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 wàndâ/wàddà/wàdàndà (MSG/FSG/PL) ‘the one(s) who(m), which, that etc’, or simplex dà ‘who(m), which, that, etc.’—and (normally) require a focus (sùkà, sùkè, 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/wàdàndà; 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.
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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 Gouffe [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).\(^1\)

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

Abbreviations:

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

continued on next page...
In (1) the external NP head mótàr ‘the car’ in the matrix clause is uniquely identified via the presupposed information entailed by the intersecting RRC [dà mukà sàyà 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), there is a formal distinction between what I here refer to as the FOCUS and NON-FOCUS agreement-aspect paradigms, 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

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

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 of 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)  
\text{kà ga bàkí-n RC[\text{dà sukà isò jìyà}]?}  
\text{2MSG.PF see guests-DD(PL) REL 3PL.FOC-PF arrive yesterday}  
‘did you see the guests who/that arrived yesterday?’

(3)  
\text{yàrà-n (-nan) RC[\text{dà sukà ga hadàràñí}]}  
\text{boys-DD(PL) (-DEM) REL 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)}  
\text{sun gayà wà ’yan sàndà kömè}  
\text{3PL.PF tell to police everything}  
‘the (those) boys who/that saw the accident told the police everything’

(4)  
\text{yàrà-n RC[\text{dà kè nan à lòkàcìn}] yà ga kômè}  
\text{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)  
\text{dàlibà-n RC[\text{dà sukà gamà aikinsù}] sun tafì}  
\text{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[\text{dà INF [- 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 -’t < -t) 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 \rightarrow H / ____ L dà tonal simplification rule (also gaining ground in other dialects) being the mirror-image of the F \rightarrow L / H ___ mechanism discovered by Newman [1995:766-767].) The NP-DD formation is then postmodified 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) \( \text{wànnan àkàlàmì/àkàlàmì-n dà kè kàršhen tèbùr} \)
\( \text{DEM(SG) pen/pen-DD(MSG) REL FOC-IMPF end. of table} \)
\( bà nàwa ba nè? \)
\( \text{NEG of.1SG NEG COP(MSG)} \)
\( \text{‘isn’t that pen which is at the end of the table mine?’} \)

Rufa’i [1983: 422] presents examples of head NPS with demonstrative enclitics followed by RRCs introduced by the explicit HL \( \text{wàndà, etc. relative pronoun (see §3.2), for example, (tones and vowel length supplied)} \)
\( ?yàrö-n-nan \)
\( \text{wàndà yà kwàntà à asibità yà ràsu ‘that boy who was hospitalized has died’.} \)

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, \( nì dà (?wàndà) nà cè ... ‘I who said ...’. \)

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).\(^ {4} \)

\(^ {4} \text{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) \( \text{wàtò } \text{Mùsà-n } \text{dà } \text{ya } \text{zò } \text{yànzù} \)
that is Musa-DD(MSG) REL 3MSG.FOC-PF come now
‘you mean the Musa who came now?’

(8) \( \text{wàtò } \text{Biùnin Kùdù-n } \text{dà } \text{kè } \text{Jìhàr } \text{Kâno?} \)
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 wàndà (MSG), wàddà = wàccè (FSG), HLL wàdàndà (PL) (also LHL wàdàndà) ‘the one(s) who(m), which, that etc.’5 Alongside the HL(L) RELPRO, some speakers also have an all L tone variant wàndà (MSG), wàddà = wàccè (FSG), wàdàndà (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 wàndà, 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 \( \text{sài } \) and \( \text{sànna } \) ‘then, after that’ in focus-perfective narrative sequences is another manifestation of this semantic specificity. (See also Tuller [1986], Abdoulaye [1992:60ff].)

5 Although the LHL wàdàndà plural variant is in fact quite common (like its LHL plural demonstrative counterpart wàdànnàn ‘these’), for the sake of consistency I cite the more familiar HLL wàdàndà in examples.
labelled 1-RELPRO speakers (henceforth I use (MSG) *wandà* and *wàndà* to represent the two respective RELPRO sets).

