

## Grammatical Restructuring in Hausa: Indirect Objects and Possessives

PAUL NEWMAN

Indirect objects in Hausa are indicated by an overt i.o. marker plus the object nominal, noun or pronoun. The i.o. occurs immediately following the verb and preceding the d.o. in the basic SVO word order.

The characterization of the i.o. as a syntactic category is straightforward. The semantic role of the i.o., on the other hand, is highly varied (cf. the similar situation in Hebrew described by Berman 1982). The interpretation of the i.o. "affectee" in a particular sentence depends on the derivational grade of the verb – whether neutral, applicative, ventive, efferential, etc. – and on the general semantic context.<sup>1</sup>

- |     |    |   |  |
|-----|----|---|--|
| (1) | a. | <i>zaatà kaawoo <u>makà</u> ruwaa</i>         | She will bring <u>you</u> water.                               |
|     | b. | <i>yaa yaafam <u>mini</u> shii</i>            | He forgave <u>me</u> (for) it.                                 |
|     | c. | <i>sun gyaaràa <u>wà Muusaa</u> mootàa</i>    | They repaired the car <u>for</u><br><u>Musa.</u>               |
|     | d. | <i>naa sookàa <u>matà</u> maashii</i>         | I stabbed a spear <u>into</u> <u>her.</u>                      |
|     | e. | <i>kà sakàa <u>mà</u> dookii linzaamii</i>    | Put a bridle <u>on</u> <u>the horse.</u>                       |
|     | f. | <i>sun yi <u>musu</u> dàariyaa</i>            | They laughed <u>at</u> <u>them.</u>                            |
|     | g. | <i>siuruutuu ya yi <u>wà</u> maalàm yawàa</i> | The chatter was too much<br><u>for</u> <u>the teacher.</u>     |
|     | h. | <i>kadà zoobèe yà sullùbee <u>makà</u></i>    | Don't let the ring slip<br><u>away</u> <u>from</u> <u>you.</u> |
|     | i. | <i>kàakaa taa macèe <u>manà</u></i>           | Grandma died <u>on</u> <u>us.</u>                              |
|     | j. | <i>kai nakèe gayàa <u>wà</u></i>              | It is you I am telling it <u>to.</u>                           |

The form of the i.o. marker is *ma* (with high tone) before personal pronouns and *wà* or *mà*, depending on dialect, elsewhere, i.e. before nouns, demonstrative pronouns, or in phrase-final position. For convenience, I

\* This work was supported in part by an NSF grant BNS77-16841, awarded to the Center for Applied Linguistics. I would like to thank Julianna Kuperus, Thilo Schadeberg, and Russell Schuh for valuable comments and suggestions concerning the paper. An earlier version of the paper was presented at a Colloquium on grammatical change held at the University of Leiden in September, 1979.

shall refer to this as the pre-noun form in contrast to the pronominal form. The high tone *ma-* and the following pronouns combine to form inseparable words, the “i.o. pronouns”. The vowel of *ma-* usually assimilates to the vowel of the following pronoun (e.g. *mani* = *mini* ‘to me’) whereas the pre-noun particles *wà/mà* are invariant. Ignoring optional contractions of the pronouns that commonly occur (e.g. *mini* = *min*) the full paradigm of i.o. forms in Standard Hausa is as given in (2). For comparison, a corresponding set of d.o. forms is also given.

(2)	Indirect Objects		Direct Objects			
	1sg	<i>mini</i>	1pl	<i>manà</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>mu</i>
	2m	<i>makà</i>	2pl	<i>mukù</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>ku</i>
	2f	<i>miki</i>			<i>ki</i>	
	3m	<i>masà</i>	3pl	<i>musù</i>	<i>shi</i>	<i>su</i>
	3f	<i>matà</i>			<i>ta</i>	
	N	<i>wà/mà</i> + Noun			Noun	

Since the Hausa i.o. system looks so transparent and regular, it wouldn't seem to pose any interesting historical problems. Presumably all one would have to do would be to locate the cognate i.o. marker(s) in related languages and then reconstruct the ancestral system from which the present-day Hausa system is derived. However, it turns out that the problem is far from simple and that the morpho-syntactic structure of Hausa as we see it today is the result of significant grammatical change and restructuring.

## 1. THE TYPICAL CHADIC INDIRECT OBJECT SYSTEM

Viewed from a comparative Chadic perspective, the Hausa i.o. system is noticeably aberrant in two respects. First, there shouldn't be an overt prefix or particle with the pronoun i.o.'s. While there are other Chadic languages that also have pre-pronoun i.o. markers, the usual case is for the i.o. pronoun to be suffixed directly to the verb. This i.o. pronoun is usually distinguished from the d.o. pronoun by having a different pronoun paradigm and/or by being treated as a bound clitic attached to the verb. In Kanakuru (Newman 1974), for instance, the i.o. pronoun constitutes part of the verb for the purpose of tone assignment and word formation rules whereas the d.o. pronoun has its own intrinsic tone. Similarly in Ngamo (Schuh n.d.), i.o. pronouns are closely bound to the verb while, in certain verb forms at least, d.o. pronouns use the independent pronoun paradigm and behave morpho-syntactically like nouns.

