

*O*ccasional Paper

Institut für Afrikawissenschaften der Universität Wien
Department of African Studies, University of Vienna

Nr.13 / Februar 2013

Sprache / Language

Focus realization in Gashua Bade

Georg Ziegelmeyer

1. Introduction

This paper discusses different focus realization strategies in Gashua Bade, a West Chadic sub-branch B language (Newman 1990), spoken in northern Yobe State, Nigeria. Together with Ngizim, Duwai and the extinct languages Teshena, Auyo and Shira (Broß 1997, Schuh 2001) it constitutes the Bade-Ngizim group. Gashua Bade (GB) and Central Bade (CB), form a dialect continuum called Northern Bade (NB). Although CB has many linguistic features in common with GB, it also shares some features with Western Bade (WB). Another main dialect variety is Southern Bade (SB). However, Bade is dialectally very diverse, to the extent that one could also speak of several “Bade languages”. For a detailed discussion of Bade dialects see Schuh (1981). The major languages, which are adjacent to the Bade speaking area are Kanuri in the East, and Hausa in the West. The history of north-eastern Nigeria, as well as linguistic scrutiny suggests that Bade is heavily influenced by its neighbouring languages in several linguistic domains. Besides borrowing of content words and a high amount of function words, the linguistic influence of Hausa and Kanuri on Bade becomes also evident in some grammatical domains, e.g. borrowing of derivational morphology (Schuh 2003, and 2011, Ziegelmeyer 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, and 2010).

When it comes to focus realization, Bade, like some other West Chadic languages, displays a clear-cut asymmetry between subjects and non-subjects (cf. Green & Jaggar 2003, Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007a, Schuh 1971, 1982). Whereas focused and questioned subjects are realized *ex-situ*, i.e. moved to the right periphery of the clause, focused and questioned non-subjects are realized *in-situ*. This is what we will call the basic strategy and which is outlined throughout §3. In addition to this, in GB, but also in WB, it is possible to realize focused constituents, subjects as well as non-subjects, at the left periphery of the clause. We will call this the innovative strategy which is outlined in §4. The latter strategy is affected by contact with Hausa. This becomes apparent, since in GB also the Hausa particle **nee**, which is frequently analysed as a focus marker (but see Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007b), is used to accompany the focused constituent. The data presented in this article predominantly come from my fieldwork in northern Yobe State during the years 2008 to 2010¹.

2. Remarks on Bade typology

Bade has the basic word order SVO, and case is not morphologically marked. It is rather an aspectual than a tense language, where temporal aspectual information is encoded in distinctions in tone and final vowel of verbs, accompanied by distinct preverbal subject

¹ I gratefully acknowledge the sponsorship of the FWF (Austrian Science Fund) which financed me during the project ‘Dynamik sprachlichen Wandels in Nordostnigeria’ at the University of Vienna. My special thanks go to all my friends, colleagues and language consultants in Gashua.

agreement clitics and in some cases auxiliaries. Like all Chadic languages Bade is a tone language where tones are part of the lexical meaning of words (except for verbs) and grammatically distinctive. Consequently pitch accent cannot be used to indicate focus² to same extent as in intonational languages³. In GB focus marking has no overt effect on the prosodic phrasing. Therefore, different means of highlighting informationally prominent parts of the clause have to be employed.

3. Focus realization in GB – The basic strategy

GB has two basic strategies to realize focus, i.e. a) the focused or questioned constituent either appears *ex situ*, where the target of the movement is to the right periphery of the clause (3.1.), or b) the focused or questioned constituent appears *in situ* (3.2.). The basic system of focus realization, which probably is shared by all Bade-Ngizim languages (Schuh 1982), exhibits a clear-cut asymmetry between subjects and non-subjects. Whereas focused and questioned subjects are moved to the right periphery of the clause, focus of non-subjects must be unrealized. Movement of focused or questioned subjects is accompanied by morphological marking.

3.1. Focused and questioned subjects

GB makes use of a syntactic transformation to mark focused or questioned subjects. Therefore, GB exhibits subject inversion, i.e. focused or questioned subject NPs are realized in a marked post-verbal position. Focused and questioned subject NPs are morphologically marked by a formative which can be reconstructed as ***nə**⁴, and which is inserted before the postposed subject NP. The origin of the formative **nə** probably lies in the demonstrative system⁵. However, according to Schuh (1982) at the proto-Bade-Ngizim level this morpheme must have already been specialized to its use in postposed subject constructions. The syntactic transformation for focused and questioned subjects can be summarized as follows:

² Following Aboh et al. (2007: 1) we take focus as a pragmatic category that interacts with grammar, i.e. ‘Focus refers to that part of the clause that provides the most relevant or most salient information in a given discourse situation’.

³ The interaction of pitch variation and intonation in GB is still a poorly-understood area of the language.

⁴ According to Schuh (1982) in WB and SB the focused subject marker has allomorphs, much like that of the associative linker, rather than the alveolar nasal **n(ə)**. Usually the allomorphs of the linker are **∅** before velars, **g** before voiced obstruents, **k** before voiceless and glottalized obstruents, and **n** before nasals and vowels. Examples from Schuh (1982: 168): **jàawà-k Saakù**, **jàawà-g Jaajì**, **jàawà-n Àadàmu**, **jàawà-n Muusa** “SAKU/JAJI/ADAMU/MUSA came”.

⁵ Masculine proximal demonstrative; cf. GB: **kwàm-àni** “that bull”.

(1) NP(subject) + PRED ... > Ø + PRED + **n(ə)** + NP(subject) ...

