

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

**DEIXIS (DEMONSTRATIVES AND ADVERBIALS) IN HAUSA**

By

Malami Buba

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement of the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

February, 1997



ProQuest Number: 10673075

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10673075

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

## Abstract

This thesis investigates deixis in Hausa. Specifically, it examines the deictic interpretation of Hausa demonstratives, adverbs and certain deictic particles within a systematic paradigm of referential interpretation. I show that the participant-based approach to Hausa deictic adverbials, first proposed by Jaggar and Buba (1994), can be extended to cover other (related) deictic elements. In that work, we demonstrated how the tripartite system of spatial, anaphoric and symbolic usage interacts with the speaker-proximal, speaker-distal and speaker/addressee-distal distinctions encoded by *NAN*- and *CAN*-adverbials. In this thesis, the same model is extended to explain the functional distribution of the related demonstratives *WANNAN* and *WANCAN*. Chapter 1 provides a general introduction to the notion of deixis, covering its definition and various manifestations in the referential subsystems of demonstratives, adverbs (and personal pronouns). Chapter 2 addresses the speaker-proximal demonstrative and adverbial deictics (e.g. nân ‘here’ [near me the speaker], wannàn + NP, NP-n/r-nân/nàn ‘this NP [near me the speaker]’). Chapter 3 is concerned with the basically addressee-proximal deictics (e.g. nan ‘there [near you the addressee]’, wànnan / wânnan + NP, NP-n/r-nan ‘that NP [near you the addressee]’). In Chapter 4, I look at the speaker/addressee-distal forms (e.g. cân ‘there [distant from speaker and addressee]’, wancàn + NP, NP-n/r-cân/càn ‘that NP [distant from speaker and addressee]’), and their remote-distal counterparts (e.g. can ‘over there [remote from speaker and addressee]’, wàncan / wâncan + NP, NP-n/r-can ‘that NP [remote from speaker and addressee]’). The functional distribution of the pre-head and post-head demonstratives is described and explained in terms of the semantic-pragmatic notion of presuppositionality. The core claims are summarised in Chapter 5, where I briefly address the implications of the findings for the Hausa system of deixis, and for cross-linguistic deictic theory in general.

## Contents

Title of Thesis .....	1	
Abstract .....	2	
Contents .....	3	
Tables .....	7	
Abbreviations, symbols and transcription .....	9	
Acknowledgements .....	10	
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
1. 0.	The Hausa Language..... 12	
1. 1.	The Problem .....	14
1. 2.	Defining the notion of Deixis .....	17
1. 3.	Data Sources .....	20
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>THE SEMANTIC-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF SPEAKER-CENTRED DEIXIS IN HAUSA</b>	
2. 0.	Introduction .....	23
2. 1.	F <u>nân</u> = speaker-proximal adverbial .....	23
2. 1. 1.	Previous descriptions: F <u>nân</u> = [+proximal + visible] .....	24
2. 1. 2.	Spatial F <u>nân</u> .....	26
2. 1. 3.	Anaphoric F <u>nân</u> .....	34
2. 1. 4.	Symbolic F <u>nân</u> .....	44

2. 2.	Speaker-proximal HL <u>wannàn</u> , HLF (pl.) <u>wadànnân</u> (HHL <u>wadànnân</u> ) (+NP), NP+ <u>-n/r-nân/nàn</u> demonstratives .....	49
2. 2. 1.	Previous descriptions.....	49
2. 2. 2.	HL <u>wannàn</u> etc. (+NP), NP- <u>n/r-nân/nàn</u> = speaker-proximal demonstratives .....	57
2. 2. 3.	Spatial HL <u>wannàn</u> etc. (+NP), NP+ <u>-n/r-nân/nàn</u> .....	58
2. 2. 4.	Anaphoric HL <u>wannàn</u> etc. (+NP), NP+ <u>-n/r-nân/nàn</u> .....	66
2. 2. 5.	Symbolic HL <u>wannàn</u> etc. (+NP).....	85
2. 3.	Summary.....	90
CHAPTER 3	THE SEMANTIC-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ADDRESSEE-CENTRED DEIXIS IN HAUSA	
3. 0.	Introduction.....	103
3. 1.	Adverbial H <u>nan</u> = Addressee-proximal, (= spatial) or speaker-distal (= non-spatial) .....	103
3. 1. 1.	Previous descriptions of H <u>nan</u> .....	104
3. 1. 2.	Spatial H <u>nan</u> .....	109
3. 1. 3.	Anaphoric H <u>nan</u> .....	115
3. 1. 4.	Symbolic H <u>nan</u> .....	125
3. 2.	Addressee-proximal LH <u>wànnan</u> , LLH (pl.) <u>wadànnan</u> , FH <u>wànnan</u> , HLH (pl.) <u>wadànnan</u> (+NP), NP+ <u>-n/r-nan</u> demonstratives .....	131
3. 2. 1.	Previous descriptions of LH <u>wànnan</u> etc. (+NP), FH <u>wànnan</u> etc. (+NP), NP- <u>n/r-nan</u> .....	132

3. 2. 2.	Spatial LH <u>wànnan</u> etc. (+NP), FH <u>wànnan</u> etc. (+NP), NP+ <u>-n/r-nan</u> .....	140
3. 2. 3.	Anaphoric FH <u>wànnan</u> etc. (+NP), LH <u>wànnan</u> , etc. (+NP), NP+ <u>-n/r-nan</u> .....	147
3. 2. 4.	Symbolic FH <u>wànnan</u> (only).....	168
3. 3.	Deictic <u>DIN</u> .....	172
3. 3. 1.	The two <u>DIN</u> Forms.....	176
3. 3. 1. 1.	Possessive H <u>dî-n</u> .....	176
3. 3. 1. 2.	Deictic F <u>dî-n</u> .....	179
3. 4.	Summary.....	186
CHAPTER 4	THE SEMANTIC-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF SPEAKER/ ADDRESSEE-(REMOTE) DISTAL DEIXIS IN HAUSA	
4. 0.	Introduction.....	192
4. 1.	CAN-adverbial deictics.....	192
4. 1. 1.	Previous descriptions of CAN-adverbials .....	193
4. 1. 2.	Spatial F <u>cân</u> and H <u>can</u> .....	196
4. 1. 3.	Anaphoric H <u>can</u> (only).....	202
4. 1. 4.	Symbolic F <u>cân</u> and H <u>can</u> .....	210
4. 2.	WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives.....	212
4. 2. 1.	Previous descriptions of WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN .....	213

4. 2. 2.	Spatial <i>WANCAN</i> (+NP), NP- <i>CAN</i> demonstratives.....	220
4. 2. 2. 1.	Spatial HL <u>wancàn</u> etc. (+NP), NP- <u>n/r-cân/càn</u> = speaker/addressee-distal .....	220
4. 2. 2. 2.	Spatial LH <u>wàncan</u> etc. (+NP), FH <u>wâncan</u> etc. (+NP), NP <u>-n/r-can</u> + speaker/addressee remote- distal .....	228
4. 2. 3.	Anaphoric <i>WANCAN</i> (+NP), NP- <i>CAN</i> demonstratives .....	236
4. 2. 3. 1.	Anaphoric HL <u>wancàn</u> etc. (+NP) (only) .....	236
4. 2. 3. 2.	Anaphoric FH <u>wâncan</u> etc. (+NP), NP- <u>n/r-can</u> ...	237
4. 2. 4.	Symbolic HL <u>wancàn</u> etc. (only).....	241
4. 3.	Summary.....	243
CHAPTER 5	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	249
Appendix .....		253
References .....		266

## Tables

Table 1	Summary of previous descriptions of F <u>nân</u> -adverbial .....	25
Table 2	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal F <u>nân</u> -adverbial.....	26
Table 3	Summary of previous descriptions of HL <u>wannàn</u> , NP- <u>n/r-nân/nàn</u> demonstratives ...	56
Table 4	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal HL <u>wannàn</u> , NP- <u>n/r-nân/nàn</u> demonstratives .....	57
Table 5	Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski's (1993:275) The Givenness Hierarchy .....	61
Table 6	Frequency count of speaker-proximal (anaphoric, non-spatial) demonstratives in Imam's <u>Magana Jari Ce 3</u> .....	67
Table 7	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal deictics .....	91
Table 8	Summary of previous descriptions of H <u>nan</u> -adverbial .....	107
Table 9	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based H <u>nan</u> -adverbial .....	109
Table 10	Summary of previous descriptions of LH <u>wànnan</u> , FH <u>wànnan</u> , NP- <u>n/r-nan</u> demonstratives .....	139
Table 11	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-proximal LH <u>wànnan</u> , FH <u>wànnan</u> , NP- <u>n/r-nan</u> (also speaker-distal) demonstratives...	140
Table 12	Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski's (1993:275) The Givenness Hierarchy .....	142
Table 13	Frequency count of speaker-distal (< addressee-proximal) anaphoric demonstratives in <u>Imam's Magana Jari Ce 3</u> .....	148

Table 14	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based deictics .....	171
Table 15	Summary of previous descriptions of <i>CAN</i> -adverbials .....	195
Table 16	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of <i>CAN</i> -adverbials .....	196
Table 17	Summary of previous descriptions of <i>WANCAN</i> (+NP) NP- <i>CAN</i> demonstratives .....	217
Table 18	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal <i>WANCAN</i> (+NP), NP- <i>CAN</i> demonstratives .....	219
Table 19	Summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal deictics ...	245

## Abbreviations, Symbols and Transcription

#	ungrammatical
?	marginally acceptable
*	underlying (historical) form
<	derived from
=	equivalent in meaning
≠	not equivalent in meaning
→	changes to
↔	two-way opposition
f.	feminine
F	falling tone
H	high tone
L	low tone
lit.	literally
m.	masculine
NP	noun phrase
pl.	plural
s.	singular
vs	versus

### Transcription

For all the Hausa citations, the tone and vowel marking system is as follows: L(ow) tone = (â or àa), F(alling) tone = (âa or â), H(igh) tone is unmarked; long vowels are indicated with double vowels, e.g. (aa) vs. short (a). The glottalised consonants are represented by the so-called ‘hooked letters’ ɓ/B, ɗ/D, ƙ/K, and the apostrophe ( ’ ) is used to signify the glottal stop; ʔ is a glottalised palatal, and ts is an ejective. A hyphen is used between enclitics and their host NP’s. Deictic elements under discussion are underlined, and their English equivalents are typed in bold, e.g. F nân ‘here’.

## **Acknowledgements**

Many people have contributed to the eventual completion of this thesis. For outstanding supervision and academic counselling, I am grateful to Philip J. Jaggar 'Malam Bala'. I am also indebted to Graham Furniss and Wynn Chao for agreeing to be members of my committee, and for supporting me all along, and to Ruth Kempson for advice. For total support, encouragement and help with proofreading, I thank my wife, Norma E. Buba. I have also benefited from discussions with Paul Newman and Roxana Ma Newman, and am grateful to them for sharing their home with me, while I was a Research Associate working on the Hausa Reference Grammar Project directed by Paul Newman.

I thank my parents, Hajiya Mairamu and Malam Buba Na-Sarki Kofarini, for their guidance and continuous support, my relatives, especially Alhaji Muhammadu Arzika Tambuwal (OFR), Bello A. Malami Tambuwal and Ibrahim Magawata, and my principal informants and friends, including: Mansur and Jummai Abdulkadir, Auwal Ibrahim, Bello Abubakar, Saleh Haliru, Umar Yusuf Karaye, Mustapha Chinade, Muhammad el-Nafaty, Sadiq Abubakar, Bello Daudun Bada, Fatima and A'isha Mahdi Adamu, Ummulhairi 'Dantata, Mansur Liman, Hassan Marafa, Malama Sa'adiyya Omar and Bilkisu Labaran. For making me always feel like one of the lads whenever on a research visit to Nigeria, I thank my (childhood) friends, Umaru Sarkin Shanu, Usman Daniya, Muhammad Kabir and Fatima Abdullahi, Hassan and Badamasi Muhammadu Maccido, Aminu, Ahmad and Mu'azzam Abubakar Tunau Mafara, Ahmed Rufa'i Na-Dange, Faruk Bello, Abu and Karima Shehu Shagari, Aminu Balarabe Bazza, Aliyu Sahabi, Abubakar Ladan, Abdullahi Kyafe and Sanusi Usman Junaidu.

At Danfodiyo University (Sokoto, Nigeria), I am grateful to colleagues and former teachers, including the Vice-Chancellor, Zayyanu Abdullahi, Omar Bello,

Kabir Ahmed Gandi, Ibrahim Mukoshy, Luciano Bulber, Abubakar Atiku Tambuwal, Riskuwa Shehu, Lawal Bilbis, Ibrahim Jumare, Fatima Ahmad, Ahmad Amfani, Salisu Yakasai, Muhammad 'Danmantu, Ahmad Adili, Shehu Ladan, Garba Ahmed Gusau, and Garba Alhassan.

For their encouragement and support, I thank all my colleagues in the Department of Africa, SOAS (London), especially my seminar and research collaborators, Farouk Topan and Akin Oyetade. For their prayers and goodwill, I am grateful to Anna Debska, Wangari Mouria-Sal, Jackie Collis, Gloria Hatrick, Tae-San and Young-Hee Jang, Richard Fardon, David Hall, Mustapha Sulaiman, Tijjani Umar, Kabir Shehu, Ruth, Viv, Rosylee, Horace, David, Alan, Yolande, Andrew and Juliette Hudson, Lloyd and Maureen Evans and Sa'id el-Geithy. For giving me access to Hausa materials, I thank Barry Burgess of the Hausa Section of the BBC World Service, where I worked as a Relief Producer. I am also grateful to Matthew Lockwood for allowing me to listen to his vast collection of taped interviews with (monolingual) Hausa farmers.

I owe my friend and fellow traveller, Nicholas Awde, special thanks for agreeing to overhaul and proofread this thesis for me.

These people, particularly Malam Bala, deserve to share any positive outcomes from this work, but I take full responsibility for any remaining errors in the data or analysis.

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

#### *1. 0. The Hausa Language*

Hausa is a major world language with more first-language speakers than any other sub-Saharan African language—more than 30 million according to recent estimates, most of whom live in northern Nigeria and the Republic of Niger (see Kirk-Greene 1967; Kraft & Kirk-Greene 1973; Abu-Manga, 1982, 1990; Gouffé 1981; Newman 1987, 1991, 1992; Parsons 1971; Jaggar 1993). It is a first language for ‘original’ Hausas, in addition to many ethnic (settled) Fulani (*Filanin gida*), who by reason of intermarriage and a long history of contact have become linguistically indistinguishable from the Hausa. Hausa is also spoken by diaspora communities of traders, Muslim scholars and immigrants in urban areas of West Africa, e.g. Southern Nigeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, (northern) Ghana (= lingua franca, used in TV and radio broadcasts) and Togo, as well as the Blue Nile Province of the Sudan. Colonies of Hausa speakers are also to be found in large cities in North Africa, e.g. Tripoli (Libya), and in Equatorial Africa, e.g. Bangui (Central African Republic), and Brazzaville (Congo). It is the most important and widespread West African language, and is rivalled only by Swahili as an African lingua franca.

Hausa has a long literary tradition, and was first written in (Arabic-based) *ajami* script, and later in its more familiar Roman script introduced in the 1930’s (Yahaya 1988; Furniss 1996). In the (British) colonial period, Hausa was recognised as the official language of the Northern Regional Assembly, and it still remains one of the three national languages of Nigeria (together with Igbo and Yoruba), as enshrined in the (now) suspended Nigerian Constitution (1979) and the (revised) National Policy on Education (1989). Hausa is used extensively in

commercial and educational spheres, and in the mass media. There are several Hausa language newspapers, including the twice weekly Gaskiya Ta Fi Kwabo ('Truth is Worth More than a Penny'). Many radio stations, both African and international, broadcast in (mainly Kano) Hausa, including the BBC World Service, Voice of America, Deutsche Welle, Radio Moscow and Radio Peking.

Hausa is a member of the (West branch) of the Chadic language family, which contains some 150 distinct languages spoken to the east, west and south of Lake Chad. Chadic is a coordinate branch of the Afroasiatic (Hamito-Semitic) super-family, the other branches being Ancient Egyptian (extinct), Berber (e.g. Tamazhaq, Tamazight), Cushitic (e.g. Somali, Oromo), Omotic (e.g. Beja), and Semitic (e.g. Arabic, Hebrew, Amharic).

Hausa has been a subject of serious scholarly investigation for 150 years, and is one of the most extensively researched of all sub-Saharan African languages (Hair 1976; Newman 1989; Baldi 1977; Awde 1988). It also has some of the best dictionaries (Bargery 1934; Abraham 1962; Newman and Newman 1977; Newman 1990; Awde 1996) and reference grammars (Wolff 1993; Newman (in press); Jaggar (in preparation)) of any African language.

In contrast to many African languages, and in spite of its geographical spread and numbers of speakers, Hausa dialects display relatively little variation, but it is possible to differentiate broadly between Eastern dialects, e.g. Kano (= Standard Hausa, the dialect used in this thesis), and Western dialects, e.g. Katsina, Sokoto and northwards into Niger (Malka 1978; Zaria 1982; Matsushita 1990; Bello 1992).

### *1.1. The problem*

The study of Hausa in a naturally occurring context of communication is a relatively recent phenomenon, in spite of the tremendous growth in Hausa linguistic scholarship, and its long tradition as a well-researched language. (Yahaya 1988 and Newman 1991 provide a detailed chronology of the age and extent of this scholarship.) The references contained in a recent Hausa (Chadic) bibliography attest to the enormous amount of attention that the language is getting from Hausaists. However, there is a big gap in our understanding of the uses and usage of the language in a context-sensitive environment. Jaggar (1983, 1985b) and Jaggar and Buba (1994) remain the only major works which are solely devoted to the uses and constraints characterising certain grammatical items in Hausa discourse, including deictic formatives. (While Galadanci (1969), see also Howeydy (1953), correctly identified the semantic and pragmatic coding of Hausa demonstrative determiners and adverbs, he did not elaborate on the ways in which these forms are actually exploited in naturally-occurring contexts.)

