

**RESTRICTIVE VS NON-RESTRICTIVE  
RELATIVE CLAUSES IN HAUSA:  
WHERE MORPHOSYNTAX AND SEMANTICS MEET\***

Philip J. Jaggar  
SOAS, University of London

Restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in Hausa are characterized by morphosyntactic properties which are in (near) complementary distribution. Restrictives are introduced by one of two relative markers—either complex HL(L) tone *wandà/waddà/wad'andà* (MSG/FSG/PL) ‘the one(s) who(m), which, that etc’, or simplex *dà* ‘who(m), which, that, etc.’—and (normally) require a focus (*sukà, sukè*, etc.) form of the inflectional (perfective/imperfective) agreement-aspect paradigms. Non-restrictives, in contrast, are (for many speakers) distinguished from restrictives as follows: (1) they are introduced by a distinctive *all L tone* allomorph of the explicit relativizing pronoun *wàndà/wàddà/wàd'andà*; and (2) some speakers also allow *either* the same focus form of the INFL as occurs in restrictives, *or* use the neutral non-focus (*sun, sunà*, etc.) form as a possible alternative. This tense-aspect variation is attributable to the fact that non-restrictive relative clauses are (coordinate-like) appositional constructions which do not uniquely restrict/define/identify, etc. their antecedents.

---

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2nd World Congress of African Linguistics, University of Leipzig (July 27-August 3, 1997), where I received many helpful suggestions from various colleagues. I am grateful to the following Hausa-speakers for their intuitive judgements and insightful comments: Mahamane Lawali Abdoulaye, Mustapha Ahmad, Mahaman Bahir Attouman, Abdullahi Bature, Aliyu Bunza, Pascal de Campos, Abdulkadir Mansur Funtua, Muhammadu Mustafa Gwadabe, Lawan Danladi Yalwa, and Malami Buba in particular. The final product has also benefitted substantially from perceptive critiques from Paul Newman and Russell Schuh, and I would also like to thank Barbara Bradford, Wynn Chao, Melanie Green, Ruth Kempson, Joseph McIntyre, Andrew Simpson, and Laurie Tuller for reading and commenting on earlier drafts. None of the above should be held responsible for any remaining flaws. I am grateful to the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, for helping to fund my attendance at the Leipzig Congress (Grant #5030).

## 1. Introduction

My purpose in this paper is to characterize the major differences between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in Hausa (Chadic/Afroasiatic). Section 2 provides information on the data sources and speakers. In Section 3, I describe the core morphosyntactic properties of (the still poorly-understood class of) restrictive relative clauses, including restrictives with definite (§3.1), proform (§3.2), and indefinite (§3.3) external heads, and elucidate some previously unreported correlations and patterns. Section 3.4 examines specifiable contexts in which the usual focus tense-aspect marking rule in restrictive relative clauses (RRCs) can be overridden (contrary to accepted wisdom). The descriptive analysis in Section 3 serves not only to clarify some of the key design-features of RRCs, but also provides a comparative baseline for the subsequent account of the even more under-researched class of non-restrictive RCs. In Section 4 I show that there are important differences in the distribution and internal properties of the two RC structures. Following some background comments in Section 4.1, Section 4.2 examines the form and function of non-restrictive relative clauses (NRRCs) in Hausa, with special reference to two morphosyntactic properties which are in (partial) complementary distribution with RRCs—the form (tone) of the relative pronoun (§4.2.1), and the greater flexibility in tense-aspect and mood (TAM) selection (§4.2.2). This tense-aspect (INFL) variability is shown to be both syntactically and semantically motivated, and is attributable to the fact that appositional NRRCs, in contrast to intersecting RRCs, are loose, coordinate-like structures which do not narrowly restrict/define/identify, etc. their antecedents (a variable which has interesting implications for current theoretical approaches to syntactic problems like relative clause formation). The paper concludes (§4.2.3) by demonstrating that head-NRRC constructions have properties similar to topic-comment structures.

## 2. Data sources

My database of NRRCs derives from a variety of published and unpublished sources (see Appendix for full details of published works). Many of the naturally-occurring NRRC tokens come from two (media) sources (where I first became aware of the existence and nature of NRRCs)—*An Advanced Hausa Reader* (AHR, 1992) and *Hausa Newspaper Reader* (HNR, 1996). For each of these corpora, a (different) speaker read aloud scripted Hausa materials from BBC World Service Hausa radio broadcasts [= AHR], and selections from modern Hausa newspaper articles [= HNR]. All the readings were recorded on accompanying cassette-tapes by two speakers—Usman Muhammed (male, 50, from Kano) read the AHR materials, and Malami Buba (male, early 30s, from Sokoto) read the HNR selections. Additional naturalistic non-restrictive tokens were taken from *Hausar Yau da Kullum* (HYDK, 1991), a commercially

available video presentation of Hausa cultural materials (speaker = Abdullahi Bature, male, 30s, Kano; examples identified by time-point on *HYDK* tape). Finally, there are a number of made-up tokens in the corpus which were devised with and accepted by native-speakers in the course of elicitation sessions (plus a few examples from earlier works such as Imam 1970 [1939]). In the text, no identification indicates constructed (interview) examples. Other speakers consulted (all young males in a 20-40 age range) include (dialect areas added in parentheses): Mahamane Lawali Abdoulaye (Maradi/Katsina), Mustapha Ahmad (Kano), Mahaman Bachir Attouman (Zinder/Damagaram), Aliyu Bunza (Birnin Kebbi/Sokoto), Pascal de Campos (Matamaye/Damagaram), Abdulkadir Mansur Funtua (Funtuwa), Muhammadu Mustafa Gwadabe (Kano), Lawan Danladi Yalwa (Kano).

### 3. General properties of (restrictive) relative clauses in Hausa

For purposes of this background profile, we restrict our discussion to (clarification of) the core features of restrictives. Although this subtype is by far the most productive, restrictives remain to be adequately described, and there is still confusion and inconsistency in many grammars, teaching manuals and dictionaries. We shall see in due course that, although some of the restrictive properties do generalize to non-restrictives (§4), there are important differences in morphosyntax which are directly relatable to differences in both structure and meaning. (For extensive cross-language discussion of RC types in general, see Peranteau et al. [1972], Keenan & Comrie [1977], Comrie [1981:131ff], Keenan [1985:168-170], Lehmann [1986], and Kayne [1994].)

**3.1. Restrictives with definite heads.** Postnominal relative clauses in Hausa are embedded subordinate constructions (complex NPs) which intersect via predication with a coreferential argument in the top clause (see Gouffé [1964], McConvell [1973, 1977], Schachter [1973], Parsons [1981:46ff], Rufa'i [1983], Tuller [1985, 1986:80ff], Haïk [1990], and Attouman [1996] for various descriptions). To date, treatments of Hausa RCs have concentrated almost exclusively on the more productive restrictive RC formations [bracketed off] with definite NP heads of the type exemplified in (1).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Transcription system:  $\hat{a}/\hat{a}$  = L(ow) tone,  $\hat{a}$  = F(alling) tone, H(igh) tone is unmarked. A macron over a vowel indicates length, e.g.  $\hat{a}$ ,  $\hat{i}$  are long,  $a$ ,  $i$  are short, and  $a(a)$  = either long  $\hat{a}$  or short  $a$ ;  $b$  and  $d$  ( $D$ ) = laryngealized stops,  $k$  ( $K$ ) and the digraph  $ts$  = ejectives, 'y = glottalized semivowel,  $\check{r}$  = apical tap/roll,  $c$  and  $j$  = palato-alveolar affricates.

Abbreviations:

COP	copula	F	feminine	HAB	habitual
DD	definite determiner	FOC-IMPF	focus imperfective	IMP	imperative
DEM	demonstrative	FOC-PF	focus perfective	IMPF	imperfective
EXIST	existential	FUT	future	KH	(Standard) Kano Hausa

*continued on next page...*

- (1) *gà mōtā-ř RC[dà mukà sàyā jiyà]*  
 PRES car-DD(FSG) REL 1PL.FOC-PF buy yesterday  
 'here's the car that we bought yesterday'

In (1) the external NP head *mōtāř* 'the car' in the matrix clause is uniquely identified via the presupposed information entailed by the intersecting RRC [*dà mukà sàyā jiyà*] 'that we bought yesterday'. The head argument of the relativized predicate takes the enclitic definite determiner if [+definite], followed by the relative marker (REL) *dà* which marks/derives the relative predicate (see below). The antecedent head NP (typically a common noun plus any determiners) is inserted at the front of the postmodifying, externally-headed RC, and (depending upon its syntactic role) leaves either a gap or an overt resumptive pronoun in the base position. (See the works cited above for extensive discussion of the extraction facts and relativizable positions, the details of which will not concern us here.)

Within the affirmative perfective and imperfective tense-aspects (only),<sup>2</sup> there is a formal distinction between what I here refer to as the FOCUS and NON-FOCUS agreement-aspect paradigms,<sup>3</sup> and an important characteristic of Hausa RCs is that they generally require the same focus (INFL) form of the perfective (= 3PL *sukà*, etc.) and imperfective (= 3PL *sukè*, etc.) as other WH-movement operations which also bring a constituent to the left periphery focus site (see below and §§3.4, 4.2, however, for interesting exceptions in both restrictive and non-restrictive RCs). Sentences (2-5) further illustrate (and

---

M	masculine	PRES	presentative	SID	specific indefinite
NEG	negative	RC	relative clause		determiner
NRRC	non-restrictive RC	REL	relative marker	SUBJ	subjunctive
PF	perfective	RELPRO	relative pronoun	TAM	tense/aspect/mood
PL	plural	RRC	restrictive RC	VN	verbal noun
POT	potential	SG	singular		

1/2/3/4 = first/second/third/fourth person

\* = ungrammatical in the given context, ? = marginally acceptable

2 The inflectional categories of subject-agreement and tense-aspect and modality in Hausa are represented in a 2nd-position string of affixes and clitics (= INFL). The preverbal subject-agreement pronouns read the semantic features of person, gender, and number off their coreferential subject-controllers which may be overtly expressed, e.g., as lexical nouns or independent pronouns, or are null arguments (= 'small pro', licensed by INFL).

3 My choice of the (semantic) cover-term FOCUS (= FOCUS-PERFECTIVE, FOCUS-IMPERFECTIVE) is at variance with the traditional (but wholly misleading) labels "Relative Perfective" and "Relative Imperfective", so called because of their widespread distribution in (restrictive) relative clauses. Use of the unitary term focus (in preference to "relative") avoids potential confusion with the notion "relative tense" and also captures a specific semantic property which generalizes to a range of related focus operations. Non-focus is a catch-all category used here for convenience, and covers contexts where no such narrow semantic focus is entailed.

clarify) the normative configuration for restrictive RCs dominated by referentially definite NP heads.