- (3) Kanakuru
- |        |                              |                           |
|--------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| a.     | <i>à d̀̀l̀̀è né</i>          | He pushed me.             |
| b.     | <i>à d̀̀l̀̀-̀̀l̀̀ò g̀̀ám</i> | He pushed the ram for me. |
| cf. c. | <i>à d̀̀l̀̀è</i>             | He pushed (it).           |
| d.     | <i>à d̀̀l̀̀-̀̀l̀̀ò</i>       | He pushed (it) for me.    |
- (4) Ngamo
- |    |                              |                        |
|----|------------------------------|------------------------|
| a. | <i>ǹ̀è s̀̀àlá ǹ̀z̀̀uní</i> | I built them.          |
| b. | <i>ǹ̀è s̀̀àl̀̀-̀̀s̀̀ù</i>   | I built (it) for them. |

Second, the noun i.o. is in the wrong place. Unlike the pronoun i.o., which is attached to the verb, the noun i.o. phrase should occur *after*, not before, the direct object. The typical Chadic pattern is to have sentences such as 'He brought me the book', but 'He brought the book to/for John', the word order in both cases being obligatory. This distinction in word order can be seen clearly in Kanakuru and Ngamo, languages belonging to the same branch of Chadic as Hausa, as well as in Kera (Ebert 1979:207) and Dangaleat (Ebobissé 1979:52-56), two more distantly related languages belonging to the East Chadic branch. (See Newman 1977a for Chadic subclassification.)

- (5) Kanakuru
- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| a.  | <i>à j̀̀òb̀̀-̀̀r̀̀ò l̀̀ándàì</i>                 | } He washed the robe for her.<br>He washed the robe for the<br>woman. |
| b.  | <i>à j̀̀òb̀̀è l̀̀ándàì g̀̀èn t̀̀ámǹ̀ó</i>       |   |
| b'. | <i>à j̀̀òb̀̀-̀̀r̀̀ò l̀̀ándàì g̀̀èn t̀̀ámǹ̀ó</i> |   |
| c.  | <i>ǹ̀à b̀̀ál̀̀-̀̀ẁ̀ù</i>                       | I said to them.   |
| d.  | <i>ǹ̀à b̀̀ál̀̀-̀̀ẁ̀ù g̀̀èn ámb̀̀òì</i>         | I said to the children.   |
- (6) Ngamo (Gashinge dialect)
- |    |  |                         |
|----|--|-------------------------|
| a. | <i>ní oo-ní-ko oyu</i><br>I give-him-perf money          | I gave him money.       |
| b. | <i>ní on-ko oyu kí Tijani</i><br>I give-perf money to T. | I gave money to Tijani. |
- (7) Kera
- |    |   |                                    |
|----|---|------------------------------------|
| a. | <i>ẁ̀ə̀ g̀̀ùsn-ə̀ h̀̀àrg̀̀á b̀̀à</i><br>he buy-her goat neg .                              | He didn't buy her a goat.          |
| b. | <i>ẁ̀ə̀ g̀̀ùs̀̀úɾ̀̀j̀̀ h̀̀àrg̀̀á á m̀̀ū̀r̀̀úɾ̀̀j̀̀ b̀̀à</i><br>he buy goat to wife-his neg | He didn't buy a goat for his wife. |

## (8) Dangaleat (East dialect)

- a. *nō bër-dyī āmày* I gave him water.  
 b. *dyāmīn lèè-dyī ātày kū rontī* The elder gave poison to  
 elder pour-him poison to son-her her son.

Whether one uses a pleonastic i.o. pronoun in sentences with noun i.o.'s, as seen in the Kanakuru and Dangaleat examples, seems to vary from language to language. In Kanakuru the use of the pronoun is usually optional, but always preferred.

In Tera (Newman 1970), in which i.o. pronouns use an overt i.o. marker, the i.o. phrase occurs to the right of the d.o. in exactly the same position as for noun i.o.'s.

## (9) Tera

- a. *ŋa ver məjin bara ye-nda* I gave the money away to  
 him.  
 b. *ŋa vər məjin bara ye xatin* I gave the money away to  
 his brother.

Similarly in Kanakuru, if one wants to emphasize a pronoun i.o. without fronting it – fronting being the normal preferred process – one uses the pre-noun i.o. marker plus an independent pronoun. In this event, the i.o. phrase occurs after the d.o. and, like a noun i.o., allows the use of a pleonastic pronoun immediately following the verb.

