

THE HAUSA "GRADE 5/CAUSATIVE-EFFERENTIAL" VERB: CAUSATIVE, NONCAUSATIVE, OR BOTH? A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF PREVIOUS ANALYSES

PHILIP J. JAGGAR, SOAS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

1. Introduction.

Hausa has rich system of polysynthetic (suffixal) verbal morphology, and derived verbs fall into (one or more of) four morphologically distinct classes or "Grades" (Parsons 1960). The so-called "Grade 5" (gr5) of the Hausa verb is a complex (supra)segmental formation, which suffixes **-aĩ** to the stem (from an original ***-as** suffix) and imposes all high tones on the output,¹ e.g., **kwant-aĩ** = Grade 5tr 'lay down' < Grade 1intr **kwántaa** 'lie down', **firgit-aĩ** = Grade 5tr 'startle, frighten' < Grade 3intr **firgità** 'be(come) startled/frightened', **say-aĩ** = Grade 5tr 'sell' < Grade 2tr **sàyaa** 'buy', **jeef-aĩ** = Grade 5tr 'throw away' < Grade 1tr **jeefàa** 'throw' (leaving any causative/noncausative labelling until §2). Derived Grade 5 verbs are all transitive, and are most commonly based on intransitives, both active-unergative verbs with agent subjects, e.g., **kwantaĩ** = Grade 5tr. 'lay down' < Grade 1intr **kwántaa** 'lie down', and inactive-unaccusative verbs with patient subjects, e.g., Grade 5tr **suumaĩ** 'cause to faint' < **suuma** gr3a.intr. 'faint' (see §2.1). Transitive-based Grade 5 verbs also participate in the alternation (§2.2), and include such semantically diverse verb-pairs as Grade 5tr **auraiĩ** 'marry off' < Grade 2tr. **àuraa** 'marry', Grade 5tr **ciyaĩ** 'feed' < Grade 0tr **ci** 'eat', Grade 5tr **sanaĩ** 'inform' < Grade *2tr **sani** 'know', and Grade 5tr **zubaĩ** 'pour away/out' < Grade 1tr **zuba** 'pour (into)' (see Abraham 1934:119ff., and Parsons 1981:238ff. for numerous examples). When followed by an object, the Grade 5 verb usually adds the grammaticized (transitive) preposition **dà** 'with' (on **dà** see Abdoulaye 1996, Jaggar 2010, and Zima 2010). The argument/complement—the entity affected by the Grade 5 action—bears the role of theme, and is formally realized as an oblique which is a full syntactic argument of the governing verb (see also Lobben 2010:65ff., 379-391 for further discussion).²

The above data represent a case of a single surface element (Grade 5 morphology) encoding a lexicalized range of semantic categories, and there have been a number of attempts to describe the various meanings and explain the interrelations within a causative/noncausative framework. This review paper is organised as follows: In §2 I present an overview of the usage range covered by the Grade 5 alternation, and in §3 I provide an alternative perspective by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each of the major accounts in sequence.

At various points in the assessment I have integrated observations and analyses stemming from my current thinking about the best way to isolate and classify the various causative/noncausative usages expressed by Grade 5 morphology (see §2 in particular). The revised fine-grained model is, I argue, more consistent with the surface facts, and is intended to advance our understanding of one of the more intractable issues in Hausa derivational verbal behaviour.

¹ Transcription: **à(a)** = low tone, **â(a)** = falling tone (on heavy CVV or CVC syllable), high tone is unmarked; **aa**, **ii**, etc. = long, **a**, **i**, etc. = short; **ɓ**, **ɗ** = laryngeal implosives, **ƙ**, **ts** = ejectives, **ʔ** = glottalized palatal glide, **ɾ** = apical tap/roll, **c** and **j** = palato-alveolar affricates. Abbreviations: caus = causative; dial. = dialect form; f = feminine; fut = future; gr = grade; impfv = imperfective; intr = intransitive; i.o. = indirect object; m = masculine; pfv = perfective; p = plural; s = singular; tr = transitive; 1/2/3/4 = first/second/third/fourth person; * = irregular.

² Hausa is basically a "verb-framed" language in the sense of Talmy (2000), with motion and

2. The Grade 5 semantic map: causative vs. noncausative characterizations

- 2.1. Intransitive-based causative Grade 5 verbs/constructions (LIE/LAY, FREEZE/FREEZE)
 CAUSATIVE: Taylor (1923), Abraham (1934, 1940, 1959), Gouffé (1962), Parsons (1962), Lobben (2010), Jaggar (2011)
 NONCAUSATIVE: Newman (1983)

A definable subset of Grade 5 verbs can be uncontroversially analyzed on both syntactic (increased valency) and semantic grounds as direct causatives, and I will assume that this identification is beyond dispute.⁴ A new agent/causer argument is added, and the original subject is demoted to object/causee, i.e., the theme which undergoes a change of state or location. I am thus in agreement with Abdoulaye (2005:89-90), a Hausa-speaker who, in a review of my *non-causative* analysis (2001:255), also correctly argues for a causative interpretation of those Grade 5 verbs that entail a valency-increase. Example (1b) illustrates a stereotypic Grade 5 causative construction:

1. a. **yaaròn zâi kwântaa** (gr1intr)
 boy.the fut.3ms lie down.gr1
 'the boy will lie down'

Cf. Grade 5 causative = 'lay down':

- b. **zaa tà kwantaĩ dà yaaròn**
 fut 3fs lie down.gr5caus boy.the
 'she will lay the boy down'

In (1b) the causative Grade 5 form **kwantaĩ** 'lay (s'one) down' is a morphologically complex (2-place) verb based on the (1a) intransitive (1-place) Grade 1 verb **kwântaa** 'lie down' (notice the corresponding 'lie/lay' alternation in English). (Henceforth I provide the citation/isolation form of the Grade 5 without the **dà**). Sentence (2b) contains a nonagentive inanimate causer:

2. a. **ruwaa yaa daskàree** (= autonomous action with inchoative gr4intr)
 water 3ms.pfv freeze
 'the water froze'

→ Grade 5 transitive-causative

- b. **sanyii yaa daskaraĩ dà àbinci**
 cold 3ms.pfv freeze.gr5caus food
 'the cold froze the food'

The following list contains a representative sample of verbs alternating between intransitive and derived transitive-causative Grade 5 usages, expressing: (a) physical change-of-state (patientive), (b) manner-of-motion (agentive), and (c) directed motion (agentive). (See Pinker (1989) on comparable semantic classes in English.)

- a. Base intransitive (change-of-state) → Grade 5 causative
farkàa gr1intr 'wake up' → **farkaĩ** 'wake (s'one) up'
kùmburà gr3intr 'swell' → **kumburaĩ** 'cause to swell, cause constipation'

⁴ Schuh (2005:4) states that the "causative" extension (together with the "ventive" and "totality" markers) is found in a number of West Chadic (A/B) languages, including Hausa, i.e., Grade 5. Frajzyngier and Munkaila (2004) propose an unusual and counterintuitive analysis of Grade 5 which is non-committal on the causative/noncausative debate, claiming that Grade 5 does *not* transitivize and does *not* express an 'away' meaning.