Following are a number of examples (3-6) with inverted subjects:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| (2) | (acî) | m̀bàanàatiiyù ⁶ | | | <i>neutral</i> |
| | 3M | help.COMPL.DO1SG | | | |
| | | <i>he helped me</i> | | | |
| (3) | | m̀bàanàatiiyù | n-acì | | <i>S-focus</i> |
| | | help.COMPL.DO1SG | FOC-3M | | |
| | | he⁷ helped me | | | |
| (4) | | m̀bàanàatiigìi | nài | | <i>S-focus</i> |
| | | help.COMPL.DO2M | FOC.Q | | |
| | | who helped you? | | | |
| (5) | | m̀bàanàatiiyè-n | Muusa | | <i>S-focus</i> |
| | | help.COMPL.DO1SG-FOC | Musa | | |
| | | Musa helped me | | | |
| (6) | | m̀bàanàatə | Audə-n | Muusa | <i>S-focus</i> |
| | | help.COMPL | Audu-FOC | Musa | |
| | | Musa helped Audu | | | |

3.1.1. Preverbal subject agreement clitics and auxiliaries

With the exception of the third person completive, preverbal subject agreement clitics as well as auxiliaries are still found before the verb. The transformation (1) will have to apply after subject agreement clitics and auxiliaries have been inserted, e.g.

- | | | | | | |
|------|-----|---------------------|--------------|--|----------------|
| (7a) | nəm | m̀bàanàataci | n-iyù | | <i>S-focus</i> |
| | 1SG | help.COMPL.DO3M | FOC-1SG | | |
| | | I helped him | | | |
| (7b) | | *m̀bàanàataci | n-iyù | | |
| | | help.COMPL.DO3M | FOC-1SG | | |
| | | I helped him | | | |

⁶ Transcription: **aa**, **ii**, etc. = long vowel; **a**, **i**, etc. = short vowel; **ə** = high central vowel; **à(a)** = low tone; **â(a)** = falling tone; **ǎ(a)** rising tone; high tone is unmarked; **ɸ**, **ɗ** = laryngeal implosives; **ʔ** = glottalized palatal glide; **tl** and **jl** = lateral fricatives, **ɾ** = apical tap/roll, **c** and **j** = palato-alveolar affricates.

⁷ In the object language and the translations focused and questioned constituents are indicated in bold.

- (8) aa bènà-n **Saaku** *S-focus*
 AUX cook.VN.INCOMPL-FOC Saku
Saku will cook (it) (Schuh 1982: 167) [GB]

In the third person completive there is some variation as to the insertion of subject agreement clitics. In simple declarative sentences GB prefers to use preverbal subject agreement clitics with the third person completive, if the subject is a personal pronoun. However, subject clitics never appear together with an overt noun. This also applies to focused pronominal (example 9) and nominal (example 10) subjects.

- (9) (acî) jii aasâk **n-acì** *S-focus*
 3M go.COMPL.to market FOC-3M
he went to the market

- (10a) màsə goomâkə-n **Muusa** *S-focus*
 buy.COMPL ram-FOC Musa
Musa bought a ram

- (10b) *acî màsə goomâkə-n **Muusa** *S-focus*
 3M buy.COMPL ram-FOC Musa
Musa bought a ram

3.1.2. Focused subjects in the imperative

In GB subjects may be focused even in imperative sentences. In the second person singular imperative GB neutralizes gender distinctions (example 11). However, if a focused subject is postposed gender distinction becomes effective again (examples 12a and 12b).

- (11) à tii kajlùwaw! *neutral*
 AUX eat.IMP.SG mush.DET
eat (2M or 2F) the mush!

- (12a) à tii kajlùwaw **ni-giì!** *S-focus*
 AUX eat.IMP.SG mush.DET FOC-2M
you (2M) eat the mush!

- (12b) à tii kajlùwaw **nə-gə̀m!** *S-focus*
 AUX eat.IMP.SG mush.DET FOC-2F
you (2F) eat the mush!

- (13) à ta kajlùwaw **nu-wùn!** *S-focus*
 AUX eat.IMP.PL mush.DET FOC-2PL
you (2PL) eat the mush!

Focused subjects in the imperative differ from intransitive copy pronouns (ICPs). For instance, the ICPs which are optionally taken by the verb **ju** ‘to go’ can be distinguished from focused subjects (cf. examples 15a vs. 15b and 16a vs. 16b).

(14)	àji! AUX.go.IMP.SG <i>go!</i> (2M or 2F)		<i>neutral</i>
(15a)	àji AUX.go.IMP.SG <i>go!</i> (2M)	naagii! ICP2M	<i>neutral</i>
(15b)	àji AUX.go.IMP.SG <i>you</i> (2M) <i>go!</i>	ni-gii! FOC-2M	<i>S-focus</i>
(16a)	àji AUX.go.IMP.SG <i>go!</i> (2F)	naagəm! ICP2F	<i>neutral</i>
(16b)	àji AUX.go.IMP.SG <i>you</i> (2F) <i>go!</i>	nə-gəm! FOC-2F	<i>S-focus</i>

3.1.3. Questioned subjects

Like focused subjects, questioned subjects are moved to a post-verbal position in the sentence. The transformation formulated in (1) also accounts for questioned subjects and the same morpheme **n(ə)** is applied. There are two realizations which were volunteered in elicitations. Either the independent question words, i.e. **tài** ‘who?’ and **təm/tam(ù)** ‘what?’ (table 1), are postposed and the morpheme **n(ə)** is attached to the preceding constituent (in a-series of examples 17-20), or a set of grammaticalized subject question words, i.e. **nài** ‘who?’ and **nəm** ‘what?’ is employed (in b-series of examples 17-20).

Table 1. Question words ‘*who(m)?*’ and ‘*what?*’ in GB

	<i>who(m)?, whose?</i>	<i>what?</i>
independent and object form	tài	təm/tamù
postposed subject form	nài	nəm
genitive linked form	kài	kəm

- (17a) m̀tə-**n** **tài?** = (17b) m̀tə **nài?** *S-focus*
 die.COMPL-FOC Q die.COMPL FOC.Q
who died?
- (18a) s̀aatə-**n** **tàm?** = (18b) s̀aatə **nəm?** *S-focus*
 happen.COMPL-FOC Q happen.COMPL FOC.Q
what happened?
- (19a) ətkaakcî-**n** **tàm?** = (19b) ətkaakcî **nəm?** *S-focus*
 kill.COMPL.DO3PL-FOC Q kill.COMPL.DO3PL FOC.Q
what killed them?
- (20a) əlmə madùwà ñkuu-**n** **tài?** *S-focus*
 build.COMPL house DEM-FOC Q
who built this house?
- =
- (20b) əlmə madùwà ñkau **nài?** *S-focus*
 build.COMPL house DEM FOC.Q
who built this house?