This thesis attempts to fill this large gap in our understanding of Hausa deixis and represents the most complete discussion and analysis of demonstratives, adverbs, and other deictic particles to date. More importantly, the study is presented within a participant-based framework that has never before been used to categorise deictic elements in Hausa (but see Jaggar and Buba 1994). Such a model (which is not specific to Hausa) permits a rigorous reappraisal of some long-established proposals, most of which are found to be wholly inadequate in addressing the various deictic paradigms in Hausa.

The basic assumption informing this study is that deictic adverbs and demonstratives (determiners, pronouns) are part of a system of indexicalisation used to designate the material relationship of signs in a communicative context. The material relationship in focus is largely dyadic, in the sense that it rests

squarely on the participants (i.e. speaker and hearer), who determine the specificity of not only the deictic centre, but also its orientation relative to the context of communication.<sup>1</sup> The context in the sense of Sebeok (1991:29) is what validates the tacit or explicit assumptions of the participants ('a setting in which any message is emitted, transmitted, and admitted...' (p. 29). In other words, a piece of text, or any other kind of message, is only as good as the context permits an intended interpretation to be made. The message, being the basis of the communication process, is interpretable in terms of: (a) a *spatial* expression accompanied by a physical gesture, which further individuates the (visible) object of reference or its location as cognitively perceived by a speaker; (b) an *anaphoric* inference, by means of which coreferentiality between an anaphor and its antecedent is properly established within a spatio-temporally determined context; and (c) a *symbolic* codification, in which certain abstract relations are realised with the speaker as centre of the metaphorical extension.

Chapter 2 examines the (egocentric) speaker-centred locative adverbial F tone nân 'here' (§2.1.), pre-head demonstrative HL tone wannân etc. (+NP), and post-head NP-n/-r-nân/nân 'this, these' (§2.2.), within the tripartite *spatial*, *anaphoric*, and *symbolic* system of deictic interpretation. In addition, the chapter tackles the issue of word order variation between the pre-and post-head demonstratives. Using the cognitive model developed by Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1989, 1993), I show that far from being synonymous alternatives (as previously claimed), the choice between e.g. (pre-head) wannân yaarinyàa and (post-head) yaarinyà-r-nân 'this girl' is conditioned by the cognitive status of the referent ('girl')—the pre-head demonstrative references [-identifiable] entities, whereas the post-head option indexes [+identifiable] referents. I also discuss a number of speaker-based deictic adverbials, including nân gâba 'in future' (lit. 'here/now in front'), nân dà 'from now' (lit. 'here/now and'), and the modal pro-form hakà 'thus, this, so',

which I show to be semantically equivalent to pronominal HL wannàn in certain discourse contexts.

Chapter 3 documents findings that confirm the intuitions of Howeidy (1953), Galadanci (1969), Jaggar (1985b), and Jaggar and Buba (1994) that Hausa lexicalises the addressee's position. Most (semantic) descriptions were heavily influenced (and distracted) by languages such as English with a basic 2-term deictic opposition (e.g. **this** <—> **that**). Adverbial H nan, pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan etc., FH wànnan etc. (+NP), and post-head NP-n/r-nan are shown to pick out objects which are in the vicinity of the addressee. As F nân and HL wannàn etc. are [+ proximal] to the speaker, so are H nan and LH wànnan etc. [+ proximal] in relation to the addressee. (These essentially addressee-based deictics have a more generalised speaker-distal coding in many of the *anaphoric* extracts that I present (§3.2.3).) As with the speaker-proximal demonstratives (Chapter 2), the addressee-based demonstrative variants are characterised by a (previously unreported) form-meaning correlation: pre-head demonstrative = [-identifiable], post-head = [+identifiable]. In §3.3, I provide new insights into the DIN deictic particle, describing possessive H tone dī-n (§3.3.1.1) and referential F tone dĩ-n (§3.3.1.2).

In chapter 4, I look at the speaker/addressee-(remote) distal *CAN* (§4.1), *WANCAN* (+NP), and NP-*CAN* (§4.2), and document the same pre-head demonstrative = [-identifiable], post-head = [+identifiable] correlation. These (*CAN*) adverbials and (*WANCAN*) demonstratives are also shown to have a more defective distribution in the (non-spatial) anaphoric and symbolic domains.

Finally, I summarise my findings in chapter 5, in which I also examine the implications of the Hausa facts for cross-linguistic theories on deixis in general.

## ***1.2. Defining the notion of Deixis***

According to Rauh (1983b:10) the term 'deixis' derives from a Greek word, *deiktikos*, meaning 'apt for pointing with the finger'. Lyons (1977:636-37) refers to its 'pointing' and 'indicating' origin in Greek, and writes: 'By deixis is meant the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee.' Fillmore (1975:39) emphasises the properties of an utterance which identify it as a deictic expression: 'Deixis is the name given to those formal properties of utterances which are determined by, and which are interpreted by knowing, certain aspects of the communication act in which the utterances in question can play a role.'

Like Lyons, Rauh (1983b:10) claims that a major distinction between deictic and non-deictic expressions is that the former '...are dependent upon or related to the situation of the encoder'. According to Wales (1986:401): '...demonstratives, pronouns, adverbs of place, verbs of motion such as 'come' and 'go', definite articles, tenses, direct the hearer's attention to spatial or temporal aspects of the situation of utterance which are often critical for its appropriate interpretation.' In other words, in this kind of reference, it is not enough to understand what is said—one must also know who said it (*person deixis*, *social deixis*), the location at which the speaker uttered it (*place deixis*), and when it is said (*time deixis*, *discourse deixis*). In this connection, Freidman (1975:941) has argued that 'any language must provide for the...concepts of *time*, *space* and *person* in its surface representation'.

In this study, I take the view that the primary form of deictic codification is the category of person. As Lyons (1977) has stated, this usually refers to (at least) the *speaker* (the person who makes the utterance) and the *addressee* (the person

spoken to). For me, these participants define how we interpret any utterance containing a deictic form. The most obvious way in which these persons are realised is the pronouns *I* and *You* (but also *He*, included by Benveniste (1971) as a non-person category); any utterance containing *I* necessarily refers to the person saying it (the *I*-sayer in the terminology of Parrett (1980)), and that person is the only means we have of interpreting what the utterance means. In fact, the role of the speaker in deixis is considered so crucial that some scholars are wont to see language as essentially a projection of the speaker's state of being. Russell's (1940) notion of *egocentric particulars* promotes *this* to be the main instrument in this speaker projection. Thus, according to him, the pronoun *I* 'means the biography to which *this* belongs', the time adverb *now* with 'what is copresent with *this*, but also *here* as 'the time at which *this* occurs'. *Indexical sign* is also a term that has been used to describe the relationship of these forms to the speaker (*interpretant* for Peirce). Peirce (1932:151), however, sees such words as *this*, *here* and *now* as a '...surrogate for an index finger in an act of pointing'. Bühler (1990[1934]:94ff.) makes a similar observation concerning the indexical (pointing) origin of his *deictic field of language*. He argues that the central import of his description is '...to show how the fulfilment of the meaning of deictic words is connected to sensory deictic clues, and to show how this fulfilment is dependent on these clues and their equivalents' (p. 94). The sensory clues that Bühler has in mind are the use of the index finger or such other 'ocular' forms of pointing in the felicitous use of a deictic form, and it remains for him the one constant proposition: 'Although the index finger, the natural tool of ocular demonstration, may well be replaced by other deictic clues, although it is even replaced in speech concerning things that are present, the assistance it and its equivalents provide can never completely cease and simply be dispensed with, not even in anaphora...This insight is the pivotal point of our doctrine of the deictic field of language' (Bühler 1990 [1934] :95).

Reichenbach (1947) talks of *token reflexive words* to describe deictic categories. The self-referring power given to these forms means that their meaning is invariant so long as the context of utterance is taken into account—again *this* remains the constant pivotal point from which other forms of deixis are to be viewed. Thus, *I* in this system will mean ‘the person who utters *this token*; *now* means ‘the time at which *this token* is uttered’, and so on. A critical discussion of these positions is to be found in Burks (1948) and Gale (1968:152).

The reference of *You*, however, is less straightforward, not so much because it is not lexically encoded, but because it has received little attention in the past. In most of the literature, *you* (= addressee) is negatively defined in relation to the speaker. Anyone other than the utterer may therefore be encoded by it. Interestingly, it seems that such a rendering reflects the nature of the languages investigated, rather than a universal paradigm for describing pronouns, demonstratives, and adverbs as deictics. In English, for example, while *this* directs attention to referent objects that are in the vicinity of the speaker (hence speaker-relative), *that* largely defines objects which are not proximal to the speaker. It is the same two-way contrast for the English adverbs *here* and *there* as well (see also Ingram (1971, 1978), Zwicky (1977) and Nunberg (1993).

Hausa, in common with a large number of disparate languages, exploits deictic forms which articulate a system more sophisticated than the basic two-term (spatial) system of English and many European languages.<sup>2</sup> Japanese, for example, has a three-term system for both its demonstratives and locative adverbs (Coulmas 1982; Hinds 1971,1973; Fillmore, 1975:42; Anderson and Keenan, 1985). Spanish *aquí* ‘here’, *ahí* ‘(just) there’ and *allí* ‘(over) there’ also exemplify a tripartite deictic adverbial system (Sacks 1954; Saeed 1997:174). Fillmore (1975) reports another language in an almost incredulous tone: ‘One is told that Tlingit from the Na-Dane language family (USA, Alaska [Crystal 1987:443]) is a

language with a four-way contrast, translatable, I suppose, as ‘right here’, ‘right there’, ‘over there’, and ‘way the heck over there’ (p. 42). Yet this is precisely what happens in (Standard) Hausa, e.g. (locative adverbials) F nân = ‘**here** [near me the speaker]’, H nan = ‘**there** [near you the hearer]’, F cân = ‘**over there** [distant from speaker and hearer]’, and H can = ‘**way over there** [remote from speaker and hearer]’.

Within this participant-based system, the deictic forms are further classifiable in terms of the referential functions they perform. In his model, Fillmore (1975:40) suggests that pronouns, demonstratives (especially) and locative adverbs can be classified according to the *gestural*, *anaphoric* and *symbolic* functions they perform in a given pragmatic context. A *gestural* (deictic) function for Fillmore is one in which ‘a deictic expression ... can be properly interpreted only by somebody monitoring some physical aspect of the communication situation’, e.g., ‘I want you to put it **there**’ (cf. Lyons’ (1977) description of ‘the canonical situation of utterance’). An *anaphoric* use of ‘**there**’ will be ‘I drove the car to the parking lot and left it **there**’. ‘**There**’ is symbolically used for example in a telephoner’s inquiry ‘Is John **there**’ (Fillmore 1975:41). Two qualifications are however needed with regard to the handling of the (derivative) anaphoric/symbolic functions. First, although I will be dealing with temporal deictics as extensions of their basic spatial function, I have decided to discuss them under anaphora, largely because it is in the (anaphoric) discourse contexts that their pragmatic meaning is most apparent. This does not, however, invalidate the use of, for example, F nân to encode both ‘here/now’ (chapter 2) and H nan for both ‘there/then’ (chapter 3), depending on the respective function that these forms are performing. Second, as the reader will see in subsequent chapters, the symbolic function is also a problematic category in that it encompasses a far wider range of (discourse) uses than is encountered in the spatial and anaphoric domains. For instance, deictic forms are encountered in their symbolic role in contexts where they a) add narrative vividness to the story; b)

depict various hypothetical scenarios; c) encode speaker's empathy with the addressee; etc. It is within this broad category of the 'symbolic' that I subsume these discourse strategies. In this thesis, I use a (slightly modified) version of Fillmore's three-way functional categorisation (the same model used in Jaggar and Buba 1994).

### *1.3. Data sources*

The corpus for this study is drawn from a variety of sources, including: (a) published Hausa works, especially Imam (1966, 1970 [1939]) and Jaggar (1992b); (b) extracts from unscripted and scripted Hausa programmes (radio and television); and (c) taped interviews of conversations between Hausa (bilingual and monolingual) speakers and myself. All the examples cited, including (invented) uncoded extracts are based on (Standard) Kano Hausa, and have been checked with a variety of native speakers from various parts of northern Nigeria and Niger. And with the exception of A Hausa Reader (AHR), all tones (especially on deictics) derive from listening to speakers and checking for acceptability of alternative tone patterns. They are mostly in their thirties, of both sexes, and are bilingual Hausa-English. They include (in addition to myself): Mansur and Jummai Abdulkadir (Funtua/Katsina), Auwal Ibrahim (Katagum), Bello Abubakar (Katsina), Saleh Haliru (Kano), Umar Yusuf Karaye (Kano), Mustapha Chinade (Bauchi), Muhammad el-Nafaty (Kano/Bauchi), Sadiq Abubakar (Sokoto), Bello Bada (Sokoto), Fatima and A'isha Adamu (Sokoto/Yauri), Ummulhairi Dantata (Kano), Mansur Liman (Kano), Hassan Marafa (Sokoto), Malam Buba (Sokoto), Sa'adiyya Omar (Kano), and Bilkisu Labaran (Zaria/Katsina). In those (interesting) cases where informants' acceptability-judgements do not coincide, such differences are reported.

## *Notes*

---

<sup>1</sup> Some languages exploit other salient (deictic) orientational axes. For instance, Clayre (1973:74) has demonstrated that in Melanau (a Bornean language), the river is the primary orientational axis upon which its basic 'six-term set of spatial deictic reference' is anchored. However, Melanau also has a 'secondary orientational model constructed around the Personal Reference System' (p. 77). (See also Leonard 1982, 1985, 1987; Opalka 1982; Wilt 1987, for Swahili facts).

<sup>2</sup> There is a curious hypothesis reported in Ariel's (1995) review of Perkins (1992). It claims that '...the less complex the culture, the more semantic distinctions are grammaticalised in the field of deixis. The more complex the culture, the fewer the grammatical relations' (p. 455). Thus, the English deictic system reflects the complexity of the culture. However, Hausa, Japanese, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, etc., all of which have been reported to have more than the two-term basic system, presumably have less complex cultures according to this 'hypothesis'. But Ariel (1995) has rightly questioned how this conclusion could be arrived at without a discourse-based analysis of the use of deictic terms '...to check whether it is indeed statistically true that complex and noncomplex cultures differ with respect to the frequency of deictic reference' (p. 458).

## CHAPTER TWO

### **The Semantic-Pragmatic Features of Speaker-Centred Deixis In Hausa**

#### ***2.0. Introduction***

The purpose of this chapter is to further demonstrate the validity of the participant-based explanatory model formulated in Jaggar and Buba (1994) by focusing on a detailed study of the semantic-pragmatic features encoded in the speaker-centred deictic forms of the Hausa system of deixis — adverbial F nân ‘here’, pre-head demonstrative HL wannân+NP and post-head NP+ -n/r-nân/nân ‘this NP’. Previous discussion of these forms by Hausaists (both native and non-native speakers) is wholly inadequate in outlining the conditions under which they are felicitously used, resulting in descriptively inadequate taxonomies which do not capture even the most basic (person-centric) information encoded in these deictics. In this chapter, I provide a framework of analysis and present a unified discussion of the way in which the deictic adverbial F nân is pragmatically identical to the HL demonstrative wannân+NP:NP+-n/r-nân/nân. The analysis also extends to temporal adverbial phrases such as nân gâba (lit. ‘here/now in front’) ‘in future’, nân dà ... (lit. ‘here/now and’) ‘in the next...’, as well as the deictic pro-form hakà ‘thus’.

#### ***2.1. F nân = speaker-proximal adverbial***

The Standard (Kano) Hausa F nân locative adverbial is traditionally glossed as ‘here’, as distinct from H nan (chapter 3) which is glossed as ‘there’.<sup>1</sup> F nân is identical to its demonstrative counterparts, HL wannân+NP: NP+ -n/r-nân/nân (§2.2.), in serving to individuate the specific position of the speaker in a given communicative context.

### 2.1.1 Previous descriptions: F nân = [+proximal +visible]

In earlier grammars of Hausa (Robinson 1941[1897]:12; Taylor (1959 [1923]:80) only a rudimentary one-to-one identification was proposed, defining *NAN* [= nân/nan] simply as ‘**here**’, and thereby overlooking the tonally signalled semantic distinction between the two adverbials.

Abraham (1934:17) provides a more accurate form-meaning correlation model based on the co-variables [+proximal] and [+visible]. Abraham proposes that nearer distance is encoded by a falling tone [= nân], e.g. kadà kà zoo nân ‘don’t come **here**’, naa ga kaayaa nân ‘I saw a load **here**’, gàa ni nân fa ‘I’m **here**’. He was equally aware of the important temporal function of deictic nân, where it is used as a zero-point for a projective context, e.g. nân gàba ‘in future’. Bargery’s (1934, ([1993]) :814) dictionary simply defines nân as ‘**here**’, e.g. àjìyee shi nân, ‘place it **here**’, kàawoo shì nân, ‘bring it **here**’.

Kraft and Kirk-Greene (1973:52) propose that F nân means ‘**here**’, i.e. close to the speaker, e.g. gàa Audù nân ‘here’s Audu **here** (nearby)’, but with no appeal to the feature [+visible] mentioned above. Cowan and Schuh (1976:57) state that ‘very generally ... nân is normally used whenever ‘**here**’ is used in English ... e.g. yanàa nân ‘he is **here**’, but it overlaps a great deal with English ‘**there**’’. They also claim that ‘with a falling tone [= nân], the place indicated is in sight, e.g. Q: inaa takàrdarkà? ‘where’s your paper?’, A: gàa ta nân cikin littaaafi ‘**here** it is in my book (the student shows it to the teacher).’ In two recent dictionaries (Newman and Newman 1979:18; Newman 1990:122, 276), F nân is defined as [+proximal] and [+visible] and glossed as ‘**here** (nearby)’, e.g. inàa zàune à nân ‘I live **here**’.