## (10) Kanakuru

- a. *à wùpè lándài gèn shiré* He sold the cloth *to her*.  
 a'. *à wùpè-rò lándài gèn shiré*  
 cf. b. *shiré shī wùpè-rà lándài* It was *she* he sold the cloth  
 to.

In Ngizim (Schuh 1972:47ff), on the other hand, the general pattern of pronoun i.o.'s occurring before and noun i.o.'s occurring after the d.o. holds even though the pronouns use an i.o. marker.

## (11) Ngizim

- a. *nāa karam ii-kshi dəm tku* I am chopping this wood for  
 I chop for-them wood this them.  
 b. *á-baren dagwda ii gazgara-gaa* Give money to my brother.

In short, although we find various structures in present-day Chadic languages, the overall picture allows one to identify a typical Chadic indirect object system containing two different word orders, one for pronoun i.o.'s and one for noun (and other) i.o.'s.

(12) Typical Chadic System

- |    |               |        |   |                 |
|----|---------------|--------|---|-----------------|
| a. | I.O. Pronoun: | V-pn   | — | d.o.            |
| b. | I.O. Noun:    | V(-pn) | — | d.o. — prep + N |

2. THE TYPICAL I.O. SYSTEM IN (EARLY) HAUSA

If one looks at the usual examples of indirect objects in Hausa, such as presented in (1), one finds a system very different from that schematized in (12). However, if one starts with (12) as an ideal model, one discovers that the system is actually exemplified in Hausa. It is only that our traditional approach to Hausa description has prevented us from seeing this.

2.1. The principle that the i.o. pronoun should directly follow the verb without an overt marker still holds in Hausa in the case of the dative verb par excellence, *baa* 'to give'.

- |      |    |                                    |                                      |
|------|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (13) | a. | <i>yaa baa ni littaaƴii</i>        | He gave me a book.                   |
|      | b. | <i>gàa huulunàn dà sukà baa mù</i> | Here are the caps that they gave us. |

Because the pronoun set used after the verb *baa* is identical to the direct object set, it is common for Hausaists to describe *baa* as taking two direct objects. But I would argue that *baa* is not "aberrant" in having two d.o.'s, but rather is "archaic" in that it has preserved the historically earlier structure in which pronoun i.o.'s were bare pronoun forms immediately following the verb. That an old pattern should be preserved with the verb 'to give' — a high frequency verb that in Hausa requires, not just allows, an i.o. — is not surprising. One should note that all Chadic languages without exception, as far as I am aware, express the recipient of the verb 'to give' by an i.o., not a d.o. pronoun.

As would be expected, noun i.o.'s after *baa* do require an overt i.o. marker. With some speakers this is *wà*, usually occurring with a special form of the verb, *bai*, with others it is a phonologically reduced form consisting simply of a low tone, which is realized on the verb as *baà* with falling tone as opposed to the pre-pronoun form *baa* with level high tone. In any case, the marker is clearly evident and preserves the important syntactic distinction between noun and pronoun i.o.'s.

- (14) a. *yaa baà dansà littaañi* He gave his son a book.  
 b. *gàa mutàanen dà sukà bai wà* Here are the men they gave (it) to.

2.2. Hausa is usually described as having two pre-noun i.o. markers, *wà* and *mà*, the former occurring in "Standard" Hausa, the other ascribed to western dialects, but in fact being the commoner and more widely distributed of the two forms. However, in the northern dialect of the young man Dorugu recorded in the mid-nineteenth century by Schön (e.g. 1862, 1885),<sup>2</sup> neither of these markers occurs, although the full i.o. pronoun paradigm (*manì*, *makà*, etc.) is well documented. Instead, one finds a marker *ga* (= /gà/). What is interesting for our purposes is that when a noun i.o. and an expressed d.o. co-occur, the i.o. phrase *ga* + noun occurs after the d.o., contrary to the normal rule in present-day Hausa. Consider the following examples, in which I have modernized Schön's transcription slightly but have left tone and vowel length unmarked. (Example (b) is from the 1862 grammar; the others are from the 1885 work.)

- (15) a. *ya gwada ga dansa* He showed (it) to his son. (p. 112)  
 a'. *ya gwada masa* He showed (it) to him. (p. 112)  
 b. *ina son koya ga mutanen kasammu* I want to teach (to) the people of our country. (p. 141)  
 b'. *ina son koya masu abin da Isa ya ce* I want to teach them what Jesus said. (p. 141)  
 c. *da uwatta ta yi tuwo da yawa, ta bai ga kar[n]juka* After her mother made a lot of food, she gave (it) to the dogs. (p. 134)  
 d. *ya kawo ta ga diyansa* He brought her to his children (p. 130).  
 e. *suka kawo labari ga sarki Aliyu* They brought the news to Emir Aliyu. (p. 76)  
 f. *ka yi karatu ga duk wadanda ka gamu da su* Read (lit. 'do reading') to all whom you meet. (p. 14)

