and the subsequent application of the LL tone raising rule (see Schuh [1978], Leben [1971]). It is possible, then, that the LHL nouns represent the overtly characterized forms of LL feminine nouns, a possible derivation being *tsàakÈ + àa* > *tsàakíyàa* → *tsàakìyáa*, and then by a historical tone reversal to *tsàakíyàa*. But for the moment, this is pure speculation.

Leaving this problem aside, we can now summarize the correspondences between the presumed form of feminine words in early Hausa before overt characterization and the present-day, actually occurring form. See Table 1.

TABLE 1: Overtly Characterized Feminine Nouns

Presumed earlier form of [+f] word		Present-day form		
Tone pattern	-E	-O	Y	W
Hi-Hi				
Heavy	*tóolé 'tuft'	*bóobó 'a fly'	tóolíyáa	bóobúwáa
Light (non-stop C <sub>2</sub> )	*díné 'plum tree'	*báró 'quail'	díníyáa	bárwáa
Light (stop C <sub>2</sub> )	*tságé 'hematuria'	*rákó 'a bee'	tságíyáa	rákúwáa
Lo-Hi				
Heavy	*gùrbé 'rich soup'	*gàrkó 'shield'	gùrdíyáa	gàrkúwáa
Light (non-stop C <sub>2</sub> )	*fùré 'drumstick'	*kùró 'spirit'	fùryáa	kùrwáa
Light (stop C <sub>2</sub> )	---	---	---	---
Hi-Lo				
Heavy	*túmki 'sheep'	*múudú 'python'	túnkíyáa	múudúwáa
Light (non-stop C <sub>2</sub> )	*tsánĕ 'cricket'	*kúrò 'beetle'	tsányàa	kúrùwàa
Light (stop C <sub>2</sub> )	*kíbĕ 'arrow'	*tsákò 'gravel'	kíbíyàa	tsákúwàa
Lo-Lo	?	?	?	?
Final -í with Hi tone (most not identifiable)				
Hi-Hi	*wútí 'fire'		wútáa	
Lo-Hi	*lúgùbí 'ripe fruit'		lúgùbáa	
Final -a with any tone				
Hi-Hi	*gáawá 'corpse'		gáawáa	
Lo-Hi	*kàazá 'chicken'		kàazáa	
Hi-Lo	*kúukà 'baobab'		kúukàa	

## Notes:

- (a) E = i or e; O = u or o
- (b) Tone pattern refers to last two syllables
- (c) Heavy/Light refers to weight of penultimate syllable



#### 4. Deverbative Nouns

Hausa has a number of morphological processes by which nouns can be, or have been, derived from verbs. Some of these deverbative nouns (dvn's) function as optional or obligatory replacements for progressive participles or verbs in the continuous tenses, e.g. *kòoyóo* 'learning', *háǎ̀b̀ì* 'shooting'. In this function they are generally referred to as "secondary verbal nouns". Other deverbative nouns, e.g. *tàaróo* 'a meeting', *yáak̀ì* 'war', are verbal in derivation only, functioning just like ordinary non-deverbative nouns. Some dvn's have both properties, e.g. *gíǹì* 'the action of building' or 'a building', *góoyóo* 'carrying on the back' or 'an infant (carried on the back)'.

From a morphological point of view, i.e. in terms of accounting for the *form* of dvn's, the difference in function between the various dvn's can be ignored (or, at least, temporarily put aside). The question here is what light can the model of gender developed above throw on the form of dvn's. A full study of dvn's goes beyond the scope of this paper; but I would like to show briefly how the number of presumably independent dvn formations can be reduced by treating some of the forms as overtly characterized feminatives corresponding to more common masculine forms.

4.1. dvn's with final -aa . As with non-verbal nouns, dvn's that are feminine end in *-aa* but not all dvn's that end in *-aa* are feminine, e.g.

- (24) HH (masc.): *gyáaráa* 'repairing'; *néemáa* 'seeking';  
*yánkáa* 'cutting/slaughtering'; *háwáa* 'mounting'  
 HH (fem.): *ǎ́ayáa* 'stripping (bark)'; *tsáagáa* 'splitting';  
*fánsáa* 'redeeming'; *yántáa* 'thatching'  
 HL (masc.): *ǎ́íibàa* 'dipping'; *jííifàa* 'throwing';  
*dúukàa* 'beating'; *súukàa* 'stabbing'  
 HL (fem.): *fíiràa* 'paring'; *jíímàa* 'tanning';  
*kúudáa* 'sharpening'; *súuyàa* 'frying'

4.2. dvn's with final -iyaa/-uwaa and HHH tone. There are many HHH dvn's ending in *-íyáa* and a smaller number in *-úwáa* , e.g.