Table 1 summarises these descriptions:

Table 1: summary of previous descriptions of F nân-adverbial

	Robinson	Abraham	Bargery	Kraft and Kirk Greene	Cowan and Schuh	Newman and Newman
F <u>nân</u>	(= <u>nan</u> ) ' <b>here</b> ' (no tones provided)	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. <u>kadà</u> <u>kà</u> <u>zoo</u> <u>nân</u> 'don't come <b>here</b> '	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. <u>àjìyee</u> <u>shi</u> <u>nân</u> 'place it <b>here</b> '	[+proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. <u>gàa</u> <u>Audù</u> <u>nân</u> 'here's Audu <b>here</b> ' (nearby)	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. <u>yanàa</u> <u>nân</u> '(there)', e.g. <u>yanàa</u> <u>nân</u> 'he is <b>here</b> '	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ' (nearby), e.g. <u>inàa</u> <u>zàune</u> <u>à</u> <u>nân</u> 'I live <b>here</b> '

What emerges from these descriptions is a simplistic view of F nân based on two major variables, [+visible] and/or [+proximal], which presumably relates to the spatial position occupied by the speaker at the moment of speaking (though this assumption is not explicitly stated in the literature).<sup>2</sup> Thus F nân is generally taken to pragmatically encode the following features:

(1) F nân = [+visible], also [+proximal], e.g. gàa shi nân 'he is here'

In what follows, I provide an alternative model of deictic orientation based on an understanding of the crucial person-centric role of F nân in relation to its intrinsic first-person, speaker-proximal projection. It is this primary first-person participant role which serves to locate a speaker-proximal referent in the three spheres of deictic function as outlined in Fillmore (1975:40),<sup>3</sup> and modified in Jaggar and Buba (1994): *spatial* (gestural), *anaphoric* and *symbolic* (see §1.2).

Table 2 outlines the use of F nân under these functions:

Table 2: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal F nân adverbial

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
F <u>nân</u>	speaker-proximal, e.g. [+ gesture], e.g. gâa shi <u>nân</u> kusa dà nii 'here it is <b>here</b> close to me.	(< speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wàatò dai muu <u>nân</u> ... 'in short, for us <b>here</b> (in this pre-mentioned area)...'  [cataphoric], e.g. shaawarâr dà zân baa kâ à <u>nân</u> ita cèè... 'my advice to you <b>here</b> is ...'  [temporal], e.g. <u>nân</u> gâba kâdân zaa kî jî sâakâmakon ga an à wâr 'soon, you'll hear the result of the interview'	(<< speaker-proximal) ... in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>nân</u> '...if I move <b>here</b> , he moves [t] <b>here</b> '

### 2.1.2. *Spatial F nân*

The most obvious way in which the speaker-proximal value of F nân can be seen is in the locating of a given referent in the physical space occupied by the speaker at the moment of utterance. This is the 'canonical situation of utterance' examined by Lyons (1977:637), where the interlocutors (= speaker and addressee)<sup>4</sup> are visible to each other, and the object of reference is in sight, hence implicating a 'one-one or one-many signalling in the phonic medium along the vocal auditory channel, with all the participants present in the same actual situation able to see one another and to perceive the associated non-vocal paralinguistic features of their utterances, and each assuming the role of sender and receiver in turn' (p. 637). See also Hanks (1989:117), Bühler (1990 [1934]), Hottenroth (1982:137), Clark (1973:34). The referent can therefore be pointed out to the addressee with an accompanying paralinguistic action, e.g. a pointing gesture with the hand, a simultaneous elevation of the chin and protrusion of the lips, etc. In fact, it is largely due to this (pointing) possibility that Rauh (1978:107ff) refers to the

deictic use of language in the following context as ‘situation-bound utterances’.<sup>5</sup>

Examples:

(2) [A wants B to tell him the location of A’s pen]:

a) A: ìnaa ka ga na ajìyee biirònaa?

‘where did you see me put my pen?’

b) B: gàa biirònkà nân inàa rìke dà shii<sup>6</sup>

‘here’s your biro **here**, I’m holding it’

B’s response will typically be accompanied by the gesture of holding the pen in his hand for A to see and/or subsequently handing it over to him.<sup>7</sup> The same possibility exists in a context where the referent’s identity may be known and the referent may even be visible, but not immediately identifiable by the speaker as in (3b) below:

(3) [A arrives looking for a certain Kallamu whom he cannot pick out from among the gathered crowd]:

a) A: ’yan’uwaa, dàgà cikinkù wàa nee nèe Kàllamù?

‘hey folks, who is Kallamu from among you?’

[B responds touching himself on the chest]:

b) B: gàa ni nân, tàaraa koo baashì?

‘I’m **here**, a fine or an (unpaid) loan?’

A’s attention will shift from the crowd to the individuated referent whom he can now associate with the name Kallamu. Of course, another person close to (but not touching) the speaker of (3b) could point the referent out to the speaker of (3a):

(4) gàa shi nân zàune cikinmù

‘he’s **here**, in our midst’ [points out the referent sitting further away]:

thus signifying the spatial proximity of the referent to the speaker of (4). In certain situations, the speaker may even use F nân with an accompanying foot gesture, which now assumes the role of a definite location specifier, especially where the speaker is fairly certain of the position of the referent, but cannot see it at the moment of utterance. A typical context is a land dispute requiring resolution through the visitation of a court representative, in order to determine the exact demarcation originally drawn between two properties:

(5) [stamping his feet several times, a complainant identifies the original

location of a sign, say a stone, used to separate two plots, but which is now not visible]:

kaa ga nân indà nakèe bugà kafaataa, tòò à nân nee akà kafà iyaakaa  
tsàkaanin fiilàayenmù

‘you see **here** where I’m stamping my feet, well, **here** is the location of the sign separating our plots’

Extract (6) below exemplifies a similar orientation, in which speaker-proximal F nân can be accompanied by both a foot movement and a pointing finger in a gesture of defiance, as if to protect what is considered as one’s territory :

(6) [an argument erupts between A and B, and B dismisses A’s threat]:

B: à nân ka tarar dà nii, tòò kuma à nân zaa kà bar nì

‘you met me **here**, and you’ll leave me **here** (i.e. I call your bluff)’

In extracts (7)-(8), both speaker and addressee are located in the same place, and in addition to its speaker-proximal value, F nân expresses a certain emotional attitude of the speaker towards the addressee and/or specified place:

(7) [speaker is irritated by addressee's presence]:

mèe ka zoo yîi nân kuma?

'what're you **here** for again?'

(8) [speaker has warned addressee against sitting idly by the roadside, and he's there again]:

bàa naa cêe kadà ìn saakè ganinkà à nân bàakin tiitì ba?

'didn't I say I must never again see you **here** by the roadside?'

And (9) shows how F nân is closely connected to the speaker's position.

(9) [patient points out the areas of pain in his body to the doctor]:

nân dà nân kèe yi minì ciwòò

'the pain is **here** and [**t**]here'

In certain contextual uses, F nân may serve to shift the centre of orientation from a non-visible object to an analogous (visible) referent, which then serves the purpose of encoding the relevant cues for associating the deictic act with its origo. Klein (1978) has termed this usage 'analogische Deixis', where as Rauh puts it, 'the centre of orientation is established not in a space reconstructed cognitively but in one represented by a concrete object which functions as an analog' (Rauh, 1983b:50). Consider examples (10)-(12):

(10) [A indicates a point on a map to B]:

gàa mu nân yànzù, àmmaa nân mukèe sôo mù kai kàafin raanaa tà faadî  
'we are **here** now, but we want to be **here** before sundown (sunset)'

(11) [A and B are examining their school photos]:

nii nèe nân, kai kuma gàa ka nân, sânnan gàa Hàliimà nân  
'**here** I am, and here you are **here**, and here is Halima **here**'

(12) [A describes the condition of an accident victim by pointing to a part of his own leg]:

ta nân akà yankè kafâr taasà  
'his leg was amputated **here**'

Coulmas (1982:213) has referred to a similar language strategy in the use of speaker-based *ko* in Japanese to point to a position on a map. But such examples do not exhaust the ways in which F nân '**here**' is intimately bound to a speaker's position. It is possible, for example, to conceive of varying degrees of proximity of the referent to the speaker's location, such that the speaker may not be able to touch or sometimes even see the actual referent. Thus, F nân may be used to denote not only the actual space occupied by the speaker at the coding (speech act) time, but also any other space which s/he may construe to be relevant to such proximal individuation, e.g.:

(13) [A meets B whom he has known for some time, but is unaware that they share the same locality]:

a) A: àshee kai maa nân kakèe dà zamaa?  
'oh, so you live **here** as well?'

b) B: ii, ai naa jumàa nân

‘yes, and I’ve been **here** for some time’

One enclosure within another may have speaker-proximal value, if it is contextually appropriate for the speaker to signal proximity, e.g.:

(14) [mother and son are at home, but not in the same room. And she calls out]:

Mother: kai Muusaa! Muusaa! ìnaa kakèè?

‘Musa! Musa! where are you?’

Son: nà’am, gàa ni nân cikin wannàn òfàakìì<sup>8</sup>

‘yes, I’m **here**, in **this** (other) room’

(15) [mother calls upon her daughter]:

Mother: Zàinabù! Zàinabù!

‘Zainabu! Zainabu!’

Daughter: nà’am, gàa ni nân zaurèn dakàa

‘yes, I’m **here** in the grinding hut’

F nân may be combined with the deictic proform hakà ‘thus, **this**, so, etc.’, to form a complex directional speaker-grounded deictic expression, e.g.:

(16) [A is not sure about the direction previously given to him by B, and asks again]:

a) A: shîn nân hakà ka cêe ìn bi zuwàa jaami’<sup>9</sup>àa?

‘did you say I should follow **here/this way** to the university?’

b) B: nân hakà dai na cêe kà bi har zuwàa can

‘I said you should follow **here** right up to there’

In (16) above, A and B may be physically located at the intersection at which the direction is being given, in which case each of them may point towards a different direction, but still use F nân to situate their location on the same speaker-orientational axis. It may also be the case that a map is displayed in front of them, such that it serves as a spatial reference point upon which they can anchor spatial F nân. Both of these interpretations are available in determining the deictic orientation of F nân in (17):

(17) [speaker indicates how far the clearing of the bush should go]:

kaa ga dàgà nân zuwàa nân har àbin dà ya kai cân, sàaree

‘you see, from **here** to **here**, right up to there, clear (it)’

F nân is also typically used as a pro-locative adverbial to map the goal of a verb of motion directed towards the location of the speaker, e.g.:

(18) [speaker calls someone towards him]:

zoo nân<sup>9</sup>

‘come **here**’

(19) [speaker instructs the addressee to bring the baby to him]:

kàawoo shì nân

‘bring him **here**’

and can equally be used with verbs indicating motion away from the speaker’s physical location, as in (20)-(21):

(20) [speaker threatens to leave if his request is not met]:

zân ficèè dâgà nân ìdan bà kù yi shiruu ba

'I'll leave (from) **here**, if you don't keep quite'

(21) [speaker insists]:

bàa zân dâgàa dâgà nân ba, sai an biyaa nì laadar aikìinaa

'I'm not going to move from **here** until I'm paid for the work done'

In the above contexts (20)-(21), only F nân is possible, its use signifying a speaker-proximal strategy for picking out a coding place (normally, the speaker's location). It is significant to remark that gestures can form a crucial delimitative aid in spatial deictic encoding, for as we have seen in many of the contextual information accompanying F nân extract in this section, the speaker often uses these 'extralinguistic' features to further direct and/or re-orient the addressee's attention to a referent object. This deictic (performative) function of gestures (*spatial* in this dissertation) has been variously described as *demonstratio ad oculos* (Bühler 1990 [1934], 1982:12), *extralinguistic deixis* (Searle 1959:96), *Real Deixis* (Harweg 1968:167), *deixis at its purest* (Lyons 1973:10), and *gestural* (Fillmore 1975:40).

What is constant about the choice and use of F nân is this characteristic associative act of pointing used by the speaker to locate the referent object. But the fact that a deictic form like F nân may be used in a non-spatial discourse context is sufficient to indicate that gestures are to be seen as additional 'sign posts', and not indispensable to the process of deictic encoding. Maclaran (1982:191) talks of gestures and deictic forms as acting 'in tandem'. We have also seen that F nân exhibits a capacity to collocate with essentially presentative and/or local spatial deictics, thereby specifying the delimitation of the usage of F nân in the 'canonical situation of utterance'. Its participant orientation is firmly anchored

on the speaker, for whom all referents coded with F nân point to his/her 'space'. This space is to be defined as both physical and psychological. In the following section, I deal with aspects of the deictic interpretation of speaker-proximal F nân where the 'pointing' is achieved by means other than gestures.

### ***2.1.3 Anaphoric F nân***

The basic spatial meaning of F nân 'here [near me-the-speaker]' is also manipulated to anaphorically identify referents in terms of their location within what Lyons (1977:657ff.) calls a given 'universe-of-discourse'.<sup>10</sup> Anaphoric cross-reference is crucially dependent on the co-text for interpretation, and these discourse deictic usages of F nân can be related to, and explained in terms of, the basic notion of speaker-proximal spatial deixis — cf. the comparable discourse uses of English 'here'. Notice, however, that there is an explicit shift of the centre of orientation from an audio-visual, face to face participants' encounter to the textual world here. Rauh (1978:17) speaks of 'textual deixis' to describe an encoder's 'momentary situation within the course of the text, considered either temporal or local with respect to which either temporal or local domains of the textual context are determined' (p. 48). Fillmore's (1975:70) and Lakoff's (1974) term for this usage is 'discourse deixis', all of which fit into my anaphoric sphere of deictic description. And the fact that in many languages, e.g. Vietnamese, Guugu Yimidhirr, Paumari, and Mohawk (see Booij, Lehman and Mugdan, and the associated references in [Rauh 1980:44]), the same (spatial) form is used to anchor what Bühler (1990 [1934]: 140), 1982:12) calls *imagination-oriented deixis* (*Deixis am Phantasma*) is further evidence that the localistic (deictic field) theory has a lot of interesting things to say about deixis in general. And one of the major premises of this theory of deixis is that all kinds of deictic phenomena are derivable from a basic spatial notion.<sup>11</sup> Examples (22)-(26) illustrate the speaker-proximal derived anaphoric use of F nân:

(22) [writer explains the social context of his novel]:

talakaawaa suu ya kàmaatà sù zoo sù canjà al'amuràa kânsù ... tòo àmmaa à nân an takàitaa shi nèe à kân ma' àikàtan gwamnatì

'the poor should be the ones to come out ... and change things by themselves... but **here** (i.e. in this novel), it is confined to (a description of the role of ) government officials'

(23) [speaker describes to an interviewer the relatively less harmful effect of the farming that affected northern Nigeria in the 1970s]:

...wàatò dai, muu nân , Allàh yaa saukaakar dà àl'amàrii

'...in short, for us **here** (i.e. in this pre-mentioned area), the situation was less distressing'

(24) [speaker reaches an important part of his discussion]:

tôo à nân sai à tsayàa ài nazàrii kân lamàrîn

'well, let's pause **here** to cast a critical eye on the issue'

(25) [judge divides inherited camels between the disputing brothers]:

a) A: wàare shidà. Na cêe koo bà à kwàaree kà ba

'take six aside. I hope you've not been short-changed'

b) B: ìnaa fa kwàaraa à nân

'there's no short-change **here** (i.e. it is a fair division)'

(26) [broadcaster continues the narration]:

jàma' àa dai sun gálàabaità ainùn à Nàajeeriyàa ... tòo nân maa kuma dàlilân bàa à bòoye sukè ba

‘people are really suffering in Nigeria ... and **here** too the reasons are not obscure’

In (22)-(26) the deictic proximal F nân ‘**here**’ refers to the speaker-established proposition in the immediately preceding clause. As long as F nân is employed by the speaker, the intention will clearly be to underscore the continuity or flow of an immediately established frame of reference, and in this case, a highly salient set of propositions. H nan (chapter 3, §3.2.2.) could be used as a deictic substitute for F nân in (22), (25) and (26), but its selection would force the addressee to relate the present information to a proposition or statement made at some distance in the prior discourse. In (23), the subject pronoun muu ‘we’<sup>12</sup> is deictically used to encode a speaker-proximal reference, reinforced by the choice of F nân.<sup>13</sup> As for (24), F nân is deployed in a cataphoric capacity, although its antecedent is clearly the whole of the prior text. Thus, the choice of speaker-based F nân in these contexts, is crucial evidence that F nân requires speaker-activation (coding at the moment of utterance) for it to be felicitous, in contrast to H nan which does not (see chapter 3). Cf. too:

(27) [The London-based speaker/broadcaster has been describing the case of a prominent Nigerian who has moved to Britain]:

tòò, à duk lookàcin zamansà à nân Birtaaniyà dai, Ùumarù Dikkò yaa shaa naanàatà cêewaa shii bàì sàaci kudfii nairàa miliyàn bìlaa àdadìn ba ta hanyàr gàdàa-gadar shìnkàafaa (AHR:2)

‘and throughout his stay **here** in Britain, Umaru Dikko has insisted that he did not siphon millions of naira through rice deals’

In (27) the use of the speaker-proximate deictic nân not only anaphorically picks up on the previous mention of Britain, but also provides the additional

implicational information that the speaker is based in Britain at the time of speaking.

Speaker-proximal F nân 'here' can also be used as a strategy for cataphorically anticipating new information,<sup>14</sup> as in (28)-(32):

(28) [a policeman advises a complainant whose wife has left home]:

tòo, nii dai, shaawaràr dà zân baa kà à nân ita cèe... [TG]

'well, my advice to you **here** is...'

(29) [reporter summarising a speech delivered at a festival]:

shùugàbân yaa taboo màgàngànuu dà daamaa dàngàne dà matsaloolin kasan nàn. Tòo à nân gàa kàdàn dàgà cikinsù

'the President touched on a number of issues concerning the nation. And **here** are a few from among them'

(30) [speaker is describing the very exorbitant price of fuel in his area]:

in yànzù ka jee nân dà akèe cèe wà Kwalkwalaawaa, zaa kà tarar anàa sayar dà galàn nairàa tàlàatin

'even now, if you go over **here** to Kwalkwalawa (area), you'll find fuel being sold at thirty naira a gallon'

(31) [A and B are radio broadcasters anchoring a light entertainment programme transmitted to various parts of the world]:

kuma, à nân Landàn nee à wata ùnguwaà dà akèe kiràa Streatham, nân kudancin Landàn ...