3.1.4. Position of inverted subjects

Transformation rule (1) says that questioned and focused subjects be put at the end of the predicate. However, the position of postposed subjects is fairly free with respect to adverbs and indirect objects (examples 21-23). The focused subject may even be placed after the negative marker **bai**, which usually appears at the end of the clause (example 24). The situation is not clear, since there are also sentences which were rejected by informants, when an adverb precedes the focused constituent (example 25b). When a direct object or the locative goal of a verb of motion is involved usually the focused subject has to follow (in b-series of examples 26-29 where the subject cannot precede the direct object). This resembles the situation in Ngizim where a postposed subject can in no case precede the direct object (Schuh 1972: 230). However, in GB focused subjects can also precede the direct object (examples 30 and 31). Cf. also examples 32 and 33 from WB where the direct objects follow the questioned subjects. Although the position of inverted subjects with respect to direct objects is still a poorly-understood area of GB, I propose that in proto-Bade-Ngizim the underlying position for focused subjects is after the direct object, and that those instances in GB and WB where the inverted subject precedes the direct object are innovations. This assumption is corroborated by the situation in other West Chadic languages with post-verbal focus constructions, e.g. Kanakuru and Tangale, where the linear position of focused constituents is not after the verb, but immediately after the direct object (Tuller 1992).

- (21a) ðřbùutii Pàtəmà kakkadu-**n** **Muusa** *S-focus*
 write.COMPL.to Fatima letter-FOC Musa
Musa wrote Fatima a letter
- =
- (21b) ðřbùutə kakkadu-**n** **Muusa** ii Pàtəmà *S-focus*
 write.COMPL letter-FOC Musa to Fatima
Musa wrote Fatima a letter
- (22a) d'əbdə kañiıwu à aasə̀kə-**n** **Audù** *S-focus*
 sell.COMPL goods.DET at market-FOC Audu
Audu sold the goods in the market
- =
- (22b) d'əbdə kañiıwu-**n** **Audù** à aasə̀k *S-focus*
 sell.COMPL goods.DET-FOC Audu at market
Audu sold the goods in the market
- (23a) zənə **n-acì** nanu? = (23b) zənə nanu **n-acì?** *S-focus*
 say.COMPL FOC-3M this say.COMPL this FOC-3M
did he say this?
- (24a) jii Kaanùu-**n** **Muusa** bai *S-focus*
 go.COMPL.to Kano-FOC Musa NEG
Musa didn't go to Kano
- =
- (24b) jii Kaanàù **bii-n** **Muusa** *S-focus*
 go.COMPL.to Kano NEG-FOC Musa
Musa didn't go to Kano
- (25a) jii Kaanùu-**n** **Muusa** kadùwau *S-focus*
 go.COMPL.to Kano-FOC Musa yesterday
Musa went to Kano yesterday
- (25b) *jii Kaanàù kadùwo-**n** **Muusa** *S-focus*
 go.COMPL.to Kano yesterday-FOC Musa
Musa went to Kano yesterday
- (26a) acî jii aasə̀k **n-acì** *S-focus*
 3M go.COMPL.to market FOC-3M
he went to the market
- (26b) *acî jii **n-acì** aasə̀k *S-focus*
 3M go.COMPL.to FOC-3M market
he went to the market

- (27a) nèn gàyau vènyi **n-iyù** *S-focus*
 1SG climb.COMPL mountain FOC-1SG
I climbed a mountain
- (27b) *nèn gàyau **n-iyù** vènyi *S-focus*
 1SG climb.COMPL FOC-1SG mountain
- I climbed a mountain*
- (28a) sùidə goomâkwu **nài?** *S-focus*
 slaughter.COMPL ram.DET FOC.Q
who slaughtered the ram?
- (28b) *sùidə **nài** goomâkwu? *S-focus*
 slaughter.COMPL FOC.Q ram.DET
who slaughtered the ram?
- (29a) tlèďə málàpaw **nài?** *S-focus*
 weave.COMPL palm.leaf.mat.DET FOC.Q
who plaited the palm leaf mat?
- (29b) *tlèďə **nài** málàpaw? *S-focus*
 weave.COMPL FOC.Q palm.leaf.mat.DET
who plaited the palm leaf mat?
- (30a) tlèďə d'oonakwu-**n** **Audù** *S-focus*
 weave.COMPL grass.mat.DET-FOC Audu
Audu plaited the grass mat
- =
- (30b) tlèďə-**n** **Audù** d'oonakwu *S-focus*
 weave.COMPL-FOC Audu grass.mat.DET
Audu plaited the grass mat
- (31a) sùidə goomâkwu-**n** **Gàpciya** *S-focus*
 slaughter.COMPL ram.DET-FOC Gapciya
Gapciya slaughtered the ram
- =
- (31b) sùidə-**n** **Gàpciya** goomâkwu *S-focus*
 slaughter.COMPL-FOC Gapciya ram.DET
Gapciya slaughtered the ram
- (32) gàfa-ŋ **kè** vèivèidgwàrən? *S-focus*
 catch-FOC Q giant.rat
who caught the giant rat? (Schuh 1982: 166) [WB]

- (33) aa bènà-ŋ kè kajlùwaw? S-focus
 AUX cook.VN.INCOMPL-FOC Q mush
who will cook the mush? (Schuh 1982: 166) [WB]

3.1.5. Fronted objects

It is fairly common to move direct objects to the left periphery, when focused subjects are postposed, e.g.

- (34) sàasik jǎwu kàm, và kiidâ-n kǎrdàwat S-focus
 meat.of dog.DET TOP AUX eat.VN.INCOMPL-FOC pagans
(as for) the dog meat, pagans eat (it)
- (35a) goomâkwu, sìidə-n tǎi? S-focus
 ram.DET slaughter.COMPL-FOC Q
(as for) the ram, who slaughtered (it)?
- (35b) goomâkwu, sìidə-n Gǎpciya S-focus
 ram.DET slaughter.COMPL-FOC Gapciya
(as for) the ram, Gapciya slaughtered (it)

3.1.6. Complex subjects

Subjects can be focused by inversion regardless of internal complexity of the subject NP, e.g.