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 -`n, FSG -`C < *-t, where -C = copy of following consonant) which produces a Fall on the *wà-* , followed by the simplex REL *dà*, for example, (MSG) *wa(a)* + `n + dà → wàndà*. The widespread (cross-dialectal) surface HL forms *wandà* (MSG), *wàddà* = *wàccè* (FSG) are generated as follows: FL (MSG) *wàndà* → 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 *wàndà* RELPROs are recorded in grammars and dictionaries, their synchronic status and distribution are uncertain.) The feminine singular variant *wàccè* (also FL *wàccè*) is anomalous in suffixing what is probably an allomorph (-cè) of the *cè* feminine copula (with no REL *dà*). (The plural pronoun also contains the -*dàn*- pluralizer.) The segmentally identical all L (MSG, FSG, PL) *wàndà*, *wàddà* = *wàccè*, *wàd’dàndà* 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 [±identifiable] features of the referent, and the following form-meaning correlations hold: 7 (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

6 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].

7 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].
Table 1: Proforms in Restrictive Relative Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE PRONOUNS</th>
<th>REFERENT = NEW</th>
<th>REFERENT = OLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-RELPRO speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= HL(L) wandà (MSG)</td>
<td>HL wandà, etc.</td>
<td>all L wandà, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waddà (= wacce) (FSG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wad’ändà (= wàd’ändà) (PL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ all L wandà (MSG)</td>
<td>(? all L wandà, etc.)</td>
<td>(? HL wandà, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wàddà (= wàccè) (FSG),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wàd’ändà (PL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the one(s) who(m), which, that, etc.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-RELPRO speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= only HL(L) wandà (MSG)</td>
<td>HL wandà, etc.</td>
<td>HL wandà, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waddà (= wacce) (FSG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wad’ändà</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= wàd’ändà) (PL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the one(s) who(m), which, that, etc.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the all L tone wandà variant. (As we shall see below (§4.2), a previously unknown but key function of the all L tone wandà 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.

---

8 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) ṭò àmmà duk dà hákà, àkwai waɗândâ kè ganin cèwà ...
   OK but nevertheless EXIST RELPRO(PL) FOC-IMPF see.VN.of that
   ‘OK but nevertheless, there are those who feel that ...’  [AHR: 3]

(10) à wajen indà ya kàmàtâ à ṭùbùtà
   in place.of where 3MSG.FOC-PF be appropriate 4PL.SUBJ write
   wandà ya aikà dà àkwàtìn ...
   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 gayâ makà làbàrin
    let.IMP 1SG.SUBJ tell to.2MSG news.of
    waccè na ganî jìyà
    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 construc-
tions 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 hákà wâwâ 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 rikici ...
    DEM(SG) conflict
    ‘anyone who knows the origin of this conflict ...’

(14) irin wannàn aiki, sai wandà ya ganî
    kind.of DEM(SG) work, only RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF see
    dà idônsà
    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]
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-inferrable—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 wàndà 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

HEAER-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 jè wancàn gidà
if 3MSG.FOC-PF go to DEM(MSG) house

ya gànà 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 ...’

(18) làbārin yà ci gàba dà cèwà wàd’ândà
story.DD(MSG) 3MSG.PF continue with say.VN RELPRO(PL)

sukà mutù d’in ...
3PL.FOC-PF die DIN
‘the story added that those who had died ...’
in RC clause-final position—deictic-anaphoric *dën* ‘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'ändà* (PL) RELPRO to index a new referent (20), but switching to the all L *wàd'ändà* RELPRO to anaphorize now pre-established (hearer-old) discourse-referents (21).

(20) [A policeman arrives at the scene of an accident and asks]
\[
\text{àkwai } wàd'ändà \text{ sukà } ga \text{ had'ärìn?}
\]
\text{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]
\[
inà \ wàd'ändà \text{ sukà } ga \text{ had'ärìn?}
\]
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. *bàyàn shèkarà gùdà nè kuma*
\text{after year one COP(MSG) and}
\[
sùkà \text{ ga had'ärìn?}
\]
\text{RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-PF get lost-DD(MSG)}
‘the one that got lost ...’ [Buba 1997a: 173, taken from Parsons 1981:42]

b. *ál'ämàrìn na Õmarù Dikkò ya kai gà wàd'ändà sukà yi nìyyàrà sàcè shìn ... [AHR:1]*
\text{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. ... arängamà dà zub dà jinî ... tsàkànnin dàlibài dà kuma 'yan sàndà. clash and spill blood between students and also policemen

b. Wàdàndà sukà ràsu ... 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 bái ji ‘bàri’ ba,
RELPRO(MSG) NEG PF.3MSG hear stop.IMP NEG

yà ji ‘òhô’
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 RC[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 yàrà dà/wàdàndà sukà ga hadàrrìn
SID(PL) boys REL/RELPRO(PL) 3PL.FOC-PF see accident.DD(MSG)

sun gayà wà ’yan sàndà kòmè
3PL.PF tell to police everything
‘some [specific] boys that saw the accident told the police everything’
(26) *wani yárò dà/wandà kè* nan à lökàcin
SID(MSG) boy REL/RELPRO(MSG) FOC-IMPF there at time.DD(MSG)
yà ga kômë
3MSG.PF see everything
‘a [specific] boy that was there at the time saw everything’