'and, it's **here** in a London district called Streatham, **here** in the south of London ...'

(32) [speaker continues his description]:

wàatòo shii Gareth, lauyà nee à nân Mid-Glamorgan ...

‘Gareth is a solicitor, **here** in Mid-Glamorgan ...’

where anticipatory nân refers cataphorically forward to information later in the text.

The basic locative speaker-proximal ‘**here**’ value of F nân is also exploited in the temporal domain, where it is used as a cohesion marker to identify the time of an action/event relative to the coding time, with a meaning equivalent to the English temporal deictic adverbial ‘now’. In other words, the literal speaker-proximal spatial meaning of F nân is extended to the temporal domain, where proximity in space is analogically transferred to proximity in time:<sup>15</sup>

(33) [A needs to know from B when to return for an answer to his request]:

a) A: yàushè zân daawoo kèe nan?

‘when should I come back then?’

b) B: dàgà nân zuwàa kàrshen wannàn maakòo

‘between **now** and the end of this week’

(34) [‘Dan Shaidfan vows not to forgive Mansur]:

ai nii dà gaafàrtaa mà Mànsûr har àbàdaa. Dàgà nân mun faarà gàabaa kèe nan (MJC:106)

‘I’ll never forgive Mansur. Our enmity starts from **now**’

(35) [A wants to assure a client on a work’s progress]:

zân kammàlà aikìn nân bàà dà jumàawaa ba

‘I’ll finish the work **soon** [after **now**]’

The use of F nân in (33)-(35) shows the very close affinity of the deictic interpretation of ‘**here**’ and ‘**now**’, since both English glosses can be used to define F nân’s local (= ‘**here**’ in 28-32) and temporal (= ‘**now**’ in 33-35) extension in the anaphoric domain. It is significant to point out that the **here** and **now** encoded by F nân in (28)-(35) is the world of discourse that the author-narrator creates by that process of deictic transference which Lyons (1968) has used to justify his assertion that anaphoric reference necessarily points to a basic (deictic) spatial template in the real world. It appears, therefore, that what we are dealing with here is not just an indication of the ‘**here** and **now**’ meaning of F nân with respect to discourse deixis, but also its subjective speaker projection. There is a sense in which we can analyse (33)-(35) as reflecting the degree to which the speaker wishes to express a personal commitment to the proposition encoded in the utterance, thereby empathising with the addressee for whom the statement will be a timely and reassuring one<sup>16</sup> — cf. dàgà nan, where H nan is used to anaphorically pick up a temporally remote reference point (chapter 3, §3.2.3). Note that there are other ways in which the speaker can express (33), for example, without using the pro-temporal nân, but the speaker’s answer will sound rather evasive, dismissive, or even rude, e.g.:

(36) zuwàa kàrshen wannàn maakòo  
‘toward the end of this week’

In this connection, it is useful to point out that Hausa is not alone in employing a single deictic item (F nân) to encode both pro-locative ‘**here**’ and pro-temporal ‘**now**’. Jaggar and Buba (1994:416) refer to Anderson and Keenan (1985:295) who document other languages, e.g. Wik-Munkan (Pama-Nyungan, Queensland), in which use of the same spatial and temporal deictics reflect the fact that time and space dimensions are conceptualised as parallel. Haviland (1991:41) also shows how Zinacantec Tzotzil (Mayan, Mexico) encode spatial and temporal reference

with a single lexical item. Lyons (1979:92) notes the ‘very close semantic connection between ... pro-locative and pro-temporals’. See also Fuchs (1993), Talmy (1988), Casad (1975) and Colinson (1937) for more details.

An analogous strategy involves speaker-proximal F nân with a following time-adverbial to specify a more precise temporal point than is coded by the adverb alone. It also serves to extend the more restricted, literal spatial meaning of F nân (proximity in time = proximity in space), to signify the speaker’s involvement in and/or knowledge of the temporal event, for which s/he is surprised at the addressee’s obvious ignorance, as in (37)-(38):

(37) [A and B are discussing the recent birth of C’s child and A asks]:

a) A: af, yàushè ta sàuka nèe?

‘oh, when did she deliver?’

[B replies]:

b) B: ai nân jiyà nee ta haihù

‘well, it was **just yesterday** she gave birth’

(38) [speaker A asks addressee B]:

a) A: yàushè nee zaa kù tàfi?

‘when are you going?’

[B replies]:

b) B: ai nân gòobe nèe zaa mù yi haramàa

‘well, it’s **as soon as** tomorrow that we’re setting off’

In (37b) the speaker further delimits the deictic day-word jiyà ‘yesterday’ with a preceding (speaker-proximal) F nân in order to confirm his personal knowledge

about the exact day the referent gave birth (and possibly clarify A's misunderstanding of the precise date of birth). Inclusion of F nân also serves to further narrow down the temporal immediacy of the event (cf. Eng. 'just yesterday'). Note the aspectual coding in (37)-(38) above, in which nân jiyà co-occurs with the focus ('relative') perfective ya and nân gòobe with the future zaa, showing once again that deixis is the key interface between language and context.<sup>17</sup> Fragment (39) also illustrates the correlation between a deictically-specific past time point and the use of the focus perfective:

(39) [speaker points out]:

tò àmmaa nân bàara nèe gwamnatin Nàajeeriyàa ta bayyàna manufoofin  
saabon tsaarìn sìyaasàa

'but it was **only** last year that the Nigerian government outlined the  
framework for a new political system'

where F nân is again used to link the relative temporal proximity of the event to the time of speaking, as well as to the inference that the speaker is specifying personal knowledge.

F nân also combines with other spatio-temporal adverbials to encode the future in relation to the coding time, i.e. the time at which a speaker utters a statement. An instance of this usage is nân gàba 'hereafter, in future' (gàba is an adverbial place-deictic meaning 'in front'):

(40) [tradesman promises a client]:

zân kammàlà aikìn nân gàba<sup>18</sup>

'I'll finish the work (some time) **in the future**'

(41) [a news item on the Bosnian crisis]:

zaa à miikà shirìn gà Saabiyaawaa nân gàba à yâu  
'the plan will be presented to the Serbs **later** today'

(42) [a reassuring report on a government's next line of action]:

nân gàba kàdán, gwamnati zaa tà bayyàná sàakàmakon bìncìken dà ta  
gudaanar  
'**soon**, the government will reveal the result of the inquiry it conducted'

The information encoded by (40)-(42) is that the zero-point (i.e. the centre of orientation) upon which the temporal reference is anchored is the moment at which the speaker produces the utterance, hence the use of the speaker-based deictic strategy. A similar strategy is exploited by the speaker in (43), where F nân follows the deictic adverbial gàba to code essentially the same temporal projection (from the time of utterance) as nân gàba 'in future':

(43) [Sususu's wife has just been told of the foolish thing that Shashasha was conned into doing by his wife, and the following dialogue ensues]:

a) A: ... lallee mijìn nan naakì yaa amsà suunansà  
'that husband of yours has really lived up to his name'

[wife B responds]:

b) B: ìnaa kikà san yaa amsà suunansà tükùn? Tsàyaa dai kì ga àbin  
dà zài àuku gàba nân (MJC:207)  
'how do you know that he's true to his name just yet? Just wait and see what's going to happen **soon**'

Another temporal usage in this connection is the exploitation of speaker-proximal nân (+ dà 'with') to code an interval with a definite end-point starting from the

moment of utterance production. F nân in such a context also provides the means for making cataphoric reference, thereby adding to text cohesion,<sup>19</sup> hence to utterance comprehension. Consider (44)-(46):

(44) [a report on the growth of telephone network in Africa]:

anàa sâa râi nân dà shèekaràa bìyar, bugà wayàr tsàkaanin kasàashen  
kudancin Afirkà zâi yi sauƙii (AHR:44)

'it is expected that **within** five years, telephoning between southern African countries will be easier'

(45) [A explains to B a possible option for a woman who is fined by the court]:

mîsaalli, tanàa iyà cêewaa, tîo nii bâa ni dà shii; nân dà shèekàruu hàmsin  
zân dingà biyàn kwabòo-kwabòo

'for instance, she could say, well, I don't have it; **over the next** fifty years, I'll be paying a penny (at a time)'

(46) [a report on the next round of elections]:

zaa à gudaanar dà saabon zàabee nân dà wàtànnii shidà

'a new election is to be held **within** six months **from now**'

The exploitation of forward-pointing pro-temporal F nân in the above context relates to the fact that, like nân gàba 'hereafter, in future' above, the compound time conjunction nân dà 'within' is normally used to specify a future time event with reference to the coding-time (not the reference-time). The presence of F nân in these complex temporal adverbial compounds ties in neatly with the theoretical model proposed in Jaggar and Buba (1994) — since they are speaker-based strategies, they are prototypically used to refer to the time at which the speaker actually produces the utterance, i.e. the coding time, and never the reference time

which is specified by H nân (chapter 3 [§3.2.2.]), and sometimes by H can (chapter 4 [§ 4.2.2.]).

#### 2.1.4. *Symbolic F nân*

In his Lectures, Fillmore (1975:40) allows for a *symbolic* (non-spatial, non-anaphoric) function of deixis in a communicative context, and identifies it as one requiring for its interpretation the knowledge of an ‘aspect of the speech communication situation’ (p. 40). An example of the kind of usage that Fillmore has in mind is ‘Is Johnny **there**?’ over a telephone line, since the use of ‘**there**’ encodes neither a spatial nor an anaphoric reference. What Fillmore seems to be underscoring here is the very wide range of interpretations that a deictic term can come to acquire outside its basic spatial (and anaphoric) usages. Even within this more subjective deictic category, the major motivation for the choice of symbolic F nân is directly related to its basic speaker-centredness.

In a narrative context, symbolic F nân can be used to underscore or comment on the scenario of the mainline narrative. In such instances, it is the speaker’s subjective position that is assumed to be the pivot — hence the symbolic usage is an instrument for visualising what is essentially an ethereal state of affairs. Consider (47), where the imaginative resources of the animals are being harnessed to seek ways of escape from human predators:

(47) [the rabbit is offering his thoughts on ways of escape from man’s attention]:

... kaa ga in an ritsàa ka nân, sai kà bullèè nân; in an datsèè nân, sai kà bulloo  
nân  
‘thus, if you’re cornered **here**, you break out [**t**]**here**, if you’re blocked **here**,  
you come out [**t**]**here**’

In (47), it is the speaker [rabbit] who serves as the reference point, having projected himself as a centre for the construction of the narrative scenario — what Bühler (1990 [1934]:140ff.) and Anderson and Keenan (1985:278) call ‘imagination-oriented deixis’<sup>20</sup> and ‘psychological proximity’ respectively. The use of speaker-proximal F nân in (47) is, therefore, quite appropriate, and, like English ‘**here**’, allows the speaker to create a more vivid visualisation and depiction of the scenario in question. Extracts (48)–(51) illustrates the same F nân used as a speaker-projection strategy (see Yule, 1996:12f):

(48) [The narrator describes the secretive way in which an affair is taking place between a man and his former fiancée, whose husband has moved south in search of work]:

ita kèe fitôwaa, in ta duubàa nân, ta duubàa nân bà tà ga koowaa ba sai tà cêe ‘wùcee-wùcee’

‘she’ll come out, if she looks **here**, and looks [**t**]here without seeing anyone, she then says ‘come in, come in’

(49) [two people are trying to catch the narrator, and he describes his frantic movement to avoid them]:

na yi nân tarài-tarài, na yi nân tarài-tarài, duk gàbaanaa nàa faadûwaa

‘I moved **here**, I moved [**t**]here, really frightened’

(50) [narrator describes his resistant stand against being pushed around]:

in akà yi dà nii nân òn yi nân<sup>21</sup>

‘if I’m pushed **here**, I pull [**t**]here’

(51) [ speaker is trying to justify his supposed prudence in the face of criticism from his older sister that he’s neglecting his parents by claiming that his wife is expecting a baby]:

a) A: yàaya, in ta haihù, sôo kikèè ìn jee nân ìn ci baashii, ìn jee nân ìn  
 ci baashii, ìn jee nân ... [TG]  
 ‘sister, if she gives birth, would you like me to go **here** for a loan, to  
 go [[**t**]**here** for a loan, to go [**t**]**here**...’

[sister is not convinced, and still insists her brother is spending too much  
 money on his wife — the brother feels she is shifting the goal posts to suit  
 herself]:

b) B: bàa hakà ba nèè, yàaya; in na bulloo nân kî cêe bàa hakà ba, in  
 na bulloo nân kî cêe bàa hakà ba [TG]  
 ‘it’s not so sister; if I come out **here**, you say it’s not so, if I come out  
 [**t**]**here**, you say it’s not so’

In (51b), deictic hakà ‘thus’ is also used symbolically together with F nân. And  
 like F nân, it may be used to cataphorically specify a referent within the following  
 context, e.g.: baayan an nàtsu, an yi shiruu, na shaarè kasaa, sai kà cêe màì shirìn  
hadî, na zaanà wata àlaamàa hakà...: (RBJ:9) ‘when it became calm and quite, I  
 cleared the sand, like someone preparing to evoke mystical powers, and drew a  
 sign like **this**...’. Notice that in (51), both speaker and addressee may be located  
 in the same place, and indeed be face-to-face (hence the possibility if not necessity  
 for an accompanying gesture), but the speaker can still evoke symbolic F nân to  
 convey the degree to which s/he feels personally involved and at the centre of the  
 conversation. Notice also that Hausa, unlike English, can express the deictic  
 ‘**here/there**’ contrast with the same F nân adverbial. Some speakers, however,  
 prefer to use speaker/hearer distal F cân ‘**there**’ (chapter 4 [§4.2.3]) to mark the  
 contrast, possibly a legacy of their exposure to English in which ‘**here**’ and  
 ‘**there**’ (not ‘**here**’ again) are the only means for conveying such contrast e.g.:

(52) [a ceasefire between Bosnian Croats and Muslims has been violated]:

an karyàa ta ta hanyàr lùgùden wutaa nân dà cân

'it was broken by **sporadic** (**here** and **there**) mortar fire'

(53) [Umaru's teacher usually hands him back his homework with the following words]:

kaa ci à nân, kaa faadî à cân (Gemu:13)

'you passed **here**, you fail **there**'

(54) [narrator describes Binta's moving to and fro, as she looks after the house]:

Bintà taa faarà hidimaa kèe nan à cikin gidaa. Tà kai nân, tà kai cân  
(Gemu:14)

'Binta then set about the house chores. She will go **here**, she will go **there**'

In certain contexts F nân can be used symbolically by the speaker, either with the intention of withholding information or in the belief that the addressee does not require any specific information about the object of enquiry, as in (55):

(55) [A meets B on the street and enquires]:

a) A: ìnaa zuwàa?

'where are you going?'

b) B: zân jee nân

'I'm off [**t**]here'

In (55b) the speaker is deliberately evasive in his response, and uses symbolic F nân in a non-localisable sense to avoid specifying his intended destination.

Interestingly, a speaker can also use F nân to emphasise an idea about which s/he feels strongly, but which was previously discredited by the addressee. In this case,

F nân projects the speaker's emotional attachment to an earlier expressed proposition, and so can be used to restate his/her case in a more forceful personal manner, as illustrated in the symbolic choice of F nân in (56):

(56) [speaker is re-affirming his viewpoint which has previously been discounted by addressees, but has now turned out to be true]:

Allàh yaa nuunàa mukù halinkù... nân, nân, nân, nân, baa àbin dà bà kù  
wâa yaarinyàr nan ba...nân na zoo na cêe dà kuu bàa hakà akèe harakàr  
duuniyàa ba [TG]

'God has repaid you in your terms... **here, here, here, here**...you've done so much [harm] to that girl ... it was **here** that I came to say to you that this not the way to behave'.

Notice that the choice of F nân in (56) is not conditioned by any reference to the 'here' and 'now' of the spatio-temporal location of speaker and addressees. In fact, they are located in a place other than the one in which the speaker admonished the addressees in the first instance. In other words, F nân can only serve to symbolically indicate a re-assertion of his emotional closeness/commitment to his previously dismissed view. This usage illustrates the emotional-empathetic function of deixis.

In this section, I have examined the traditional analysis of F nân and provided an alternative pragmatic explanation. Previous descriptions of F nân have been superficial, leading to an enormous gap in our understanding of its usage in context. I have demonstrated that the significant pragmatic information encoded by F nân is contextually dependant on its interpretation as a speaker-proximal deictic, and that it is this inherent speaker orientation which serves to define the deictic coding of F nân in its (basic) *spatial* and (derivative) *anaphoric* (= *temporal*) and *symbolic* roles in Hausa.

**2. 2. Speaker-proximal HL wannàn, HLF (pl.) wadànnân (HHL wadànnàn) (+NP), NP+-n/-r-nân/nàn demonstratives**

Speaker-proximal demonstratives can occur either pre-head, in which case they have the form HL wannàn + NP ‘**this**’ (m./f./s.), and HLF wadànnân (also HHL wadànnàn) + NP (pl.) ‘**these**’, or post-head, in the form NP-definite determiner -nân/nàn (definite determiner = -n/-r/-n m./f./pl.) ‘**this, these**’. This section will be concerned with outlining the referential-pragmatic features of these deictic demonstratives, using the Jaggar and Buba (1994) model. I shall show that these demonstrative forms encode the same contextual speaker-proximal reference as the related adverbial F nân ‘**here**’. As I have shown in the treatment of F nân, this is a multi-faceted phenomenon, and the significant cognitive information encoded in these deictic forms has either been misunderstood or overlooked by Hausaists. For while the general formula proposed by Hausaists of assigning a (speaker) proximal value to HL wannàn etc. holds, it is not clear how this characterisation relates to functions in referential domains other than the oft-mentioned [+visible] property, which characterises most of the previous descriptions of these demonstratives.