jikèe gr4intr 'get wet'	→	jikaĩ 'wet, moisten, soak' (= gr1tr jikàa)
ƙanjàmee gr4intr 'be(come) thin'	→	ƙanjamaĩ 'make thin'
makàncee gr4intr 'go blind'	→	makantaĩ 'blind' (= gr1tr makàntaa)
narkèe gr4intr 'melt, dissolve'	→	narkaĩ 'melt/dissolve s'th' (= gr1tr narkàa)
nutsèe gr4intr 'sink, drown'	→	nutsaĩ 'sink sth., drown s'one'
(= gr1intr. nutsàa)		
suuma gr3a.intr. 'faint'	→	suumaĩ 'cause to faint'
tsuufa gr3a.intr. 'grow old, age'	→	tsoofaĩ '(cause to) age'

b. Base intransitive (manner-of-motion) → Grade 5 causative

gangàraa gr1intr 'flow/roll down'	→	gangaraĩ 'roll (s'th.) down'
gusàa gr1intr 'move aside'	→	gusaĩ 'move aside, remove (s'th.)'
kwàntaa gr1intr 'lie (down)'	→	kwantaĩ 'lay down'
tsayàa gr1intr 'stop, stand'	→	tsayaĩ 'stop (s'one/s'th.)'
tsugùnaa gr1intr 'squat'	→	tsugunaĩ 'make s'one squat'
zaunàa gr1intr 'sit down, remain'	→	zaunaĩ 'seat, settle'

c. Base intransitive (directed motion) → Grade 5 causative

fiƙa gr3intr 'go out, exit'	→	fiƙaĩ = fiƙ dà 'take out/off, remove, sack'
isa gr3intr 'reach, arrive at'	→	isaĩ 'deliver'

Diachronic changes within the grade system have produced some (near) interchangeable doublets whose transitive/causal meanings can overlap to varying degrees, e.g., gr1tr **fusàataa** = gr5caus **fusaataĩ** 'anger, make angry', gr1tr **haukàtaa** = gr5caus **haukataĩ** 'madden, drive mad', etc. With verbs allowing an alternation between transitive Grade 1 and Grade 5 constructions, Abdoulaye (1996:119), citing Parsons (1962:257n), claims that the Grade 5 form "may convey the idea of effectiveness", but checking with speakers shows that this reported form-meaning difference is not shared by all (see also Newman 2000:656, and Lobben 2010:290-91). There are also cognate Grade 1 and Grade 5 verbs with related but specialized meanings, cf. **taĩwàtsaa** gr1tr 'disperse/scatter (e.g., crowd)', **taĩwatsaĩ** gr5caus 'detonate/explode (bomb), smash' (see also **taĩwàtsee** gr4intr 'explode').⁵

2.2. Transitive-based causative Grade 5 verbs/constructions (BUY/SELL, KNOW/INFORM, EAT/FEED) = "transfer of possession"

CAUSATIVE: Taylor (1923), Abraham (1934, 1940, 1959), Gouffé (1962), Parsons (1962 = 'quasi-causative'), Lobben (2010)

NONCAUSATIVE: Newman (1983), Jaggar (2011, but now reassigned as CAUSATIVE)

Hausa also licenses Grade 5 causatives on transitive verbs expressing "transfer of possession", e.g., **sàyaa/sayaĩ** 'buy/sell', and including verbs of ingestion, e.g., **ci/ciyaĩ** 'eat/feed', and cognition, e.g., **sanii/sanaĩ** 'know/inform'. Contrary to my earlier approach (2011, §3.5), I now consider these Grade 5 subsets are best analyzed as semantic causatives expressing "transfer/change of possession", i.e., Grade 5 expressions such as 'Musa sold the car' (ex. 3b)

⁵ The existence of the (near) synonymous pair Grade 1 verb **tsooràtaa** 'frighten' and Grade 5 **tsoorataĩ** 'frighten (off)' is interesting because the Grade 1 form is probably an Applicative deriving from the basic intransitive Grade 3 **tsòoratà** 'be(come) frightened'. This runs counter to the general cross-language rule of "morphological blocking" which states that a given root should not license two derived forms with the same meaning (Miyagawa 1984).

are prototypically used with verbs interpretable as someone transferring something to someone. Jackendoff (1972, 1983), Pinker (1989:31, 307), Shibatani (1996), and Talmy (2007), *inter alia*, explain the relationship as an extension of literal physical location and motion to changes of possession and abstract states/changes. Thus, derived forms such as Grade 5 'sell' and 'teach' express causation of transfer-of-possession of a theme which can be a concrete object ('sell a car') or, by metaphorical extension, an abstract entity ('teach Hausa'). As such, they pattern with nonactional KNOW/INFORM pairs which Pinker describes as "communication-as-possession-transfer". Lobben (2010:170ff., 311ff., 425ff.) proposes a similar "possession switch" account of some of the Hausa alternations, but using Goldberg's 1995 "caused motion semantics" model (see also §3.4).

Nedyalkov and Silnitsky (1973:16), cited by Dixon (2000:64), also make the important point that if a language allows morphological causatives on transitive bases, then it is verb-pairs such as 'see/show', 'understand/explain', 'drink/give to drink (water)', and 'eat/feed' which participate in the derivation, precisely the ones which we find in Hausa (on 'eat/feed' see also Jaggar and Buba 2009). In such cases, no new syntactic argument is introduced into the argument structure, and all we have is a simple realignment of semantic functions following the switch. Example (3a) illustrates, and entails transfer of the object to the goal/buyer (the subject), i.e., the transaction is seen from the goal/buyer's perspective:

3. a. **Muusaa yaa sàyi mootàĩ** (gr2tr)

Musa 3ms.pfv buy car.the

'Musa bought the car'

Switching to the corresponding causative Grade 5 **sayaĩ** 'sell' in (3b) reverses the direction:

b. **Muusaa yaa sayaĩ dà mootàĩ**

Musa 3ms.pfv buy.gr5caus car.the

'Musa sold the car'

(4) exemplifies causation of transfer of possession ("cause X to have"), extended to express the abstract transfer of propositions/information, e.g., with a base perception verb 'know':

4. a. **sarkii yaa san làabaaĩn** (*gr2tr)

chief 3ms.pfv know news.the

'the chief knows the news'

Cf. causative Grade 5 = 'inform':

b. **naa sanaĩ dà sarkii làabaaĩn**

1s.pfv know.gr5caus chief news.the

'I informed the chief of the news'

Example (5) illustrates the EAT/FEED transfer alternation:

5. a. **dabboobii sun ci cìyawàa** (gr0tr)

animals 3pl.pfv eat grass

'the animals ate the grass'

Cf. causative Grade 5 = 'feed':

b. **sun ciyaĩ dà dabboobii**

3pl.pfv eat.gr5caus animals

'they fed the animals'

Other transitive bases which allow transfer-of-possession Grade 5 causatives include:⁶

⁶ Grade 5 verbs also occur in V-NP compounds, e.g., **auraĩ-dà-kâi** 'woman who remarries without consent of parents' (marry off-self), **ɓad-dà-kâma** 'disguise' (lose-appearance). See Ahmad (1994) and McIntyre (2006).

a. Perception/explication (abstract transfer)

fāhimtāa gr2tr 'understand' (also fāhimtā gr3intr 'understand')	⇒	fahimtaĩ 'teach, lead to understanding'
gani *gr2tr 'see'	⇒	ganaĩ 'show' (dial.)
gaanèe gr4tr 'understand'	⇒	gaanaĩ 'explain' (dial.)
kařanta gr1tr 'read, study'	⇒	kařantaĩ 'teach (usu. subject), educate'
tabbāta gr1tr 'be sure' (also tābbatā gr3intr 'be certain/confirmed')	⇒	tabbataĩ 'confirm, ensure'

b. General transfer

āra gr2tr 'borrow'	⇒	araĩ 'lend'
āna gr2tr 'weigh and buy'	⇒	anaĩ 'weigh and sell'
āra gr2tr 'marry'	⇒	araĩ 'marry off'
baa/bā *gr0tr 'give'	⇒	baayaĩ = baa (dā) 'give away'
bi gr0tr 'follow'	⇒	biyaĩ = bii (dā) 'lead, control, take on detour'
cēfanā gr2tr (+ i.o.) 'give food'	⇒	ceefanaĩ 'get rid of, sell'
gāda gr2tr 'inherit'	⇒	gaadaĩ 'bequeath'
gayā gr1tr (+ i.o.) 'tell'	⇒	gayaĩ = gai (dā) 'greet'
hāifa gr2tr 'give birth to'	⇒	haifaĩ 'produce, give rise to'
hau *gr0tr 'mount, ride'	⇒	hawaĩ = hau (dā) 'mount' (e.g., s'one on horse)
māyā gr2tr 'replace, succeed'	⇒	mayaĩ 'transfer, take back'
raḅā gr1tr 'divide up'	⇒	raḅaĩ 'divide out, distribute'
saadā gr1tr 'introduce'	⇒	saadaĩ 'deliver, connect'
saamū gr2tr 'get'	⇒	saamaĩ 'provide, give'

c. Ingestion/bodily consumption

Both canonical verbs of ingestion/consumption—transitive **ci** 'eat' and **shaa** 'drink'—freely operate causative possession-change Grade 5's thus:

Base transitive verb	⇒	Causative grade 5
ci gr0tr 'eat'	⇒	ciyaĩ/cii (dā) 'feed (usu. animals), support, subsidize'
shaa gr0tr 'drink'	⇒	shaayaĩ/shaa (dā) 'water, give water to (usu. animals)'

2.3. Transitive-based noncausative Grade 5 verbs/constructions expressing ballistic motion (THROW/THROW AWAY), or physical emission of a substance (POUR/POUR AWAY)

CAUSATIVE: Taylor (1923), Abraham (1934, 1940, 1959), Gouffé (1962), and Lobben (2010)

NONCAUSATIVE: Parsons (1962), Newman (1983), and Jaggar (2011)

How to relate this particular subfield to the other semantic categories has probably proved to be the most contentious issue, precluding any simplistic solution. This subclass contains a handful of actional force-exerting verbs expressing, *in their basic root form*, either ballistic

motion (THROW) or physical emission of a substance (POUR) (see Shibatani 1976, Talmy 1988, and Gropen et al. 1991 on these causal notions). The derived Grade 5 then simply adds the basic translocational notion of 'away from here' [the source, e.g., where speaker is located], i.e., POUR/THROW ----> POUR/THROW AWAY. These directed motion Grade 5 verbs, like the "possession transfer" class (§2.2), entail no change in the argument structure of the base, and the goal/endpoint is usually not specified.

Verbs in this class are not within the scope of the causativization rule, and are analyzed as noncausative by Parsons (1962) Newman (1983) and Jaggar (2011), with Lobben (2010) essentially favouring a causative analysis (see §3.4 for details). In both English and Hausa the change-of-location source complement is typically licensed by force-imparting base verbs which already express instantaneous or continuous causation of physical movement by an animate (human) agent, e.g., 'kick', 'knock', 'pour', 'move', 'push', 'throw (at)', 'turn over', etc. Examples are:

6. a. **taa jeefà kwalloo cikin kòogii** (gr1tr)
3fs.pfv throw ball in river
'she threw the ball into the river'

Cf. Grade 5 = 'throw away (object)' (= change-of-location 'away'):

- b. **taa jeefaĩ dà fànkoo**
3fs.pfv throw.gr5 matchbox
'she threw away the matchbox'

7. a. **naa zubà kaayaa cikin leedàa** (gr1tr)
1sg.pfv pour things in plastic bag
'I put (poured) the things in the plastic bag'

Cf. Grade 5 = "pour away (substance/fluid) ' (= change-of-location 'away'):

- b. **naa zubaĩ dà ruwaa**
1sg.pfv pour.gr5 water
'I poured away the water'

This interpretation is directly inherited, moreover, from the core ontological semantics of the Grade 5 formation, i.e., a directional "away from source" meaning (cf. Parsons' "riddance/disposal", §3.2, and Newman's (1983) "Efferential", §3.3). The same motion + path pathway orientation also provides a natural basis for the emergence and organization of the causal concept.

Following is a list of other central members of this event subclass, where the source verbs express force-imparted caused motion, and the shift to Grade 5 adds the deictically specified directional component "away from the deictic centre":

Base transitive (movement) verb	Grade 5 (= change-of-location 'away')
gusàa gr1tr 'move aside, migrate'	gusaĩ 'move out, remove'
jèfaa gr2tr 'throw at'	jeefaĩ 'throw away'
juuyàa gr1tr 'turn over'	juuyaĩ 'dump out'
kaasàyee gr4tr 'cover in excrement'	kaasayaĩ 'expel in excrement'
tuuràa gr1tr 'push'	tuuraĩ 'push away'
waatsàa gr1tr 'spread, scatter'	waatsaĩ 'reject, dispose of abandon, dismiss'
wuĩgàa gr1tr 'throw, swing' (the latter two also with metaphorical extensions in addition to the core movement meaning)	wuĩgaĩ 'fling away, dismiss'

3. Individual "solutions" to the Grade 5 problem.

It is clear from the above that developing a coherent overall semantic map for Grade 5 constructions has been (and remains) a matter of dispute, and I now trace the key developments in sequence, covering the major (sometimes overlapping) analyses proposed by researchers.

3.1

Claim 1: ALL Grade 5 constructions are CAUSATIVE

Cf: Taylor (1923), Abraham (1934, 1940, 1959), Gouffé (1962)

Taylor (1923: 76-77) was one of the first scholars to propose a unitary semantics for Grade 5 verbs, referring to their "causal signification", e.g., (transitive base) **sanii** *gr2tr 'know' → causative Grade 5tr **sanaĩ** 'inform'. Abraham's (1934, 1940, 1959) subsequent descriptions of Grade 5 verbs are the most detailed and comprehensive in the period, and between them provide the data and analyses underpinning later descriptions. In his (1934) and (1940) grammars he refers to the entire set as "causal verbs", a semantic characterization also used in Bargery's dictionary (Bargery, 1934): xxiii), and by Gouffé (1962) in his causative/factative analysis. The prototypical examples are "causals derived from intransitives" (1934:123, 1940:105-6), e.g.,

8. **a. mootàa taa tsayàa**

car 3fs.pfv stop

'the car stopped'

b.

yaa tsayaĩ dà muu

3ms.pfv stop/delay.gr5caus 1p

'he stopped/delayed us'

In his subset of "causals ... formed from transitives", Abraham (1934:125) correctly included a number of what I describe as "transfer of possession" pairs, e.g., (9) 'know' ----> 'inform', (10) 'eat' ----> 'feed', and (11) 'buy' ----> 'sell', e.g. (with minor adjustments):

9. **naa sanaĩ dà shii** (< **sanii** *gr2tr. 'know')

1s.pfv know.gr5caus 3ms

'I informed him'

10. **naa ciyaĩ dà shii** (< **ci** gr0tr. 'eat')

1s.pfv eat.gr5caus 3ms

'I fed him'

11. **naa sayaaĩ dà mootàataa** (< **sàyaa** gr2tr. 'buy')

1s.pfv buy.gr5caus car.my

'I sold my car'

Abraham also included within his catch-all "causal" definition those Grade 5 verbs expressing substance-emission such as **zubaĩ** 'pour/throw away' (cf. gr1tr. **zubaà** 'pour (into)'), adding that "causals sometimes add to the sense of the simple verb, the idea of 'rejection'" (1934:126). Examples (12-13) illustrate:

12. **injii yaa feesaĩ dà ruwaa** (< **feesaa** gr1tr. 'spurt (liquid) on sthing')

engine 3ms.pfv spurt.gr5 water

'the locomotive (engine) spurted out water (to get rid of it)'

13. **naa zubañ dà suu** (< **zubàa** gr1tr. 'pour (into)')
 1s.pfv pour.gr5 3p
 'I threw (poured) them away' (Abraham's gloss)

As noted in §2.3, it is the verbs in the base/Grade 5 THROW/THROW AWAY subset that have caused the most problems for attempts at a unified semantic analysis of Grade 5 verbs, and it is perhaps worth noting that Abraham dropped reference to the “rejection” subset in later works (e.g., 1940:105ff., 1959:68ff.).

Claim 1:

PROS: Accounts recognise the existence of Grade 5 causatives, including on transitive bases.