(27) nà hà đu dà *wata yärinyà dà/waddà* akè
1SG.PF meet with SID(FSG) girl REL/RELPRO(FSG) 4PL.FOC-IMPF
kiràn tà Dèlu
call.VN.of.3FSG Delu
‘I met a [specific] girl who’s called Delu’

(28) dà ya *shiga cikin dákè sai ya îskè*
when 3MSG.FOC-PF enter in 3MSG.FOC-PF find
wasu mutànë dà/wad'andà sukà râyu
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 nèman *wani māgànì dà/wandà*
1SG.IMPF look for.VN.of SID(MSG) medicine REL/RELPRO(MSG)
zài warkař dà nī
FUT.3MSG cure 1SG
‘I’m looking for a [specific] medicine that will cure me’

(30) àkwai wasu mutànë dà/wad'andà aikinsù kawài ròkò
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'arìn*
SID(MSG) REL/RELPRO(MSG) 4PL.FOC-PF do accident.DD(MSG)
à idònsà yà 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 ɗà), as in (32).

(32) **wasu yara-n ɗà suka ga hadarrière ...** (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'āikâtā wad'ändâ/ɗà suka kwarē sèsai**
    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) **mutânë wad'ändâ/ɗà kè cikin d'ākunasù sun gudù**
    people RELPRO(PL)/REL FOC-IMPF 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 kàyà wad'ändâ/ɗà akè sàwà lòkàcin zàfì**
    EXIST clothes RELPRO(PL)/REL 4PL.FOC-IMPF put on.VN time.of heat
    'there are clothes that are worn during warm weather'

(36) **àkwai mutânë wad'ändâ/ɗà bà sà sòn irin wannàn**
    EXIST people RELPRO(PL)/REL NEG 3PL.IMPF 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 wandâ or REL ɗà in the postnominal RC.

(37) **nà sayô dâwà waccè/ɗà zân yi tuwô ɗà 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’, kọyàushë ‘always’, tun tùni ‘(since) long ago’; a quantifier, for example, duk(â) ‘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 yà tunà dà màgânàr ìbànsà dà kullum vanà cèwà ... ‘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. wàkîlijmù yà yi hîrâ dà reporter.of.1PL 3MSG.PF do talk with
b. wasu mutànè dà tun tùni sukà (= sun) san SID(PL) people REL since long ago 3PL.FOC-PF (= 3PL.PF) know
 àbìn dà ya tâ 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 dàuki ma’àiktà wàdàndà dà mà suka (= sun) 3PL.PF take workers RELPRO(PL) all along 3PL.FOC-PF (= 3PL.PF)
kwarè wajen aikinsù be expert place.of job.of.3PL
‘they’ve taken on workers who all along have been experts in their jobs’
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 tìnì ‘for some time, since long ago’ (38), dà mà ‘all along, from the start’ (39), duk shèkarà ‘annually, every year’ (40b), kòyàushè ‘always, regularly’ (41), and the quantifiers duk(k)ànsù ‘all of them’, dà dâmaṛsù/dà yawànsù ‘many/most of them’ (42), between REL and INFL.9 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.

---

9 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 lôkàcîn dâ/yàyîn dâ ‘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) lôkàcîn dâ/yàyîn dâ nakè (= inà) yàrò
time.DD(MSG) REL/time.DD(MSG) REL 1SG.FOC-IMPF (= 1SG.IMPF) boy
bàbànà yà shà gayà mîn ... father.of.1SG 3MSG.PF do often tell to.1SG
‘when I was a boy my father often told me ...’

(44) lôkàcîn dâ/yàyîn dà sukà (*sun) kai gidà
time.DD(MSG) REL/time.DD(MSG) REL 3PL.FOC-PF (*3PL.PF) reach home
sài sukà tarař dà shì nàn
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)).
Restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses in Hausa

(45) a. *ai, mu₂ণён nan dà tun sunà yàrà*  
    well people.DD(PL) DEM REL since 3PL.IMPF children

    *sukè (= sunà) yìn hakà,*  
    3PL.FOC-IMPF (= 3pl.IMPF) do.VN.of this

    b. *bà zài yiwu sù gyàrà 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. *sù nè sàkà́rka⁡rùn nan dà,*  
    3PL COP(PL) fools.DD(PL) DEM REL

    b. *kòda⁡yàkè nà shà gayà musù sù dainà,*  
    although 1SG.PF do often tell to.3PL 3PL.SUBJ stop

    c. *àmmà sun (?)sukà* ci gàba dà sàkà́rçìnsù  
    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.