RESTRICTIVE RCS WITH DEFINITE HEADS

- (2) *kā ga bàkî-n* RC[*dà sukà isō jiyà?*]  
 2MSG.PF see guests-DD(PL) REL 3PL.FOC-PF arrive yesterday  
 ‘did you see the guests who/that arrived yesterday?’
- (3) *yârâ-n (-nan)* RC[*dà sukà ga had’ârîn*]  
 boys-DD(PL) (-DEM) REL 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)  
*sun gayà wà ’yan sàndā kōmē*  
 3PL.PF tell to police everything  
 ‘the (those) boys who/that saw the accident told the police everything’
- (4) *yārò-n* RC[*dà kè nan à lōkàcîn*] *yā ga kōmē*  
 boy-DD(MSG) REL FOC-IMPF there at time.DD(MSG) 3MSG.PF see everything  
 ‘the boy who/that was there at the time saw everything’
- (5) *d’ālibâ-n* RC[*dà sukà gamà aikinsù*] *sun tàfi*  
 students-DD(PL) REL 3PL.FOC-PF finish work.of.3PL 3PL.PF leave  
 ‘the students who/that have finished their work have left’

The NP-DD RC[*dà* INFL [+ focus] VP...] structures in (1-5) consist of an external NP head with a gender/number-sensitive D(efinite) D(eterminer) suffix. The enclitic DD has a floating L tone (MSG/PL - `n, FSG - `ř < \* - `i) which docks onto a preceding H tone syllable and produces a F (exx. 2, 3, 5). (Speakers of Western Hausa dialects in particular usually adjust this F to H before the L tone REL *dà*, this F → H / \_\_\_ L *dà* tonal simplification rule (also gaining ground in other dialects) being the mirror-image of the F → L / H \_\_\_ mechanism discovered by Newman [1995:766-767].) The NP-DD formation is then post-modified by a restrictive RC introduced by the morphologically invariant (non-enclitic) relative marker *dà* ‘who(m), which, that, etc.’ (*dà* also functions as a clause-initial complementizer of subordinate propositional clauses, e.g., sentential objects of COMMAND-verbs). In contrast to NRRCs which are typically postpausal (§4.2.1), (*dà*-introduced) RRCs are usually linked prosodically to their antecedents, with which they form a constituent. Example (3) also shows that the same REL *dà* is present if the definite NP is further postmodified by a demonstrative determiner (here enclitic *nan*). It is also the strongly preferred choice if the head NP is determined by an explicit (pre-head) demonstrative.

- (6) *wànnan àlkalàmī/àlkalàmī-n dà kè kàrshen tēbūr*  
 DEM(SG) pen/pen-DD(MSG) REL FOC-IMPF end.of table  
*bā nāwa ba nē?*  
 NEG of.1SG NEG COP(MSG)  
 'isn't that pen which is at the end of the table mine?'

Rufa'i [1983: 422] presents examples of head NPs with demonstrative enclitics followed by RRCs introduced by the explicit HL *wandà*, etc. relative pronoun (see §3.2), for example, (tones and vowel length supplied) *?yārò-n-nan wandà ya kwântā à asibitì yā ràsu* 'that boy who was hospitalized has died'. However, the speakers I consulted, whilst requiring this maximal coding in postpausal non-restrictives (§4.2), adjudged the double-marking of a lexical NP head with two gender/number-marking deictic morphemes to be an awkward overspecification, in the same way that a complex relative pronoun would be semantically redundant with an independent pronoun head, for example, *nī dà (?wandà) na cè ...* 'I who said ...'.

As noted above, a core (deictic) characteristic of RRCs like those in (1-6) is the selection of the focus form of the (affirmative perfective, imperfective only) agreement-aspect INFL, a requirement they share with other (WH-)fronting operations whereby constituents are similarly extracted and moved to the clause-initial informational focus position, i.e., focus-fronting (including clefting for present purposes), WH-interrogation, and WH-ever expressions (Hausa is a 'discourse configurational' language in the sense of Kiss [1995]). All these operations thus involve the same functional category (see Haïk [1990] and Bearth [1993] for discussion of comparable phenomena in other African languages, and Tuller [1992] on related Chadic languages). (In current theoretical formulations, the landing-site for WH-movement is the specifier of CP [Chomsky 1986], with WH and focus phrases acting as local operators; see also Bresnan & Mchombo [1987], Horvath [1995], and Kiss [1995] for claims that WH-elements are inherently foci.) The semantic correlate common to all these (narrow focus entailing) movement rules is that the identification of the left-dislocated element is highly constrained, i.e., it is uniquely specified as the one (and only) constituent over which the predicate has scope. (Stated formally, restrictives denote sets which intersect with the set designated by some nominal projection, i.e., the head noun.) This key interpretive factor takes on added significance when we come to consider the interaction between (non-identifying) NRRCs and TAM (§4.2).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> One advantage of a semantically-motivated account which refers to notions of specificity, restrictiveness, etc. is that it can be extended to explain the functional distribution of the focus-perfective in narrative discourse, where individualized, punctual event sequences are iconically represented by a linear string of focus-perfective verbs. In a similar vein, Schuh (p.c. 1996, continued on next page...

Although proper nouns normally only admit non-restrictive postmodification (because they are independently identifiable via their assumed uniqueness), they can, when functioning as common nouns, occur as the antecedents of RRCs (with the definite determiner), as in (7-8).

- (7) *wàtò* *Mūsâ-n* *dà ya* *zō yànzū*  
 that is Musa-DD(MSG) REL 3MSG.FOC-PF come now  
 ‘you mean the Musa who came now?’
- (8) *wàtò* *Bīrñin Kudù-n* *dà kè* *Jihār Kanò?*  
 that is Birnin Kudu-DD(MSG) REL FOC-IMPF State.of Kano  
 ‘you mean the Birnin Kudu (town) that is in Kano State?’

**3.2. Proform-headed restrictive RCs.** RRCs may also be headed by substitutive PROFORMS—relativizing pronominal elements which move from the basic argument position and replace an (antecedent) NP head (where the lexical head could be felicitously copied into the site occupied by the proform). There are two (semantically-conditioned) gender/number-sensitive proforms, minimally distinguished by the tone on the initial syllable. Of the two occurring allomorphs, the most widespread (used by all speakers as far as we know) is a relative pronoun (RELPRO) with HL(L) tones—HL tone *wandà* (MSG), *waddà* = *waccè* (FSG), HLL *wad'andà* (PL) (also LHL *wad'andà*) ‘the one(s) who(m), which, that etc.’<sup>5</sup> Alongside the HL(L) RELPRO, some speakers also have an all L tone variant *wàndà* (MSG), *wàddà* = *wàccè* (FSG), *wàd'andà* (PL)—a well-established allomorph first noted by Bargery [1934:1078], but largely ignored in standard descriptions of RCs (see §4.1). Speakers who use both the heterotonic HL *wandà*, etc. and monotonic all L *wàndà*, etc. forms are henceforth referred to as 2-RELPRO speakers, and those with only the HL variant are

---

refining some earlier proposals [1985:14]) has suggested that another (related) way of looking at this phenomenon is to say that a common semantic characteristic of all WH-constructions is that the INFL itself is contained within a presupposed proposition. According to this analysis, the choice of the specific/presuppositional, etc. focus-perfective in narrative discourse is attributable to the (interpretive) fact that the speaker has a specific time and/or place in mind when the realized event took place, and also presupposes that the hearer shares this assumption (much like the ‘Definite Past’ in English—cf. McConvell’s [1977] use of the term ‘Definite Perfect’). Use of the definite/specific focus-perfective thus acts to narrow down the temporality of the single, actualized events of the historical narrative, all of which have a clear and specific end result (= telic). The widespread co-occurrence of deictic time-ordering connectors like *sai* and *sànnan* ‘then, after that’ in focus-perfective narrative sequences is another manifestation of this semantic specificity. (See also Tuller [1986], Abdoulaye [1992:60ff].)

<sup>5</sup> Although the LHL *wad'andà* plural variant is in fact quite common (like its LHL plural demonstrative counterpart *wad'annàn* ‘these’), for the sake of consistency I cite the more familiar HLL *wad'andà* in examples.

labelled 1-RELPRO speakers (henceforth I use (MSG) *wandà* and *wàndà* to represent the two respective RELPRO sets).<sup>6</sup>

These complex RELPROs are compounds made up of a generalized (basically deictic) formative *wa(a)-* which also occurs independently in various interrogative and demonstrative determiners/pronouns, specific indefinite determiners/pronouns (§3.3), and (possibly?) the deictic appositional conjunct *wàtò* 'that is, namely', plus the definite determiner (MSG/PL  $\text{-}n$ , FSG  $\text{-}C < * \text{-}t$ , where  $\text{-}C$  = copy of following consonant) which produces a Fall on the *wâ-*, followed by the simplex REL *dà*, for example, (MSG) *wa(a) + n + dà* → *wândà*. The widespread (cross-dialectal) surface HL forms *wandà* (MSG), *waddà* = *waccè* (FSG) are generated as follows: FL (MSG) *wândà* → HL *wandà*, following simplification of the F to H before the REL *dà*, and to simplify the discussion, I will use this HL (*wandà*) variant for illustrative purposes. (Although the [underlying/ historically original] FL *wândà* RELPROs are recorded in grammars and dictionaries, their synchronic status and distribution are uncertain.) The feminine singular variant *waccè* (?also FL *wâccè*) is anomalous in suffixing what is probably an allomorph ( $\text{-}cè$ ) of the *cè* feminine copula (with no REL *dà*). (The plural pronoun also contains the  $\text{-}dàn$ - pluralizer.) The segmentally identical all L (MSG, FSG, PL) *wàndà*, *wàddà* = *wàccè*, *wàd'àndà* variants are (minimally) distinct in having a L tone on the initial syllable.

For many of the 2-RELPRO speakers with the HL (*wandà*) vs. all L (*wàndà*) distinction in their grammars, the distribution of the two variants in restrictive RCs seems to be largely determined by the [ $\pm$ identifiable] features of the referent, and the following form-meaning correlations hold:<sup>7</sup> (a) if the referent of the RELPRO is hearer-*new* (assumed not to be hearer-identifiable, non-presupposed), then HL *wandà* is strongly preferred (the same form used with indefinite heads, §3.3); (b) if the referent of the RELPRO is hearer-*old* (assumed to be hearer-identifiable, presupposed), then there is a discernible bias towards

<sup>6</sup> 2-RELPRO speakers include (dialect areas repeated for convenience): Mahamane Lawali Abdoulaye (Maradi/Katsina), Mahaman Bachir Attouman (Zinder/Damagaram), Abdullahi Bature (Kano, = *HYDK* speaker), Malami Buba (Sokoto, = *HNR* speaker), Aliyu Bunza (Birnin Kebbi/Sokoto), Pascal de Campos (Matamaye/Damagaram), Abdulkadir Mansur Funtua (Funtua), Muhammadu Mustafa Gwadabe (Kano), and Usman Muhammed (Kano, = *AHR* speaker). Mustapha Ahmad (Kano) and Lawan Danladi Yalwa (Kano) are 1-RELPRO speakers [p.c., 1997].

<sup>7</sup> This is possibly one area of the grammar of RC formation where the form-meaning correlation in question is more consistent and stable for some (2-RELPRO) speakers than for others, i.e., where the system is scalar rather than discrete (perhaps a sign of language change in progress)—compare, too, the focus vs. non-focus TAM variation in non-restrictives (§4.2.2). It is still possible, however, to extrapolate from the attested data and capture key form-function correlations which are valid for a significant number of speakers, in the same way that important generalizations about RCs in English remain available despite inter- and intra-speaker variation [Quirk et al. 1985: 1239ff].