The marker *gà*, seen in the above examples with noun i.o.'s, still exists in Hausa as a multifunctional preposition indicating 'to, in/on/near, in relation to, in the presence of, etc.'. In standard Hausa grammars it is never mentioned when discussing indirect objects (but see Parsons 1971/72:72). Nevertheless, one of its important functions *is* to serve as a pre-noun i.o.

marker, namely when the i.o. phrase is complex and thus has been shifted to the right of the d.o. Thus we find that the typical Chadic i.o. structure V - d.o. - prep + noun is still much in evidence in modern Hausa, even in those dialects – now practically all – which normally express noun i.o.'s by *wà* or *mà* + noun before the d.o.

- (16) a. *yaa yaakè hakòoransà gà bàbban bàakoo*  
 = a'. *yaa yaakèè wà/mà bàbban bàakoo hakòoransà*  
 He (the dog) bared his teeth at the important visitor.
- b. *yaa yaakè hakòoransà gà yaaròn dà bàì saabàa dà shii ba*  
 He bared his teeth at the boy he wasn't used to.
- c. *sarkii yaa yi jàwaabii gà mutàaneñ dà sukà tàaru à dandàlii*  
 The chief made a speech to the people who assembled in the square.
- d. *yakàn kaawoo ràguwar fàhimtáa gà wandà karin harshènsà yakè dàban*  
 This brings a lessening of understanding to the person whose manner of speaking is different.
- e. *naa nuunà takàrdarè gà wandà na faarà gàmuwaa dà shii 'à koo fàa*  
 I showed the letter to the first person I met at the door.

I suggest, then, that in Old Hausa, pronoun and noun indirect objects were formed on the model of sentences (13a) and (16e) respectively, i.e. that the language looked very much like any other Chadic language adhering to the i.o. pattern (12) and not like the way it generally looks today.

### 3. THE SOURCE OF THE PRESENT I.O. FORMS IN HAUSA

Assuming that the analysis presented above is essentially correct, then it remains to be explained where the present Hausa i.o. forms came from. If one looks at related Chadic languages, one does not find i.o. pronominal paradigms corresponding to the Hausa *mini*, *makà*...forms. But in fact one does find them! That is, pronominal paradigms corresponding to Hausa *mini*...exist in related languages, only they are *possessive*, not i.o. pronouns. Similarly one finds forms like *mà* as a marker of noun possessors, but not (with one exception to be discussed below) as an i.o. marker. Compare the paradigms of possessives in Kanakuru (Newman 1974: 91) and Sura (Jungraithmayr 1963:24-29) with the i.o. forms in Hausa.

(17)	Kanakuru		Sura		Hausa	
1sg	<i>mónó</i>	my, mine	<i>mēná</i>	mine	<i>mínì</i>	to me
2m	<i>móŋgó</i>	your, yours	<i>mōγá</i>	yours	<i>mákà</i>	to you
2f	<i>mónjí</i>	your, yours	<i>mīyí</i>	yours	<i>míkì</i>	to you
3m	<i>máni</i>	his	<i>mērí</i>	his	<i>màsà</i>	to him
3f	<i>móndó</i>	her, hers	<i>mērá</i>	hers	<i>mátà</i>	to her
1pl	<i>máamù</i>	our, ours	<i>mūnú</i>	ours	<i>mánà</i>	to us
2pl	<i>mámái</i>	your, yours	<i>mūú</i>	yours	<i>múki</i>	to you
3pl	<i>máawù</i>	their, theirs	<i>mūrú</i>	theirs	<i>músù</i>	to them
N	<i>mà Ngójè</i>		<i>mù Gálìli-mó</i>		<i>mà Múusáa</i>	
	Ngoje's		the Galileans's		to Muusaa	

There are specific points of resemblance between the Hausa i.o. forms and the possessives found in other languages belonging to the same sub-branch of Chadic as Hausa that show clearly that they are historically the same.

First, there is the unusual 1st person plural pronoun: *-nà* in Hausa, *-nú* in Sura. In Hausa, as in other West Chadic languages, the normal pronoun for this person is *mu(n)*. In Hausa, *mu(n)* is used in all syntactic environments *except* in the i.o. form *manà* (= *munà*), and even this is being analogically replaced in many dialects by *mamù*. Similarly in Sura, *mə(n)* is the standard 1st person plural pronoun in all environments (including direct *and* indirect object) *except* in the case of possessives, where *-nu* is required.

Second, there is the shared tonal assymetry between the high (or mid) tone pre-pronoun marker and the low tone pre-noun particle, which is evidenced in all three of the above languages.