CONS: Accounts overextend the class of causatives by including, without any semantic motivation, POUR/POUR AWAY, THROW/THROW AWAY etc. verb-pairs.

3.2.

Claim 2 = dichotomy: Some Grade 5 constructions are CAUSATIVE, some entail NONCAUSATIVE "riddance/disposal" meaning

Cf. Parsons (1962, 1971/72)

Parsons (1962): 'lie/lay' alternations = CAUSATIVE; 'learn/teach' = quasi-CAUSATIVE; 'throw/throw away' = NONCAUSATIVE.

It was left to Parsons, drawing on Abraham's work, to finetune the semantics and open up the causative vs. noncausative debate. Parsons (1962:265ff., 1971/72) accepted that an identifiable subset of Grade 5 verbs was characterizable as causative, but he was the first Hausa scholar to express doubts about categorizing *all* Grade 5 verbs as “causative”—cf. his response to a detailed study by Gouffé in which he repeated the conventional “causative” analysis—“la valeur d’emploi du causatif est claire” (1962:189ff.). Instead, Parsons essentially proposed a dichotomy which embodied classifications central to my own preferred analysis (see §2). Firstly, although Parsons did not deal explicitly with syntactic valency, like Abraham he understood the core elements of the system, and wrote: “...with *most* causatives that correlate with *intransitive* primary grades there can be little doubt about the function, which is quite simply causative” (p. 265, original emphasis), e.g. (with minor adjustments):

14. **mootàa taa tsayàa**
 car 3fs.pfv stop
 ‘the car stopped’

Cf. Grade 5:

15. **yaa tsayañ dà mootàa**
 3ms.pfv stop.gr5caus car
 ‘he stopped the car’ (= 1-place to 2-place valency)

Following Abraham (1934:119ff.), Parsons also allowed a set of *transitive* verbs to operate Grade 5 forms construable as causatives, e.g., ‘know/inform’, ‘learn/teach’,

16. a. **sarkii yaa san làabaañin**
 chief 3ms.pfv know news.the
 ‘the chief has ascertained (knows) the news’

Cf. Grade 5:

- b. **naa sanañ dà sarkii làabaañin**

1s.pfv know.gr5caus chief news.the
 'I apprised (informed) the chief of the news' (=2-place to 3-place valency)

Although Parsons provided relatively few examples of the Grade 5 causative alternations in his (1962) paper, his contemporaneous writings, subsequently collected and published by Furniss in (1981), contained a large illustrative corpus (pp. 236-41, 494). Some examples were taken from Abraham's (1934:117ff.) own very detailed description, and included such (active) intransitive:causative pairings as: **gusàa** gr1intr 'move aside' → **gusaĩ** gr5caus 'move aside, remove', **kau** *gr0intr 'move out of way' → **kawaĩ** = **kau dà** gr5caus 'remove, shift', **sàuka** gr3intr 'descend, lodge' → **saukaĩ** gr5caus 'unload, put down, lodge', **kùbutà** gr3intr 'escape' → **kubutaĩ** gr5caus 'rescue', etc.

The same corpus reveals another insight Parsons shared with Abraham (1934:117-18)—he extended the class of causative verbs beyond Grade 5 expressions to include Grade 6 prepositional verbs expressing direction of movement towards a goal (speaker default), and formed with the fixed transitive preposition **dà** 'with' combined with intransitive motion verbs, e.g., **fitoo dà** 'bring out' (cf. gr6intr. **fitoo** 'come out'), **gangaroo dà** 'roll s'thing down (here)' (cf. gr6intr. **gangaroo** 'roll down (here)'), **zoo dà** 'bring' (cf. **zoo** gr0intr. 'come') (pp. 180ff., 494, see also Parsons 1962:257n). He also listed a number of similar formations composed of irregular intransitive self-movement verbs also extended with **dà** (+ oblique complement), e.g., **tàfi dà** 'take (away)' (cf. *gr3intr. **tàfi** 'go'), and **gudù dà** 'run off with' (cf. *gr3intr. **gudù** 'run away'), but for some reason stopped short of describing them as causative, instead preferring to label them as "verbs of motion...used associatively", though elsewhere he uses the cover-term "causative associative" (1981:354). They are of course causatives, equivalent to English accompanied motion/causative alternations such as 'go/take', 'come/bring', etc. See also comments on Lobben (2010) in §3.3.1.⁷

Parsons then turned his attention to transitive-based Grade 5 verbs which, to varying degrees, were not as obviously classifiable as causative, and as usual his intuitions were right on target. Developing Abraham's (1934:119ff.) earlier observation, he proposed two semantically distinct subclasses—his so-called "projective-applicative" and "transactional" categories (1962:267-68). Base projective-applicative verbs "transfer the psychological emphasis on to the target object" and include derived Grade 5 THROW AWAY/POUR AWAY verbs such as **jeefaĩ** 'throw away' (cf. Grades 1tr **jeefàa** 'throw' and 2tr **jèefaa** 'throw at'). Parsons defined his "transactionals" as expressing a "shift of focus on to the other party in the transaction", with derived Grade 5's such as **kooyaĩ** 'teach' (cf. basic Grade 2tr **kòoyaa** 'learn'), Grade 5 **sayaĩ** 'sell' (cf. basic Grade 2tr **sàyaa** 'buy'), Grade 5 **auraaĩ** 'give away in

⁷ Subsequent analyses include Abdoulaye (1996), who accepts Newman's "Efferential" label (§3.3), and generalizes it to motion verbs in Grade 1, e.g., **aikàa dà** 'send', and Grade 4 verbs, e.g., **wucèe dà** 'take inside'. He adds that they combine with what he terms the "(defective) auxiliary verb **dà**" (p. 117), with context-dependent "causative" and "effective action" senses, and notes that: "it is not always easy to separate the efferential "action away" sense from the causative sense" (p. 123). Newman (2000:662ff.) analyses Grade 6 + **dà** structures such as **fitoo dà** 'bring out' as combined "efferential/ventive" Grade 5/6 verbs. Regarding the sometimes blurred distinction between causation and accompaniment, generally speaking, potential ambiguity arises if the theme/object is human, in which case a Grade 6 + **dà** sentence such as **taa fitoo dà yàarân** can either mean (causative) 'she brought the children out' or (accompaniment) 'she came out (together) with the children'. On the other hand, the corresponding Grade 5 version **taa fitaĩ dà yàarân** would have (only?) a non-ambiguous (direct) causative 'she took the children out' construal. Space restrictions, however, prevent more detailed study of these constructions.

marriage, marry off' (cf. basic Grade 2tr **àuraa** 'marry'), etc. Parsons' definitions of the two subgroups overlap to a certain extent, and vague notions such as "psychological emphasis" are difficult to characterize in a non-circular fashion, but his observations indicate that he understood why these various meanings were conflated in Grade 5. Subsequently, Newman (1983), Lobben (2010) and Jaggar (2011) made various explicit proposals regarding argument structure, valency, metaphorical extensions from physical to abstract, and the semantic/cognitive properties of the alternation (see §§§ below).

Significantly, Parsons concluded that whereas "it might be possible to consider the transactional examples as having some sort of causative meaning", this interpretation was *not* possible with projective-applicatives such as Grade 5 **jeefaɗ** 'throw away', adding that "... the real semantic significance is the same in both cases, viz. *disposal, or riddance*" (p. 268, original emphasis), a construal typically reflected in the English glosses with the source prepositions 'away, off'.

Finally, note the following miscellaneous ditransitive Grade 5 constructions (Parsons 1981:349):

17. **yaa hawaɗ dà nii dookìnsà** (< gr0tr **hau** 'mount, ride')
 3ms.pfv mount.gr5caus 1s horse.his
 'he mounted me (on) his horse'
18. **dirēbànmù yaa biyaɗ/bii dà muu wata hanyàa** (< gr0tr **bi** 'follow')
 driver.our 3ms.pfv follow.gr5caus 1p another road
 'our driver led us (by) another road'

Claim 2:

PROS: Parsons' model is the one most consistent with the various surface elements expressed by Grade 5, i.e., in recognising the existence of a subset of Grade 5 causatives, both intransitive- and transitive-based, and arguing against a causative analysis for the subset of THROW AWAY verbs. The classification also correctly integrates causative verbs attested in other grades, and the proposed semantic subfields were the starting point for subsequent accounts.