RELATIVE PRONOUNS	REFERENT = NEW	REFERENT = OLD
2-RELPRO speakers = HL(L) <i>wandà</i> (MSG) <i>waddà</i> (= <i>waccè</i> ) (FSG) <i>wad'àndà</i> (= <i>wàd'andà</i> ) (PL) + all L <i>wàndà</i> (MSG) <i>wàddà</i> (= <i>wàccè</i> ) (FSG), <i>wàd'àndà</i> (PL) ‘the one(s) who(m), which, that, etc.’	HL <i>wandà</i> , etc.  (? all L <i>wàndà</i> , etc.)	all L <i>wàndà</i> , etc.  (? HL <i>wandà</i> , etc.)
1-RELPRO speakers = only HL(L) <i>wandà</i> (MSG) <i>waddà</i> (= <i>waccè</i> ) (FSG) <i>wad'àndà</i> (= <i>wàd'andà</i> ) (PL) ‘the one(s) who(m), which, that, etc.’	HL <i>wandà</i> , etc.	HL <i>wandà</i> , etc.

Table 1: Proforms in Restrictive Relative Clauses.

the all L tone *wàndà* variant.<sup>8</sup> (As we shall see below (§4.2), a previously unknown but key function of the all L tone *wàndà* allomorph is also to act as the marker of NRRCs for 2-RELPRO speakers.) Table 1 above summarizes the distributional RELPRO facts.

**3.2.1. Hearer-new referent = HL *wandà* proform.** Examples (9-15) contain RELPROs which replace NP heads (referents) which are hearer-new in the sense that the speaker assumes they do not exist within the hearer’s knowledge store; with such nonpresupposed (first mention) referents, HL *wandà* is the strongly preferred proform choice for 2-RELPRO speakers.

<sup>8</sup> The correlation between morphology (syntax) and the cognitive status of referents is also a feature of the demonstrative system [Buba 1997a], where the posthead and prehead demonstrative determiners typically encode identifiable and non-identifiable referents respectively, e.g., *gà littāfin-nān* ‘here is this/the book’ (= hearer-old, prementioned, e.g., you asked me to bring it) vs. *gà wannān littāfi* ‘here is this book’ (= hearer-new, no prior mention).

## HEARER-NEW RELATIVE PROFORMS

- (9) *tò àmmā duk dà hakà, àkwai wad'andà kè ganin cêwā ...*  
 OK but nevertheless EXIST RELPRO(PL) FOC-IMP see.VN.of that  
 'OK but nevertheless, there are those who feel that ...' [AHR: 3]
- (10) *à wajen indà ya kāmātà à řubùtā*  
 in place.of where 3MSG.FOC-PF be appropriate 4PL.SUBJ write  
*wandà ya aikà dà àkwàtin ...* [AHR: 1]  
 RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF send crate.DD(MSG)  
 'and where the name of the one (MSG) that sent the crate should have been  
 written ...'
- (11) *bàri nà gayà makà lābārīn*  
 let.IMP 1SG.SUBJ tell to.2MSG news.of  
*waccè na ganī jiyà*  
 RELPRO(FSG) 1SG.FOC-PF see yesterday  
 'let me tell you about the one (FSG) that I saw yesterday'

The same HL *wandà* RELPRO cooccurs with the universal determiner *duk* 'all, every' to introduce concessive-conditional constructions with indefinite, non-referring (personal) 'anyone who, whoever, etc.' readings (12-13), in addition to other non-specific generic constructions. It is also used in relative constructions following a negative existential marker (= 'no-one, etc.', lit. 'there is not the one that'), as in (15).

- (12) *duk wandà (= wandà duk) ya yi hakà wāwā nè*  
 all RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF do this fool COP(MSG)  
 'anyone who did this is a fool'
- (13) *duk wandà (= wandà duk) ya san asalin*  
 all RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF know origin.of  
*wannàn rìkicī ...*  
 DEM(SG) conflict  
 'anyone who knows the origin of this conflict ...'
- (14) *irìn wannàn aikì, sai wandà ya ganī*  
 kind.of DEM(SG) work, only RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF see  
*dà idònsà*  
 with eye.of.3MSG  
 'this kind of work has to be seen to be believed'  
 [lit. only the one who has seen with his eye]

- (15) *bābù wàndà ya san asalin wannàn rikicī*  
 NEG EXIST RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF know origin.of DEM(SG) conflict  
 ‘no-one knows the origin of this conflict’

**3.2.2. Hearer-old referent = all L *wàndà* proform.** If the referent is hearer-old—assumed to be either identifiable from the preceding discourse (anaphoric) or context-inferable—then most 2-RELPRO speakers favour the monotonic all L *wàndà* proforms, i.e., where the initial syllable (*wàn*) has an unstressed L tone (as opposed to the initial stressed H tone of the heterotonic HL *wandà* variant). This correspondence between the all L tone anaphor and the [+ identifiable] cognitive status of the referent is not accidental; it is also a feature of the Hausa pronominal system, another deictic-anaphoric domain where weak direct object, possessive and indirect pronoun clitics carry a lexically specific L tone, for example, (3PL) *-sù* ‘them’, *-n-sù* ‘their’, *mu-sù* ‘to them’. Given the available choice between a strongly stressed and weakly stressed form, it is not surprising (all other things being equal) that these speakers exploit the relatively unstressed all L variant to code situationally given/old information (consider, too, the fact that presupposed information in English carries weak stress within the tone unit [Quirk et al. 1985:1360ff]). Use of the weak all L RELPRO thus acts to reflect the reduced semantic weight and “communicative dynamism” of the presupposed referent [Firbas 1971]. Examples in (16-19) illustrate the use of all L anaphoric *wàndà* to coindex an overtly expressed antecedent. Notice the use in (18-19) of the additional (definite) markers

HEARER-OLD RELATIVE PROFORMS

- (16) *ita cè wàddà nakè sô*  
 3FSG COP(FSG) RELPRO(FSG) 1SG.FOC-IMPF love.VN  
 ‘SHE is the one I love’
- (17) *in ya jē wancàn gidā*  
 if 3MSG.FOC-PF go to DEM(MSG) house  
  
*ya gānà dà wàddà kè can ...*  
 3MSG.FOC-PF talk with RELPRO(FSG) FOC-IMPF there  
 ‘if he goes to that house and talks with the one who (FSG) is there ...’  
 [Katsina 1982:11, transcribed in Buba 1997a:242]
- (18) *lābārīn yā ci gāba dà cēwā wàd'andà*  
 story.DD(MSG) 3MSG.PF continue with say.VN RELPRO(PL)  
  
*sukà mutù d'īn ...*  
 3PL.FOC-PF die DIN  
 ‘the story added that those who had died ...’

- (19) *wàndà*                    *ya*                    *batà-n* ...  
 RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF get lost-DD(MSG)  
 ‘the one that got lost ...’ [Buba 1997a:173, taken from Parsons 1981:42]

in RC clause-final position—deictic-anaphoric *d’in* ‘the one(s) referred to’ in (18) (see also Buba [1997b]), and a (default MSG *-n*) definite determiner therefore, the [+identifiable] status of the referents in examples like (18-19) is expressed by a combination of an all L RELPRO plus a definite marker.

Examples (20-21) nicely illustrate the all L *wàndà* [+identifiable] vs. HL *wandà* [-identifiable] form-meaning contrast using the HLL *wàd’andà* (PL) RELPRO to index a new referent (20), but switching to the all L *wàd’andà* RELPRO to anaphorize now pre-established (hearer-old) discourse-referents (21).

- (20) [A policeman arrives at the scene of an accident and asks]  
*àkwai wàd’andà sukà ga had’arîn?*  
 EXIST RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)  
 ‘are there any who saw the accident?’
- (21) [Sometime later the same policeman returns and asks the same people]  
*inā wàd’andà sukà ga had’arîn?*  
 where RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)  
 ‘where are the ones that saw the accident?’

Fragments (22-23) illustrate the use of all L *wàndà* to express entities which have no overt linguistic antecedent but are assumed to be recoverable from context (= discourse-new definite referents).

- (22) a. *bāyan shèkarà gùdā nè kuma*  
 after year one COP(MSG) and
- b. *à’amàrîn na Ûmarù Dikkò ya kai gà*  
 case.DD(MSG) of(MSG) Umaru Dikko 3MSG.FOC-PF reach to  
*wani sābon matsayī*  
 SID(MSG) new.of position
- c. *bāyân dà akà sēcè shi à Ingilà.*  
 after 4PL.FOC-PF kidnap 3MSG in England
- d. *Wàd’andà sukà yi niyyār sēcè shîn ...* [AHR:1]  
 RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF do intention.of kidnap 3MSG.DD(MSG)

‘One year later Umaru Dikko’s situation reached a new turning-point after he was kidnapped in England. Those who planned to kidnap him ...

(23) a. ... *aràngamà dà zub dà jinī* ... *tsàkànin d'àlìbai dà kuma 'yan sàndā*.  
 clash and spill blood between students and also policemen

b. *Wàdàndà sukà ràsu* ... [AHR:99]  
 RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF die

'... the bloody clashes between students and police. Those who died ...'

For 2-RELPRO speakers, all L *wàndà* also introduces proverbs used to illustrate a particular action/event, and it is selected in this context because the hearer is assumed to share the (old) knowledge and beliefs expressed in the proverb, for example, (said in reference to someone who has committed a senseless act regardless of the consequences).

(24) *wàndà bàì jì 'bàri' ba*,  
 RELPRO(MSG) NEG PF.3MSG hear stop.IMP NEG

*yâ jì 'òhō'*  
 3MSG.POT hear it's not my concern

'better safe than sorry'

[lit. 'the one who doesn't hear "stop" will hear "it's not my concern"']

**3.3. Restrictives with indefinite heads.** In cases where the RRC functions to characterize or describe a hearer-new indefinite head NP, the RRC can be introduced either by the same simplex REL *dà* used to code definite heads (§3.2), or by the complex coreferential RELPRO which reads the gender-number features off the indefinite head. If a complex RELPRO is used to postmodify an indefinite antecedent, 2-RELPRO speakers strongly prefer the HL *wandà* variant (the same form which substitutes as a proform for hearer-new NP referents, §3.2.1). (Rufa'i [1983:421-22] records only explicit RELPROs with indefinite antecedents, but the *dà* REL is, in fact, commonly used; see below.) If the indefinite head is referentially specific, it is premodified by an appropriate form of the gender/number-inflected specific indefinite determiner (SID) *wani/wata/wa(d'an)su* (MSG/FSG/PL) 'a (certain), some', yielding a SID NP<sub>RC</sub>[*dà/wandà* INFL (Focus) VP...] configuration, as examples (25-30) illustrate. Example (30) illustrates the same phenomenon with a nonverbal predicate.