Third – and this is probably significant, although not apparent from the examples in (17) – there is the distinction between the pre-pronoun marker with the assimilating vowel, which can be traced to a form reconstructable as *\*mə*, and the pre-noun marker with the stable vowel, which goes back to a form reconstructable as *\*ma*.<sup>3</sup>

Since the *má/mà* paradigm in Hausa can be identified with the *mV*-paradigm in related languages, and since in all these other languages (e.g. Angas, Bole, Galambu, Gera, Kanakuru, Kirfi, Kulere, Ron, Sura) it represents a possessive pronoun set, it follows that the present-day Hausa indirect object forms must originally have been possessives. In other words, the present forms and syntax of indirect objects in Hausa represent not a direct modification of an earlier i.o. system, but rather its replacement by something that originally was quite different, namely possessives. Sentences such as *taa ginàa makà tìuuluu* and *yaa saacèe mà sarkii zoobèe*, which now mean 'she made a water pot for you' and 'he stole the ring from the chief', earlier would literally have meant 'she made yours, a water



pot' and 'he stole the chief's, the ring'. The exceptional first person plural form *manà* 'to us' would have means 'ours', exactly as it now does in Sura.

The original motivation for using possessives may have been to give prominence to the i.o. affectee, something that was inherently difficult with the weak, semi-clitic i.o. pronouns. The usage may also have been helped along by the need to avoid ambiguity between i.o.'s and d.o.'s resulting from the merger of the two originally distinct sets. Whatever the mechanism involved, the semantically possessive nature of the possessives gradually faded away, leaving them to be redefined by their new syntactic role as i.o. pronouns.

Note that I am assuming that the Hausa *má/mà* forms that eventually became indirect objects were originally independent possessives. The fixed word order for attributive possessives in Hausa, as in other Chadic languages, is (and seems always to have been) Possessed-Possessor, e.g. modern Hausa *tùulu-n-kà* 'your pot' (lit. 'pot-of-you', cf. Kanakuru *jírà' móngó*), *zoobè-n sarkii* 'the chief's ring' (lit. 'ring-of the chief'). At no time would *\*makà tùuluu* ever have been a noun phrase meaning 'your pot'. On the other hand, when an independent possessive (usually pronominal) is used in the same construction with a possessed noun, as is possible in Hausa, the possessive may occur before the noun, thereby giving it special emphasis.

- (18) a. *yaa saacè zoobèn nan naakà* He stole this ring of yours.  
 b. *yaa saacè naakà zoobèn* He stole *your* ring.  
 cf. c. *zoobèn nan naakà nee* This ring is yours.<sup>4</sup>

The West Chadic pre-noun form *\*mà* was probably used only in forming absolute possessives, since another form *\*kə* is easily reconstructed for N of N constructions. With pronominal possessives the picture is not so clear. In some of the languages that have *mV*- possessive forms (Angas, Bole, Sura), the pronouns only function as independent possessives. In others (Galambu, Gera, Kanakuru, Kirfi, Kulere, Ron), they also function attributively. (In all these cases, with the exception of Kulere, the *mV*-forms are only used with masculine (and plural) nouns alongside a separate paradigm for grammatically feminine words.) Nevertheless, whatever the original West Chadic situation may have been with regard to the function of the *mV*- forms, by the time that they underwent the possessive to i.o. change in Hausa, they were almost certainly restricted to the role of absolute/independent possessives.

In considering the historical connection between possessives and indirect objects in Hausa, one should take into account the facts, albeit sketchy, that Schuh (1978:64-70) provides for Galambu, a language belonging to the same group as Kanakuru, and thus reasonably closely re-

lated to Hausa. In this language, attributive possessive pronouns used with masculine and plural nouns are formed with the prefix *mà-*, e.g. *kilà máná* 'my bull', ...*màgá* 'your bull', ...*màzá* 'her bull', ...*mùsí* 'their bull', etc. (Possessives with feminine nouns are formed with a prefix *cá-*.) Noun plus noun possessives are formed by simple juxtaposition without an overt marker, e.g. *kilà Gárbà* 'Garba's bull'. No information is given regarding absolute possessives, noun or pronoun.

Turning to i.o.'s we find, not surprisingly, that pronoun i.o.'s are suffixed to the verb stem, preceding any d.o. What is unexpected is to find that noun i.o.'s make use of a particle *mà*!

(19) Galambu

- |        |                            |   |
|--------|----------------------------|---|
| a.     | <i>shì kwàzáa mà Gárbà</i> | He chased (it) for Garba.                               |
| b.     | <i>kà màs-shí mà Gárbà</i> | You shot him for Garba.                                 |
| cf. c. | <i>shì màn-ná-sh'áalá</i>  | He shot him for me (lit. he shot for me him perfective) |

Presumably Galambu *mà* and *mà* are (or were) variants of the same morpheme. If so, this raises the question whether Galambu has undergone a change from possessive to indirect object parallel to the one in Hausa (but limited only to nouns), or whether the Galambu and Hausa data taken together point to an originally broader relational function for the pre-noun particle *\*mà* than indicated by the label possessive.