3.3

Claim 3 = Grade 5 constructions are NONCAUSATIVE, expressing the "Efferential" notion of action out/away from the speaker

Cf. Newman (1983)

In the next significant (and influential) study of Grade 5 verbs, Newman (1983 [reprinted in Jaggar and Wolff 2002:239-56]) disputed the causative characterization, cf. his statements: "in this paper I argue that the characterization of the Hausa grade 5 as a 'causative' is totally inaccurate and without justification" (p. 398), and "its [Grade 5] deviation from typical causative patterns constitutes significant evidence in support of the contention that grade 5 is really not a causative" (p. 403). In his (2000) reference grammar, Newman reaffirmed his position and stated that indirect periphrastic **sâa**-constructions represent "the only causative in the language" (p. 81). Instead, picking up on Abraham's (1934:119ff.) and Parsons' (1962:265ff.) concept of "disposal/riddance", Newman, citing comparative Chadic data,⁸

⁸ For critical discussion of Newman's Chadic evidence for the putative historical source of the extension, see Frajzyngier (1985) and Lobben (2010:152ff.). Newman's comparative data are suggestive of a form-function pattern, but are not conclusive, and further detailed descriptions of a range of Chadic languages should allow more definitive statements. Caron

(re)defined Grade 5 verbs as “EFFERENTIAL”, indicating ACTION AWAY FROM THE SPEAKER, both literally and figuratively, and regardless of their lexical semantics. He also looked at the syntax of Grade 5 expressions, and identified some systematic interrelations between the semantics and valency features. Newman analyzed the mechanism as transitivity inherently intransitive verbs with an actor subject, noting (405ff.) the argument restructuring of this subset of Grade 5 verbs. He added that the Efferential “serves to reverse the direction of the action, so that what originally affects the subject in the 1-place intransitive verb emanates from the subject to the object in the related 2-place verb.” Cf. too his later statement that: “with many verbs the gr5 serves to shift the locus of the action in a conceptual rather than a literally directional sense” (2000:655). Examples (adapted from Newman 2000:655ff.):

Transitive base verb

19. a. **taa zubà madañaa à kwaanòn** (gr1tr)
 3fs.pfv pour milk in bowl.the
 ‘she poured the milk in(to) the bowl’

→ Grade 5 = literal ACTION AWAY

- b. **taa zubañ dà madañaa**
 3fs.pfv pour.gr5 milk
 ‘she poured away the milk’

Transitive base verb

20. a. **zân kòoyi Hausa** (g2tr)
 fut.1s learn Hausa
 ‘I will learn Hausa’

→ Grade 5 = figurative ACTION AWAY

- b. **zân kooyañ dà Hausa**
 fut.1s learn.gr5 Hausa
 ‘I will teach Hausa’

Intransitive base verb

21. a. **yaarò yaa ɓatà** (*gr3intr)
 boy 3ms.pfv be lost boy
 ‘the boy got/was lost’

→ Grade 5 = transitive ACTION AWAY

- b. **yaarò yaa ɓatañ dà kudii**
 3ms.pfv be lost.gr5 money
 ‘the boy lost/squandered the money’

Newman’s revised noncausative model was a key advance in the quest for a unified solution and was accepted by most scholars and followed in major reference grammars of recent times, i.e., Wolff (1993:368ff.), Newman himself (2000:651ff.), and Jaggar (2001:248ff.), with Caron (1987:429ff.) the exception.

Turning briefly to the evolution of the Grade 5 verb, Newman suggests that the various meanings are inherited from the core ontological semantics of the formation, i.e., a directional “away from source” (Efferential) meaning, with some comparative support. For Newman, therefore, the various functions inherit the lexical properties of the putative historical source, and he is almost certainly right about this diachronic pathway (though

(2001:4, 2002:164), for example, provides a short list of derived verbs he defines as “causatives” in Guus and Dott (West Chadic-B), formed with **-(ə)r** and **-dər** suffixes respectively (cf. Hausa **-añ**), but his brief description sheds little light on the Efferential hypothesis as such.

Lobben 2010:190 challenges his hypothesis, see §3.4).

Newman (402ff.) based his reformulation of the causative analysis on several premises, both Hausa-internal and cross-linguistic, as follows: (a) the earlier (X cause Y do Z) causative paraphrases of Grade 5 constructions are incorrect, i.e., ‘I informed the chief’ ≠ ‘I caused the chief to know’ (§3.3.1); (b) Hausa already has a periphrastic/analytic (X cause Y do Z) causative formation (§3.3.2); (c) causative constructions are highly productive, the Grade 5 derivational rule is not, and there are idiosyncratic lexical gaps (§3.3.3); (d) the patient causee in transitive-based Grade 5 expressions should formally be realised as an indirect object, not an oblique (§3.3.4). I now briefly assess these claims. See also Lobben (2010:166ff.) and Jaggar (2011) for critical responses.

3.3.1 'Inform' is not the semantic causative of 'know'

Problem: "communication verbs", i.e., verbs such as 'know', 'teach', 'inform', 'show' etc., which encode the communication of information, represent a subfield of possessional transfer. Nedyalkov and Silnitsky (1973:16), cited by Pinker (1989:214, 307), and Dixon (2000:64), make the point that if a language allows morphological causatives on *transitive bases*, then it is verb-pairs such as 'know/inform', 'see/show', 'understand/explain' etc. which participate in the derivation. These are precisely the ones we find in Hausa, e.g., **san̄i/sanā** 'know/inform', **gani/ganā** 'see/show', etc. As noted in §2.2, ingestion verbs also alternate in the same manner, i.e., **ci/ciyā** 'eat/feed', and **shaa/shaayā** 'drink/give to drink'.

3.3.2 Hausa has a periphrastic causative

Newman's statement is correct, Hausa does have an indirect periphrastic causative, formed with **s̄a** 'cause' (lit. 'put') as the higher causal verb, e.g.,

22. [màalàmai sun s̄a [yâaraa sun fita]]

teachers 3p.pfv cause children 3p.pfv go out
 'the teachers got (caused) the children to go out'

Newman also points out that earlier accounts were wrong to paraphrase morphological Grade 5 expressions with "X cause Y to V-intransitive". Cf. the corresponding direct Grade 5 construction:

23. màalàmai sun fitā dà yâaraa

teachers 3p.pfv go out.gr5caus children
 'the teachers took the children out'

Problem: At the level of actual usage, the two causative constructions perform different functions, e.g., the mediated periphrastic has two VP's, the second of which has an agent or patient subject, and it also describes different causative events and participant roles, so the existence of a periphrastic causative cannot be used as evidence that Hausa lacks a co-existing morphological causative (Grade 5) construction. Cross-linguistic surveys, e.g., Nedyalkov and Silnitsky (1973), Dixon and Aikhenwald (2000), Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002), and Shibatani (2006), *inter alia*, clearly show that there are many languages with more than one independent means of expressing causation which are distinguishable according to clear diagnostic criteria. Hausa is no exception, maintaining a formal and semantic/pragmatic distinction between direct morphological causation (Grade 5) and indirect periphrastic causation (Jaggar, forthcoming).

3.3.3 Productivity.

Newman (p. 403, citing Comrie 1976) writes: "generally speaking causative constructions are highly productive...in Hausa, however, gr5 is extremely rare".