#### SPECIFIC INDEFINITE HEAD

(25) *wasu yârâ dà/wadàndà sukà ga had'àrīn*  
 SID(PL) boys REL/RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)

*sun gayà wà 'yan sàndā kōmē*  
 3PL.PF tell to police everything

'some [specific] boys that saw the accident told the police everything'

- (26) wani yārò dà/wandà kè nan à lōkàcîn  
 SID(MSG) boy REL/RELPRO(MSG) FOC-IMPF there at time.DD(MSG)  
*yā ga kōmē*  
 3MSG.PF see everything  
 ‘a [specific] boy that was there at the time saw everything’
- (27) *nā hàd'u dà wata yārinyà dà/waddà akè*  
 1SG.PF meet with SID(FSG) girl REL/RELPRO(FSG) 4PL.FOC-IMPF  
*kiràntà Dèlu*  
 call.VN.of.3FSG Delu  
 ‘I met a [specific] girl who’s called Delu’
- (28) *dà ya shìga cikin dākì sai ya ìskē*  
 when 3MSG.FOC-PF enter in room then 3MSG.FOC-PF find  
wasu mutànē dà/wad'andà sukà ràyu  
 SID(PL) people REL/RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF survive  
 ‘when he entered the room he found some [specific] people who’d survived’
- (29) *inà nēman wani māgàní dà/wandà*  
 1SG.IMPF look for.VN.of SID(MSG) medicine REL/RELPRO(MSG)  
*zâi warkař dà nī*  
 FUT.3MSG cure 1SG  
 ‘I’m looking for a [specific] medicine that will cure me’
- (30) *àkwai wasu mutànē dà/wad'andà aikinsù kawài ròkō*  
 EXIST SID(PL) men REL/RELPRO(PL) job.of.3PL only begging  
 ‘there are some men whose only job is begging’

The presence of the prehead SID with a specific-indefinite NP is required independently of RC formation [Jaggar 1988], and the SID can in fact function as a lexical head in its own right, as illustrated, for example, in (31).

- (31) wani dà/wandà akà yi had'arîn  
 SID(MSG) REL/RELPRO(MSG) 4PL.FOC-PF do accident.DD(MSG)  
*à idònsà yā cê ...*  
 in eye.of.3MSG 3MSG.PF say  
 ‘an eyewitness to the accident said that ... [lit. a certain one who...]

To signal an additive-incremental ‘another X, some other Xs, etc.’ reading, the head NP also suffixes the definite determiner (which then licenses only simplex REL *dà*), as in (32).

- (32) *wasu yârâ-n dà sukà ga hadàrîn ...* (cf. ex. 25)  
 SID(PL) boys-DD(PL) REL 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)  
 ‘some other boys who saw the accident ...’

If the indefinite head NP is non-specific, it appears as a bare nominal (again this is an independently-occurring feature not limited to RC formation), and either the inflected RELPRO or basic REL are possible in the RC, as in (33-36).

NON-SPECIFIC INDEFINITE HEAD

- (33) *sun d’auki ma’aikâtâ wad’andà/dà sukà kwarè sòsai*  
 3PL.PF take workers RELPRO(PL)/REL 3PL.FOC-PF be experienced really  
 ‘they’ve taken on workers that have a lot of experience’
- (34) *mutànē wad’andà/dà kè cikin d’ākunànsù sun gudù*  
 people RELPRO(PL)/REL FOC-IMPV in huts.of.3PL 3pl.PF run away  
*don tsòrò*  
 because of fear  
 ‘people who were in their huts ran away in fear’
- (35) *àkwai kāyā wad’andà/dà akè sâwā lōkàcin zāfi*  
 EXIST clothes RELPRO(PL)/REL 4PL.FOC-IMPV put on.VN time.of heat  
 ‘there are clothes that are worn during warm weather’
- (36) *àkwai mutànē wad’andà/dà bā sà sôn irìn wannàn*  
 EXIST people RELPRO(PL)/REL NEG 3PL.IMPV like.VN.of kind.of DEM(SG)  
 ‘there are people who don’t like this kind of thing’

Non-count mass nouns usually appear in the bare form (SID-determination of mass nouns in general is unusual, except in the additive-incremental ‘another, some other’ sense), and speakers seem to have no strong preference with regard to RELPRO *wandà* or REL *dà* in the postnominal RC.

- (37) *nā sayō dāwà waccè/dà zân yi tuwō dà ita*  
 1SG.PF buy guineacorn RELPRO(FSG)/REL FUT.1SG make tuwo with 3FSG  
 ‘I’ve bought (some) guineacorn that I’ll make *tuwo* (food) with’

### 3.4. Use of non-focus (*sun*, *sunà*, etc.) INFL in restrictive RCs.

Although it is generally held that RRCs behave categorically with regard to selection of the focus INFL form from within the perfective and imperfective paradigms, scrutiny of a larger corpus of RC data reveals that this “rule” can (for some speakers) be overridden in favour of a non-focus INFL, though only if the following syntactic condition (there could be others) is satisfied—the REL *dà* (or RELPRO *wandà*) is separated from the following INFL by some element. The intervening material typically consists of a time adverb (simple or complex), for example, *kullum* ‘always, every day’, *kōyàushē* ‘always’, *tun tūni* ‘(since) long ago’; a quantifier, for example, *duk(à)* ‘all, every’; or a full adverbial clause; and the preference for a non-focus INFL increases in proportion to the complexity (length) of the interposed adverbial constituent (= distance between REL(PRO) and INFL). For convenience, we shall use the cover-term “adverbial-insertion” to refer to this apparently structure-dependent behaviour, and note also that it seems to be considered more acceptable among speakers of (Standard) Kano Hausa. (Abraham [1940:86] had in fact already remarked on the phenomenon (“when *dà* is separated from its verb”), citing the (restrictive) example *yā tunà dà màgànār ùbansà dà kullum yanà cēwā* ... ‘he remembered the words of his father who always used to say ...’, but the significance of his observation was overlooked.) Examples (38-42) illustrate (with definite NP, indefinite NP and proform heads).

#### NON-FOCUS INFL IN RESTRICTIVES WITH ADVERBIAL-INSERTION

- (38) a. *wàkìlìnmù*      *yā*      *yi hīřa dà*  
 reporter.of.1PL 3MSG.PF do talk with
- b. *wasu mutàné dà tun tūni sukà*      (= *sun*)      *san*  
 SID(PL) people REL since long ago 3PL.FOC-PF (= 3PL.PF) know
- àbìn*      *dà ya*      *tā dà rikicìn*  
 thing.DD(MSG) REL 3MSG.FOC-PF raise crisis.DD(MSG)  
 ‘our reporter talked with some people who long ago knew what had triggered the crisis’
- (39) *sun d’auki ma’aikàtā wad’andà dā mā sukà*      (= *sun*)  
 3PL.PF take workers RELPRO(PL) all along 3PL.FOC-PF (= 3PL.PF)
- kwarè wajen aikìnsù*  
 be expert place.of job.of.3PL  
 ‘they’ve taken on workers who all along have been experts in their jobs’



- (40) a. *wàkìlinmù* *yā* *yi hīřa dà*  
reporter.of.1PL 3MSG.PF do talk with
- b. *wasu àlhàzai dà duk shèkarà sukè (= sunà) zuwà*  
SID(PL) pilgrims REL every year 3PL.FOC-IMPf (= 3PL.IMPf) go.VN  
*aikin haji*  
work.of pilgrimage  
'our reporter talked with some pilgrims who annually go on pilgrimage [to Mecca]'
- (41) *inā d'ālibān nan dà kōyàushē sukè (= sunà)*  
where students.DD(PL) DEM REL always 3PL.FOC-IMPf (= 3pl.IMPf)  
*zuwà ajin nān?*  
come.VN class.DD(MSG) DEM  
'where are those students who always come to this class?'
- (42) *fāsinjōjīn dà duk(k)ānsù/dà dāmařsù/dà yawānsù*  
passengers.DD(PL) REL all.of.3PL/many.of.3PL/most.of.3PL  
*sukà (= sun) ji rāunī an kwantař dà sū*  
3PL.FOC-PF (= 3PL.PF) feel injury 4PL.PF lay down 3PL  
'all/many/most of the passengers who were injured have been admitted to hospital'

In examples (38-42) selection of the non-focus TAM (as a second-choice alternative to the focus TAM) is licensed by the intrusion of the temporal adverbs *tun tūni* 'for some time, since long ago' (38), *dā mā* 'all along, from the start' (39), *duk shèkarà* 'annually, every year' (40b), *kōyàushē* 'always, regularly' (41), and the quantifiers *duk(k)ānsù* 'all of them', *dà dāmařsù/dà yawānsù* 'many/most of them' (42), between REL and INFL.<sup>9</sup> A possible explanation for this phenomenon derives from the fact that (universal) quantifiers and non-punctual, time-duration adverbs would normally be positioned in (S-initial) pre-INFL position in the related independent sentences (minus any focal elements), without triggering a focus INFL, and that speakers who allow the non-focus INFL in such as (38-42) are simply generalizing this rule to (restrictive) RC environments.

<sup>9</sup> I leave aside (for further research) the interesting question of why adverbial-insertion apparently does not license a non-focus INFL following left periphery WH-movement of interrogative and focus phrases (which target the same clause-initial position).

Although the above examples illustrate the TAM variation with both perfective (38-39, 42) and imperfective (40-41) INFLs, speakers are generally more willing to accept a non-focus form with the imperfective, a preference which extends to subordinate adverbial clauses introduced by temporal conjunctions such as *lōkàcîn dà/yâyîn dà* ‘when’, which are lexicalized adnominal (restrictive) relative formations (lit. ‘the time that’), as in (43), for example. (For some speakers, use of the focus INFL *nakè* in the time-clause in (43) would introduce a slightly more specific reading.). In (44) only the focus perfective INFL (*sukà*) is considered grammatical.

(43) *lōkàcîn*            *dà/yâyîn*            *dà* *nakè*            (= *inà*)            *yārò*  
time.DD(MSG) REL/time.DD(MSG) REL 1SG.FOC-IMPF (= 1SG.IMPF) boy

*bābānā*            *yā*            *shā*            *gayà mîn* ...  
father.of.1SG 3MSG.PF do often tell to.1SG  
‘when I was a boy my father often told me ...’

(44) *lōkàcîn*            *dà/yâyîn*            *dà* *sukà*            (\**sun*)            *kai gidā*  
time.DD(MSG) REL/time.DD(MSG) REL 3PL.FOC-PF (\*3PL.PF) reach home

*sai sukà*            *tarař dà shī*            *nan*  
then 3PL.FOC-PF find 3MSG there  
‘when they reached home they found him there’

This variability across tense-aspect has a natural explanation: the focus perfective is required in contexts like (44) because its main (deictic) narrative function is to narrow down the temporal and locational properties of core punctual events, thereby framing specific time-positions in strict narrative sequence (see also fn. 4). The imperfective, on the other hand, serves only to encode supportive, nonpunctual background information which is external to the event-line narrative structure, and so can take the non-focus form as in (43) where there is a temporal overlap of the two (simultaneous) situations in the root and subordinate clauses. (See also Abraham [1959:163] and Abdoulaye [1992:66].)

Whereas speakers are sometimes uncertain about the inflectional focus:non-focus choice in contexts such as (38-42) (the choice is not equally determinate in all contexts), non-focus forms become increasingly felicitous for all speakers when the adverbial material inserted between the REL and INFL is morpho-syntactically complex. A “heavy” adverbial clause, for example, increases the distance between the REL and INFL, and so enhances the acceptability of a non-focus INFL (for some speakers clause-intervention actually rules out (or marginalizes) use of a focus form, as in (46c)).