#### 4. STANDARD HAUSA *wà*

Because the pre-noun i.o. markers *mà* and *wà* are functionally equivalent dialect variants (sometimes used interchangeably by one and the same speaker), it has generally been assumed that they bear some kind of direct historical relationship to one another. According to one analysis, tacitly held by myself and others, the *wà* is taken as original and the dialectal change *wà* to *mà* is explained in terms of analogic levelling under the influence of the pre-pronoun form *má*. However, if *mà* goes back directly to an old possessive marker of the same shape, as argued above, this would obviate the need and the justification for the presumed *wà* to *mà* change. In that case, should we conclude that the correct historical analysis is to derive *wà* from *mà*?

As far as I am aware, the only scholar ever to suggest that this was the direction of change is Eulenberg (1972:33-36). Eulenberg's explanation was that the *mà* > *wà* shift was simply a special instance of a more general process of lenition that we know to have affected Hausa consonants. He was particularly focussing on the *\*/m/* > */w/* change that has taken

place in some, but not all, Hausa dialects, cf. Sokoto *zamnàa* ‘to sit’, ‘*amree*’ ‘marriage’ (Sokoto having *mà* as the i.o. marker) with Kano *zaunàa* and ‘*auree*’ (Kano having *wà* as the i.o. marker). While this analysis would solve our problems, unfortunately it does not seem to be correct. In the first place, the \*/m/ > /w/ change (or \*/m/ > /u/ as I would prefer to represent it, see Newman and Salim 1981) is a strictly conditioned sound change applying only to /m/ in syllable-final position followed by /n/ or /r/. There is no evidence of an \*/m/ > /w/ change in other positions, cf. the Sokoto/Kano forms *kimsàa/kimsàa* ‘to stuff into’, *kumcii/kuncii* ‘cheek’, *zama/zama* ‘to become’ (this being the same root as in ‘to sit’), *màrii/màrii* ‘shackle’. Second, it is not true that the dialect distributions of *mà* vs. *wà* and *zamnàa* vs. *zaunàa* are coterminous. While this holds to a considerable extent, one also finds dialects where *mà* coexists with *zaunàa* and dialects where *wà* coexists with *zamnàa*. Even within a particular dialect, there is often considerable variation in the use of *mà* or *wà*. In Katsina, they apparently can occur in succession in certain constructions, e.g. *wàa zañ kai mà wà?* ‘Whom shall I take (it) to?’ (Parsons 1971/72:66).

It seems, then, that *mà* doesn’t come from *wà* and that *wà* doesn’t come from *mà*, i.e. that they are historically unrelated and their synchronic closeness is due to a kind of morphological/syntactic merger. Thus we are still left with the problem of explaining the origin of *wà*.

Since Hausa should have had a preposition-like particle with noun i.o.’s long before the presumably possessive marker *mà* acquired an i.o. function, *wà* could easily be a reflex of this morpheme. The fact that *mà* and *wà* coexist in many dialects is fully consistent with this approach. In looking around Chadic for cognate forms, the historically most likely (though phonetically not the most obvious) comparison is with Kanakuru *kò* (one of its variant i.o. markers), Ngamo *k(i)*, and Dangaleat *ku*. Although the change \*/k/ > /w/ is not regular in Hausa, it is attested in the case of other grammatical morphemes, e.g. *-uwàa* ‘plural marker’ < *-ukàa* (which still occurs), and *-waa* ‘progressive participle ending’ < *\*àka*.<sup>5</sup> I would suggest, however, that the most likely source for *wà* is to be found within Hausa itself, namely the preposition *gà*.<sup>6</sup>

It was demonstrated above that the preposition *gà* was and is a preposition i.o. marker. Thus to derive *wà* from *gà* would only require a morpheme specific phonological weakening limited to the case where the i.o. marker immediately followed the verb, e.g. *yaa fadàa wà sarkii* ‘He told the chief’, but *yaa fadi làabaarii gà wandà ya baa shi duukaa* ‘He told the story to the one who gave him a beating’. It seems that Eulenberg’s lenition idea was basically correct, only he applied it to the wrong morpheme.

That *wà* is in a “weak” position has been noted by Parsons and Gouffé, both of whom propose synchronically that *wà* be regarded as a verbal suffix rather than as a separate particle.<sup>7</sup>

Indeed, though it [wà] is always written disjunctively (from the verb), there is a case for regarding it as some sort of verbal suffix or extension, it being even possible to make a pause between it and the noun in speech, but never before it. (Parsons 1971/72:64)

Lorsque l'objet indirect est de nature nominale, il est essentiel de rappeler que la marque /wà/ se comporte comme un morphème enclitique du verbe; plus précisément, elle fonctionne comme un véritable suffixe de ce verbe. (Gouffé 1981:49)

It is interesting that the phonological weakening proposed to account for the *gà* to *wà* change in postverbal position is an ongoing process that is now affecting *wà*. In addition to the pre-noun verb form *baà* 'to give', presumably derived from *\*baa wà*, one can cite other examples where *wà* has weakened and been incorporated into the verb that have not been appreciated as such.