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

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 Gouffe [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 INF 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)  
gā mādàkā kāttī biye dà sarki, wā̀ddàndà, kō wūtā sarki ya cè sù fā̀dà, kāfīn yà rufà bākī, sùn 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 mà bā yà yārda yà fitō bā, wā̀ndà kullum yāndà can bɔ́yɛ cikin gārī ‘... 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 INF can in fact be explicitly extended as follows: (1) as already observed in §3.4, selection of a non-focus INF is also felicitous in RRCs when adverbial material has been interposed between the REL(PO) and INF; (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 INF.

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 wā̀ndà/wā́ddà/wā̀dàndà, 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 Jaggar [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'àndà vs. HL(L) wàndà, wàddà = wàccè, wàd'àndà (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) wàndà, wàddà = wàccè, wàd'àndà (MSG, FSG, PL), FL/HLL wàndà, wàddà = wàccè, wàd'àndà, and all L wàndà, wàddà = wàccè, wàd'àndà. 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 wàndà 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 [Jaggar 1992]. However, my proposal that the choice between HL wàndà 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 wàndà 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.)\(^{10}\) 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* allo-morph of the complex RELPRO (MSG/FSG/PL) \(\text{wàndà}/\text{wàddà} = \text{wàccè}/\text{wàd'andà}\) (§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,\(^{11}\) 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.\(^{12}\)

---

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

\[(i) \quad \text{yàrdòn, wàndà yakè tsòròn cidà, yà kàsà bàrcí}
\text{boy.DD(MSG) RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.FOC-!MPF fear.of thunder 3MSG.PF be unable sleep}
\text{‘the boy, who was afraid of the sound of thunder, couldn’t sleep’}
\]

\(^{11}\) 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.)

\(^{12}\) 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... continued on next page..."
Examples (47-55) illustrate the formal properties of NRRCs with INFLs and independently-identifiable definite heads, 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 irìn kàyàyyakín ‘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]).

NRRCs can occur without a verb and INFL constituent, for example, (existential, equational):

(i) akà yi wani sarki,
4PL.FOC-PF do SID(MSG) emir
wàndà duk kasàr ba àbù mài arzikì kàmarsa [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) wàddànnà nàrùn, wàddàndà dukkànsù màtásà nè,
DEM(PL) boys.DD(PL) RELPRO(PL) all.of.3PL adolescents COP(PL)
sùn zó kàsuwà ...
3PL.PF come to market
‘these boys, who were all adolescents, had come to the market ...’

Although definite heads are by far the overwhelming norm in NRRCs, indefinite antecedents are occasionally encountered, for example:

(i) dà an yi wani sarki,
formerly 4PL.PF do SID(MSG) emir
wàndà akè sùnsà kwařai
RELPRO(MSG) 4PL.FOC-IMPF like.VN.of.3MSG extremely
‘there was once an emir, who was extremely well liked’

Examples:

(i) wannàn (= wàddànnà) tagwàwen hanyöyi dà suka tashì
DEM(SG) (= DEM(PL)) twins.of roads.DD(PL) REL 3PL.FOC-PF start
[tun dàgà Titìn Mando] [HNR:18]
right from Street.of Mando
‘this divided highway [lit. this twins of roads] which starts right from Mando Street’

(ii) kàmař yaddà kùkè gànì à wannàn (= wàddànnà) hòtunà
like how 2PL.FOC-IMPF 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 wannàn ‘this’ is used to determine the grammatically plural head NPs tagwàyen hanyöyi ‘divided highways’ and hòtunà ‘shots (photos)’. 