- (25) táadíyáa 'tripping up'; góocíyáa 'swerving';  
 dátsíyáa 'a dam'; ráamúwáa 'retaliation'; gáisúwáa  
 'greeting'; tsáiwáa (= Kts. tsáyúwáa) 'standing'

The -iyaa forms have two possible explanations: (a) feminatives of \*CVCé forms, i.e. táadíyáa < \*táadé<sub>[f]</sub>, or (b) feminatives of \*CVCì forms, i.e. táadíyáa < \*táadì<sub>[f]</sub>. Solution (a) is the easiest in that the tone rules discussed above (section 3) automatically produce the correct result; but it leaves unexplained why there aren't any corresponding CVCée<sub>[m]</sub> dvn's. (The only masculine dvn of this form that I know of is zúukée (= zúukíyáa) 'going back on one's word'.) Solution (b) has the drawback of requiring an ad hoc tone rule to produce the occurring HHH instead of the expected HLH, i.e. táadíyáa, not ??táadíyáa. However, since HLH dvn's with -iyaa do not occur, even though this is generally a common feminine pattern, solution (b) with an added HLH > HHH rule might be the correct one. In this case, dvn's such as táadíyáa, etc. would simply be the feminine forms corresponding to the very common CVCìi masculine dvn's; and in fact, there are a number of cases where the two forms are variants of one another, e.g.

- (26) jéeríyáa = jéerìi 'row'  
 náaníyáa = náanìi 'repairing by sealing over'  
 tóoshíyáa = tóoshìi 'bribe'  
 yáafíyáa = yáafìi 'sowing by scattering'

With the -uwaa forms, on the other hand, a straightforward derivation from \*CVCó bases seems preferable, i.e. ráamúwáa < \*ráamó<sub>[f]</sub>. These uncommon forms thus become the natural counterparts to the also relatively uncommon HH masculine forms such as góoyóo 'carrying an infant', bóoyóo 'hiding', 'áróo 'borrowing', etc.

4.3. dvn's with final -uwaa and HLH or HHL tone. The small dvn

class composed of fáadúwáa 'falling', háifúwáa 'giving birth', rántsùwáa 'oath', and mútúwàa 'death, dying' corresponds to the masculine HL uu-final class, e.g. búgùu 'beating', sáamùu 'obtaining', dáamùu 'bothering', káamùu 'catching', yáagùu 'tearing the flesh', and (?)gúdùu 'running'. The HHL tone of mútúwàa is due to the light first syllable (cf. tsákúwàa 'gravel' with gwáidùwáa 'white of egg').

Although there are no HLH -iyaa dvn's, as mentioned above, there are some HHL words, e.g. rákíyàa 'accompanying', sákíyàa 'puncturing to let out pus', which contrast with HHH words such as káfíyáa 'standing one's ground', lákíyáa 'not sharing meat'. It may be that the analysis adopted in section 4.2 is incorrect for light syllable verbs, and that the source of káfíyáa, e.g., must be \*CVCé<sub>[f]</sub>, even though no masculine counterpart exists, while rákíyàa, e.g., would correspond to the light syllable CVCìi dvn's such as sáábìi 'measuring a farm'.

4.4. dvn's with final -iyaa and LLH tone. LLH forms such as gòodíyáa 'thanks', kwàncíyáa 'lying down', m̀òoríyáa 'advantage, benefit', etc. are presumably derived from CVCé bases and thus correspond to the now-occurring masculine dvn's such as sàyée 'buying', yàabée 'plastering', hàngée 'espying', etc.

Theoretically, one would expect to find feminine dvn's of the form CVCúwáa corresponding to the LH oo-final words such as zàtóo 'thinking', ròokóo 'begging', etc.; and dàfúwáa 'cooking' might be such a word. But since such words would be identical in shape to inflected progressive participles with `wáa of grade 7 verbs (those with final -ú), their form would not be distinctive. Thus they have either shifted to other forms or else have remained, but are now unidentifiable.