- (20) a. *yakàn tiilàsà mutàanee sù yi hakà*  
 = a'. *yakàn tiilàsaa wà mutàanee sù yi hakà*  
 He compels people to act thus.  
 b. *kaṛ kà durkùsàa mùtuṃ, kadà kà kwanṭàa mùtuṃ*  
 Don't kneel down for a man, don't lie down for a man.<sup>5</sup>

Examples such as the above have been described by many scholars (e.g. Parsons 1971/72:66) in terms of optional omission or deletion of the i.o. marker. The tone, however, shows clearly that we are dealing with the incorporation of *wà* and not its absence. If *wà* were deleted, as generally claimed, then the trisyllabic verbs should show up with high-low-high tone. The actually occurring high-low-low pattern, as seen in *durkùsàa*, results from the fusion of the underlying high-low-low verb *\*durkùsà* with the highly reduced form of the i.o. marker consisting only of length plus low tone, i.e. /:/.

The close nexus between the verb and the i.o. marker not only helps explain the phonological weakening that led to *wà*, it also explains why the extraposition of the noun i.o. doesn't take place. In this connection, we need to clarify certain matters purposely left in abeyance when the word order of noun i.o.'s was being discussed.

Although the typical word order with noun i.o.'s was said to be V – d.o. – prep. + Noun, sentences with a noun i.o. in fact seldom contain an expressed d.o. This is avoided by sequences of sentences and clauses such as 'The lion killed the animal; he brought (it) to his children', or 'Whenever her mother made a lot of food, she gave (it) to the dogs'. The result is that the noun i.o. phrase normally finds itself immediately after the verb. Compare *ya kawo ga diyansa* 'He brought (it) to his children', a sentence taken from the old dialect with V – d.o. – i.o. word order, with its modern equivalent *yaa kaawoo wà 'yaa'yansà*.

The second point is that I regard the typical Chadic word order with noun i.o.'s after the d.o. as being due to a shared extraposition rule that moved i.o.'s to the right of the d.o. In underlying structure, the word order was presumably the same whether the i.o. was nominal or pronominal, namely V – i.o. – d.o. If the i.o. was “cumbersome” or “heavy”, i.e. if it provided too much of a barrier between the verb and its d.o., then it was removed to the right. The question of what constituted “cumbersome” seems to have been a language specific matter. In some Chadic languages the very fact of the i.o. being a prepositional phrase made it cumbersome, so that all noun i.o.'s were obligatorily extraposed. In others, such as present-day Hausa, extraposition depends on the complexity of the i.o. in relation to the complexity of the d.o. The weakening of *gà* to *wà* and its semi-attachment to the verb stem had the effect of lessening the heaviness of noun i.o.'s, thereby allowing noun i.o.'s to remain before d.o.'s and not be extraposed as was probably more general at an earlier period.

## 5. SUMMARY

The typical means of forming indirect objects in Chadic is to suffix pronouns directly to the verb and to express noun i.o.'s by means of a prepositional phrase. The noun i.o. is typically shifted to the right of the direct object, commonly leaving a pronominal trace in its original position. Such a system was probably characteristic of Proto-Chadic.

At an earlier period, Hausa probably manifested such a system, with bare pronouns occurring to the left of the d.o. and noun i.o.'s, indicated by *gà* + N, occurring to the right of the d.o. The innovations that led to the strikingly different i.o. system that one finds in present-day Hausa were: (a) the change in meaning and function of the *mini*, *makà*...pronominal paradigm from absolute possessive to dative; (b) the change in meaning and function of the pre-noun marker *mà* from possessive to dative; and (c) the weakening of *gà* to *wà* with the concomitant relaxation of the noun i.o. extraposition rule.

## NOTES

1. The most important treatment of indirect objects in Hausa is Parsons (1971/72), from which I have freely drawn examples. One should also see Newman (1973, 1977b). In transcribing examples from Hausa, long vowels are indicated by double letters, low tone is indicated /à(a)/, and high tone is left unmarked. Falling tone, in effect a sequence of high plus low, is indicated by a low tone mark on the final V or C of a heavy syllable, e.g. /aà/ or /aḥ/.