**2. 2. 1. Previous descriptions**

Robinson (1925:12-14) exemplifies the simplified picture of (presumably) speaker-proximal HL wannàn, glossed as English ‘**this**’. Robinson proposes that ‘wannan... wadannan... nan’ refer to objects ‘near by’ (tones and vowel length not marked in the original), e.g. ‘wannan littafi or littafin nan’ = ‘**this** book’.

Bargery (1934:814, 1081) describes the Hausa demonstratives as either pronouns or determiners (adjectives) depending on the presence or absence of an overt noun, e.g. (pre- and post-head variants):



(57) wannàn bàa nàawa ba nèe

'**this one** is not mine'

(58) a) tàfi dà wannàn dookìi = b) tàfi dà dookì-n-nân

'take **this** horse away'

(59) aikì-n-nân bàa shi dà wùyaa

'**this** work is not hard

Abraham (1959:53-54, 1962:924) was one of the first Hausa scholars to identify the tonally signalled meaning-distinction for HL wannàn '**this**', and to assign a semantic-pragmatic criterion for its interpretation. Abraham (1959) represents the meaning of HL wannàn pictorially with two illustrations of a parrot and a horse in a 'downward' posture (p. 53). He then goes on to point out that both HL wannàn and its alternative post-head short form [NP+ -nàn/nân] mean '**this** ... (near us)', arguing that the 'tone *varies* in order to provide the combination *high low* [i.e. downwards]' (p. 53). Abraham (1959) identified the post-head demonstratives with the adverbial F nân and argued that the tonal variation of the forms [-nàn/nân] is conditioned by the tone on the final syllable of the noun to which it is attached by means of the (genitive) linker: if the final syllable is **high**, the initial H tone component of F nân is absorbed, leaving a L tone nàn, as in gàrii, 'town' —> gàri-n-nàn '**this** town, àku 'parrot' —> àku-n-nàn '**this** parrot'; but if the final syllable is **low**, then post-head nân remains F, e.g. dookìi 'horse' —> dookì-n-nân '**this** horse', jaakunàa 'donkeys' —> jaakunà-n-nân '**these** donkeys' (see also below). He also claimed that wannàn +NP may be used in place of NP+-n/r-nân/nàn, e.g. (cf. above examples) wannàn gàrii '**this** town', wannàn dookìi 'this horse', wadànnân jaakunàa 'these donkeys' (p. 54). As we shall see, however, these demonstrative forms differ semantically in a number of important ways. Abraham (1962) also notes the symbolic employability of HL wannàn, e.g.

wannàn yà dùubi wannàn, wannàn yà dùubi wannàn [with corrections to tense-aspect pronouns] ‘then they kept looking at one another, pair after pair’ (lit. ‘**this** (one) would look at **this** one, **this** (one) would look at **this** (one)’ ; wannàn yanàa bîn wannàn ‘all **this** in the right sequence’ (lit. ‘**this** (one) follows **this** (one)’ (p. 924). However, his post-head HL wannàn usage in #laasàfii (= ?lissaafii) wannàn ‘this counting’ (p. 924) is no longer attested in Hausa, assuming that it was an acceptable utterance at the time, as neither my informants nor I allow post-posed HL wannàn. Jaggar (1985b:175) too has suggested that demonstrative HL wannàn ‘can in fact be postposed’, although he acknowledges that ‘...no examples were found in the corpus’ (p. 175). (However, there is one attested (collocational) instance of a postposed full demonstrative in Hausa, and this is the LH wàccan form after the temporal adverb bàara ‘last year’ = bàara wàccan (lit. year **that**) ‘the year before last’ documented in chapter 4).

Cowan and Schuh (1976:56) write: ‘Hausa tends to use wannàn to refer to any single object which is fairly close to the speaker, even objects far enough away that we might use ‘**that/those**’ to designate them in English.’ In this respect, Cowan and Schuh are addressing the spatial function of the speaker-centred pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn. Cowan and Schuh also examine another facet of the meaning of these terms by proposing that ‘when referring to a concept, idea, statement, etc. about to be presented or just presented, wannàn is used’ (p. 57). In other words, there is a shift of function from a purely spatial domain to the anaphoric domain, where the deictic HL wannàn has a proximal anaphoric or cataphoric value. In the case of the spatial meaning of HL wannàn, Cowan and Schuh provide examples such as wannàn littaaifi nèe ‘**this** is a book’, and wannàn gàskiyaa nèe ‘**that**’s right’ in a discourse-anaphoric context. Another usage captured in Cowan and Schuh (1976:57) is the way in which the HL wannàn demonstrative can be used to stress or emphasise ‘the word in question’, which

according to the authors correspond to the contrastive use of English ‘**this** (one)’, ‘**that** (one)’, etc., as in (60a-c):

(60) a) [teacher asks a student]:

wannàn fensìr nee?

‘is **this** (one) a pencil?’

b) [student answers]:

#aa’àa, wannàn àlkalàmii nee

‘no, **this** (=that) (one) is a pen’

c) [finally, student points to the right object]:

wannàn shii nèe fensìr (p. 57)

‘**this** (one) is a pencil (i.e. this one, it is the pencil)’

Notice that for (60b) to be felicitous, the addressee-centred spatial deictic LH wànnan ‘**that**’ [near you the hearer] must be selected (see chapter 3), signalling a shift of deictic centre from the speaker’s position to the addressee’s — speaker-based HL wannàn ‘**this**’ is therefore anomalous in (60b).

Cowan and Schuh (p. 85) also exemplify the use of these demonstratives as determiners, which agree in number with the noun they pre-modify as in (61)-(63):

(61) [speaker redirects addressee]:

kujèerâr tanàa baayan wannàn ðaakîi

‘the chair is behind **this** hut’

(62) [speaker answers addressee]:

an dīnkà wannàn riigaa à Kàtsinà (p. 84)

‘**this** gown was sewn in Katsina’

(63) [speaker points to different objects]:

wadānnân kàftàanai kùwa dàgà Zaariyà akà zoo dà suu

‘as for **these** caftans, they are from Zaria’

In addition, Cowan and Schuh (1976) follow Abraham (1959:53-57) in explaining the morphological variation in the use of the post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn [**this** NP]: ‘when the noun ends in a high tone, nàn [has] a low tone [as in] audùga-r-nàn [**this** cotton **here**] ... [if] the noun ends in a low tone, nân [has] a falling tone ... naamà-n-nân [**this** meat **here**]’ (p. 165). Cowan and Schuh also distinguish between ‘[a] demonstratives referring to things in sight which one can point to, and [b] demonstratives referring to something mentioned or understood in a conversation or narrative’ (p. 298). The b-forms according to Cowan and Schuh, have a low-high tone reversal of the a-forms, as in (64)-(65):

(64) wànnan bàraawòo yaa kwaashèe manà kaayaa (p. 298)

‘**that** thief stole our goods’

(65) wannàn ita cèe makarantaa sòosai; wàccan makarkataa cèe (p. 298)

‘**this** (school where we are now) is the real school; **that** (school that you have just mentioned) is a place of deviation.’

In subsequent chapters (3 and 4), I shall show why any distinction between the demonstrative forms solely in terms of the [ $\pm$  visible] dichotomy is incorrect.

Bagari (1986:114) makes a similar distinction between the spatial demonstratives, lāmìiran nuunìn jìbìntakàa, and the referential ones lāmìiran tsookàcìi, defined in terms of a combination of their [ $\pm$ proximal,  $\pm$ visible] characteristics, i.e.:

(66) ‘àkwai lāmìiran nuunìn jìbìntakàa, wàatò wadàndà sukèe nuunì gà àbîn dà kèe kusa gà mài màganàa (wandà mài màganàa *koo mài jîi kèe iyà ganinsà koo tabàa shi à lookàcîn dà akèe màganàr [italics mine]*)’, e.g. wannàn yaaròn, ‘**this** boy’; wadànnân yàarân, ‘**these** boys’ (tones supplied) ‘there are demonstratives which show relationship, i.e. **those** that point out what is near to the speaker (which the speaker or hearer [sic]) can see or touch at the time of speaking’) (p. 114)

In chapter 3, it will be shown that such a semantic categorisation of the *WANNAN* (+NP), NP-*NAN* demonstrative forms is erroneous in its basic assumption<sup>22</sup> — addressee-proximal referents are coded by the tonally-distinct pre-head LH wànnan etc. In two recent Hausa dictionaries (Newman and Newman 1979:131-2; Newman 1990:275-7), HL wannàn is simply glossed as ‘**this, this one**’.

Galadanci (1969:283) gives greater weight to semantic-pragmatic considerations in his description of what he calls ‘demonstrative specifiers’. Specifically, he argues that ‘the tones of the demonstrative specifiers are largely semantically controlled, each item having different tone patterns associated with: a) different meanings, viz.: deictic ... or anaphoric; and b) position in relation to the speaker and person addressed’ (p. 283). Thus, pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn in wannàn rìigaa ‘**this** gown’, is deictically related to the position of the speaker, hence Galadanci’s description of the gown as ‘near me’. In this connection, Howeidý (1953:32) has claimed that the post-head demonstrative -nàn/nân strategy ‘rìiga-t-nàn’ ‘this gown’ ‘...is more popular and is preferable. The student, should, therefore, adhere to it as much as possible’. One of my tasks in

this thesis is to demonstrate that the ‘popularity’ of the post-head demonstrative strategy across all domains is a function of its distinct referential properties (never before specified). The person-centric approach I adopt in this thesis will fully account for the semantic and pragmatic analysis suggested by Galadanci.

Mohmed’s (1977 [chapter 4]) dissertation deals with a number of interesting semantic and pragmatic issues relating to the distinction between pre- and post-positional adjectives, but ignored the obvious word-order distinction between the speaker-proximal demonstrative HL wannàn and its post-head -nân/nàn variant. He also argues (wrongly) that there is a basic semantic [ $\pm$ visible] distinction between HL wannàn etc. (= ‘within sight’) and LH wànnan etc. (= ‘neither present nor within sight’) demonstratives (p. 145).

Jaggar (1985b:174) suggests that HL wannàn NP (= NP-n/-r-nân/nân) is used in Hausa ‘to map referents which are either physically visible or abstract and non-visible to the encoder or decoder, e.g. wannàn yaarò ‘**this** boy’ [+visible], vs. wannàn gaskiyaa ne ‘**this/that** is true’ (p. 174). He also pointed out that within the [-visible] anaphoric usage of HL wannàn, there is an abstract (=symbolic?) function, which the speaker may use to anchor an imaginary state of affairs, e.g. ... yà kai wannàn gàrii yà wucèe, yà kai wannàn yà wucèe ... ‘he arrives at **this** town and passes, and arrives at **this [that]** and passes’ (Imam 1970 [1939]:58, quoted in Jaggar (1985b:174f). However, Jaggar underestimated the high frequency of anaphoric HL wannàn beyond ‘direct speech contexts’. In this research, I show that, in fact, readers/narrators often appropriate the authorial voice, by presenting stories from their own perspective, and hence resort to speaker-proximal wannàn in narratives (like Imam’s Magana Jari Ce, vols. 1-3). I believe when Bühler (1990 [1934]: 99) echoes Brugman (1904) in talking about ‘the dramatic use of demonstratives’, he was alluding to the (present) speaker appropriation that happens when actors assume the persona of the character they

are dramatising. He quotes Brugman (1904:41): ‘... *dramatic* use is involved when demonstratives with a spatial or temporal meaning valid for spatial or temporal presence from the *standpoint of the speaker* occur in narration, similar to when the present is used instead of a past tense.’

In table 3 below, I tabulate the major claims of Hausaists with respect to the speaker-proximal deictic HL wannàn:

Table 3: summary of previous descriptions of HL wannàn, NP-n/r-nân/nàn demonstratives

	Bargery	Abraham	Cowan and Schuh	Bagari	Galadanci	Mohmed	Jaggar
HL <u>wannàn</u> (+NP)	speaker-proximal <u>tàfi</u> dà <u>wannàn</u> dookìi (= dookì-n <u>-nân</u> ) ‘take <b>this</b> horse away’	speaker-proximal <u>wannàn</u> ‘ <b>this</b> (near us)’, e.g. <u>wannàn</u> dookìi = dookì-n <u>n â n.</u> ‘ <b>this</b> horse’	[±visible], e.g. <u>wannàn</u> littaañi nee ‘ <b>this</b> is a book’; <u>wannàn</u> gaskiyaa nee ‘ <b>this/that</b> is true’	[+visible] <u>wannàn</u> yaaròn ‘ <b>this</b> boy (near us)’	speaker-proximal <u>wannàn</u> riigaa ‘ <b>this</b> gown (near me)’	[+visible] <u>wannàn</u> ( <u>wancàn</u> ) etc	[±visible], speaker-proximal, e.g. <u>wannàn</u> yaarò ‘ <b>this</b> boy’; <u>wannàn</u> gaskiyaa nee ‘ <b>this/that</b> is true’

In (§2.2.3)-(§2.2.5.), I provide a more accurate and detailed picture of the pragmatic interpretation of the speaker-proximal demonstratives. The following table is a summary of their main pragmatic features of these deictics:

**Table 4: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of HL wannàn, NP-n/r -nân/nàn demonstratives**

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Demonstrative (pre-head) <u>wannàn</u> + NP	speaker-proximal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. gàa <u>wannàn</u> maalàmii (# dà ka cêe ...) 'here's <b>this</b> teacher (# that you said...')	(< speaker-proximal) [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. yàayàa zân yi dà <u>w a n n à n</u> maalàmii? 'what am I going to do with <b>this</b> teacher'	(<< speaker-proximal) [±gesture], e.g. fàad'aa wajen <u>wannàn</u> bookaa, gàngàraa wajen <u>wannàn</u> maalàmii ... 'he would go to <b>this</b> sorcerer, and shift to <b>this</b> [that] Islamic teacher...'
Demonstrative (post-head) NP-n/r- <u>nân/nàn</u>	speaker-proximal [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. gàa maalàmi- <u>n-nân</u> (dà ka cêe ...) 'here's <b>this</b> teacher (that you said...')	(< speaker-proximal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ], [+ <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. yàayàa zân yi dà maalàmi- <u>n-nân</u> 'what am I going to do with <b>this</b> teacher?'	Not applicable

**2.2.2. HL wannàn etc. (+NP), NP + -nân/nàn = speaker-proximal demonstratives.**

Pre-nominal demonstrative HL wannàn (= pl. HLF wafànnân or HHL wafànnàn) is marked proximally in relation to the speaker (i.e. first person), as are the post-head demonstrative clitics -nân/nàn. Both forms are directly relatable to the F nân speaker-proximal adverbial.<sup>23</sup> Structurally, the post-head (determinative only) configuration is analysable as NP+ definite determiner + -nân, i.e. NP plus definite determiner (m./pl. = -n, f.= -ɪ) plus the cliticised F nân adverbial, and the pre-head long form HL wa-n-nàn is made up of the deictic formative wa- + linker + adverbial nân. Plural wa-dân-nân contains a dân pluralizer (infix). The tones on pre-head HL wannàn and post-head nân/nàn result from an independently motivated phonological rule by which the initial H tone of the HL = F nân spreads leftwards and is absorbed into a preceding H tone syllable, i.e. underlying H-HL \*wa-n-nân —> HL wannàn, and LH-HL \*bùhu-n-nân 'this sack' —> LH-L bùhu-n-nàn, following H tone absorption. However, this process does not affect heads

with final L tone syllables, i.e. yaarò-n-nân ‘**this** boy’. (See Newman 1992:69ff., and Newman 1995:766ff., Newman (in press) for details).

### 2.2.3. *Spatial HL wannàn etc. (+NP), NP + -nân/nân*

Pre-head wannàn (pl. wadānnân/wadannàn)+NP, NP-n/r-nân/nân are all functionally available for use as *spatial* deictics, to identify an object in the physical realm of the speaker (usually with an accompanying gesture), e.g.:

(67) [speaker A asks]:

- a) A: mēe nee nēe kakēe rīke dà shii?  
‘what’s it you’re holding?’

[B replies]:

- b) B: wannàn àku/ àku-n-nân nēe ka gani.  
‘it is **this** parrot that you saw’

(68) [speaker seeks clarification]:

- a) mēe kakēe sōo ìn yi?  
‘what would you like me to do?’

[reply]:

- b) ungo wannàn cèefānee/cèefāne-n-nân kà kai cikin gidāa  
‘**here**, take **these** groceries into the house’

(69) [same context as (68)]:

- a) mēe kuma zaa mù yi yànzū?  
‘what else are we going to do now?’

[reply]:

b) zaa kù dāuki wannàn àkwàati/àkwàati-n-nàn kù kai bàakin tiitii.

‘you’ll take **this** box to the main road’

Interestingly, the pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn has two semantically equivalent plurals which are equally possible in the same spatial context. Thus, it is possible to substitute HLF wadānnân with HHL wadannàn [as below], with no apparent difference in meaning :

(70) [mother to her child]:

a) tōo, gàa tufaafin dà bàabankà ya dīnkàa makà bana

‘well, here are the clothes made for you by your dad this year’

[child replies]:

b) màama, nii baa nàa sôn sâa wadānnân/wadannàn.

‘mum, I don’t want to wear **these** (pointing or holding them)’

(71) [speaker making inquiries]:

inàa neeman wandà zâi kai wà Ûsmân wadānnân/wadannàn kaayan sâawaa

‘I’m looking for someone who will take **these** clothes to Usman’

I myself prefer the HHL wadannàn variant, although I permit both demonstratives in my grammar. Their usage also cuts across dialectal areas including Standard (Kano) Hausa. However, for many speakers, HLF wadānnân seems to be the preferred speaker-proximal plural form.

In (72)-(73) below, both adverbial F nân and its equivalent pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn co-occur in the same sentence:

(72) [mother and son are at home, but not in the same room, and she calls out]:

Mother: kai Muusaa! Muusaa! ìnaa kakè?

‘Musa! Musa! where are you?’