4.5. Two problematic cases. It has always been assumed, I believe, that the words tàfíyàa 'travelling' and g̀àjíyàa 'tiredness' were dvn's formed from the verbs tàfí 'go' and g̀àjí 'to tire'

by the addition of a feminine nominalizing suffix *-yàa* . But if this were true, the form of the dvn's should have been *??táfáa* and *??gàzáa* , the actual forms being wrong both as regards tone and the presence of the transition glide. The explanation—already discovered by Parsons [1971/72:96] but generally overlooked—is that the *-yà(a)* ending on these words is etymologically a verbal extensional suffix, whose surface resemblance to the feminine gender marker is completely accidental. The forms *táfíyàa* and *gàjíyàa* are normal primary verbal nouns of the trisyllabic grade 3 verbs *\*táfíyà* and *\*gàjíyà* (cf. *tàwáyàa* 'shrinking < *tàwáyà* 'to shrink'), from which the irregular verb forms *tàfí* and *gàjí* have been created by apocope or back formation.

#### 5. Summary

This paper provides an introduction to the historical morphology of Hausa feminines. The discussion and analysis center on four themes: (a) the identification of "overt characterization" as the key process in understanding the development of Hausa feminines; (b) the distinctiveness of the derivational suffix *{-nyàa}* from the inflectional/grammatical ending *{-aa}*; (c) the regularity and non-arbitrariness of feminine forms in relation to underlying bases; and (d) the interpretation of certain deverbative noun forms as simply the feminine counterparts to common masculine deverbative noun forms.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, R.C. 1959. *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: University Press.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1977. "Niger-Congo noun class markers: prefixes, suffixes, both or neither." In M. Mould and T.J. Hinnebusch (eds.), *Papers from the Eighth Conference on African Linguistics*, pp. 97-104. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 7.
- Ibrahim, M.H. 1973. *Grammatical Gender*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Klingenheben, A. 1927/28. "Die Silbenauslautgesetze des Hausa." *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 18:272-97.
- Leben, W.R. 1971. "The morphophonemics of tone in Hausa. In C.-W. Kim and H. Stahlke (eds.), *Papers in African Linguistics*, pp. 201-18. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- Lukas, J. 1968. "Nunation in afrikanischen Sprachen." *Anthropos* 63:97-114.
- Lukas, J. 1977. "Tschadische Studien I. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Mukulu (République du Tchad)." *Afrika und Übersee* 60:1-58, 192-229.
- Lukas, R. 1967/68. "Das Nomen im Bade (Nordnigerien)." *Afrika und Übersee* 51:91-116, 198-224.
- Malkiel, Y. 1957-58. "Diachronic hypercharacterization in Romance." *Archivum Linguisticum* 9:79-113; 10:1-36.
- Martinet, A. 1956. "Le genre féminin en indo-européen: examen fonctionnel du problème." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 52(1):83-95.
- Newman, P. 1972. "Syllable weight as a phonological variable." *Studies in African Linguistics* 3:301-23.
- Newman, P. 1979. "The historical development of medial /ee/ and /oo/ in Hausa." *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 1 (in press).
- Parsons, F.W. 1960-61-63. "The operation of gender in Hausa." *African Language Studies* 1:117-36; 2:100-24; 4:166-207.
- Parsons, F.W. 1971/72. "Suppletion and neutralization in the verbal system of Hausa." *Afrika und Übersee* 55:49-97, 188-208.
- Parsons, F.W. n.d. "Alphabetical list of all the common disyllabic nouns in Hausa having distinct plural forms in regular use." Unpublished ms. (mimeo).
- Schachter, P. 1966. "A generative account of Hausa ne/ce." *Journal of African Languages* 5:34-53.

- Schuh, R.G. 1976. "The history of Hausa nasals." In L.M. Hyman et al. (eds.), *Papers in African Linguistics in Honor of Wm. E. Welmers*, pp. 221-32. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 6.
- Schuh, R.G. 1977. "Bade/Ngizim determiner system." *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 4(3):101-74.
- Schuh, R.G. 1978. "West Chadic vowel correspondences." Paper presented at the Third International Hamito-Semitic Congress, London. [Citations from this work refer to a typescript of the full text.]
- Skinner, M. 1977. "Gender in Pa'a." In P. Newman and R.M. Newman (eds.), *Papers in Chadic Linguistics*, pp. 167-74. Leiden: Afrika-Studiecentrum.
- Skinner, N. 1975. "The Hausa genitive morpheme as an exponent of gender: a query." In J. and T. Bynon (eds.), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 389-94. The Hague: Mouton.
- Taylor, F.W. 1959. *A Practical Hausa Grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Oxford University Press.