- (36) jii aasâkwu-n Cǎakwà dǎk Taavi S-focus
 go.COMPL.to market.DET-FOC Cakwa and Tavi
Cakwan and Tavi went to the market
- (37) jii aasâkwu-n ñdi bèe (bàabu) S-focus
 go.COMPL.to market.DET-FOC person REL (REL)
 dǎawau dè Kaanàu kadùwau
 come.COMPL from Kano yesterday
the person who came from Kano yesterday went to the market

3.2. Focused and questioned non-subjects

In GB focused and questioned constituents other than subjects usually retain their underlying position in the sentence at the right periphery of the verb. In this case focus of non-subjects is not overtly realized, i.e. focus is neither syntactically, nor morphologically nor prosodically marked.

3.2.1. Direct objects

Sentences in the completive with focused or questioned direct objects can be seen in the b-series of examples 38-41. Questioned direct objects of finite verbs take the independent forms of the question words in all TAMs other than the imperfective (a-series of examples 38-41). In the imperfective, where the verbal noun rather than the verb, is used, the genitive linked forms (cf. table 1) are employed, when directly after the verb. The verbal noun plus direct object is formally the same as a genitive or associative noun phrase, which is linked by a morpheme reconstructable as ***kə** (in c-series of examples 42-44). Questioned objects in the imperfective either use a grammaticalized free form **kài** ‘whom’ and **kəm** ‘what’ (in a-series of examples 42-44), or the independent forms are preceded by the linker **kə**, which is usually suffixed to the verb (in b-series of examples 42-44).

Completive

(38a)	kə	màsə	təm?	(38b)	nə	màsə	goomâk	<i>O-focus</i>
	2SG	buy.COMPL	Q		1SG	buy.COMPL	ram	
	<i>what did you buy?</i>				<i>I bought a ram</i>			
(39a)	Saaku	bènə	tamù?	(39b)	Saaku	bènə	kajlùwà	<i>O-focus</i>
	Saaku	cook.COMPL	Q		Saaku	cook.COMPL	mush	
	<i>what did Saku cook?</i>				<i>Saku cooked mush</i>			
(40a)	kə	m̀bàanàatə	tài?	(40b)	nəm	m̀bàanàatə	Taavi	<i>O-focus</i>
	2SG	help.COMPL	Q		1SG	help.COMPL	Tavi	
	<i>whom did you help?</i>				<i>I helped Tavi</i>			
(41a)	akcî	làulə	tài?	(41b)	akcî	làulə	Muusa	<i>O-focus</i>
	3PL	call.COMPL	Q		3PL	call.COMPL	Musa	
	<i>whom did they call?</i>				<i>they called Musa</i>			

Incompletive

(42a)	yàa	m̀sì	kəm?				<i>O-focus</i>
	2M	buy.VN.INCOMPL	Q				
	<i>what will you buy?</i>						
(42b)	yàa	m̀sì-k	təm?				<i>O-focus</i>
	2M	buy.VN.INCOMPL-of	Q				
	<i>what will you buy?</i>						
(42c)	nàa	m̀sì-k	akû				<i>O-focus</i>
	1SG	buy.VN.INCOMPL-of	goat				
	<i>I will buy a goat</i>						

- (43a) atû và bènà **kəm?** *O-focus*
 3F AUX cook.VN.INCOMPL Q
what is she cooking?
- (43b) atû và bènà-k **təm?** *O-focus*
 3F AUX cook.VN.INCOMPL-of Q
what is she cooking?
- (43c) atû và bènà-k-kajlùwà *O-focus*
 3F AUX cook.VN.INCOMPL-of-mush
*she is cooking **mush***
- (44a) gii và-abdà **kài?** *O-focus*
 2M AUX-ask.VN.INCOMPL Q
whom are you asking?
- (44b) gii và-abdà-k **tài** *O-focus*
 2M AUX-ask.VN.INCOMPL-of
whom are you asking?
- (44c) nii và-abdà-k **Audù** *O-focus*
 1SG AUX-ask.VN.INCOMPL-of Audu
*I am asking **Audu***

Note also example 45 where the questioned associative noun phrase is formed with the genitive linked form of the question words.

- (45) wùn àtfii **ngwà-k-ai?** *O-focus*
 2PL enter.COMPL.to compound-of-Q
whose compound did you (pl.) enter? (Schuh 1982: 163) [GB]

3.2.2. Indirect objects

Indirect objects in Bade are usually preceded by the preposition **ii** 'to'. Focused indirect objects appear *in situ*, i.e. in a position after the verb, either before the direct object (examples 46a and 46d) or after it (examples 46b and 46c). Question words as indirect objects take the independent forms preceded by the preposition **ii**.

- (46a) kə zèn-ii **tài** làabàařuw? *O-focus*
 2SG tell.COMPL-to Q news.DET
whom did you tell the news?

=

- (46b) kə zənə làabàãruw ii tàì? *O-focus*
 2SG tell.COMPL news.DET to Q
whom did you tell the news?
- (46c) nə zənə làabàãruw ii Taavì *O-focus*
 1SG tell.COMPL news.DET to Tavi
I told Tavi the news
- (46d) nə zən-**ee**tù làabàãruw *O-focus*
 1SG tell.COMPL-IDO3F news.DET
I told her the news

3.2.3. Other constituents

Focus of all other constituents like prepositional arguments and locative adverbs, the manner interrogative word **gàtàm** 'how?', time adverbs and adverbs of purpose and reason are realized *in situ*. Various examples are given with sentences 47-52.

Prepositional arguments

- (47a) kə sìidə goomâkwu də kəm? *PP-focus*
 2SG slaughter.COMPL ram.DET with Q
what did you slaughter the ram with?
- (47b) nə sìidə goomâkwu dək wədu *PP-focus*
 1SG slaughter.COMPL ram.DET with knife
I slaughtered the ram with a knife

Locative adverbs and predicates

- (48a) yàa nee (< na+ii) d'an? (48b) nàa nee (< na+ii) tashàa *adv-focus*
 2M go.INCOMPL Q 1SG go.INCOMPL station
where will you go to? I will go to the station
- (49) nàa bə'yik madùwàk tə'yi à d'an? *adv-focus*
 1SG find.VN.INCOMPL.of house.of food at Q
where will I find a restaurant?