Problem: Newman is correct, Hausa Grade 5 verbs *are* lexically restricted/non-productive (though they are high-frequency nonetheless). However, extensive typological-universal surveys (e.g., Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002:163, 172) show that, more precisely, it is the class of derivational direct causatives which is non-productive and shows lexical gaps (i.e., the Grade 5). Arbitrary lexical restrictions on productivity are to be expected with direct causatives. Indirect periphrastic causatives, on the other hand, represent a more productive class cross-linguistically.

3.3.4. Syntactic role of causee: should be encoded as an indirect object

Newman (p. 404, citing Comrie 1976:263ff.) writes: “with causatives of transitive verbs, the normal pattern is for the embedded subject to function as an indirect object...”, restricting this requirement to transitive bases.

Problem: As already noted, objects of Grade 5 verbs, both transitive- and intransitive-based, are formally expressed as obliques following the grammaticalized **dà** comitative-instrumental preposition ‘with’. Contra Comrie (1976), Dixon (2000:54ff.), Haspelmath & Müller-Bardey (2004:1142), and Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002:115ff.) all report that the causee can align with, *inter alia*, indirect object, direct object, or *instrumental*, thereby correcting the generalization that the indirect object function represents the “paradigm” case. See also Maranz (1984:263-64) and Song (1996:166ff.).

In sum, although Newman's Efferential cover-term neatly captured the locative/directional meaning of Grade 5 verbs such as **jeefaɗ** ‘throw away’ < **jèefaa** ‘throw at’, **tuuraaɗ** ‘push away’ < **tuuràa** ‘push’, etc., the main problem in this reductionist account is the generalization of the noncausative semantics to expressions involving such unequivocal causative alternations as **kwàntaa/kwantaaɗ** ‘lie/lay s’one down’. Such alternations effectively falsify a noncausative classification. In this regard, however, it is worth noting that Newman himself occasionally signals his own reservations about the overall noncausative Efferential classification—compare, for example, his statement that the causative characterization is “totally inaccurate” (p. 398) with the more ambiguous subsequent qualification that it is “totally inapplicable to a large number (*perhaps a majority*) of verbs that occur in this form” (p. 401, my emphasis). Cf. also Newman's (2007) dictionary, where a number of unequivocal Grade 5 causatives are paraphrased with “X cause Y to V-intransitive” frames.

Claim 3:

PROS: The Efferential concept captures the underlying locative/directional meaning of Grade verbs, in addition to extended (metaphorical) senses, with some supportive comparative data. Addresses, for the first time, the issue of valency changes.

CONS: Overextends the class of Efferentials, so misses the causative generalization.

3.4.

Claim 4 = Grade 5 constructions express CAUSATIVE/CAUSED MOTION meanings

Cf. Lobben (2010)

Lobben (2010): Grade 5 verbs express semantic "high transitivity" (causative or "caused motion")

In the most comprehensive treatment to date, Lobben (2010) correctly challenges Newman's (largely) noncausative characterization, defining Grade 5 verbs in cognitive-semantic terms as encoding "high transitivity" and analyzable as causatives in most cases. Drawing on work by Langacker (1991a, b), Hopper and Thompson (1980), Talmy (1985), and Goldberg (1995, 2006) in particular, she analyzes the data from the perspective of "physical transfer as the human basis by which the grammatical phenomenon of transitivity and sentence constructions are to

be understood" (p. 137). Goldberg's cognitive model treats causation as a "caused motion construction" which contributes causal and motion semantics not directly attributable to the lexical verb. Basically, Lobben's reanalysis appears to treat *all* Grade 5 constructions as causative with the exception of Newman's Efferential (THROW AWAY) subset, e.g. **tuuràa** gr1tr 'push' > **tuuraĩ** gr5tr 'push away', which she defines as "non-causative ... to be labelled the *caused motion construction*" (p. 287, original emphasis). I say "*appears* to treat ..." because there are some ambiguities and contradictions (see below). Applied to the Hausa data, if the base caused-motion verb is transitive, e.g., gr2tr **hà̄rbaa** 'kick, shoot at', then the object is already a "Mover" and the "high transitivity intensive meaning of the ... [Grade 5 **hārbaĩ** 'kick off'] ... supplies *additional motion* to the Mover" (p. 421, original emphasis). If the base verb is *non-motion*, the object/theme "may still acquire a Mover role" (p. 421), e.g., gr5tr **hakuntaĩ** 'dispose of s'thng at agreed price (after court ruling)' < gr3intr **hà̄kuntà** 'exercise jurisdiction'.

Lobben also challenges Newman's diachronic scenario, stating: "Thus the most serious challenge for an analysis which takes direction as primary resides in how to arrive at an *interactional scene* from a purely directional meaning alone. Motion emanating from a fixed point cannot cause a change unless it encounters something" (2010:190, original emphasis). In support of Newman's hypothesis, however, a change-of-location event is a sub-type of change-of-state, and a key feature of causative constructions across languages is that they typically represent an agential (human) action initiating a process which in turn effects a change-of-state in the causee. If something is moved, then we can reasonably infer that some entity caused it to move. Causative morphemes also express a wide range of meanings within and between languages (see Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002 for details). The source-oriented construal of Grade 5 verbs and transferability of an entity clearly overlap semantically, together with other senses such as (physical) and possession transfer, displacement, etc. ('cause to go/move' ---> 'cause to have').

A large subset of Grade 5 constructions covered in the present review article are indisputably causative, and so confirm the validity of some of Lobben's counter claims, also independently reinforced in Jaggar (2011). There are problems, however, which have wider relevance for the understanding of causation cross-linguistically. Like Newman (1983), Lobben's model has the advantage of economy, but it largely ignores the syntax and valency features of the derivation: "the semantic notion of causation ... in principle should be given priority to [sic] the nature of the formal derivation process" (p. 37). Whether a "semantic notion" which ignores syntactic effects is preferable as an "explanation" is an open question, though Lobben was perhaps simply reacting against the traditional focus on syntax. Causatives, like passives, often differ substantially in form and function cross-linguistically, and there are other descriptions which allow valency-preserving causatives, e.g., Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002), though in later works Shibatani appears to adjust his position somewhat, thus: "certain phenomena (e.g. the causative and applicative) show an increase in valency" (2006:218), "causatives and applicatives have a valency-increasing effect" (2006:260). Lobben, therefore, sacrifices the valency effects in her attempt to achieve a cognitive (semantic) commonality, and I agree that understanding the semantics is a crucial first step in any analysis, but the syntactic reflexes should also be considered. Lobben's system also leads to unnecessary complexities and internal inconsistencies. Having drawn a binary distinction between "causatives" and "non-causative caused motion" constructions (p. 287), the two categories then merge at times and sometimes appear as alternatives. If, for example, we track the Grade 5 verb **zubaĩ** 'pour away', it is variously glossed as "causative" (353, 389) and "causative/caused motion" (222, 429, 433). Similarly, **jeefaĩ** 'throw away' appears as "causative" (353), "causative/caused motion" (429), "caused motion" (421, 422, 423), and **auraĩ** 'marry off' and comparable Grade 5's are described as "transitive-based causative/caused motion" (66), and later (170) analyzed as transfer verbs taking recipient

subjects.¹²

Although there is still some indeterminacy at the edges, a more integrated semantic/syntactic approach is heuristically preferable and allows us to organize the facts into more approachable categories consistent with the variation (notwithstanding that linguists often prefer to use criteria which allow analyses consistent with their scientific predisposition and theoretical stance!) There is, however, a more serious problem.