Son: nà’am, gàa ni nân cikin wannàn ðaakii

‘yes, I’m **here** in **this** (other) room’

(73) [speaker calls from inside the room]:

A: kee Zàinabù! Zàinabù! ìnaa kikè?

‘hey, Zainabu! Zainabu! where are you?’

B: ai gàa ni nân baayan wannàn ðaakii

‘look, I’m **here** behind **this** (other) hut’

A similar morphological and semantic-pragmatic correlation is found in other languages—see Lyons (1977:676), for example, who has argued for an integrated interpretation of adverbs, demonstratives (and personal pronouns) in terms of participant roles.

An obvious and important question which has never been confronted by Hausaists is whether or not the pre- and post-head strategies (wannàn etc.+NP/NP-n-/r-nân/nàn) are interchangeable without any meaning-difference. In all previous descriptions, these coding options have been assumed to be completely synonymous. In fact this is incorrect. The use of pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn strategy indicates that the speaker is introducing a discourse-new [-*identifiable*, -*familiar*] referent into the conversational context. But a post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn implies that the reference object is assumed by the speaker to be correctly identifiable by the addressee either from the immediately preceding

discourse context or from other relevant clues, such as the fact that the addressee is believed to have prior knowledge of the referent. In this case, the speaker is indicating the givenness of the reference object as [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*]. Note that the same form-function correlation characterises addressee-centred LH wànnan (also FH wànnan) +NP vs. NP-n-nan (chapter 3), and applies (albeit in a less direct way) to speaker/addressee-distal WANCAN NP vs. NP-n/r-CAN (chapter 4). Below, I provide a detailed description of how these factors determine appropriate interpretation in both the spatial and anaphoric contexts.

In a revision of their 1989 paper, Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993) have argued for a unified theory of referring expressions, built upon the implicational hierarchy of cognitive statuses which a referring expression can have. The relevant cognitive statuses they evoke (with English forms) are :

Table 5: Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski's (1993:275) The Givenness Hierarchy

in focus >	activated >	familiar >	uniquely identifiable >	referential >	type identifiable
{ <i>it</i> }	{ <i>that</i> } { <i>this</i> } { <i>this</i> N }	{ <i>that</i> N }	{ <i>the</i> N }	{ indefinite <i>this</i> N }	{ <i>a</i> N }

According to them 'each status on the hierarchy is a necessary and sufficient condition for the appropriate use of a different form or forms...'. And since the statuses are conceived in such a way that each status entails all lower statuses (statuses to the right), they are 'thus ordered from the most restrictive (*in focus*) to the least restrictive (*type identifiable*), with respect to the set of possible referents they include' (p. 276).

Briefly, *type identifiable* merely requires that 'the addressee is able to access a representation of the type of object described by the expression...', *referential*:

‘the addressee not only needs to access an appropriate type-representation, he must either retrieve an existing representation of the speaker’s intended referent or construct a new representation by the time the sentence has been processed...’, *uniquely identifiable*: the addressee can identify the speaker’s intended referent on the basis of the nominal alone...’, *familiar*: ‘the addressee is able to identify the intended referent because he already has a representation of it in memory (in long-term memory if it has not been recently mentioned or perceived, or in short-term memory if it has)...’, *activated*: ‘the referent is represented in current short-term memory. Activated representations may have been retrieved from long-term memory, or they may arise from the immediate linguistic or extralinguistic context...’, *in focus*: ‘the referent is not only in short-term memory, but is also at the centre of attention.’ (Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski 1993:276-9). For the purpose of distinguishing between pre- and post-head demonstrative strategies in this section, I will invoke the intermediate statuses, i.e. [ $\pm$  *familiar*] and [ $\pm$  *uniquely identifiable*]. I believe that these features, together with Chafe’s (1976) givenness theory, are critical to explaining the pragmatically subtle, but cognitively significant distinction between pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn and post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn.

In Hausa, the distinction between *uniquely identifiable* and *familiar* referents is not only in the cognitively-driven statuses, as is the case in some of the languages that Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski examined, but is also manifested in word order variation for demonstratives.<sup>24</sup> Consider (74)-(75) below where this shift in word order affects the underlying assumption that the speaker makes about the addressee’s background knowledge (cf. too (67)-(69)):

(74) [speaker hands an unexpected present to the addressee]:

tôo, gâa wannàn gùzurii kù shìga mootàa dà shii

‘well, here, take **this** provision (of money) for you to pay your fare’

(75) [speaker hands an expected gift to the addressee]:

tôo, gâa gùzuri-n-nân kù shaa ruwaa dà shii

'well, here is **the/this** provision for you to drink water (buy something) with it.

(76) [speaker directs addressee's attention to his problem car]:

wannân mootàa tanàa baa nì wàhalàa

'**this** car is giving me a hard time'

(77) [speaker points to his problem car]:

mootà-r-nân tanàa baa nì wàhalàa

'**this** car is giving me a hard time'

(78) [a comprehension exercise instruction at the end of a Hausa story]:

dùubi wadànnân jumlooli sânnan kà yi bàyaanìn bambancìnsù

'examine **these** (following) sentences and comment on their differences'

(79) [a comprehension exercise instruction at the end of a Hausa story]:

dùubi jumlooli-n-nân sânnan kà yi bàyaanìn bambancìnsù

'examine **these** sentences and comment on their differences'

By choosing the pre-head demonstrative HL wannân strategy in (74), the speaker believes that although the referent may be an inferrable entity, it is not a discourse-activated entity, and hence the choice of HL wannân. In other words, the speaker is signalling the introduction of non-presupposed, non-identifiable (new) information by choosing the pre-head strategy. In (75), on the other hand, the speaker presupposes an existing frame of reference to which both speaker and addressee subscribe, thereby indicating that the information (the uniquely-identifiable gùzuri 'provision (for journey)'), is hearer-old/given. The addressee of

(75) must have expressly informed the speaker that he will need some money to pay his fares. Thus, in this case, the use of the post-head demonstrative is triggered by the assumed familiarity, identifiability of the referent at the speech time as an expressed proposition or a presupposed one. A similar cognitive/referential distinction is discernible between (76) and (77) and (78) and (79). The speaker of (76) may well have just arrived at her friend's house, only to start complaining about wannàn mootàa 'this car'—addressee must wait for more (new) information, since she is not aware of the problems of the car. This is not the case in (77) where the addressee is assumed to have a prior knowledge of the sort of problems associated with her friend's car. Similarly, the addressee/student reading (78) would have to wait until s/he reads the sentences before s/he can set about explaining their differences, whereas in (79), the sentences have already been read by the addressee, hence familiar, and therefore, uniquely identifiable from among all the possible entities. Consider also (80) and (81) below:

(80) [speaker presents a paper to the addressee, presuming that s/he has not seen it or known about it before]:

gàa wannàn takàrdàa kà duubàa  
 'here is **this** paper for you to look at'

(81) [speaker presents a paper to addressee, who must have seen, or knew about it]:

gàa takàrda-r-nàn kà duubàa  
 'here is **this** paper for you to look at'

where the speaker of (80) presents the paper as an 'addressee-new' item of information, and the newness of the referent is perceivable from the surprised look on the face of the addressee, who must now plough through the paper before s/he

can make any appropriate response. With (81), however, the addressee will have no hesitation in responding with (82) below:

(82) *yâuwaa, naa goodèè* ‘fine, thank you’

as an acknowledgement of his/her immediate recognition of the relevant cues of the givenness of the referent ‘paper’ indicated by the choice of post-head demonstrative *-nân*.<sup>25</sup>

Interestingly, non-count (mass) nouns always attract the post-head demonstrative *-nân/nàn* in *spatial* context regardless of the presuppositionality of the referent, e.g.:

(83) [mother sends child to the mill]:

*gàa geero-n-nàn/daawà-r-nân/masàra-r-nàn* [*#wannàn geeroo/daawàa/masàraa*] *kà kai mareedii*

‘here is **this** millet/guinea corn/maize for you to take to the grinding mill’

(84) [father to his daughter]:

*ungo ruwa-n-nàn/fura-r-nàn/àbinci-n-nàn* *kì kai wà bàakoo*

‘take **this** water/porridge/food, and take it to the guest’

As a spatial pronominal deictic, the explicit demonstrative *wannàn* is the only possible referring expression, and in this case, its referent can be either [+*identifiable* (+presupposed)] or [-*identifiable* (-presupposed)] depending on the context, e.g.:

(85) [father talks to his friend about his wayward son, who is passing by]:

kaa ga wannàn, wata raanaa sai yaa sâa ni cikin rikicîi

'you see **this** one [boy], one day he will get me into trouble'

(86) [a mother expresses concern that her daughter, standing before her, is not eating well]:

dùubi wannàn, àbu làalàace

'look at **this** one [girl], a wasting thing'

(87) [a messenger is being sent with a couple of files for distribution]:

gàa wannàn kà kai oofishin àkantàa, wannàn kùwa na oofishin dàarektàa nee

'here, take **this** [one] to the accountant's office; **this** [one] is for the director's office'

(88) [father gets furious with his meddlesome son after he makes

a comment, so he gave him a knock on the head as he speaks]

wannàn, wannàn, àkwai shì dà rìgimàa!

'**this**, **this**, [one] is really meddlesome!'

#### 2. 2. 4. Anaphoric HL wannàn etc. (+ NP), NP+ -n/r-nân/nàn

Like adverbial F nân, the pre-head wannàn etc. and post-head -nân/nàn speaker-proximal demonstratives are used in texts to anaphorically identify referents, where their uses are explicable in terms of their speaker-proximal (spatial) semantics (cf. English 'this'). Both the pre-head- and post-head demonstrative strategies are possible in this anaphoric context. However, the default anaphoric option is the post-head demonstrative -nân/nan which ties in with its spatial meaning discussed in §2.2.3 above. In fact, this strategy is attested neither cataphorically nor in symbolic (metaphorical) contexts (see §2.2.5). I will

therefore be concentrating on this strategy. Later, I specify the contexts in which its intrinsic givenness constrains post-head demonstrative -nân/nân from occurring, in which case the pre-head (= discourse-new [§2.2.3.]) demonstrative HL wannân is deployed. I shall also discuss those contexts in which both strategies are deployable, albeit with subtle pragmatic distinctions.

The determination of the default anaphoric status of the post-head demonstrative -nân/nân is the result of a careful scrutiny of all the stories in the classic Hausa novel Magana Jari Ce 3 (Imam, 1970 [1939]), with a view to finding out the frequency of both pre-head demonstrative wannân and post-head demonstrative -nân/nân as anaphors. I found 204 tokens of post-head NP+-nân/nân and 91 tokens of pre-head HL wannân + NP. 26

Table 6: Frequency count of speaker-proximal (anaphoric, non-spatial) demonstratives in Imam's Magana Jari Ce 3

Demonstrative form	Demonstrative form
Post-head NP+ <u>-n/r-nân/nân</u>	Pre-head HL <u>wannân</u> +NP
204	91

The post-head variant, therefore, is the normative text-anaphoric strategy in written Hausa (at least in the text examined), and the explanation for this is largely to be found in the cognitive hierarchy developed by Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993), also the model used to explain the choice between pre-head demonstrative HL wannân and post-head -nân/nân in *spatial*-locative contexts (§2.2.3.).

In a written narrative, the writer (speaker) makes maximum use of anaphoric reference in order to achieve the necessary cohering grounding for the benefit of

the reader (addressee). The reader thus follows the relevant cues (or signposts, as Bühler calls them), which are indeed the ‘thread of discourse’ on which his/her attention depends (Grimes 1975). Anaphoric (backward) referencing will enable the reader to derive the maximum contextual effect in decoding the message. One of the ways that this is achieved in Hausa writing especially, is to individuate a referent by resorting to the post-head demonstrative NP-n/-r-nân/nàn structure. This in turn provides a clue to the reader that the referent is not only discourse-old and hearer-old, but is also in the current context of pragmatic reference in the sense of Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993:279 [i.e. ‘in focus’]). Notice how the use of the post-head strategy in *spatial* contexts to code given presupposed (speaker-proximal) referents (§2.2.3) extends to and explains this *anaphoric* (textual) context. Whenever the writer wishes to anaphorise an identifiable referent in the present discourse scenario, s/he does so by invoking a post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn linear variant, e.g.:

(89) [at the beginning of the story of Hassan]:

wai an yi wani bàbban taajiriii nèè, wàndà yakè dà ðan ðansà ðaya, Hassàn.  
 Baayan àttaajìri-n-nàn yaa yi wà Hassàn auree dà wata wai ita Rakìyaa, sai ya  
 kwântaa ya mutù  
 ‘it’s said that there was once a very wealthy merchant, who has an only  
 (male) child, Hassan. After **this** merchant married off Hassan to some  
 woman called Rakiya, he laid down and died (MJC:53)

(90) [a description of Hassan’s generosity]:

kullum daree sai màatarsà tà yi àbinci irii-irii, shii kùwa yà fita kân hanyàr  
 fatàakee yà tsayàa, in ya ga fatàakee zaa sù shìga gàrii sai yà jaa sù yà kai  
 gidansà, yà kaawo àbinci-n-nàn sù zaunàa sù ci... (MJC:53)

'every night, his wife will prepare all kinds of food, and he'd go by the merchant's road and wait. When he saw the merchants going into the town he'd take them to his house, bring **this** food, and they'd sit down to eat it'

(91) [Hassan is confused about his new status as a king]:

Jàkaadiyaa ta cèe, 'Kâi Sarkin Saraakunàa!' Hassàn ya cèe, 'Kee maa kî zama Sarkin Saraakunàa, nii Hassàn nee.' Sukà ràrràashee shì dai, sukà baa shì tufaafii irìn na Saraakunàa, sukà tiilàstaa masà, ya fita yanàa dùube-dùuben gidân, yanàa zazzàarè idòo, sai kà cêe bàkauyèe yaa jee faadà. Hanyàr fitaa maa sai dà Jàkaadiya-r-nàn ta nuunàa masà (MJC:55f)

'Jakadiya said, 'Hail to the King of Kings!' Hassan replied, 'You too (have) become the King of Kings!' In the end, they persuaded him, and gave him regal attire, and forced him (to wear it); he got out looking at the house, eyes wide open like a villager visiting a palace. In fact, he had to be shown the way by **this** Jakadiya'

(92) [the merchants decide to pass the night at a market stall]:

dà ìsarsù sai sukà tarar dà wadansu fataakee cikin rùmfaa ... cikin fataake-n-nàn dà kèe rùmfaa sai sauroo ya dàami ðaya (MJC:96)

'when they got there, they met some merchants in the shelter ... one of them among **these** merchants was kept awake by mosquitoes'

The antecedents of àttaajìri-n-nàn '**this** merchant', àbinci-n-nàn '**this** food', Jàkaadiya-r-nàn '**this** Jakadiya' and fataake-n-nàn '**these** merchants' in (89)-(92) have been explicitly mentioned by the writer in the immediate preceding discourse-context. Most of the post-head -nân/nàn usage conforms to the requirement that the referent be retrievable from the immediately preceding discourse-context, and therefore identifiable to the addressee.

Notice, however, that in both (93) and (94) below the continuity of the coreferencing is also signalled by the post-head demonstrative -nân/nân, and this is in spite of the wide distance separating the prior mention of the referent to the present one (one page in (93), two paragraphs in (94)):

(93) [at the beginning of a story of an Islamic teacher and his difficult child]:

nân gabàs wajen kasàashen Bàrno an yi wani Shaihùn Maalàmi ...  
maalàmi-n-nân ya cêe à kiraa masà d'ansà...Baayan kwaanaa bakwàì [dà  
gamà jànaa'izàrsà] akà zoo rabà gaadòn àbin dà maalàmi-n-nân ya barìi  
(MJC:22-24)

'here, in the east of the kingdom of Bornu, there was an Islamic teacher...  
**this** teacher requested that his son be called ... Seven days [after his  
funeral], the time came for the distribution of the things that **this** clergyman  
left [to his family]'

(94) [writer describes Wowo's disrespectful behaviour]:

Wòowoo yanàa cikin tàfiyàa ... sai ya gàmù dà wani bàakon òan tsoohoo dà  
gafakàrsa ... Koo dà Wòowoo ya ga òan tsooho-n-nân bàì raatsèe masà ba,  
sai ya taasam masà haikàn ... yaarò-n-nân bàì kullà watàa gùdaa ba dàgà  
gàmonsà dà tsooho-n-nân sai dà ya haukàcee (MJC:27).

'Wowo was walking... then he met a certain old stranger with his bag... The  
moment Wowo realised that **this** old man did not give way for him, he went  
straight after him..., **this** boy became mad within one month of his encounter  
with **this** old man'

As long as the writer assumes that the referent is *identifiable/familiar* in the  
present discourse-context, the reader/addressee is expected to recognise this fact  
from the choice of the post-head -nân/nân strategy. Cf. also:

(95) [Tsohuwa decides to do something with the money she's getting]:

tsoohuwaa ta cèè, 'lallee kudî-n-nân bâa su dà niyyàr kaarèewaa. Bàri mùtùm yà yi gidan katangaa, kadà yà bar banzaa tà wucèè' (MJC:37)

'tsohuwa said, '**this** money isn't going to be spent. Let one make a walled building, lest one leaves a good chance to pass him by', '

(96) [speaker warns]:

kudî-n-nân na jàma'aa hàraamùn nee à tabàa su  
'it's unlawful to touch **this** public money'

(97) [speaker wonders]:

ruwa-n-nân dà akèè ta labtàawaa zaa sù dâukee kùwa?  
'is **this** downpour ever going to stop?'