intonational grounds...no clear cases of nonrestrictive relative clauses” in their conversational data base.)
Notice, too, that because the proform-headed RC in (47c) is semantically restrictive, the RELPRO appears as HLL $\text{wad'andà}$ (not all L $\text{*wad'andà}$), 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. yànzu kun ga irin kāyàyyàkìn
    now 2PL.PF see kind.of crops.DD(PL)

    dà Bàhaushè yakè nòmàwà,
    REL Hausaman 3MSG.FOC-IMPF farm.VN

b. wàndà sun (= sukà) hadà dà kàmàr su dàwà ...
    RELPRO(MSG) 3PL.PF (= 3PL.FOC-PF) join with like 3PL guineacorn

c. dà kuma wàd'andà akè (*anà) hakòwà,
    and also RELPRO(PL) 4PL.FOC-IMPF (*4PL.IMPF) dig up.VN

    irin su rògò ...
    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 ga iyàyensà,
    when 3MSG.FOC-PF go USA then 3MSG.FOC-PF see parents.of.3MSG

b. wàd'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. bàyan zàngà-zangàr sai ya kômà
    after demonstrations.DD(FSG) then 3MSG.FOC-PF return

    kauyèn iyàyensà,
    village.of parents.of.3MSG

b. wàndà nà (= kè) can kudàncin kasàr
    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 tārôn dà* [HNR:63]
    well FUT 4PL fill place.of meeting.DD(MSG) with

b. *mutānên dà zā sù dingà yīn màgānàř sòkakken*
   people.DD(PL) REL FUT 3PL keep on do.VN.of talk.of annulled.of
   zàbên 12 ḡà Yūnì, election.of 12 of June

   *c. wàndà (hakàn) nà (= kè) iyà kāwọ*
   RELPRO(MSG) (this.DD(MSG)) IMPF (= FOC-IMPF) can bring
   tāshe-tāshen hankālì
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 disturb-
   ances’

(51) a. *hakà mā Luke d’ālibinkà,*
    so also Luke student.of.2MSG

   b. *wàndà à yànzu yanà (= yakè) jámi’ār*
   RELPRO(MSG) at now 3MSG.IMPF (= 3MSG.FOC-IMPF) university.of
   *Sakkwato*
   Sokoto

   c. *yanà (= yakè) kòyon Sakkwatanci,*
   3MSG.IMPF (= 3MSG.FOC-IMPF) learn.VN.of Sokoto Hausa

   d. *mái 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. *nà nūnà wà Bū bà hōtunàn,*
    1SG.PF show to Buba photos.DD(PL)

   b. *wàndà yà (= ya) nūnà wà Mānsūř,*
   RELPRO(MSG) 3MSG.PF (= 3MSG.FOC-PF) show to Mansur

   c. *wàndà kuma yà (= 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. *nāmān macèjìn dà wad'annān mutànē 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

  sanàdìn ajàlimsù ...

  ‘the snake meat that these people had eaten, and which nearly caused
  their death ...’

(54) a. tô, sànà'àř ginīn tukunyā tsōhuwàř sànà'à cè,
  well profession.of making.VN.of pot old.of profession COP(FSG)

  b. wàccè tā (= ta) dàdè
  RELPRO(FSG) 3FSG.PF (= 3FSG.FOC-PF) last long

  c. anà yîntà à kasař Hausa
  4PL.IMPF 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. dàlibàñ. wàd'ándà sun (= sukà) gamà aikinsù,
  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 (*suna, etc.) TAMs. Although the corresponding focus (*sukà,
suke, 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
Restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses in Hausa

parentheses), 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. 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 indà) and yaddà (?also FL yàddà) occur in addition to the all L forms.) These compound RELPROs are made up of a WH-element (cf. inà ‘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 Nàjèríyà, indà sabòdà yanàyin
    at in Cameroon and Nigeria RELPRO because of climate.of
duwàtsun wurùn ...
    mountains.of area.DD(MSG)
    [AHR:69]
    ‘in Cameroon and Nigeria, where because of the climate in the mountains of the area...’

(57) a. jùyìn mulkin dà sojà sukà yi ...
    change.of rule.DD(MSG) REL soldiers 3PL.FOC-PF do
b. indà akà hambarañ dà gwànnatin ...
    RELPRO 4PL.FOC-PF overthrow government.DD(MSG)
    [AHR:1]
    ‘the coup which the military pulled off ... when the government was overthrown ...’