Manner

- (50) kə jlàmə ñku gâtàm? *adv-focus*
 2SG do.COMPL this Q
how did you do this?

Time adverbs

- (51a) kə dāawuu **kan?** (51b) nə dāawuu **kadùwau** *adv-focus*
 2SG come.COMPL Q 1SG come.COMPL yesterday
when did you come? I came yesterday

Purpose and reason adverbs

- (52a) kə dāa **gàadà kəm?** *adv-focus*
 2SG come.COMPL because Q
why did you come?

=

- (52b) **gàadà kəm** kə dāa? *adv-focus*
 because Q 2SG come.COMPL
why did you come?

- (52c) nèn dāa **gàadàk nàṃmiigù** **tágwdaw** *adv-focus*
 1SG come.COMPL because.of 1SG.pay.SUBJ.IDO2M money.DET
I've come in order to pay you the money

3.3. Focus realization and semantic interpretation

In GB the basic *ex situ* vs. *in situ* realization of focus is not triggered by a possible semantic interpretation of focus, e.g. new information vs. contrastive focus. Cf. example 53, where corrective focus of subjects is realized *ex situ*, whereas in 54 and 55 corrective focus of a locative goal of a motion verb and a direct object are realized *in situ*. A hypothesis that different syntactic focus positions are linked to different semantic interpretations, cannot be maintained for GB.

- (53a) acî zənecì
 3M tell.COMPL.IDO3M
he told (it to) him
- (53b) oo'ò, acî zənecì bai zənə-n **Muusa** *S-focus*
 no 3M tell.COMPL.IDO3M NEG tell.COMPL-FOC Musa
*no, he didn't tell (it to) him, **Musa** told (it to) him)*
- (54a) yàa nee madùwà bi?
 2M go.INCOMPL.to house Q
are you going home?
- (54b) nàa nee madùwà bai nàa nee **aasâk** *adv-focus*
 1SG go.INCOMPL.to house NEG 1SG go.INCOMPL.to market
I am not going home, I go to the market

- (55a) atû bənə àwùnasãr bi?
 3F cook.COMPL maize Q
did she cook maize?
- (55b) atû bənə s̀nkàafa bìi-ni àwùnasãr bai O-focus
 3F cook.COMPL rice not-if maize NEG
*she cooked **rice** and not maize*

3.4. Basic focus constructions in Bade-Ngizim

According to Schuh (1982) the following forms and syntactic constructions can be reconstructed for proto-Bade-Ngizim. The formatives and basic constructions are summarized in table 2. In the right column the actual realization in present-day GB is given.

Table 2. Constructions for focused and questioned constituents in proto-Bade-Ngizim and GB

	<i>proto-Bade-Ngizim</i>	<i>Gashua Bade</i>
question words	*m̀̀ 'what?' * (a)yè 'who?'	t̀m/tam(̀̀) and t̀i
questioned subject	*[V (O) ǹ m̀̀/(a)yè]	[V (O) ǹm/ǹi]
focused subject	*[V (O) ǹ S]	[V (O) ǹ S]
questioned direct object	*[S V m̀̀/(a)yè]	[S V t̀m(̀̀)/t̀i]
questioned associative NP	*[NP k̀ m̀̀/(a)yè]	[NP k̀m/k̀i]
focused non-subjects	*[S V X _[FOC in situ]]	[S V X _[FOC in situ]]

4. Focus realization at the left periphery

It appears that, in addition to basic focus realization, Bade dialects have developed constructions where focused constituents are fronted. In this case the focused constituents are followed by a focus sensitive particle. In present-day GB focused non-subjects as well as subjects can be moved to the left periphery in the sentence. They are followed by the focus sensitive particle **nee**, which has been borrowed from Hausa. Recent studies on focus realization in Hausa (e.g. Green & Jaggar 2003, Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007a) showed that Hausa also exhibits an asymmetry between subjects and non-subjects. Whereas subjects need to be realized *ex situ*, this is not obligatory the case with non-subjects. In fact, new information focus on non-subjects is predominantly realized *in situ*, without being syntactically, morphologically or prosodically marked. However, in Hausa focused non-subjects can be moved to a left peripheral position, which also triggers the so called relative morphology in the person-aspect complex. In addition to this fronted focus constituents are

optionally marked by the focus sensitive particle **nee** (m./pl.) and **cee** (f.)⁸. Realization of focused constituents, subjects and non-subjects, in a fronted position in GB is shown throughout examples 56-62.

- (56a) pəmə jǎ **nai?** (56b) pəmə jǎ-**n** **Muusa** *S-focus*
 beat.COMPL dog FOC.Q beat.COMPL dog-FOC Musa
who beat a dog? *Musa beat a dog*
- (56c) **Muusa** **nee** pəmə jǎ *S-focus*
 Musa FSP beat.COMPL dog
(it is) Musa (who) beat a dog
- (57a) **ací** **nee** tà zənì nanu? *S-focus*
 3M FSP AUX say.SUBJ thus
did he say so?
- (57b) oo’ò, **atè** **nee** tà zənì nanu? *S-focus*
 no 3F FSP AUX say.SUBJ thus
no, she said so
- (58a) akcà nàyi **akan?** *adv-focus*
 3PL.AUX come. INCOMPL Q
when will they come?
- (58b) **sànak** **nee** akcà nàyi *adv-focus*
 tomorrow FSP 3PL.AUX come. INCOMPL
(it is) tomorrow (that) they will come
- (59a) ònda ‘yàwiigii à Màidugùrì bi?
 people give.birth.COMPL.DO2M at Maiduguri Q?
have you been born in Maiduguri?
- (59b) oo’ò, à **Kaanàù** **nee** ònda ‘yàwiiyù *adv-focus*
 no at Kano FSP people give.birth.COMPL.DO1SG
 bìi-ni à Màidugùrì bai
 not-if at Maiduguri NEG
no, (it is) in Kano (where) I've been born and not in Maiduguri

Cf. example 52c with 60, where the adverbial clause is fronted and marked by the focus sensitive particle **nee**.