3.3.1 "Change-of-location": caused motion verbs in Grade 6 (and other grades)

As already noted, Hausa is basically a “verb-framed” language in the sense of Talmy (2000), i.e., the path/direction is included in the verb itself. A clear example is provided by the derived Grade 6 of the verb (traditionally referred to as “ventive”), which has all high tones and ends in **-oo**, e.g., (with minor adjustments), Grade 2tr **sàyaa** ‘buy’ ⇒ Grade 6tr **sayoo** ‘buy (and bring here)’, Grade 2tr **ƙwàataa** ‘take by force’ ⇒ Grade 6tr **ƙwaatoo** ‘grab back (for oneself)’. Grade 6 verbs are goal-oriented, indicating direction of movement ‘to a goal’, and a number of Grade 6 verbs incorporate the ontological feature of motion or causation of motion (cf. *source*-oriented Grade 5 constructions). The transitive versions normally indicate the final goal location of the moved theme element (expressed or context-recoverable), often deictically identifiable with the speaker's location at the time of utterance. The set we are interested in contains a number of very common caused-motion verbs which fall into two subsets: (a) verb-pairs consisting of underlying transitive verbs of causation and their derived Grade 6 goal-oriented counterparts; (b) Grade 6 prepositional verbs formed with the fixed preposition **dà** ‘with’ combined with intransitive motion verbs.

(a) Examples of base transitive (2-place) verbs with intrinsic *caused motion* semantics and their goal-oriented Grade 6 derivatives are (with default speaker location): gr0tr **jaa** ‘pull’ > gr6tr **jaawoo** ‘pull (in this direction)’, gr0tr **kai** ‘take’ > gr6tr **kaawoo** ‘bring (to me)’, gr2tr **hàɓbaa** ‘shoot at, kick’ > gr6tr **haɓboo** ‘kick/pass to (in this direction)’, gr1tr **sakàa** ‘put, place’ > gr6tr **sakoo** ‘put on (and come in this direction)’, gr2tr **tsìnkàa** ‘pluck/pick’ > gr6tr **tsinkoo** ‘pluck/pick (for oneself)’, gr2tr **jèefaa** ‘throw at’ > gr6tr **jeefoo** ‘throw to (in this direction)’, gr1tr **tuuràa** ‘push’ > gr6tr **tuuroo** ‘push (in this direction)’, etc.

(b) Common intransitive (1-place) motion verbs in Grade 6 are pathway verbs such as gr6intr **daawoo** ‘come back’ (no attested base), gr6intr **fitoo** ‘come out’ (< gr3intr **fita** ‘go out’), gr6intr **koomoo** ‘come back’ (< gr1intr **koomàa** ‘go (back)’), gr6intr **shigoo** ‘come in’ (< gr3intr **shiga** ‘go in’), in addition to deictic gr0intr **zoo** ‘come’ (cf. *gr0intr **jee** ‘go’), gr6intr **tahoo** ‘come (along)’ (< *gr3intr **tàfi** ‘go’) etc., and they take locative goal complements (if explicit), e.g., **sun fitoo/shigoo gidaa** ‘they came out of/into the house’. The same deictic verbs can also combine with the transitive preposition **dà** to form *causal* prepositional verbs governing oblique complements,¹⁴ e.g., (causal accompanied motion) **daawoo dà** ‘bring back’,

¹² A major aim of Lobben's study was to show that the same **-aĩ** causative marker is also used to form benefactives. This is a complex and unresolved grammaticalization issue which cannot be considered here, so space restrictions do not allow an evaluation of Lobben's (2010:317ff.) polysemy claims. However, when combined with extensive cross-linguistic evidence that, due to close conceptual affinities, the same marker can (and often does) derive both causative and benefactive constructions, Lobben's detailed analysis suggests a more complex picture in which the accidental homophony assumption is perhaps not as secure as we had thought. Lobben (2010:475ff., 2011) also reports gender-agreement between the Grade 5 **-aC** suffix and various core arguments, an unexpected finding which awaits independent corroboration.

¹⁴ The base intransitive verbs can also combine with **dà** to produce directed motion verbs,

fitoo dà 'bring/get out', **koomoo dà** 'bring back, return s'thing', **shigoo dà** 'bring in', **zoo dà** 'bring'. The action therefore develops in a different direction to SOURCE-ORIENTED Grade 5 constructions, where the new agent/participant represents the source of the action. Examples (24-27) illustrate straightforward Grade 6 caused-motion constructions:

Transitive:

24. **yaa yiwoo cèefànee** (< gr0tr yi 'do, make')
 3ms.pfv do.gr6 shopping
 'he's done (and brought) the shopping'
25. **naa kaawoo yâaraa gidaa** (< gr0tr kai 'take')
 1s.pfv bring.gr6 children home
 'I've brought the children home'

In (26) the deictic centre shifts to Musa:

26. **yaa hañboo wà Muusaa kwalloo** (< gr2tr hañbaa 'shoot at, kick')
 3ms.pfv shoot.gr6 to Musa ball
 'he passed (kicked) the ball to Musa'

Prepositional:

27. **yaa fitoo dà kaayaa** (< gr3intr fita 'go out')
 3ms.pfv come out.gr6 with goods
 'he brought out the goods'

The problem for Lobben is that, although she does refer briefly to the Grade 6 constructions, she chooses not to analyze them as caused-motion events, instead arguing as follows: "Confer for instance the purely directional ventive grade 6, which designates a reference point of origin and motion towards another reference point, which it *has not reached*. Consequently, no causation or influence on another participant occurs [original emphasis]" (p. 190). This attempt to explain away the corresponding Grade 6 facts is clearly wrong. Transitive Grade 6's such as **kaawoo** 'bring (back)', **hañboo** 'kick/pass (in this direction)', **fitoo dà** 'bring/take out', etc., all express "caused motion" as part of agential motion events, and the respective goals are terminal points which indicate the final location of the repositioned theme/entity—so when someone passes/kicks a ball (ex. 26) to the deictic centre Musa (who could then score) then the ball by definition reaches Musa [the endpoint]; if (25) I bring the children (theme) home (locative goal) then they have reached home [the endpoint where I am]; (24) has no overt goal but implies bringing the shopping to where I am, and so on. Defining such Grade 6 formations as not "cause-X-to-move" verbs allows Lobben to avoid having to account for them alongside causative Grade 5 verbs, but this characterization is clearly inconsistent with the pragmatic/semantic reality, and misses a related construction-type which should be captured in an approach based on cognition/semantics (as opposed to form). It leads to the uncomfortable and untenable position that a Grade 5 form such as **tuuraf** 'push away (e.g., from me)', based on Grade 1 transitive **tuuràa** 'push', entails "causation or influence on another participant", but the corresponding (semantically analogous) Grade 6 **tuuroo** 'push (towards me)' does *not*. If we selected 'car' as the theme/object, on a commonsense ("force dynamics") view of the world it would clearly undergo a change of location/state with all three cognate forms (and could, for example, fall into the ditch [endpoint] as a result of all three events). Similar problems for Lobben's approach are posed by the Grade 6 construction **yaa jeefoo minì kwalloo** 'he threw the ball to me' (and I caught it)—cf. Grade 5 **jeefaf** 'throw away' (basic forms gr1tr **jeefàa** 'throw

e.g., **fita** 'go out' ⇒ **fita dà** 'take out'.

(stone)' and gr2tr *jèefaa* 'throw at'), and the examples could be multiplied.

Claim 4:

PROS: A comprehensive data-rich treatment, with analytical insights from a cognitive perspective; draws a distinction between "direct" (Grade 5) and "indirect" ("cause X do Y") causation.

CONS: The boundary between "causative" and "caused motion" is sometimes blurred; fails to extend the causative analysis to other causative formations outside Grade 5.

3.5.

Claim 5 = dichotomy: Some Grade 5 constructions are CAUSATIVE, on both intransitive and transitive roots; POUR/THROW AWAY set = NONCAUSATIVE Efferential

Cf. Jaggar (2011)

Jaggar (2011): LIE/LAY, KNOW/INFORM = CAUSATIVE, also ingestives EAT/FEED; noncausatives include THROW/THROW AWAY, BUY/SELL

A minor advance with discussion of direct causative Grade 5 constructions as distinct from their indirect "mediated" counterparts. However, the analysis overemphasised the importance of increased valency as a defining syntactic property of the process. As a result, the alternating BUY/SELL, LEARN/TEACH etc. variants were erroneously analyzed as noncausative, on the grounds that no additional argument is introduced in the Grade 5 construction.