- (45) a. *ai, mutà̀nền nan dà tun sunà̀ yârâ*  
 well people.DD(PL) DEM REL since 3PL.IMP children  
*sukè̀ (= sunà̀) yîn hakà,*  
 3PL.FOC-IMP (= 3pl.IMP) do.VN.of this
- b. *bà zâi yiwu sù gyârà halinsù ba*  
 NEG FUT.3MSG be possible 3PL.SUBJ repair character.of.3PL NEG  
 ‘well, those people who since childhood have been doing this,  
 will never mend their ways’
- (46) a. *sū nè sākà̀rkā̀fū̀n nan dà,*  
 3PL COP(PL) fools.DD(PL) DEM REL
- b. *kṑdà̀yakè̀ nā shā gayà musù sù dainà,*  
 although 1SG.PF do often tell to.3PL 3PL.SUBJ stop
- c. *ammā sun (?sukà̀) ci gā̀ba dà sākā̀rcinsù*  
 but 3PL.PF (?3PL.FOC-PF) continue with foolishness.of.3PL  
 ‘they are those fools who, even though I kept on telling them to stop,  
 continued with their foolishness’

Table 2 summarizes our explication of the grammar of restrictive RCs with definite and indefinite head NPs and proforms.

MORPHOSYNTAX	DEFINITE HEAD (hearer-old)	INDEFINITE HEAD (hearer-new)
DEFINITE DETERMINER/DEMONSTRATIVE	√	
INDEFINITE DETERMINER (SPECIFIC)		√
REL <i>dà</i>	√	√
RELPRO/PROFORM = HL <i>wandà</i> etc. 1-RELPRO speakers	√ <i>wandà</i> etc.	√ <i>wandà</i> etc.
2-RELPRO speakers	(? <i>wandà</i> etc.)	√ <i>wandà</i> etc.
RELPRO/PROFORM = all L <i>wàndà</i> etc. (= 2-RELPRO speakers only)	√ <i>wàndà</i> etc.	(? <i>wàndà</i> etc.)
FOCUS INFL (Perfective/Imperfective)	√	√
NONFOCUS INFL (Perfective/Imperfective) [with REL ↓ INFL adverbial-insertion]	√	√

Table 2. Morphosyntax of restrictive RCs with definite and indefinite heads (NPs and proforms).

#### 4. Non-restrictive relative clauses

**4.1. Background.** Although non-restrictives are a well-established and identifiable feature of the grammar of relative clause formation in present-day Hausa, they have received surprisingly little attention in standard reference works (e.g., grammars, dictionaries), and conventional descriptions of RCs have concentrated on the more productive restrictive type (§3). Parsons [1981:46ff (original paper presented in 1972)] was, to my knowledge, the first to recognize the significant fact that Hausa *does* make a formal distinction between (“is pretty hot on”) restrictive and non-restrictive RCs (see also Kraft & Kirk-Greene [1973:106, fn. 4]). Apart from orthographically marking off NRRCs with commas in the Hausa examples and English glosses, indicating that he was aware of the diagnostic pre-NRRC pause (a prosodic feature also noted by Gouffé [1964:46]), Parsons proposed [p. 48] that the one (syntactic) property distinguishing the two RC-types was that the rule requiring the focus form of the (perfective/imperfective) TAM could be overridden in non-restrictive (but not restrictive) RCs. Parsons illustrated this feature with two NRRC examples in which the RELPRO is separated from the INFL either by a sequence of subordinate adverbial clauses, for example, (tones [all L for 2-RELPRO speakers] and vowel length added, RELPROs and INFLs underlined) *gà madàkà kàttì bìye dà sarkì, wàd'andà, kō wutā sarkì ya cè sù fādà, kàfìn yà rufà bàkì, sun kai* ‘there were stalwart henchmen in the king’s train, who, were the king to order them to jump into fire, before he had closed his lips they would be in it’, or a simple temporal adverb, for example, ... *kō dājī mā bà yā yārda yà fitō ba, wàndà kullum yanà can hòye cikin gārì* ‘... he [the he-goat] would never even dare to come out into the bush, [a creature] who is skulking back in the town all the time’. Parsons’ intuitions in this regard were (as usual!) basically on the right track—the non-focus paradigm can indeed be exploited in non-restrictives—but the structural conditions for selection of the non-focus INFL can in fact be explicitly extended as follows: (1) as already observed in §3.4, selection of a non-focus INFL is also felicitous in RRCs when adverbial material has been interposed between the REL(PRO) and INFL; (2) as we shall see in §4.2, an intriguing and unique feature of NRRC formation is that (for many speakers) adverbial-insertion is not a necessary precondition for selection of a non-focus INFL.

McConvell [1973: 109ff] chose to describe and analyze NRRCs in Hausa as “right-dislocated topic NP’s which are marked off from the rest of the sentence by a pause”, and correctly observed that the “relative clause [topic]...must begin with the full relative forms *wàndà/wàddà/wàd'andà*, etc., and not simply with the relativizer *dà*” (tones provided).

Rufa’i [1983] divided Hausa RCs into “defining” (= restrictive) and “non-defining” (= non-restrictive) types on the basis of whether the head NP is “definite” or “indefinite”. Rufa’i’s definitions are sometimes mutually incon-

sistent, however, and it is by no means clear from his analysis how the above categories are meant to interact. (As we shall see in due course, whereas the external antecedents of RRCs may be definite or indefinite (§§3.1, 3.3), NRRC heads are overwhelmingly definite (§4.2).)

In Jaggat [1992], in the course of transcribing the texts read out aloud by a Kano Hausa speaker (and recorded on the accompanying cassette-tapes), I encountered what at the time seemed a surprising number of explicit RELPROs with distinctive ALL L TONES, i.e., (MSG, FSG, PL) *wàndà*, *wàddà* = *wàccè*, *wàd'andà* vs. HL(L) *wandà*, *waddà* = *waccè*, *wad'andà* (a number of which are cited in this paper). Several Hausa dictionaries and grammars had in fact already identified these all L tone RELPROs, beginning over 60 years ago with Bargery [1934:1078], who included the following tonally distinct variants: HL(L) *wandà*, *waddà* = *waccè*, *wad'andà* (MSG, FSG, PL), FL/HLL *wândà*, *wâddà* = *wâccè*, *wâd'andà*, and all L *wàndà*, *wàddà* = *wàccè*, *wàd'andà*. This information was repeated in Abraham [1940:87, 1962:920], Kraft & Kraft [1973:301], and more recently, the all L (FSG) form *wàccè* is cited in Newman [1990:304]. However, none of these distinctive all L *wàndà* variants have ever been systematically exemplified in any kind of naturally-occurring context (and were presumably thought to be in free variation with the HL *wandà* forms). Because I felt that the all L variants would prove to be of some functional-distributional significance, I decided to flag them in the texts and offered a tentative explanation of their occurrence [Jaggat 1992]. However, my proposal that the choice between HL *wandà* and all L *wàndà* might be controlled by the syntactic role of the antecedent head—if it is the subject of the RC then HL *wandà* is selected, if nonsubject then all L *wàndà* occurs (p. xi, fn. 3)—was just plain wrong. It turns out that these allomorphs *are* indeed in (near) complementary distribution with each other, but the key (semantic) determinant—which I completely missed at the time but which is now so obvious—is whether the RC they introduce is restrictive or non-restrictive.

It is clear from this background that the defining features of non-restrictive RCs have been available in isolation for some time, but no one had recognized their collective significance and attempted to integrate them into a coherent and principled system (the facts are old but the discovery of their function and systematic co-patterning is new). Each of the above writers independently presented a piece of (mainly morphosyntactic) evidence critical to our overall understanding of the problem, but what was needed was an empirically-based study which could draw together the various strands and provide a unified account of the attested facts. This paper demonstrates that the restrictive:non-restrictive RC dichotomy is indeed a valid one for Hausa, and that the two subtypes are differentiated by non-trivial constraints on form and meaning.

**4.2. Form and function of non-restrictives.** Unlike RRCs, NRRCs do not function to narrowly limit the domain of relativization, but simply add non-essential, parenthetical information about the antecedent head. (The information contained in the NRRC can be pertinent, but it does not affect the designational properties of the head.)<sup>10</sup> The head itself is almost always definite and is construed either as unique or as a member of an independently identifiable set. NRRCs have the following defining formal (and intonational) properties:

- A. They are introduced (= 2-RELPRO speakers) by the *ALL L TONE* allomorph of the complex RELPRO (MSG/FSG/PL) *wàndà/wàddà = wàccèl/wàd'àndà* (§4.2.1).
- B. Because they do not have the specifying power of restrictive RCs, non-restrictives license a wider range of TAM options (§4.2.2). In NRRCs, many speakers permit *either* the same focus (*sukà, sukè*, etc.) form of the INFL as occurs in RRCs, *or* use the (neutral) non-focus (*sun, sunà*, etc.) paradigm of the INFL as a possible alternative.
- C. NRRCs have an identifiable prosodic composition. Intonationally, the appositional (“afterthought”) status of the NRRC is often represented by a distinct tone unit, initiated (and completed) by a discernible break in the sentence prosody (= orthographic commas), and there is an audible key-shift to a lower overall pitch.

In addition to these distinctive morphosyntactic and prosodic properties, which are in (near) complementary distribution with RRCs,<sup>11</sup> NRRCs are also genre-specific in that they are characteristic of more formal planned discourse (e.g., modern journalistic Hausa, product advertizing), and so are not as productive and dominant as RRCs.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Although the information they provide is typically non-essential, there are contexts where NRRCs may convey supplementary information which can assume an explanatory/causal role, as for example in (i) below.

(i) *yāròn, wàndà yakè tsòron cidà, yā kāsà barcī*  
 boy.DD(MSG) RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-IMPF fear.of thunder 3MSG.PF be unable sleep  
 ‘the boy, who was afraid of the sound of thunder, couldn’t sleep’

<sup>11</sup> The examples in this paper have been deliberately selected to illustrate clearcut tokens of prototypical non-restrictives in an instructive and unambiguous way. This does not preclude the possibility, however, that difficulties may sometimes arise in distinguishing between restrictive and non-restrictive RCs in Hausa, e.g., due to confusion in on-line processing. (Cf. Quirk et al. [1985:1259n] on similar discrimination problems in English.)

<sup>12</sup> The corpus contains no tokens of non-restrictives in spontaneous, casual conversations. (Fox & Thompson [1990:297, fn. 2] report a similar distribution for their English corpus, finding “on

Examples (47-55) illustrate the formal properties of NRRCs with INFLs<sup>13</sup> and independently-identifiable definite heads,<sup>14</sup> for example, with a restrictive RC (47, 53), with an NP + possessive pronoun (48, 49), with a proper name (51), with an NP + definite determiner (52, 55).

Notice the discrepancy in number between the (masculine) singular RELPRO *wàndà* (47b) and the coreferential plural count NP *irin kāyàyyakīn* ‘the kinds of crops’ (47a) which triggers 3PL grammatical agreement on the following INFL *sun* in (47b) (the ‘normal’ rule requires the RELPRO to copy the number (and gender) features of the head). An equally common number-concord “mismatch” is also attested with (other deictic) NPs containing pre-head demonstrative determiners (see also Parsons [1960:129, fn. 2]).<sup>15</sup>

---

intonational grounds...no clear cases of nonrestrictive relative clauses” in their conversational data base.)