⁸ Note that, although Bade has grammatical gender, the feminine form **cee** of the focus sensitive particles is not used. Focused constituents which are grammatically feminine also take the particle **nee** which is in Hausa masculine/plural (example 57b).

- (60) **gàad̀àk nàŋmiigii t̀agwdaw nee** ǹn d̀aa *adv-focus*
 because.of 1SGpay.SUBJ.IDO2M money.DET FSP 1SG come.COMPL
(it is) in order to pay you the money I've come
- (61a) **maal̀m̀-*n* tai** liyau? (61b) **Muusa nee** maal̀m *S-focus*
 teacher-FOC Q here Musa FSP teacher
who is a teacher here? (it is) Musa (who) is a teacher
- (62a) **ac̀i nee** màaãr̀m? (62b) oo'̀ò, **at̀e nee** màaãr̀m *S-focus*
 3M FSP important no 3F FSP important
is he the most important? no, she is the most important

The following sentence (63a) appears to be neutral. In examples (63b-e) every constituent, except for the verb can be fronted followed by the focus sensitive particle **nee**.

- (63a) **Muusa à** d̀əbd̀àk goom̀àkwu à aas̀ək s̀anak *neutral*
 Musa AUX sell.VN.INCOMPL-of ram.DET at market tomorrow
tomorrow Musa will sell the ram at the market
- (63b) **Muusa nee** à d̀əbd̀àk goom̀àkwu *S-focus*
 Musa FSP AUX sell.VN.INCOMPL-of ram.DET
 à aas̀ək s̀anak
 at market tomorrow
(it is) Musa (who) will sell the ram at the market tomorrow
- (63c) **goom̀àkwu nee** Muusa à d̀əbdaal̀i *O-focus*
 ram.DET FSP Musa AUX sell.VN.INCOMPL.POSS3M
 à aas̀ək s̀anak
 at market tomorrow
(it is) the ram Musa will sell at the market tomorrow
- (63d) **s̀anak nee** Muusa à d̀əbd̀àk *adv-focus*
 tomorrow FSP Musa AUX sell.VN.INCOMPL-of
 goom̀àkwu à aas̀ək
 ram.DET at market
(it is) tomorrow (that) Musa will sell the ram at the market
- (63e) **à aas̀ək nee** Muusa à d̀əbd̀àk *adv-focus*
 at market FSP Musa AUX sell.VN.INCOMPL-of
 goom̀àkwu s̀anak
 ram.DET tomorrow
(it is) at the market (where) Musa will sell the ram tomorrow

Sentences 64-67 are further examples of fronted constituents followed by the particle **nee**.

- (64a) m̀bàanàatə Audù **nài?** *S-focus*
 help.COMPL Audu FOC.Q
who helped Audu?
- (64b) **Muusaa nee** m̀bàanàatə Audù *S-focus*
 Musa FSP help.COMPL Audu
(it is) Musa (who) helped Audu
- (65a) əgdə p̀ici **nài?** *S-focus*
 snap.off.COMPL lie FOC.Q
who lied?
- (65b) **gì nee** kəgdu p̀ici *S-focus*
 2M FSP 2SGsnap.off.COMPL lie
(it is) you (who) lied
- (66a) kə b̀aleecì **Naiřà nawàn?** *O-focus*
 2SG give.COMPL.IDO3M Naira Q
how many Naira did you give him?
- (66b) **Naiřà d̀əpu nee** nəm b̀aleecì *O-focus*
 Naira one.thousand FSP 1SG give.COMPL.IDO3M
I gave him one thousand Naira
- =
- (66c) nəm b̀aleecì **Naiřà d̀əpu** *O-focus*
 1SG give.COMPL.IDO3M Naira one.thousand
I gave him one thousand Naira
- (67a) ta tə'yi b̀e b̀aabu Bəntà b̀ənə **nài?** *S-focus*
 eat.COMPL food REL REL Binta cook.COMPL FOC.Q
who ate the food that Binta cooked?
- (67b) **Audù nee** tà tì tə'yi b̀e b̀aabu Bəntà b̀ənu *S-focus*
 Audu FSP AUX eat.SUBJ food REL REL Binta cook.COMPL
(it is) Audu (who) ate the food that Binta cooked

It appears that in GB *ex situ* focus of non-subjects as well as fronting of focused subjects is always pragmatically triggered. A focus constituent is fronted if and only if the speaker considers it to be pragmatically salient, i.e. if he or she wants to emphasize it.

4.2. A note on focus fronting in WB

WB including the CB variety of Zabudum⁹ allow fronting of focused constituents. Instead of the particle **nee** the fronted constituents are followed by the emphatic particle **maanko**, or **maan**, e.g.

- (71) **agii maanko** na jləmèdaaii sàdakaw *S-focus*
 2M FSP 1SG do.with.VN.INCOMPL sacrifice.DET
it's you I'll make the sacrifice with (Schuh 1982: 173) [WB]
- (72) **sànak maanko** akcà nàyi *adv-focus*
 tomorrow FSP 3PL.AUX come.INCOMPL
it's tomorrow they'll come [Zabudum Bade]
- (73) **Muusa maanko** maaləm = **Muusa maan** maaləm *S-focus*
 Musa FSP teacher Musa FSP teacher
Musa is a teacher [Zabudum Bade]

5. Pseudo-cleft constructions

In GB pseudo-cleft constructions are bi-clausal. The first clause is a relative formation typically headed by **fii bèe (bàabu/bèe)** ... 'the thing that, what ...'. The subject clause is typically followed by an identifying non-verbal predicate which explicitly introduces the new information. Pseudo-clefts typically express exhaustive identification, i.e. X and no other X, e.g.

- (74) [fii bèe bèe nèncu] [aamənek paampàu]
 thing REL REL 1SGwant.COMPL water.of pipe
what I need is piped water
- (75) [fii bèe bàabu sàatu] [akalāk gādii ətfii madùwà]
 thing REL REL happen.COMPL thief one enter.COMPL.in compound
what happened was that a thief has entered the compound

The identifying predication can be made more emphatic by linking the subject and the complement clause with an independent pronoun. In my examples the independent pronoun can be followed either by a restrictive particle, e.g. **yau** 'just, only', by the emphatic particle **maanko** (Bade of Zabudum), or by the borrowed marker **nee**, e.g.