16 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).
17 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 fuṣūnăn Kirikiri yā bācī,  
    house.of prisoner.of Kirikiri 3MSG.PF deteriorate

b. ta wàddà hař 'yan fuṣūnăn sukān yi barcī nè  
    via RELPRO even prisoners.DD(PL) 3PL.HAB do sleeping COP(MSG)  
    kāmū-kāmū  
    in shifts  
    ‘Kirikiri prison has deteriorated, such that the prisoners sleep in shifts’

(59) a. ya tāshī ya mangārē shī  
    3MSG.FOC-PF get up 3MSG.FOC-PF hit 3MSG

b. wàddà ya ga mutānēn can nā yi wà  
    RELPRO 3MSG.FOC-PF see people.DD(PL) DEM IMPF do to  
    ‘yà’yàyensù  
    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 (wàngà) 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 wàngà/wàddà/wàd'ändà (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 wàngà forms were consistently rejected by a significant number of 2-RELPRO speakers (representing various dialects).18 This [all L wàngà ↔ 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

18 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).
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'uwänà, wàtò wàndà zài yi kàràtù à Amùrkà,
brother.of.1SG that is RELPRO(MSG) FUT.3MSG do studying in USA

b. yà isó 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

---

19 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).20 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 lead 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 jë mun (kuma) gan tà ‘we’ve been and seen her’ (1PL.PF...

20 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 yanà dà fiye dà ’yā’yā àshiřin,
Musa 3MSG.IMPF with more than children twenty
wàd’ándà *(dà yawânsù) sun rígà 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 Landân nê na sàdu dà màtá tà,
in London COP(MSG) 1SG.FOC-PF meet with wife.of.1SG
wàddà *(à lôkâcîn) tanà aïkî 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 rôkè tā àṃmā tā fi* ‘they begged her but she refused’ (3PL.PF beg 3FSG but 3FSG.PF refuse), *munā naa nuna kāṛatū* ‘we’re t/her (and) we’re studying away’ (1PL.IMPF t/her 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 kāmu dà kansâ,*
   3MSG.PF be taken with cancer

   b. *wàddā (kuma) tā (= ta) zama ajálînsà*
   RELPRO(FSG) (and) 3FSG.PF (= 3FSG.FOC-PF) be death.of.3MSG

   ‘he went down with cancer, which proved fatal’

   =

   c. *yā kāmu dà kansâ,*
   3MSG.PF be taken with cancer

   d. *kuma tā zama ajálînsà*
   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 (*sâ*, 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 nän nê yawanci akà fì sákàř ... kàtòn
   at here COP(MSG) mainly 4PL.FOC-PF exceed weave.VN.of long.of
   zanè, cloth

b. wàndà â iyà yìn mayāfì dà shì
   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 kàtòn zanèn dà zà à (?= â) iyà yìn
   PRES long.of cloth.DD(MSG) REL FUT 4PL (?= 4PL.POT) can make.VN.of
   mayāfì dà shì
   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 irìn mōtār dà zàn (?= nâ) sàyà
   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) \( \text{wà } \text{zài} (\ast \text{yâ}) \text{ yi wannàn aikî?} \) (\( = \) WH-question)

who(3MSG) FUT.3MSG (*3MSG.POT) do DEM(SG) work

‘who will do this work?’

(66) \( \text{Audù nê } \text{zài} (\ast \text{yâ}) \text{ yi} \)

Audu COP(MSG) FUT.3MSG (*3MSG.POT) do

‘AUDU will do (it)’

(67) \( \text{nì kad’ai nê } \text{zàn} (\ast \text{nâ}) \text{ zô} \)

1SG only COP(MSG) FUT.1SG (*1SG.POT) come

‘ONLY I will come’

(68) \( \text{kômè } \text{zâ kà} (\ast \text{kâ}) \text{ yi, bèn } \text{dàmu } \text{ba} \)

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORPHOSYNTAX</th>
<th>RESTRICTIVE RC</th>
<th>NON-RESTRICTIVE RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-RELPRO speakers</td>
<td>2-RELPRO speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL $dà$</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELPRO (HL $\text{wandà}$ etc.)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ = hearer-$new$ referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELPRO (all L $\text{wàndà}$ etc.)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ = hearer-$old$ referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS INFL (Pf/Impf)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-FOCUS INFL adverbial-insertion</td>
<td>only with REL $\downarrow$ INFL</td>
<td>only with REL $\downarrow$ INFL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(69) 'yan tāwāyèn kùwa, an nūnà musù shirin 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 tāwāyèn, wàdàndà an (= akà) nūnà wà Ø (= musù)
rebels.DD(PL) RELPRO(PL) 4PL.PF (= 4PL.FOC-PF) show to Ø (= to.3PL)
    shirin jiyà,
plan.DD(MSG) yesterday
    duk sun amincē 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 tāwāyèn dà akà nūnà wà Ø shirin jiyà
rebels.DD(PL) REL 4PL.FOC-PF show to Ø plan.DD(MSG) yesterday
    duk sun amincē 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
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