<sup>13</sup> NRRCs can occur without a verb and INFL constituent, for example, (existential, equational):

(i) *akà yi wani sarkī,*  
4PL.FOC-PF do SID(MSG) emir

*wàndà duk kasār bābù m̀ai àr̀zikī k̀amàrsà* [Imam 1970:8]  
RELPRO(MSG) whole country.DD(FSG) NEG EXIST one with riches like.of.3MSG

‘there was an emir, who was the richest person in the whole country’

(ii) *wad`annān yārān, wad`andà dukkànsù matàsà n̄.*  
DEM(PL) boys.DD(PL) RELPRO(PL) all.of.3PL adolescents COP(PL)

*sun zō kàsuwā ...*  
3PL.PF come to market

‘these boys, who were all adolescents, had come to the market ...’

<sup>14</sup> Although definite heads are by far the overwhelming norm in NRRCs, indefinite antecedents are occasionally encountered, for example:

(i) *dā an yi wani sarkī,*  
formerly 4PL.PF do SID(MSG) emir

*wàndà akè sònsà kwařai*  
RELPRO(MSG) 4PL.FOC-IMPF like.VN.of.3MSG extremely

‘there was once an emir, who was extremely well liked’

<sup>15</sup> Examples:

(i) *wannān (= wad`annān) tagwāyen hanyōyīn dà sukà tāshì*  
DEM(SG) (= DEM(PL)) twins.of roads.DD(PL) REL 3PL.FOC-PF start

*tun dàgà Titiin Mando* [HNR:18]  
right from Street.of Mando

‘this divided highway [lit. this twins of roads] which starts right from Mando Street’

(ii) *kamař yaddà kukè ganī à wannān (= wad`annān) hōtunà*  
like how 2PL.FOC-IMPV see.VN in DEM(SG) (= DEM(PL)) photos

‘as you see in these [lit. this] shots (photos)’ [HYDK: SAKA, 52min:50sec]

In examples (i-ii), the singular demonstrative *wannān* ‘this’ is used to determine the grammatically plural head NPs *tagwāyen hanyōyī* ‘divided highways’ and *hōtunà* ‘shots (photos)’.

Notice, too, that because the proform-headed RC in (47c) is semantically restrictive, the RELPRO appears as HLL *wad'andà* (not all L \**wad'andà*), and the (imperfective) INFL must take the focus (*akè*) form, not the non-focus (\**anà*) form.

## NON-RESTRICTIVES WITH ALL L RELPROS + FOCUS OR NON-FOCUS INFLS

- (47) a. *yànzú kún gá irìn káyàyyakìn*  
 now 2PL.PF see kind.of crops.DD(PL)  
*dà Bàhaushè yakè nōmāwā,*  
 REL Hausaman 3MSG.FOC-IMPF farm.VN
- b. *wàndà sun (= sukà) had'à dà kàmar̃ su dāwā ...*  
 RELPRO(MSG) 3PL.PF (= 3PL.FOC-PF) join with like 3PL guineacorn
- c. *dà kuma wad'andà akè (\*anà) hakōwā,*  
 and also RELPRO(PL) 4PL.FOC-IMPF (\*4PL.IMPF) dig up.VN  
*irìn su rōgō ...*  
 kind.of 3PL cassava

[HYDK: Noma, 32min:40sec]

'now you've seen the kinds of crops that a Hausaman farms, which include the likes of guineacorn ... and also those that are dug up, like cassava ...'

- (48) a. *dà ya tàfi Amìrkà sai ya gá iyâyensà,*  
 when 3MSG.FOC-PF go USA then 3MSG.FOC-PF see parents.of.3MSG
- b. *wad'andà sun (= sukà) jimà can*  
 RELPRO(PL) 3PL.PF (= 3PL.FOC-PF) spend time there  
 'when he went to the USA he saw his parents, who'd been there for some time'
- (49) a. *bāyan zàngà-zangàř sai ya kōmà*  
 after demonstrations.DD(FSG) then 3MSG.FOC-PF return  
*kauyèn iyâyensà,*  
 village.of parents.of.3MSG
- b. *wàndà nà (= kè) can kudancin kasàř*  
 RELPRO(MSG) IMPF (= FOC-IMPF) there south.of country.DD(FSG)  
 'after the demonstrations he returned to his parents' village, which was down there in the south of the country'



- (50) a. *tò zā à cikà wurin tàrôn dà* [HNR:63]  
well FUT 4PL fill place.of meeting.DD(MSG) with
- b. *mutànrēn dà zā sù dingà yīn màganàř sòkakkēn*  
people.DD(PL) REL FUT 3PL keep on do.VN.of talk.of annulled.of  
*zāβen 12 gā Yūni,*  
election.of 12 of June
- c. *wàndà (hakàn) nà (= kè) iyà kāwō*  
RELPRO(MSG) (this.DD(MSG)) IMPF (= FOC-IMPF) can bring  
*tāshe-tāshen hankàlī*  
disturbances  
'well, the meeting will be filled with people who will keep going on about the annulled election of June 12, which could lead to disturbances'
- (51) a. *hakà mā Luke d'ālibinkà,*  
so also Luke student.of.2MSG
- b. *wàndà à yànzū yanà (= yakè) jāmi'ār*  
RELPRO(MSG) at now 3MSG.IMPF (= 3MSG.FOC-IMPF) university.of  
*Sakkwato*  
Sokoto
- c. *yanà (= yakè) kōyon Sakkwatancī,*  
3MSG.IMPF (= 3MSG.FOC-IMPF) learn.VN.of Sokoto Hausa
- d. *mài yiwuwā mā yā řubūtō makà* [e-mail, 10/94]  
with possibility also 3MSG.PF write to.2MSG  
'Also your student Luke, who's at Sokoto University now learning Sokoto Hausa, maybe he's also written to you'
- (52) a. *nā nūnà wà Būbà hōtunàn,*  
1SG.PF show to Buba photos.DD(PL)
- b. *wàndà yā (= ya) nūnà wà Mānsūř,*  
RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.PF (= 3MSG.FOC-PF) show to Mansur
- c. *wàndà kuma yā (= ya) nūnà wà Bālā*  
RELPRO(MSG) and 3MSG.PF (= 3MSG.FOC-PF) show to Bala  
'I showed the photos to Buba, who showed them to Mansur, who showed them to Bala'

(Notice that NRRCs [52b, c], like RRCs, can stack recursively.)

- (53) a. *nāmàn macìjîn dà wađànnân mutânē sukà cînyē,*  
meat.of snake.DD(MSG) REL DEM(PL) people 3PL.FOC-PF eat
- b. *wàndà kuma yā (= yā) kusa zamā*  
RELPRO(MSG) and 3MSG.PF (= 3MSG.FOC-PF) be near become.VN  
*sanàdin ajàlinsù ...* [AHR:44]  
cause.of death.of.3PL  
'the snake meat that these people had eaten, and which nearly caused  
their death ...'
- (54) a. *tô, sàná'ar ginìn tukunyā tsòhuwař sàná'á cē,*  
well profession.of making.VN.of pot old.of profession COP(FSG)
- b. *wàccè tā (= tā) dadè*  
RELPRO(FSG) 3FSG.PF (= 3FSG.FOC-PF) last long
- c. *anà yîntà à kasař Hausa*  
4PL.IMP do.VN.of.3FSG in country.of Hausa  
[HYDK: Ginin Tukwane, 1hr:28min:40sec]  
'well, potmaking is an ancient profession, which has been practised for  
a long time in Hausaland'
- (55) a. *d'àlibân, wàđàndà sun (= sukà) gamà aikìnsù,*  
students.DD(PL) RELPRO(PL) 3PL.PF (= 3PL.FOC-PF) finish work.of.3PL
- b. *duk sun tàfi*  
all 3PL.PF go  
'the students, who have finished their work, have all gone'

The above extracts (most of them produced by different speakers in naturalistic, spontaneous contexts and adjudged acceptable by other speakers) illustrate the most interesting cases for present purposes—all L *wàndà*-introduced non-restrictives with non-focus forms of the perfective (*sun*, etc.) and imperfective (*sunà*, etc.) TAMs. Although the corresponding focus (*sukà*, *sukè*, etc.) forms are often encountered in such contexts, and are certainly substitutable in (47-55) with little or no meaning difference (so are added in

parentheses),<sup>16</sup> the fact remains that what we have here are genuine counter-examples to the conventional view that Hausa RCs require a focus INFL, a perceived constraint which has been assumed to follow from exclusively structural considerations.<sup>17</sup> As I will demonstrate below, however (§4.2.2), any explanation of the distribution and increased acceptability of the inflectional non-focus paradigms in NRRCs must refer to semantic (and not simply formal) factors.

Not surprisingly, the same (all L) tone-meaning correlation is also characteristic of non-restrictive adverbial (relative) clauses expressing place, time and manner, which are typically introduced by all L tone RELPROs *indà* ‘where, when’ (non-restrictive *indà* is spatial or temporal), and causal *yàddà* ‘in such a way that, such that, just as’ (variants not recorded by Bargery [1934]). (Elsewhere both HL *indà* ‘where’ (?also FL *îndà*) and *yaddà* (?also FL *yàddà*) occur in addition to the all L forms.) These compound RELPROs are made up of a WH-element (cf. *inā* ‘where?’, *yàyà* ‘how?’) + definite determiner -*n* + REL *dà* (details of the assimilation and reduction need not concern us here). Examples (56-58) illustrate this.

- (56) *à cikin Kàmàrù dà Nàjēriyà, indà sabòdà yanàyin*  
 at in Cameroon and Nigeria RELPRO because of climate.of  
*duwàtsun wurin ...*  
 mountains.of area.DD(MSG) [AHR:69]  
 ‘in Cameroon and Nigeria, where because of the climate in the mountains  
 of the area...’
- (57) a. *jūyin mulkìn dà sōjà sukà yi ...*  
 change.of rule.DD(MSG) REL soldiers 3PL.FOC-PF do
- b. *indà akà hambarař dà gwamnatin ...* [AHR:1]  
 RELPRO 4PL.FOC-PF overthrow government.DD(MSG)  
 ‘the coup which the military pulled off ... when the government was  
 overthrown ...’

<sup>16</sup> Some speakers consider choice of the focus form to be more specific-contrastive, e.g., the use of the focus-perfective INFL *sukà* in (55a), for example, could imply a contrast with other students (who have not finished their work).

<sup>17</sup> I am (taking the liberty of) assuming that even though the existence and behaviour of non-restrictives in Hausa have been largely overlooked or ignored, (most) Hausaists would generalize the conditions on their formation and assume that because they entail the same syn-tactic (WH-movement) properties as their better-known restrictive counterparts (§3), they would necessarily be subject to identical tense-aspect restrictions, i.e., the generalization would remain equally secure throughout both domains of application.