⁹ Although the Bade variety of Zabudum belongs to the dialect cluster of Northern Bade, it also has several features in common with WB.

- (76) [fii bèe bàabu ǹ̀ncu] [at̀̀ yau aam̀̀nək paamp̀̀au]
 thing REL REL 1SGwant.COMPL 3F FSP water.of pipe
what I need is piped water
- (77) [fii bèe bèe ǹ̀ncu] [at̀̀ nee s̀̀nk̀̀aafa]
 thing REL REL 1SGwant.COMPL 3F FSP rice
what I need is rice
- (78) [bèe s̀̀atau] [at̀̀ maanko akal̀̀ak ə̀kfii mad̀̀ẁ̀w]̄
 REL happen.COMPL 3F FSP thief enter.COMPL.in house.DET
what happened was that a thief has entered the house
- (79) [fii bèe ǹ̀da c̀̀aptu f̀̀nà ǹ̀kə̀̀nau]
 thing REL people collect.COMPL calabash DEM
 [at̀̀ nee à̀lad̀̀ak B̀̀agwziya]
 3F FSP custom.of Bagwziya
what they collect in that calabash is (part of) the custom of the traditional harvest celebration
- (80) [m̀̀da bèe ə̀sk̀̀aaskẁ̀ali] [ak̀̀ci nee maagẁ̀zà]
 people REL do.INCOMPL.playing 3PL FSP professional
the ones who are playing are professionals

6. Conclusions

Summing up the discussion of focus strategies in GB the following results can be stated:

- GB exhibits a clear-cut asymmetry between subjects and non-subjects when it comes to focus realization. In the prototypical system (which is called the basic system here), it appears that focus is unrealized with non-subjects, while focus on subjects always is overtly expressed. Focused subjects are realized *ex situ* and are morphologically marked, whereas focused non-subjects are realized *in situ* and are not marked at all. This system accounts also for Ngizim and probably all languages of the Bade-Ngizim group.
- The basic system of focus realization in GB, which makes a sharp distinction between subjects and non-subjects, singles out focused subjects as being in special need of explicit focus marking. The reason for this apparent subject bias in the Bade focus system can be explained in that a (default) preverbal subject position triggers a topic interpretation (Givón 1976). Therefore, if a subject is to be interpreted as focus, and not as topic something special has to be done. In the Bade case, the subject has to be dislocated.

- Asymmetries between subjects and non-subjects are found in several West Chadic languages, e.g. Hausa and Bole where focus on non-subjects does not need to be marked, or Tangale, where for structural reasons focus on non-subjects is never realized in the imperfective aspects, i.e. progressive and future. Focus asymmetries have also been observed in a number of languages outside the West Chadic language family. For instance, Fiedler et al. 2009 investigate the peculiarities of subject focus marking in three West African language groups. It is shown that most languages in the sample exhibit a subject/non-subject asymmetry with respect to focus marking: while focus on non-subjects can often go unmarked, subject focus must always be marked. Cross-linguistically this phenomenon is nothing unusual and has also been observed in the Bantu languages Kinyarwanda, Dzamba and Kitharaka, and in the Austronesian languages Malgasy, Tagalog and Javanese, where questioned subjects have to move, whereas questioned objects can remain *in situ* (cf. Sabel & Zeller 2006, and references therein).
- In addition to the basic system of focus realization GB as well as WB have constructions where focused constituents can be fronted, i.e. subjects and non-subjects can be moved to the left periphery. GB uses the focus sensitive particle **nee**, which is a loan from Hausa, to mark left-dislocated constituents. Therefore, the question arises whether the whole construction type has been borrowed from Hausa. On the one hand copying the system could be a plausible explanation, since Hausa has become the dominant lingua franca all over northern Nigeria. On the other hand fronting of focused constituents is also attested in WB, where different language immanent markers are used, i.e. **maanko** or **maan**. It is not clear whether similar markers or similar constructions were used in GB before the incorporation of the Hausa particle **nee**.
- Dislocation of focused constituents at the left periphery also raises the question what motivates fronting of focused constituents, since they can also be realized in terms of the basic model. Moreover, there is no strict correlation between fronted focus and a specific semantic interpretation. A possible explanation could be that the fronted *ex situ* position provides a slot for constituents which are pragmatically prominent in the sense that they are ‘surprising’, ‘most relevant’, or ‘emphasized’ in the traditional Africanist usage. I propose that fronted *ex situ* focus in Bade is always pragmatically triggered. A focus constituent is fronted if and only if the speaker considers it to be pragmatically salient, if he wants to emphasize it.

References

- Aboh, Enoch Oladé, Katharina Hartmann & Malte Zimmermann (eds.). 2007. *Focus Strategies in African Languages. The Interaction of Focus and Grammar in Niger-Congo and Afro-Asiatic*. (Trends in Linguistics – Studies and Monographs 191). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Broß, Michael. 1997. Some remarks on the history of the extinct languages Auyo, Shira and Teshena. In: Wilhelm Seidensticker, Michael Broß & Ahmad Tela Baba (eds.), *Guddiri Studies – Languages and Rock Paintings in Northeastern Nigeria*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 37-63.
- Fiedler, Ines et al. 2009. Subject focus in West African languages. In: Malte Zimmermann & Caroline Féry (eds.), *Information Structure – Theoretical, Typological, and Experimental Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 234-257.
- Givón. Talmy. 1976. Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press. 151-188.
- Green Melanie & Philip J. Jaggar. 2003. *Ex-situ* and *in-situ* focus in Hausa – Syntax, semantics and discourse. In: Jacqueline Lecarme (ed.), *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar 2* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 187-213.
- Hartmann, Katharina & Malte Zimmermann. 2007a. Focus strategies in Chadic – The case of Tangale revisited. *Studia Linguistica* 61: 95-129.
- _____. 2007b. Exhaustivity marking in Hausa – A reanalysis of the particle *nee/cee*. In: Aboh, Enoch Oladé, Katharina Hartmann & Malte Zimmermann (eds.), *Focus Strategies in African Languages. The Interaction of Focus and Grammar in Niger-Congo and Afro-Asiatic*. (Trends in Linguistics – Studies and Monographs 191). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 241-263.
- Newman, Paul. 1990. *Nominal and Verbal Plurality in Chadic*. Dordrecht & Providence: Foris.
- Sabel, Joachim. & Jochen Zeller. 2006. Wh-question formation in Nguni. In: John Mugane, John P. Hutchison & Dee A. Worman (eds.), *African Languages and Linguistics in Broad Perspectives* (Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Harvard, Cambridge). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 271-283.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1971. Reconstruction of the syntax of subject emphasis in certain Chadic languages. Papers from the Second Conference on African Linguistics, UCLA, March 26-27, 1971. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 2: 67-77.