2. The remarkable story of Dorugu, the Hausa youth who accompanied the explorer Barth on his travels through Africa in the 1850s, is provided in English translation with historical notes in Kirk-Greene and Newman (1971).
3. In Kanakuru, it is only the masculine marker that assimilates. The corresponding feminine form does not, e.g. *mónó, mǒngó, mǒndó, mà bówó* 'my, your, her, your father's (ram)' vs. *ráno, rángó, rándó, rà bówó* 'my, your, her, your father's (ewe).
4. The genitive linkers/possessive markers *na(a)* and *ta(a)* that one now finds in Hausa derive historically from gender sensitive articles. I hope to treat the subject of this grammatical modification and reformulation in a subsequent publication.
5. The suggestion that the participial ("verbal noun") ending *-waa* comes from a form *\*-àka* is admittedly speculative, but not without support. It is based partly on the internal reconstruction of an earlier Hausa form *\*-àwa(a)*, motivated by the now floating low tone, and partly on the existence of possibly cognate forms in Kanakuru (*-ək*) and Warji (*-akai*).
6. Synchronically *gà*, which only occurs before nouns, pairs with a pre-pronominal form *gàree*. My guess is that historically the two forms are unrelated and that their phonological similarity is completely fortuitous. It is possible that *gàree* is related to the preposition *gàri-n* 'for, in order to'.
7. There are good reasons why one would not want to treat *wà* as a bound clitic in a strict sense. For instance, the high-low-high tone of trisyllabic verbs before indirect objects is the result of a tone raising rule that changes word-final low-low to low-high if the final vowel is long (see Leben 1971). Starting with the assumption that the underlying tone of these verbs is high-low-low, for which there is good reason, the sequence *...karàntaa wà màcè* 'read to the woman' would be derived as follows: *\*karàntà wà màcè* → *\*karàntàa wà màcè* → *karàntaa wà màcè*. Without a word boundary between the verb and the *wà*, one should get *\*\*karàntàawà màcè*, which is wrong. In addition, when occurring with the verb *yi* 'to do', which can often be deleted, the *wà* remains even in the absence of the verb, e.g. *'aà (yi) wà 'àku wazircìn mutàanee?* 'Would you bestow on a parrot viziership over men?'. If *wà* were truly a suffix, one would expect it to be deleted along with the verb to which it was attached.
8. This examples is found in McIntyre (1980:50), where the unusual tone and vowel length combination was explicitly pointed out. The incorrect explanation offered in his note 5 was provided by me.

#### REFERENCES

- Berman, Ruth A. 1982. On the nature of oblique objects in bitransitive constructions. *Lingua* 56:101-25.
- Ebert, Karen. 1979. *Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad). Teil III: Grammatik.* (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A: Afrika, 15.) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Ebobissé, Carl. 1979. *Die Morphologie des Verbs im Ost-Dangaleat (Guera, Tschad).* (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A: Afrika, 21.) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Eulenberg, John B. 1972. *Complementation Phenomena in Hausa.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at San Diego.
- Gouffé, Claude. 1981. Remarques sur quelques propositions récentes concernant l'orthographe du haoussa. *Bull. des Études africaines de l'Inalco* 1(1):43-58.
- Jungraithmayr, Herrmann. 1963. Die Sprache der Sura (Maghavul) in Nordnigerien. *Afr. u. Übersee* 47:8-89.

- . 1970. *Die Ron-Sprachen*. (Afrikanistische Forschungen, 3.) Glückstadt. J.J. Augustin.
- Kirk-Greene, Anthony, and Paul Newman. 1971. *West African Travels and Adventures*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Leben, William R. 1971. The morphophonemics of tone in Hausa. In *Papers in African Linguistics*, ed. C.-W. Kim and H. Stahlke, pp. 201-18. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- McIntyre, J.A. 1980. The language of Hausa greetings: the social construction of hierarchy. *Afr. u. Übersee* 63:39-67.
- Newman, Paul. 1970. *A Grammar of Tera: Transformational Syntax and Texts*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, 57.) Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1973. Grades, vowel-tone classes and extensions in the Hausa verbal system. *Stud. Afr. Ling.* 4:297-346.
- . 1974. *The Kanakuru Language*. (West African Language Monographs, 9.) Leeds: Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds, and West African Linguistic Society.
- . 1977a. Chadic classification and reconstructions. *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5(1): 1-42.
- . 1977b. Chadic extensions and pre-dative verb forms in Hausa. *Stud. Afr. Ling.* 8-275-97.
- Newman, Paul, and Bello Ahmad Salim. 1981. Hausa diphthongs. *Lingua* 55:101-21.
- Parsons, F.W. 1971/72. Suppletion and neutralization in the verbal system of Hausa. *Afr. u. Übersee* 55:49-97, 188-208.
- Schön, J.F. 1862. *Grammar of the Hausa Language*. London: Church Missionary House.
- . 1885. *Magána Hausa*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. [Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970]
- Schuh, Russell G. 1972. *Aspects of Ngizim Syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
- . 1978. *Bole-Tangale Languages of the Bauchi Area (Northern Nigeria)*. (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A: Afrika, 13.) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- . n.d. Ngamo verbs. Unpublished ms.

*Department of African Linguistics*  
*University of Leiden*