- (58) a. *gidan fuřsùnàn Kĩřikĩři yā bācì,* [AHR:113]  
 house.of prisoner.of Kirikiri 3MSG.PF deteriorate
- b. *ta yàddà hař 'yan fuřsùnàn sukàn yi barcì nē*  
 via RELPRO even prisoners.DD(PL) 3PL.HAB do sleeping COP(MSG)  
*kāmù-kāmù*  
 in shifts  
 'Kirikiri prison has deteriorated, such that the prisoners sleep in shifts'
- (59) a. *ya tāshì ya màngàrē shì*  
 3MSG.FOC-PF get up 3MSG.FOC-PF hit 3MSG
- b. *yàddà ya ga mutànên can nà yi wà*  
 RELPRO 3MSG.FOC-PF see people.DD(PL) DEM IMPF do to  
*'yā'yāyensù*  
 children.of.3PL  
 'he got up and hit him, like he saw those people doing to their children'  
 [Imam 1970:7, transcribed in Buba 1997a:238]

**4.2.1. All L tone (*wàndà*) RELPRO and lower overall register.** For those (2-RELPRO) speakers with the additional all L tone RELPRO in their grammars, a diagnostic (and previously unreported) property of appositional NRRCs is that they are introduced by the same all L tone *wàndà/wàddà/wàd'àndà* (MSG/FSG/PL) variant that substitutes as a proform (head) for presupposed, identifiable ('the one(s) who, etc.')

referents (§3.2.2). In the corpus examined, neither HL *wandà* nor simplex REL *dà* were attested in NRRCs, and attempts to substitute them for the actually occurring all L *wàndà* forms were consistently rejected by a significant number of 2-RELPRO speakers (representing various dialects).<sup>18</sup> This [all L *wàndà* ↔ NRRC] form-meaning correlation has a natural explanation moreover, since, all other things being equal, we would predict that a definite referent-coding RELPRO (head) would be manipulated as an anaphoric (relative) pronoun in NRRCs where the antecedent head is also typically identifiable (e.g., NP + definite determiner, demonstrative, proper noun, etc.), i.e., as opposed to the other available candidate (for 2-RELPRO

<sup>18</sup> Cf. comparable morphosemantic facts in English [Quirk et al. 1985:1257ff], where loosely connected non-restrictives usually invite only the complex *wh*-series RELPROs 'who(m), which, etc.' (not the simplex 'that' (or zero form) used in restrictives).

speakers)—the HL RELPRO *wandà* used to index first-mention indefinites (§3.2.1).<sup>19</sup>

Given the basically anaphoric function of the all L tone RELPROs, moreover, one would expect them to co-occur (for 2-RELPRO speakers) with non-restrictive appositional conjuncts such as *wàtò* ‘that is, namely, in other words, etc.’ indicating equivalence, and this prediction is straightforwardly borne out in NRRCs, as illustrated in (60).

- (60) a. *d'an'uwānā, wàtò wàndà zāi yi kārātū à Amīrkà,*  
 brother.of.1SG that is RELPRO(MSG) FUT.3MSG do studying in USA
- b. *yā isō Landàn jiyà*  
 3MSG.PF arrive London yesterday  
 ‘my brother, that is the one who’s going to study in the USA, arrived in London yesterday’

Parallel to the [all L *wàndà* ↔ NRRC] tone-function correspondence moreover, there is also a relationship between the information status of the NRRC and its prosodic composition. The NRRCs in our corpus are intonationally segregated with a prosodic boundary and pause at the beginning and end of the clause itself (denoted with commas in written Hausa), and have a lower overall register than their RRC counterparts. Like the comment component of topicalized structures therefore (§4.2.3), appositional NRRCs constitute separate illocutionary units or discourse chunks, with coordinate clause-like status (a point we shall return to below, §4.2.2). As in English (Quirk et al. [1985:1355ff]), the lower overall prominence thus correlates with, and directly reflects, the nonessential (“afterthought”) information value of NRRCs, in the same way that the weakly stressed all L RELPRO codes the least “marked” [+identifiable] referents.

**4.2.2. Tense-aspect (non-focus) in NRRCs.** An equally striking feature of NRRCs is the variability in the form of the INFL in position before the main verb—for some speakers it either takes the same focus (perfective/imperfective) TAM generally required in RRCs (§3, but see also §3.4), or the (neutral) non-focus TAM used in simple declarative sentences. This indeterminacy cuts across

<sup>19</sup> From a historical perspective, my guess would be that the original (deictic) function of the all L tone RELPRO (heard and recorded by Bargery [1934:1078]) would have been to index hearer-old (or inferrable) information, and that its innovative use to introduce NRRCs, where the antecedent head is usually hearer-old/identifiable, represents an analogical extension to a new environment. NRRCs probably became established through the gradual spread of newspaper writing and radio broadcasting in Hausa (media which were possibly influenced by the stylistic use of NRRCs in the English journalistic genre).

both 1- and 2-RELPRO speakers moreover. Although inter- and intra-speaker judgements are not always consistent in this regard (another variable which might reflect a syntactic change in progress), the overall form-function generalization is that whereas restrictives only license a non-focus INFL if adverbial-insertion has applied between REL and INFL (§3.4, exx. 38-42), examples (47-55) above demonstrate that no such structural input is necessary for a non-focus form in non-restrictives (especially for KH-speakers).<sup>20</sup> Previous analyses have attributed the distribution of the inflectional focus paradigms in WH-movement operations (including RRCs) exclusively to formal factors (Tuller [1986:474], for example, relates the triggering of a focus form to “the presence or absence of a local S-structure operator”), but I would argue that the focus:non-focus INFL variation in NRRCs can also be linked to related differences in semantic function between the two RC-types.

In structural terms, appositional NRRCs differ from (subordinate intersecting) RRCs in that they are not syntactically part of the external NP or superordinate sentence, a fact which has led some linguists to propose that the relationship is in fact discourse-derived and not a consequence of WH-movement to left periphery (see Fabb [1990] and references therein). In some ways, therefore, juxtaposed NRRCs are very similar to coordinate (main) clauses, where the NRRC (complex NP, clause) is a linguistic unit at the same level of constituent structure as the other elements (see also Quirk et al. [1985:1258-59] and Emonds [1979:232ff] on the equivalence between coordination and NRRCs in English). One syntactic feature of coordinately conjoined (verbal) clauses in Hausa which is directly relevant to the NRRC = coordinate clause equivalence is that they are not subject to any tense-aspect (non-focus → focus) replacement rules—compare *mun jē mun (kuma) gan tà* ‘we’ve been and seen her’ (1PL.PF

<sup>20</sup> Non-KH speakers again appear to be stricter in this regard than their more liberal KH counterparts (as with restrictives, §3.4), and normally only allow a non-focus INFL if material (e.g., quantifier phrase, adverbial) has been inserted. Examples \*(X) = unacceptable if X is omitted):

- (i) *Mūsā yanā dà fiye dà 'yā'yā àshìrìn,*  
Musa 3MSG.IMPF with more than children twenty

*wàd'andà \*(dà yawànsù) sun rìgā sun yi aurē*  
RELPRO(PL) \*(with many.of.3PL) 3PL.PF already do 3PL.PF do marriage  
‘Musa has over 20 children, many of whom have already got married’

- (ii) *à Landàn nē na sàdu dà mātātā,*  
in London COP(MSG) 1SG.FOC-PF meet with wife.of.1SG

*wàddà \*(à lōkàcìn) tanā aikì à can*  
RELPRO(FSG) \*(at time.DD(MSG)) 3FSG.IMPF work at there

‘it was in London that I met my wife, who was working there at the time’

1PL.PF (and) see 3FSG), *sun ròkē tà àmmā t̄ā ki* ‘they begged her but she refused’ (3PL.PF beg 3FSG but 3FSG.PF refuse), *munà nan munà kàràtū* ‘we’re t/here (and) we’re studying away’ (1PL.IMPF t/here 1PL.IMPF studying), where the non-focus perfective and imperfective TAMs are simply copied in the non-initial coordinate clauses. Because paratactic NRRCs are similar to coordinate structures, they are not constrained by the same focus tense-aspect requirements as tightly intersecting RRCs which form a constituent with the head, and so they can include a non-focus INFL. The following paraphrases show that non-restrictives (61b) and corresponding coordinate clauses (61d) are of equivalent syntactic and semantic status.

- (61) a. *yā k̄amu dà kansà,*  
3MSG.PF be taken with cancer
- b. *wàddà (kuma) t̄ā (= ta) zama ajàlinsà*  
RELPRO(FSG) (and) 3FSG.PF (= 3FSG.FOC-PF) be death.of.3MSG  
‘he went down with cancer, which proved fatal’  
=
- c. *yā k̄amu dà kansà,*  
3MSG.PF be taken with cancer
- d. *kuma t̄ā zama ajàlinsà*  
and 3FSG.PF be death.of.3MSG  
‘he went down with cancer, and it proved fatal’

(The essentially coordinative role of the NRRC in (61b) is further demonstrated by the possibility of inserting the core coordinator *kuma* ‘and, also’ after the RELPRO.)

A key semantic correlate of this coordinative (main clause) status—which also helps explain the INFL variation—is that appositional NRRCs (unlike RRCs which are subordinate units in a hierarchy) do not function to uniquely restrict/define/identify, etc. their antecedents, since the decisive interpretation of the head is external to the loosely connected NRRC. The possibility of using a non-focus INFL is related, therefore, to the semantic fact that NRRCs do not narrowly restrict the domain of relativization, but add largely non-essential parenthetical information which makes only an indirect contribution to the discourse.

This interpretive explanation is independently-motivated, moreover, and is validated by the distribution of the quasi-modal potential (*sá*, etc.) TAM—whereas it can occur in NRRCs (62b), it is considered unacceptable (or mar-

ginal) in RRCs and other (semantically restrictive, narrow focus) WH-constructions (see also Tuller [1986:70, 94], Abdoulaye [1992:50ff, 1997:9ff], and Attouman [1996]), as in (63-64)).

POTENTIAL IN NON-RESTRICTIVES

- (62) a. *à nân nē yawancī akà fi sākār ... kātòn*  
 at here COP(MSG) mainly 4PL.FOC-PF exceed weave.VN.of long.of  
*zanè,*  
 cloth
- b. *wàndà à iyà yîn mayāfi dà shī*  
 RELPRO(MSG) 4PL.POT can make.VN.of shawl with 3MSG  
 [HYDK: SAKA, 50min:50sec]  
 ‘it’s mainly here that the long cloth is woven, from which a shawl can be made’

When converted to a restrictive, (almost all) speakers expressed a strong preference for the less modal, more definite future, as in (63).

?POTENTIAL IN RESTRICTIVES

- (63) *gà kātòn zanèn dà zā à (?= à) iyà yîn*  
 PRES long.of cloth.DD(MSG) REL FUT 4PL (?= 4PL.POT) can make.VN.of  
*mayāfi dà shī*  
 shawl with 3MSG  
 ‘here is the long cloth from which a shawl can be made’

Compare, too, the same (dis)preference illustrated in (64).

- (64) *gà irin mōtār dà zân (?= nā) sàyā*  
 PRES kind.of car.DD(FSG) REL FUT.1SG (?= 1SG.POT) buy  
 ‘here’s the kind of car that I’ll (probably) buy’

The reason why the potential is dispreferred in restrictives but permissible in non-restrictives is entirely consistent with (and supportive of) our interpretive account of the distribution of the non-focus INFLs in these same RC environments—because the potential is essentially a (non-focus) modal category, expressing such attitudes as uncertainty, doubt, indefiniteness, probability, vagueness, etc. as to the future realization of an action/event, is it semantically incompatible with the type of strict identificational focus entailed by a RRC. The



same semantic constraints also explain the prohibition on the use of the potential in related WH-expressions (where again the future is substituted).