Examples (98)-(100) below illustrate [+*identifiable* human referent] numerals determined by the post-head demonstrative -nân/nân strategy. Cf. also:

(98) [Bamaguje pays a visit to Anunu, the fraudulent butcher]:

Bàmaagujèè ya nùfi wajen Ànuunu, ya tarar dà shii dà kân àkuyàa gàbansà yanàa sayâr waa ... Tòo yâu Jumma'aa, duk mutàanen kauyèè sun waawàshee, sauraa ðaya-n-nân.[#wannân ðaya]... (MJC:47f)

Bamaguje heads off to Anunu's place, and found him selling a goat head in front of him ... well, today is Friday, [so] the villagers have bought all of it, except **this** one'

(99) [speaker informs addressee]:

huðu-n-nân [#wadànnân huðu] kadai sukà ragèè dàgà cikin màalàmân dà ka yi zaamàniì dà suu à nân

'**these** four are the only ones left from the teachers that you know here'

(100) [speaker warns addressee]:

suu ukù dī-n-nân [#suu waɗànnân ukù] dà ka baa aikin kwàasar shàaraa bà  
zaa sù iyàa ba

'**these** three that you gave the job of taking out the rubbish won't be able to  
do it'

(See Chapter 3 for the uses of deictic *DIN*).

As additional evidence regarding the default anaphoric function of post-head demonstrative -nân/nân, it is the only strategy available for time-adverbs indicating temporal proximity to the utterance, as in:<sup>27</sup>

(101) [Sarki indicates that he is not interested in Mama]:

Sarkii ya cèe, 'mèe zân yi dà ita, nii yànzù maataa sàbà'in daidai gàree nì.  
Jiyà-jiyà-n-nân [#wànnàn jiyà-jiyà] na yi amaryaa, ta cikòn sàbà'in dîn  
(MJC:33)

'the king said, 'what will I do with her, I've got exactly seventy wives now. I  
got married to the seventieth **just yesterday**' '

(102) [Rakiya is trying to calm her husband down]:

dàa maa kaa kwantad dà hankàlinkà. Jiyà-n-nân [#wànnàn jiyà] dà baa kàa  
nan, Sarkii yaa aikoo akà yi wà Bàlee màì cêewaa mun fayè bidi'àn nan  
buulaalàa dârii... (MJC:57)

'you should calm down. **Just yesterday**, when you're not around, the king  
sent (someone) to give a hundred strokes of the cane to Bale, who used to say  
we're too frivolous'

(103) [a report on UN efforts in Bosnia]:

ya cèe, à 'yan kwàanàki-n-nàn [#wadànnân 'yan kwàanàkii] dàakàrrun  
majàlisàr ònkìn duuniyàa sun yi ayyukàn tàimakoo dà jiràagen samà à  
Bosniyà.

'he said, **recently**, the UN peace-keeping force flew in aid supplies to  
Bosnia'

(104) [a news report about Nigerian newspapers]:

tòo àmmaa à 'yan kwàanàkin baaya-baaya-n-nàn [#wadànnân 'yan  
kwàanàkin baaya-baaya] jàriidun Nàajeeriyàa sun shaa bugà sharhii dà kèe  
suukàr gwamnati (AHR:76)

'but **recently**, Nigerian papers have been publishing editorials that criticise  
the government'

(105) [speaker informs addressee]:

yànzú-n-nàn [#wannàn yànzú]/yànzú-yànzú-n-nàn [#wannàn yànzú-yànzú]  
mukà ràbu dà shii

'we've **just** parted company with him'

(106) [same context as (105)]:

dàazu-n-nàn [#wannàn dāazu]/dāazu-dāazu-n-nàn [#wannàn dāazu-dāazu] ya  
biyoo ta oofishiinaa

'he was in my office **just a while ago**'

(107) [speaker asks addressee]:

à cikin dare-n-nàn [#wannàn daree] zaa kà tàfi?

'are you going [in **this** night] tonight?'

In (101)-(107), the [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*] post-head demonstrative is exploited to encode time-points which are uniquely identifiable to the hearer. Thus, the normative strategy in all these complex temporal adverbials is the post-head demonstrative -nân/nân, i.e. jiyà-n-nân ‘just yesterday’, ’yan kwàanàki-n-nân ‘recently’, yàazu-n-nân ‘just now’, dàazu-n-nân ‘a little while ago’, dare-n-nân ‘tonight’. Notice also the (collocational) use of the post-head -nân/nân strategy (only) in the high-frequency nonspecific phrase àbi-n-nân ‘(thingamajig [**this** thing’]), e.g. yàayàa suunan àbi-n-nân [#wannàn àbîn] dà maataa sukèè shaafàawaa à lébbansù? ‘what’s **the/this** thing that women put on their lip called?’

Unique referents such as duuniyàa ‘world’ (108), kasaa ‘nation, land’ (109), etc. also attract the post-head strategy (except in the contrastive situations where, the world (as we know it) is compared to other possible worlds, in which case wannàn duuniyàa ‘**this** world’ is used). With uniquely identifying locative phrases, moreover, an alternative strategy to post-head demonstrative -nân/nân is the speaker-proximal adverbial -nân + NP+ definite determiner suffix ‘the’.

Examples:

(108) [Bala is resisting the execution of a judge’s order]:

koo duk duuniyà-n-nân / ?wannàn duuniyàa ta tàaru à nân wurîn/wuri-n  
-nân/ ?wannàn wurîn, ai bâa yaddà zaa à yankàa minì tsookàr jìkii. (MJC:94)  
 ‘even if **the whole of this world** were to gather in **this** place, there is no way  
 my flesh would be cut’

(109) [speaker wants to get to the bottom of an issue]:

bâa wandà zâi dagàa dàgà nân wajên/waje-n-nân / ?wannàn wajên sai an fàdî  
 gaskiyar àl’amârîn  
 ‘no one should move from **this** place, until the fact of the matter is stated’

(110) [Waziri admonishes his son]:

in bàa kai ba, ðan Wàziirìn nân kasàr/kasa-n-nân / ?wannàn kasàr duk, yâa tsayâa jàayayyâa dà kurtàttakii har sù ga daamarsà (MJC:91 )

‘who, but you, a son of the Waziri of **this** whole kingdom would stop to argue with the doves, as to make them mock him’

The unacceptability of the pre-head HL wannàn strategy in (101)-(107) and its marginality in (108)-(110) ties in neatly with my proposal that it is the main means of coding a new discourse referent. In all these examples, the time or location referred to with a post-head demonstrative -nân/nân usage is assumed by the speaker to be uniquely identifiable to the addressee at the moment of utterance. Now, although pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn may be used by the speaker to anaphorically anchor a referent, its antecedent nominal is not necessarily identical, and the coreferential items used can be simply lexically equivalent (near) synonyms. The categorising/summarising function of pre-head HL wannàn is fully exploited to highlight this relationship, e.g.:

(111) [a news report]:

an sàami rashìn jùtuwar dà koo kusa bàì daacèe yà fàaru ba. Tòo, wannàn bàrakàa [#bàrakà-r-nân] tsàkaanin jàm'ìyyûn biyu gwamnatin mulkin soojì cee ta ruuràa ta.

‘there was a misunderstanding which ought not to have occurred at all. And **this** tension between the two parties was exacerbated by the military regime’

(112) [Wowo’s encounter with an old man]:

Wòowoo ... ya cèe, ‘Kùrwaataa Kur! Mun ci mun shaa bàa ddominkà ba. Sai dai ìn ga àlheerìi. Kà ci kânkà, kà shaa baKin ruwaa, ðan neeman tsoohon kàzaamii!’ Tsoohoo ya wucèe yanàa kuukaa, don wannàn baKin cikii

[#bakin ciki-n-nân] maa koo àbinci bàì tsayàa neemaa ba à gàrîn, sai ya yi gàba (MJC:27)

‘Wowo ... said, ‘My soul be saved! We ate, we drank in spite of you. I would only encounter blessing. Eat yourself (i.e. curse yourself), and drink black water, you dirty old bastard!’ The old man went away crying, [and] because of **this** unhappiness, he did not even stop to eat in the town before moving on.’

(113) [a description of a grey-haired head]:

sunàa nan sunàa taadîi, sai gàa wani kâi tàfe farii fat dà furfuraa, gàa geemùu, gàa sàajee ... dà isôowarsà sai ... Sarkii ya yi tsalle ya tsirgoo dàgà kujèeraa, wannàn tsoohoo [#tsooho-n-nàn] ya hayèe. (MJC:33).

‘as they were chatting, then a certain head [without the rest of the body] completely grey with hair, beard and sideburns, approached ... The king jumped and dropped from his chair, [and] **this** old man [= the head] got on it.’

The clue for the reader to look no further than the immediately preceding context is indicated, among other things, by the summarising function performed by the pre-demonstrative strategy. In (112), for example, wannàn bakin ciki [#bakin ciki-n-nân] ‘**this** unhappiness’ provides a summary of the events/reactions in the immediately preceding context, and motivates the following actions/events (the man didn’t even stop to eat). Notice too that while a post-demonstrative anaphoric tsooho-n-nàn ‘**this** old man’ is possible in (113), its presuppositionality/givenness will rule out co-reference with kâi (human) ‘head’ with the lexically encoded new information that the mentioned head is an old (human) one. Wannàn tsoohoo ‘**this** old man’ in (113) thus helps to provide the addressee with (new) supplementary descriptive information about the ‘head’.

Similar motivations trigger the choice of the pre-head demonstrative strategy in a context where new and/or additional information is presented in reported speech, e.g.:

(114) [as the magistrate enters the court room, he notices a man being held by his gown by the plaintiffs]

... sai Àlkaalii ya fitoo, sukà taashì, sukà yi gaisuwaa. Ya dùubi Bàlaa, ya ga duk sun yi cukuu-cùkûu dà shii. Ya cèe, 'wannàn baawàn Allàh [#baawàn Allà-n-nân] fà...?' (MJC:97)

'... then the magistrate came out, they rose up, and bowed. He looked at Bala, and saw that he was completely entangled in their grip. He said 'what about **this** poor fellow...?'

where although the magistrate may be aware of the case, he still expresses his surprise at the way in which the accused is brought before him. Use of [+familiar] post-head demonstrative -nân/nân would be anomalous in this context, since it would presuppose that the referent was explicitly mentioned in the preceding context.

An important (referential) distinction between the pre-head and post-head demonstrative strategies is that only the former can be used cataphorically. Because post-head demonstrative -nân/nân is the strongly preferred option for referencing given information, it would be pragmatically anomalous in a context where the reference is largely cataphoric-projective, and where pre-head HL wannàn occurs excessively:

(115) [speaker is asked to give an account of what he knows concerning a dispute]:

yàddà wannàn àl'amàrii (#àl'amàri-n-nàn) yakè dai shii nèe ...

'the way the situation is is **this** ...'

The anomaly of post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn in (115) is connected to the fact that it normally requires an explicit speaker-activated antecedent in the preceding context for it to be felicitous. HL wannàn, on the other hand, typically encodes new information:

(116) [speaker enters addressee's office, and sits down for a chat]:

yàayàa zân yi dà wannàn mùtumìn?

'what am I going to do with **this** guy?'

In (116), pre-head HL wannàn is used to index a non-identifiable referent (mùtumìn) and also signifies an informal emotive attitude toward the referent. HL wannàn is often used to convey emotional solidarity, e.g. [prayer to a sick person]: Allàh yà rabàa ka dà wannàn rashìn laafiyàa (?rashìn laafiyà-r-nân 'may God remove **this** sickness (from you)'). In this connection, Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993:279) have pointed out that 'when *this* is used to refer to an entity not activated by the speaker, the speaker-activation condition is being exploited to convey special effects, such as solidarity.' In (116), the addressee also expects further discussion of the referent wannàn mùtumìn '**this** guy' from the speaker for HL wannàn usage to make sense. It is in fact a deliberate strategy to create a more heightened expectation in the addressee. However, such a clarification is unnecessary with the post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn, since the addressee must have had a prior knowledge of the problem between the speaker and the guy in question.

(117) and (118) are also examples of HL wannàn to introduce hearer- and discourse-new information:

(117) [old man's advice to Alhaji Imam]:

koomee ka ganii kadà kà kulàa dà shii, kai dai kà taasam mà duutsèn dà takdòbîn nan tsiraaraa. Dà kaa shìga gàrîn kà yi ta reerà wannàn waakàa [#waaKà-n-nân]: ... (RBJ:38)

'whatever you see, don't pay attention to it, just go straight after the hill with that bare sword. Once you're in the town, you should keep on singing **this** song: ...'

(118) [Waziri vows to revenge his humiliation]:

Wàziirì ya taashi ... ya tàfi gidaa [yanàa] bakin cikii ... ya cêe 'tun dà akà muuzàntaa ni ... sabdòdà wannàn Bàharaajèn banzaa [#Bàharaajèn banza-n-nân] wai shii Abdùn Ugù, in Allàh yaa soo sai naa ga iyàakarsà (MJC:10)

'Waziri got up ... and went home feeling very bad...and said (to himself) 'since I've been humiliated because of **this** good for nothing outsider, called Abdun Ugu, God willing I'll see the end of him' '

The use of (proximal) pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn (pl. wadànnân [wadànnàn]) to code new (sometimes cataphoric) information is often exploited in Hausa readers to guide and/or instruct the reader/student, e.g.:

(119) wadànnân [wadànnàn] jàwàabân [#jàwàaba-n-nàn] duk an rubùutaa su à

kân àbù ðaya: Àbîn dà nakèe yîi kullum. Gàa jàwàabîi na farkoo: ... (JNH:21)

'**these** (following) essays have all been written on one subject: 'what I do everyday'. Here is the first essay: ... '

(120) tóo, yànzù kàràntà wannàn jàwàabîn [#jàwàabî-n-nân] kuma don kà

kwatàntaa su

'now, read **this** essay also so that you can compare them' (JNH:21)

(121) *kàràntà wannàn* làabaarì [#làabaarì-*n-nân*], sànnan kà rubùutà jàwaabìn  
 tambayooyîn dà akà yi à kàrshen làabaarìn dà kyàkkyaaawar Hausa (JNH:41)  
 ‘read **this** story, and then write answers to the questions at the end in good  
 Hausa’

(122) [an anniversary speech by a head of government]:

don nuunà shèekaràa bìyar dà cìkar saamùn mulkìn kân wannàn jihàr, inàa  
 sôo ìn bai wà koowànè ðaya dàgà cikinkù koo’ìnaa yakè *wannàn* aikii [# aikì  
 -*n-nân*]: inàa sôo koowaa dà koowaa ... yà shuukà bishiyàa (MHR:26)  
 ‘in celebrating the fifth independence anniversary of this region, I want to  
 give each and everyone of you, wherever he may be, **this** task: I want every  
 one of you ... to plant a tree’

The deployment of a speaker-proximal deictic to code a hearer/discourse-new referent is attested in other languages. According to Maclaran (1982:66), an exception to her ‘... generalisation that the demonstrative is definite is the widespread, if colloquial, use of the proximate demonstrative to introduce a new referent into the discourse, e.g. ‘there was *this* funny rattle under the bonnet’ ’ (see also Prince 1981a., Strauss 1993 for a detailed description of the use of indefinite/non-phoric *this* in English). This kind of usage is also attested in Hausa, where pre-head HL *wannàn* is the only possible strategy, and like English new ‘this’, it will require additional information following the introduction of a new referent, e.g.:

(123) [speaker enters addressee’s office, and recounts his encounters to her]:

jiyà inàa kân hanyàataa ta zuwàa gidaa sai na hàfù dà *wannàn* ðan  
 Nàajeeriyàa (# ðan Nàajeeriyà-*r-nân*) tàare dà wani tsoohon àbookiinaa sunàa  
 neeman wandà zâi nuunàa musù hanyàr zuwàa Oofishin Jakaadancìn  
 Nàajeeriyàa

'yesterday, I was on my way home when I met **this** Nigerian with an old friend of mine looking for someone who could direct them to the Nigerian High Commission'

(124) [speaker knocks and enters addressee's office, and says]:

àkwai wannàn ruwaitôowaa (# ruwaitôowa-r-nàn) dàgà kundin Galaadancii...  
'there's **this** quotation from Galadanci's dissertation ...'

Notice that a post-head strategy (i.e. #dān Nàajeeriyà-r-nân '**this** Nigerian', #ruwaitôowa-r-nàn '**this** quotation') would indicate that the speaker presupposes that the addressee can uniquely identify the referent, either because it has been introduced in the prior discourse context, or is assumed to be mutually known to both interlocutors in the real world, hence the infelicitousness of post-head -nân/nàn in (123)-(124). Note also that it would be possible to use the specific indefinite determiner (wani m., wata f., wa(dān)su pl. 'a (certain), some') in the above contexts, as a near-synonymous substitute for HL wannàn. In §2.2.5., I shall be looking at a parallel use of HL wannàn in *symbolic* contexts.

Since HL wannàn is the only possible pronominal form, it can be used to index either [+*identifiable*] or [-*identifiable*] referents, depending on the context, e.g.:

(125) [an instruction to reader/student]:

wadānnān suu nèe mùhìmma abuubuwan dà marùbùucîn ya ginà jàwaabìn à kânsù. Yi nazàrin yaddà ya tsaaràa su: ... (JNH:18)

'**these** (following) are the major points on which the writer built his essay. Examine how he presented them'

(126) [speaker describes how expensive it is for ceremonial dress to be hired

by the well-to-do in England, and ponders over the possibility of such a venture in Nigeria]:

dàa zaa à bulloo dà wannàn, kaa ga irìn ... sai à cêe gaa kamfànin hayàr askaa biyu. In sallàa ta zoo mùtùm bâa shi dà haali sai yà jee ... kà jee kà yoo hayàr rìigakkà askaa biyu...inàa ganin wannàn kamfànîn ya kàmaatà mutàanee sù buudêe ...

'if **this** were to be possible, you see ... then one can say, here is a designer gown hire firm. When it's Eid, and a person doesn't have the means, then he goes... you just go and hire a designer gown ... I think **this** is the company that should be established by the people

(127) [a news report on paralysis]:

Kwàràrrûn sun cêe wannàn nee zâi kasàncee ginshikìn warkar dà shânyeewàr jìkii

'the experts say that **this** will be the basis for curing paralysis'

(128) [a warning to Inna]:

tôo kadà kî barii ìn kaaràa mikì gàrgàdîi na ukù à bisà wannàn (MJC:39)

'well, I don't want to warn you for the third time on **this**'

Interestingly, hakà can replace HL wannàn as pro-form for a sentential antecedent with no apparent meaning difference, e.g.:

(129) dà ya ji hakà [= wannàn] sai ya cêe wà gùdaa... (MJC:54)

'when he heard **this**, he said to one of them ...'