- _____. 1972. *Aspects of Ngizim Syntax*. PhD dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles. University Microfilms #73-1729. Michigan: Ann Arbor.
- _____. 1981. Using dialect geography to determine prehistory – A Chadic case study. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 3: 201-250.
- _____. 1982. Questioned and focused subjects and objects in Bade/Ngizim. In: Herrmann Jungraithmayr (ed.), *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Negritic Border Area*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer. 160-174.
- _____. 2001. Shira, Teshena and Auyo – Hausa's (former) eastern neighbors. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 16/17: 387-435.
- _____. 2003. The linguistic influence of Kanuri on Bade and Ngizim. *Maiduguri Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies* V. University of Maiduguri: Department of Languages and Linguistics. 55-89.
- _____. 2011. Grammatical influences of Kanuri on Chadic languages of Yobe State. In: Doris Löhr, Eva Rothmaler & Georg Ziegelmeyer (eds.), *Kanuri, Borno and Beyond – Current Studies on the Lake Chad Region* (Topics in Interdisciplinary African Studies 22). Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 137-154.
- Tuller, Laurice. 1992. The syntax of postverbal focus constructions in Chadic: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10: 303-334.
- Ziegelmeyer, Georg. 2009a. Between Hausa and Kanuri – On the linguistic influence of Hausa and Kanuri on Bade and Ngizim. In: Eva Rothmaler (ed.), *Topics in Chadic Linguistics V. Comparative and Descriptive Studies. Papers from the 4th Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Languages, Bayreuth, October 30-31, 2007*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 173-185.
- _____. 2009b. Areal features in northern Nigeria – Towards a linguistic area. In: Petr Zima (ed.), *The Verb and Related Areal Features in West Africa – Continuity and Discontinuity within and across Sprachbund Frontiers* (LINCOM Studies in African Linguistics 77). Munich: LINCOM Europa. 269-306.
- _____. 2009c. The Hausa particle “koo” – A widely spread formative in northern Nigeria. In: Norbert Cyffer & Georg Ziegelmeyer (eds.) *When Languages Meet – Language Contact and Change in West Africa*. (Topics in African Studies 13). Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 65-91.
- _____. 2010. Retention and innovation – On adverbial subordination in Gashua Bade. In: Georg Ziegelmeyer & Norbert Cyffer (eds.) *Aspects of Co- and Subordination – Case Studies from African, Slavonic, and Turkic Languages*. (Topics in Interdisciplinary African Studies 18). Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 119-144.

Abbreviations

AUX	auxiliary	NB	Northern Bade
CB	Central Bade	NEG	negation
COMPL	completive	NP	noun phrase
DEM	demonstrative	POSS	possessive pronoun
DET	determiner	PRED	predicate
DO	direct object	PL	plural
EXCL	exclusive	Q	question word
F	feminine	QUANT	quantifier
FOC	focus	REL	relative clause marker
FSP	focus sensitive particle	SB	Southern Bade
GB	Gashua Bade	SG	singular
ICP	intransitive copy pronoun	SVO	subject-verb-object
IMP	imperative	SUBJ	subjunctive
INCOMPL	incompletive	TOP	topicalizing particle
IDO	indirect object	VN	verbal noun
M	masculine	WB	Western Bade

Institut für Afrikawissenschaften / *Department of African Studies*

Universität Wien / *University of Vienna*

Spitalgasse 2, Hof 5

A-1090 Wien / *Vienna*

Österreich / *Austria*

Telefon: +43(0)1 4277 43201

Fax: +43(0)1 4277 9432

Mail: afrika@univie.ac.at

Web: <http://afrika.univie.ac.at>



Die *Occasional Papers* des Instituts für Afrikawissenschaften erscheinen unregelmäßig und haben zum Ziel, das inhaltliche Spektrum von Forschung und Lehre des Instituts in der Öffentlichkeit bekannter zu machen und den wissenschaftlichen Austausch von Kolleginnen und Kollegen weltweit sowie am Institut selbst zu fördern. Die *Occasional Papers* umfassen alle Themenbereiche der am Institut Forschenden, Lehrenden und Studierenden und werden vor der Veröffentlichung institutsintern besprochen und diskutiert.

Die *Occasional Papers* stehen allen Interessierten auf der Homepage des Instituts zum kostenlosen Herunterladen zur Verfügung.

Herausgeber ist das Institut für Afrikawissenschaften der Universität Wien.

Koordination und Layout (ab 2013): Ulrike Auer (ulrike.auer@univie.ac.at)

Koordination und Layout (bis 2011): Birgit Englert (birgit.englert@univie.ac.at)

The *Occasional Papers* of the Department of African Studies at the University of Vienna appear irregularly and aim at making the research and teaching of the people associated with the department known to a wider public and should encourage and strengthen the scientific exchange between scholars working on issues related to Africa – world wide as well as within the department itself. *Occasional Papers* relate to all the topics of research currently being worked on by researchers, teachers, and students at the Department and are discussed there before being placed Online.

The *Occasional Papers* are available for download at the homepage of the Department free of charge.

The *Occasional Papers* are published by the Department of African Studies, University of Vienna.

Co-ordination and layout (from 2013): Ulrike Auer (ulrike.auer@univie.ac.at)

Co-ordination and layout (till 2011): Birgit Englert (birgit.englert@univie.ac.at)