\*POTENTIAL IN OTHER WH-CONSTRUCTIONS

- (65) *wà zâi (\*yâ) yi wannàn aikî?* (= WH-question)  
 who(3MSG) FUT.3MSG (\*3MSG.POT) do DEM(SG) work  
 'who will do this work?'
- (66) *Audù nē zâi (\*yâ) yi* (= Focus-clefting)  
 Audu COP(MSG) FUT.3MSG (\*3MSG.POT) do  
 'AUDU will do (it)'
- (67) *nī kaḍai nē zân (\*nâ) zō* (= Focus-clefting)  
 1SG only COP(MSG) FUT.1SG (\*1SG.POT) come  
 'ONLY I will come'
- (68) *kômè zā kâ (\*kâ) yi, bàn dâmu ba*  
 whatever FUT 2MSG (\*2MSG.POT) do NEG.1SG.PF be bothered NEG  
 'whatever (it is) you're going to do, I'm not bothered' (= WH-ever)

(The modal subjunctive is also ruled out in all the above contexts, including non-restrictives in this case.)

We are now in a position to expand the relevant part of Table 2 to accommodate the NRRC facts (Table 3).

**4.2.3. [Head-NRRC] structures have [topic-comment] properties.** Finally, by way of summarizing the design-features of Hausa non-restrictives, it is instructive to point out that many of the diagnostic properties of non-restrictives are also present in topic-comment structures (shared characteristics which distinguish them operationally from both restrictives and other WH-movement operations involving focus). Thus: (a) both non-restrictives and comment structures are postpausal; (b) the clause-initial topicalized constituent and non-restrictive antecedent are independently defined (= presupposed/definite); (c) the comment S' selects (only) a non-focus INFL, and appositional (coordinate-like) non-restrictives may also take a non-focus INFL (restrictives trigger the focus INFL); (d) topic NPs are anaphorized with a resumptive pronoun in the comment (especially if the topic is personal), and some speakers will also allow a resumptive pronoun in non-restrictives, coreferential with the antecedent (as a secondary alternative to a null pronoun). Restrictives, on the other hand, only allow a zero pronominal; (e) both structures are base-generated (restrictives entail displacement). (See Jaggar [1978], Junaidu [1987, 1989], and Tuller [1986] for various treatments of topicalization.) Examples (69-71) illustrate.

MORPHOSYNTAX	RESTRICTIVE RC		NON-RESTRICTIVE RC	
	1-RELPRO speakers	2-RELPRO speakers	1-RELPRO speakers	2-RELPRO speakers
REL <i>dà</i>	√	√		
RELPRO (HL <i>wandà</i> etc.)	√	√ = hearer- <i>new</i> referent	√	
RELPRO (all L <i>wàndà</i> etc.)		√ = hearer- <i>old</i> referent		√
FOCUS INFL (Pf/Impf)	√	√	√	√
NON-FOCUS INFL	only with REL ↓ INFL adverbial-insertion	only with REL ↓ INFL adverbial-insertion	√	√

Table 3: Morphosyntax of restrictive and non-restrictive RCs.

## TOPIC-COMMENT

- (69) 'yan t̄awāyèn kùwa, an nūnà musù shirìn jiyà  
 rebels.DD(PL) as for 4PL.PF show to.3PL plan.DD(MSG) yesterday  
 'as for the rebels, they were shown the plan yesterday'

## NON-RESTRICTIVE RC

- (70) a. 'yan t̄awāyèn, wàd'andà an (= akà) nūnà wà Ø (= musù)  
 rebels.DD(PL) RELPRO(PL) 4PL.PF (= 4PL.FOC-PF) show to Ø (= to.3PL)  
 shirìn jiyà,  
 plan.DD(MSG) yesterday

- b. duk sun amìncē dà shī  
 all 3PL.PF agree with 3MSG  
 'the rebels, who were shown the plan yesterday, have all accepted it'

## RESTRICTIVE RC

- (71) a. 'yan t̄awāyèn dà akà nūnà wà Ø shirìn jiyà  
 rebels.DD(PL) REL 4PL.FOC-PF show to Ø plan.DD(MSG) yesterday  
 b. duk sun amìncē dà shī  
 all 3PL.PF agree with 3MSG  
 'the rebels who were shown the plan yesterday have all accepted it'

## 5. Summary

This paper has contrasted the core properties of restrictive and non-restrictive RCs and has demonstrated that, although subject to similar constraints, the two RC-types are characterized by significant and interesting differences in their morphosyntax and semantics. From a universal grammar perspective, the most striking syntactic difference is the ability of non-restrictives to occur with a wider range of tense-aspects (focus/non-focus) and moods, and I have argued that related formal and interpretive factors combine to determine and explain this variability. Although the system is not organized into discrete, homogeneous categories, and the distinctions are sometimes fine (with partial overlapping depending on the speaker/dialect and register), the variation is systematic enough to be of real linguistic significance.

Given the current interest in relative clause constructions and the general insights they provide into wider issues of linguistic theory and language universals, this expanded and unified account of Hausa restrictive and non-restrictive RCs adds to the body of core, cross-language data relating to the organization of grammar, and offers a potentially rich domain for further research.

## APPENDIX: DATA SOURCES

AHR = *An Advanced Hausa Reader with Grammatical Notes and Exercises*, Philip J. Jaggar, 1992, London: SOAS.

HNR = *Hausa Newspaper Reader*, Philip J. Jaggar, 1996, Kensington, Maryland: Dunwoody Press.

HYDK = *Hausar Yau Da Kullum* (Intermediate and Advanced Lessons in Hausa Language and Culture, Parts 1, 2), William Leben et al., 1991, Stanford University: CSLI Publications.

Imam, Alhaji Abubakar. 1970 [1939]. *Magana Jari Ce* (vol. 3). Zaria, Nigeria: Northern Nigerian Publishing Company.

Katsina, Sulaiman Ibrahim. 1982. *Turmin Danya*. Lagos & Zaria: Northern Nigerian Publishing Company.

## REFERENCES

- Abdoulaye, Mahamane L. 1992. "Aspects of Hausa morphosyntax in Role and Reference grammar." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Abdoulaye, Mahamane L. 1997. "Presupposition and realis status in Hausa." Unpublished MS, Universität Leipzig.
- Abraham, R. C. 1940. *An Introduction to Spoken Hausa and Hausa Reader for European Students*. London: Crown Agents for the Colonies (published on behalf of the Nigerian Government).
- Abraham, R. C. 1959. *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: University of London Press.
- Abraham, R. C. 1962. *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*. 2nd ed. London: University of London Press.

- Attouman, Bachir Mahaman. 1996. "Aspect, détermination, modalité et diathèse en Hausa." Doctorat Unique thesis, Université Denis Diderot, Paris.
- Bargery, G. P. 1934. *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bearth, Thomas. 1993. "Satztyp und Situation in einigen Sprachen Westafrikas." In W.J.G. Möhlig, Herrmann Jungraithmayr, and Siegmund Brauner (eds.), *Beiträge zur afrikanischen Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft (IX Afrikanistentag, Leipzig, September 24-26, 1992)*, pp. 91-104. Köln: Köppe Verlag.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Samuel A. Mchombo. 1987. "Topic, pronoun and agreement in Chichêwa." *Language* 63:741-82.
- Buba, Malami. 1997a. "Deixis (demonstratives and adverbials) in Hausa." Ph.D. thesis, University of London.
- Buba, Malami. 1997b. "The deictic particle DI-N in Hausa." *African Languages and Cultures* 10(1):29-45.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1979. "Appositive relatives have no properties." *Linguistic Inquiry* 10(2):211-243.
- Fabb, Nigel. 1990. "The difference between English restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses." *Journal of Linguistics* 26:57-77.
- Firbas, Jan. 1971. "The concept of communicative dynamism in the theory of functional sentence perspective." *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*, A. 19, pp. 135-144.
- Fox, Barbara, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1990. "A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation." *Language* 66(2):297-316.
- Gouffé, Claude. 1964. "À propos de la phrase relative et de la phrase nominale en berbère et en haoussa." *Comptes rendus du groupe linguistique d'études chamito-sémitiques [GLECS]* 10:35-54.

- Haïk, Isabelle. 1990. "Anaphoric, pronominal and referential INFL." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8:347-374.
- Horvath, Julia. 1995. "Structural focus, structural case and the notion of feature-assignment." In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, pp. 28-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 1978. "'And what about...?' — Topicalisation in Hausa." *Studies in African Linguistics* 9:69-81.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 1988. "Discourse-deployability and indefinite NP-marking in Hausa: a demonstration of the universal 'categoriality hypothesis'." In Graham Furniss and Philip J. Jaggar (eds.), *Studies in Hausa Language and Linguistics. In Honour of F. W. Parsons*, pp. 45-61. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 1992. *An Advanced Hausa Reader with Grammatical Notes and Exercises*. London: SOAS.
- Junaidu, Ismail. 1987. "Topicalization in Hausa." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Junaidu, Ismail. 1989. "On the nature of topicalization in Hausa." In Paul Newman and Robert D. Botne (eds.), *Current Approaches to African Linguistics* (vol. 5) (PALL 8), pp. 63-72. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1985. "Relative clauses." In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* (vol. 2, Complex Constructions), pp. 141-170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. "Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Kiss, Katalin É. (ed.). 1995. *Discourse Configurational Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kraft, Charles H., and A. H. M. Kirk-Greene. 1973. *Hausa*. (Teach Yourself Books.) London: Hodder and Stoughton.

- Kraft, Charles H., and Marguerite G. Kraft. 1973. *Introductory Hausa*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1986. "On the typology of relative clauses." *Linguistics* 24:663-680.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1973. "Cleft sentences in Hausa? A syntactic study of focus." Ph.D. dissertation, University of London.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1977. "Relativisation and the ordering of cross-reference rules in Hausa." *Studies in African Linguistics* 8:1-31.
- Newman, Paul. 1995. "Hausa tonology: Complexities in an 'easy' tone language." In John Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, pp. 762-81. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Newman, Roxana Ma. 1990. *An English-Hausa Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Parsons, F. W. 1960. "An introduction to gender in Hausa." *African Language Studies* 1:117-36.
- Parsons, F. W. 1981. *Writings on Hausa Grammar: The Collected Papers of F. W. Parsons*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Books on Demand.
- Peranteau, Paul M., Judith M. Levi, and Gloria C. Phares (eds.). 1972. *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Rufa'i, Abba. 1983. "Defining and non-defining relative clauses in Hausa." In Ekkehard Wolff and Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg (eds.), *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske. Pp. 419-427.
- Schachter, Paul. 1973. "Focus and relativization." *Language* 49:19-46.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1985. "Hausa tense/aspect/mood (TAM) system." Unpublished MS, UCLA.

- Tuller, Laurice A. 1985. "Tense features and operators in Hausa." In *Rapport de Recherches du Group de Linguistique Africaniste, Année 1985-1986*, pp. 493-516. Montréal.
- Tuller, Laurice A. 1986. "Bijective relations in universal grammar and the syntax of Hausa." Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.
- Tuller, Laurice A. 1992. "The syntax of postverbal focus constructions in Chadic." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:303-34.

Department of Africa  
SOAS  
University of London  
Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square  
London WC1H 0XG  
England  
pj@soas.ac.uk

[Received July 1998;  
accepted September 1998]