Claim 5:

PROS: Provides further evidence for a causative analysis of a definable subset of Grade 5 constructions/verbs; examines the alternations entailing "direct" causation.

CONS: Mistakenly excludes the BUY/SELL, LEARN/TEACH alternators.

4. Summary

Previous studies have attempted to explain the various semantic effects of Grade 5 constructions, but there has been disagreement about exactly how to categorize and relate the seemingly diverse meanings along a causative/noncausative opposition. In this paper, I have assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the major hypotheses, and have proposed a dichotomy which classifies all Grade 5 constructions as causative with the exception of the THROW ⇒ THROW AWAY subfield. Although there are still some areas of vagueness at the edges, working out a more finegrained semantic system has allowed us to organize categories consistent with the surface variation.

References

- Abdoulaye, Mahamane L. 1996. Figure and ground in the Hausa 'Grade 2' verb. *African Languages and Cultures* 9:1-25.
- Abdoulaye, Mahamane. L., 2005. Review of Jaggar, Hausa 2001. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 26(1), 81-92.
- Abraham, R. C., 1934. *The Principles of Hausa*. Kaduna: Government Printer.

- Abraham, R. C. 1940. *A Modern Grammar of Spoken Hausa*. London: Crown Agents for the Colonies.
- Abraham, R. C. 1959. *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: University of London Press.
- Abraham, R.C., 1962. *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*, 2nd ed. London: University of London Press.
- Ahmad, Mustapha. 1994. *Aspects of Hausa Compounding*. PhD dissertation. Indiana University.
- Bargery, G. P., 1934. *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Caron, Bernard, 1987. *Description d'un parler haoussa de l'Ader (République du Niger)*. Université de Paris 7.
- Caron, Bernard. 2001. Guus, aka Sigidi (Chadic, West-B, South Bauchi): Grammatical notes and vocabulary. *Afrika und Übersee* 84, 1-60.
- Caron, Bernard. 2002. Dott, aka Zodi (Chadic, West-B, South-Bauchi): Grammatical notes, vocabulary and text. *Afrika und Übersee* 85, 161-248.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: cross-language similarities and divergences. *The Grammar of Causative Constructions, Syntax and Semantics* 6, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 261-312. New York: Academic Press.
- Comrie, Bernard, 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In: Shopen, Timothy (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 309-48.
- Comrie, Bernard and Maria Polinsky (eds.) 1993. *Causation and Transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2000. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In Dixon and Aikhenvald (eds), pp. 30-83.
- Dixon, R. M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). 2000. *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1985. 'Causative' and 'benefactive' in Hausa. *Afrika und Übersee* 68, 1:23-42.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt, and Muhammed M. Munkaila. 2004. *Grammatical and Semantic Relations in Hausa. 'Point of View', 'Goal' and 'Affected Object'*. Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, Cologne.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work: the Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gouffé, Claude, 1962. Observations sur le degré causatif dans un parler haoussa du Niger. *Journal of African Languages* 1, 182-200.
- Gropen, Jess, Steven Pinker, Michelle Hollander, and Richard Goldberg. 1991. Affectedness and direct objects: The role of lexical semantics in the acquisition of argument structure. *Cognition* 41:153-95.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. 'More on the Typology of Inchoative/Causative Verb Alternations', in Comrie, Bernard and Maria Polinsky (eds.), 87-120.
- Haspelmath, Martin, and Thomas Müller-Bardy. 2004. Valency change. In: Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan, and Stavros Skopetas, (Eds.), *Morphology: A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, pp. 1130-45.
- Hopper, Paul and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56:251-99.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1990. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 2001. *Hausa: London Oriental and African Language Library, 7*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 2010. Relational *dà* as a preposition, coordinator and subordinator in Hausa: Polysemy or homophony? *Aspects of Co- and Subordination: Case Studies from African, Slavonic and Turkic Languages.*, ed. by Georg Ziegelmeyer and Norbert Cyffer, pp. 61-77. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 2011. Direct morphological causatives in Hausa: the “Grade 5” verb revisited. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Hausa Studies: 5 and European Perspectives*, ed. by Sergio Baldi and Hafizu Miko Yakasai. *Studi Africanistici: Serie Ciado-Sudanese* 4, pp. 171-82. Naples: University of Naples.
- Jaggar, Philip J. (forthcoming). Morphological and periphrastic causatives in Hausa: two mechanisms, two jobs.
- Jaggar, Philip J., and H. Ekkehard Wolff. 2002. *Chadic and Hausa Linguistics: Selected Papers of Paul Newman with Commentaries*. Rüdiger Köppe, Cologne.
- Jaggar, Philip J., and Malami Buba. 2009. “Metaphorical extensions of ‘eat’ → [OVERCOME] and ‘drink’ → [UNDERGO] verbs in Hausa”: 229-51 in Newman, John (Ed.), *Typological Studies in Language 84. The Linguistics of Eating and Drinking*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W., 1991a. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Descriptive Applications*, vol. 2. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W., 1991b. *Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lobben, Marit. 2010. *The Hausa causative and benefactive in a cognitive and cross-linguistic perspective*. Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor Artium, University of Oslo, Norway.
- Marantz, A., 1984. *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- McIntyre, J. A., 2006. *Hausa Verbal Compounds*. Rüdiger Köppe, Cologne.
- Miyagawa, S. 1984. Blocking and Japanese causatives. *Lingua* 64, 177-207.
- Nedyalkov, Vladimir P., and Georgij G. Sil’nickij. 1973. The typology of morphological and lexical causatives. *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*, ed. F. Keifer, 1-32. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Newman, Paul, 1983. The efferential (alias 'causative') in Hausa. In: Wolff, Ekkehard and Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg (Eds.), *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*. Helmut Buske, Hamburg, pp. 397-418.
- Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa Language: An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Newman, Paul. 2007. *A Hausa-English Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Parsons, F. W. 1960. The verbal system in Hausa. *Afrika und Übersee* 44:1-36.
- Parsons, F. W., 1962. Further observations on the 'causative' grade of the verb in Hausa. *Journal of African Languages* 1, 253-272.
- Parsons, F. W., 1971/72. Suppletion and neutralization in the verbal system of Hausa. *Afrika und Übersee* 55, 49-97, 188-208.
- Parsons, F. W., 1981. *Writings on Hausa Grammar: The Collected Papers of F. W. Parsons*, G. L. Furniss (Ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Books on Demand.
- Pinker, Steven. 1989. *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schuh, Russell G. 2005. "The totality extension and focus in West Chadic." *International Berlin Focus Conference*.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), 1976. *The Grammar of Causative Constructions, Syntax and Semantics* 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1996. Applicatives and benefactives: a cognitive account. In (eds) Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson, *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning* 157-194. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2006. On the conceptual framework for voice phenomena. *Linguistics* 44(2):217-69.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi, and Prashant Pardeshi. 2002. The causative continuum. In *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*, Typological Studies in Language 48, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 85–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Song, Jae Jung. 1996. *Causatives and Causation: A Universal-Typological Perspective*. London: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Song, Jae Jung. 2001. *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*. Harlow and London: Longman Linguistics Library.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1985. "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms." *Language typology and syntactic description* 3: 57-149.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12:49-100.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. Lexicalization patterns. In *Towards a Cognitive Semantics: Vol. 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*, 36-149. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2007. Lexical typologies. In Shopen, T. (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 3. Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 66-168.
- Taylor, F. W., 1923. *A Practical Hausa Grammar*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Wolff, Ekkehard, 1993. *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa: Hamburger Beiträge zur Afrikanistik*, 2. Lit, Münster & Hamburg.
- Zima, Petr. 2010. Sprachbund and lingua franca as dynamic features: DA-NDA beyond Hausa. *Aspects of Co- and Subordination: Case Studies from African, Slavonic and Turkic Languages.*, ed. by Georg Ziegelmeyer and Norbert Cyffer, pp. 79-100. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.