(130) baaya gà hakà [= wannàn] kuma, wai gaa shi inàa hanàa su barcii dà

dooguwar hiira dà mutàanen banzaa (MJC:54)

‘in addition to **this**, it’s alleged that I keep them awake because of my endless chat with useless people’

(131) sam bàn yàrda dà hakà [= wannàn] ba

‘I totally reject **this**’

(132) wannàn [= hakà] nàa fàaruwaa in kanàa tsàye mìsaalìn yaadii hàmsin ko

fñi dàgà tsaunìi, koo duutsèe, koo katangaa, koo bakin daajji màì duhùu

(JNH:18)

‘**this** happens when you’re standing at about fifty yards or more from a mountain, hill, wall or thick and deep forest’

An interesting feature of the system is that in colloquial Hausa, it is possible to use a singular demonstrative, e.g. HL wannàn, with a grammatically plural head noun, as in (133)-(136):

(133) wannàn mutàanee yàayàa zaa mù yi dà suu?

‘what’re we going to do with **these (this)** people?’

(134) wannàn garuuruwàa dà zân zaanàa duk naa zìyàrcee sù

‘I’ve visited all of **these (this)** towns that I’m about to mention’

(135) wannàn rìgìngìmun shàri’àr dà akèe ta kòòkarin shaawo

kânsù ...’

‘**these (this)** judicial conflicts for which efforts are being made to resolve ...’

(136) wannàn kiràaye-kiràaye dà lauyoyii kèe yîi gàme dà lamàrin

Abiola ...

'**these (this)** calls being made by lawyers over the issue of representing  
Abiola ...'

I have also come across an example of HL wannàn +plural head noun in a formal nationwide speech by the late Premier of Northern Nigeria, Sir Ahamdu Bello, as documented in Kirk-Greene and Yahaya (1967:26):

(137) tòo yâu inàa sôo ìn yi kòokarii in bayyànaa mukù wannàn wahaloolii

'well, today, I want to try and explain to you **these (this)** difficulties'

The phenomenon (singular demonstrative + plural NP) is possibly an example of a fairly widespread Chadic feature by which one plural constituent in the NP is enough to indicate plurality (Jaggar: personal communication) — cf. too wani mùtùm ukù 'some three people', sàna'ar ònkii taa baa ni daamar kurdàawaa saakòo-saakòo na kasar nàn, wàndà (= wàdàndà) sun haɗàa dà... 'the tailoring business has given me the opportunity to explore the nooks and crannies of this country, **which** include...' (Jaggar 1996:109). I myself do not use this construction but have heard it used by other native speakers.

It is also worth noting that a frequency count of both the pre-head and post-head demonstrative strategies in a random sampling of various unscripted radio and television programmes, recorded at different times by different broadcasters representing various dialects, revealed a converse pattern of choices to the written corpus above — a skewing in favour of pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn (273/200). However, since the broadcasts are mostly translated texts of English items, it is possible that this preference for pre-head HL wannàn in the modern spoken genre is due to the fact that these bilingual Hausa-English

speakers have been influenced by the pre-head linear order of the corresponding English [speaker-proximal] ‘this’ demonstrative. Another possible explanation is that a face-to-face encounter tends to generate a greater flow of newer information, and hence a greater frequency of the pre-head HL wannàn option (see Strauss 1993:407 on the use of ‘this’ for this purpose). HL wannàn is also a more efficient means of avoiding ambiguity, since it favours the use of accompanying gestures (in contrast to a post-head -nân/nàn, even in coding *spatial* referents) in contexts including reference to objects that are merely being referred to rather than being present at the moment of utterance. And the number of post-head -nân/nàn tokens in the spoken medium is boosted by the fact that in a number of (temporal and uniquely identifiable) contexts, it is the only possible form. Further research is needed in this direction to ascertain the factors governing the asymmetrical distribution of the two demonstrative strategies across different genres.

In this section, I have shown that, contrary to traditional descriptions, the post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn has a pragmatic identity distinct from its more explicit HL wannàn + NP counterpart. And even in those contexts where both strategies are possible, the speaker’s choice is largely informed by whether or not s/he believes the referent is *familiar*, and therefore *identifiable* to the addressee.

### 2. 2. 5. Symbolic HL wannàn etc. (+NP)

The symbolic function, as defined by Fillmore (1975), is the most abstract, subjective deictic category. The symbolic function catches the non-spatial, non-anaphoric usages essentially. Only the pre-head HL wannàn (pl. wadânnân/wadannàn) strategy is possible in symbolic contexts (determinative and pronominal).

The context of (138a) below is to do with a light-hearted request for information about a person, whom the speaker believes that the addressee knows well enough to comment on. (138b) is a symbolic response by the addressee:

(138) a) *shîn wai yàayàa haalin wannàn taalìkii yakè?*

‘hey, what’s **this** guy’s situation like?’

b) *tôo, gàa shi nan dai yaa kaasà rikè aikìi ðaya; yà tabà wannàn yà tabà wannàn*

‘well, he’s just there, unable to hold onto one job; he keeps dabbling in **this** and **this** [**that**]’

The speaker of (138b) is aware that the form of the request does not require him/her to provide detailed, specific information about the person — only a general response is expected. In other words, the intention is not so much that specific information is requested, but that the communication channel remains open and ready to adapt to whatever new perspective may be generated as a consequence of the response in (138b). However, symbolic pronominal HL wannàn ‘**this**’ in (138b) can equally be used by the speaker in order to avoid an honest assessment of the person in question, either because he believes it is his duty to shield him, or to hide his ignorance. In any case, whichever interpretation of (138b) is chosen, the enquirer knows that no further request for information about the referent will be entertained: it is the end of the discussion. And the fact that the speaker has the option of using gestures in (138b), for which s/he takes the left and right sides of her body as the frame of orientation, serves to highlight the speaker’s intention to make vivid his/her own point of view.

In some contexts, symbolic HL wannàn 'this' is used not only to outline a possible scenario, but also to further comment upon a specified context of utterance as in (139)-(141):

(139) [in the husband's absence his wife and other members of the family have conspired to pressurise his son to divorce his wife because she comes from a different ethnic group]:  
shii ya sâa kullum kiyayyàa takèe zàune à kasan nàn ... wannàn baa yàa sôn wannàn, wannàn baa yàa sôn wannàn [TG]  
'that's why there's always enmity existing in this country ... **this** [one] does not like **this** [that] one, **this** [one] does not like **this** [that] one'

(140) [but the wife clearly prefers a local Hausa girl to her son's present wife, who is non-Hausa; her choice, she believes, also has additional good points]:  
gàa 'yar dà zaa tà zoo tàì minì wannàn tàì minì wannàn à zamaanaa na duuniyàa kà jee kà yoo manà auren fàaree-dangì [TG]  
'here's a girl who will come to do **this** for me, to do **that** for me throughout my life, [and] you go and commit yourself to a disastrous marriage for us'

(141) [Wowo informed the gathering at his father's burial that before his death, the old man told him that whoever was the first to rise up after the burial would die within a week]:  
mutàanee dà jîn hakà fa, sai wannàn yà dùubi wannàn, wannàn yà dùubi wannàn, Sarkii ya dùubi Lìimân, ya cèe, 'Lìimân, ai sai kà taashì mù tàfi.'  
(MJC:24)  
'the moment the people heard of this, then **this**[one] would look at **that**[one], **this**[one] would look at **that** [one], the king looked at Liman, and said, 'well Liman, you get up and lead the way for us' '

While the pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn ‘**this** (NP)’ is attested in symbolic contexts, there is no recorded use of the post-head demonstrative -nàn/nân in this role. This is again attributable to the pragmatic-referential requirement of a specific, pre-mentioned antecedent for the post-head strategy, unlike the less constrained pre-head HL wannàn option. See also the determinative *symbolic* usages in (142)-(148):

(142) [a meeting is called to discuss the motives behind the refusal of a certain clergyman to start fasting on the same day as the rest of the community]:  
 an kiraa shì don à fàhìnci juunaa ... wannàn maalàmii yà kaawo taasà,  
wannàn maalàmii yà kaawo taasà [YDG]  
 ‘he was called so that there will be mutual understanding ... **this** clergyman will present his [position], **this** [that] clergyman will present his [position]’

(143) [speaker implores addressee]:  
 tòo kadà kà yi fushii, wai kà ðaukàa kàmar gàa wannàn fushii gàa wannàn fushii [YDG]  
 ‘well don’t get angry, and feel that there’s **this** anger, there’s **this** [that] anger [i.e. too many things to make one angry at the same time]’

(144) [Maisango is not happy with the lowly title of Sarkin Zagi, so he starts to think about ways of killing the king]:  
 Màisàngoo ya taashì tsàye don neeman maagàni. Fàadfaa wajen wannàn bookaa, gàngàraa wajen wannàn maalàmii ... (MJC:68)  
 ‘Maisango started looking for medicine in earnest. He would go to **this** sorcerer, and shift to **this** [that] Islamic clergy ...’

(145) [Waziri approaches the inner chambers of the palace, where he normally awaits the king on their way out to the public reception area]:

baayii sukà faadfi sukà yi gaisuwaa, sukà buudfèe masà yà wucèe. Yà wucè wannàn zaurèe ..., yà wucè wannàn zaurèe ... (MJC:152)

‘the slaves prostrated to greet [him], and opened [the door] for him to pass. He would pass **this** room ..., and he would pass **this [that]** room ...’

(146) [speaker describes the movement of locusts]:

koo dà jîn ‘fitoo’, sai fàarii sukà ruugoo sunàa tseeree, sù hayè wannàn ðan duutsèe sù gangàree ..., sù hayè wannàn ðan karaa sù gangàraa, ... (MJC:165)

‘once they heard ‘come out’, the locusts came running, they would climb over **this** little stone and swarm down ..., they would climb over **this [that]** cornstalk fence and swarm down ...’

(147) [speaker describes his wife’s search for a cure]:

màatâr kòo sai tà saamo wannàn ganyee tà baa shì yà shasshàafaa à cikii, tà sassafo wannàn itàacee tà baa shì yà shaafàa (MJC:207)

‘the wife would then get **this** plant and give him to rub on his stomach, and she would cut **this [that]** bark of tree to give him to rub it on’ (MJC:207)

(148) [a report on inter-ethnic marriage]:

à yànzù hakà àuràtayyàa tsàkaanin wafànnân/wafànnàn k àbìilun kasâr dà wafànnân/wafànnàn sai dadà kàaruwaa takèe yîi

‘right now, intermarriage between **these** ethnic groups and **these** (ones) is ever increasing’

Notice that in none of the symbolic contexts above is the referent underpinned by an antecedent reference point, providing further evidence that the speaker employs the pre-head strategy to encode essentially new information right across the spatial, anaphoric and symbolic domains in which HL wannàn is deployed.

### 2.3. Summary

In this chapter, I have examined the speaker-based Hausa demonstratives, adverbs, and associated deictic particles as part of a deictic system. Pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn and its post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn variant, locative adverbial F nân and its derivative temporal usages are to be interpreted as speaker-centred deictics. Whenever they are employed to encode a deictic utterance, we must assume that the speaker wishes to locate and/or project himself into the context of situation. This complex system, I argue, is speaker-oriented, organising and locating referent objects (both spatial and temporal) around the egocentric, pivotal point of speaker proximity. It is within this context that the three basic deictic functions — *spatial*, *anaphoric* and *symbolic* — manifest themselves in such a way as to project a speaker's position/point of view. (There is an interesting parallel between my three-term person-centric approach to Rauh's (1983b:16) egocentric-localistic criteria, according to which the following underlying deictic orientation are assumed to be crucial: a) 'coding place' (= speaker-proximal deictic discussed in the present chapter); b) 'in connexion with the coding place' (= speaker distal/addressee-proximal deictics discussed in chapter three); and c) 'not in connexion with the coding place' (= speaker-addressee distal deictics examined in chapter 4). ) The point has also been made that the three deictic functions we have examined derive their usage from a basic spatial coding where a clear and explicit deictic anchoring must be made with reference to the place occupied by the speaker at the moment of utterance. When there are variations in word order as is the case with pre- and post-demonstrative wannàn + NP, vs. NP -n/r-nân/nàn, I claim that the speaker's choice is conditioned largely by certain assumptions that s/he makes concerning the cognitive status of the information that the addressee holds about the referent object — HL wannàn+NP = new [-*identifiable*, -*familiar*] referent; (post-head) NP+-n/r-nân/nàn = old [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*] referent.

Table 7: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal deictics

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Adverbial F <u>nân</u>	speaker-proximal [+gesture], e.g. gâa shi <u>nân</u> kusa dà nii 'here it is <b>here</b> close to me'.	(< speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wàatòò dai muu <u>nân</u> ... 'in short, for us <b>here</b> (in this pre-mentioned area)...'  [cataphoric], e.g. shaawaràr dà zân baa kà à <u>nân</u> ita cêe... 'my advice to you <b>here</b> is ...'  [temporal], e.g. <u>nân</u> gâba kâdân zaa kî jî sâakâmakon gaan àawâr 'soon, you'll hear the result of the interview'	(<< speaker-proximal) [±gesture], e.g. (indicating) ...in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>nân</u> '...if I move <b>here</b> , he moves [t] <b>here</b> '
Demonstrative (pre-head) <u>wannân</u> + NP	speaker-proximal, [- <i>identifiable</i> ], [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. gâa <u>wannân</u> takârdâa (# dà ka cêe...) 'here's <b>this</b> paper (# that you said...)'	(< speaker-proximal), [- <i>identifiable</i> ], [- <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. àmsà <u>wannân</u> tàmbayàa ta kàsà 'answer <b>this</b> question below'	(<< speaker-proximal), [±gesture], e.g. yà wucè <u>wannân</u> zaurèe, ...yà wucè <u>wannân</u> zaurèe 'he would pass <b>this</b> room...and he would pass <b>this</b> room'
Demonstrative (post-head) NP- <u>n/-r-nân/nân</u>	speaker-proximal, [+ <i>identifiable</i> ], [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. gâa takârdâ- <u>r-nân</u> (dà ka cêe...) 'here's <b>this</b> paper (that you said...)'	(<speaker-proximal), [+ <i>identifiable</i> ], [+ <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. bàa dà amsàr tàmbayà- <u>r-nân</u> ta samà 'answer <b>this</b> question (above)'	Not applicable

In subsequent chapters, I show that the participant-based analytical model is adequate enough to explain other deictic forms, and is therefore superior to its predecessors that looked at these forms in an isolated and unsystematic way.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In ‘Western’, e.g. Sokoto, Hausa, there is an additional L tone nàn adverbial which encodes a similar deictic orientation to F nân, although on the scale of proximity, nàn has a more intimate/immediate proximal value for speakers than nân, e.g. gàa shi nàn gà hannuunaa ‘**here** it is in my hand’, used to code a more proximal, corporeal individuation of a visible speaker-proximal object. This is discussed in Jaggar and Buba (1994:29, n.9), where we point out that L nàn and F nân are always speaker-centred. Thus both utterances below have an intrinsically speaker-based deictic interpretation:

a) inaa hùulaataa takè? ‘where’s my hat?’

b) gàa ta nàn/nân kusa dà nii ‘it’s **here** close to me’

Notice that L tone nàn is restricted to occurrence following a H tone syllable — cf. Newman (1995:766f).

Comparable facts have been documented for other languages. Denny (1978), for example, identified Kikuyu (Bantu) *haha* and *gūkū* as ‘non-extended **here**’ (=L nàn) and ‘extended **here**’ (= F nân) respectively. Kikuyu also seems to mirror the six-way deictic differentiation that has been documented for Sokoto/Niger Hausa, in that other dimensions identified by Denny (1978) are: ‘non-extended **there** in the field’ (= H nan), ‘extended **there** in the field’ (= L cân), ‘non-extended **there** out-of field’ (= F cân), and ‘extended **there** out-of field’ (= H cân). See also Casad (1975:225) in which he glosses Cora’s (Uto-Aztecan) three deictic (here) morphemes as ‘off somewhere **here**, back inside **here**, and right **here** at an exact location’.

<sup>2</sup> In fact, as we have observed in Jaggar and Buba (1994:414 n.4), Hausaists ‘have been groping around in the dark’, often assigning erroneous tone. Abraham (1959:82), for example, incorrectly transcribes temporal nân gàba ‘in future’ with H #nan gàba, which can only occur in hearer-oriented spatial usage, e.g. nan gàba kàðan ‘a bit further (from where you, the addressee, are); on a single page in Kraft (1963:117), all of the four known adverbials NAN/CAN were assigned the wrong tone (except in the emphatic usage of H nan as in shii kèè nan); Jaggar (1992b:126, 149) also misrepresented temporal nân gàba ‘in future’ with #nan gàba, together with Awde (1987:52, 59, 67) #nan gàba ‘in the future’, #dàgà nân kuma faa? ‘then what?’, #nan gàba kàðan ‘shortly’. Cowan and Schuh (1976:88)

---

are to join this roll call as they wrongly assigned F nân to a set of ten sentences used in a drill, when the informant on the tape is actually using H nan.

3 Compare this system with Bühler's (1982, 1990 [1934]) tripartite descriptive framework of *demonstratio ad oculos* (= *spatial*), *anaphora* (= *anaphoric*), and *Deixis am Phantasma* (= *symbolic*). Fillmore's categorial functions were modified in Jaggar and Buba (1994) to accommodate the specific realisations of these deictic functions in Hausa. For instance, we rephrased his *gestural* function as *spatial* in Hausa, because the former assumes the use of gestures exclusively only under this function. The Hausa data clearly shows that it is in fact possible to accompany an *anaphoric* or *symbolic* deictic expression with an accompanying gesture, e.g., (anaphoric H can [chapter 4]) yàayàa can? 'how's **there?**' said by a speaker to an addressee who has just arrived in London from the United States, with an accompanying head and eye-raising gesture to the presumed direction of United States; (symbolic §2.2.5.) ... in ta duubàa nân tà duubàa nân '... and when she looks **here**, when she looks **here** she'll look **there**', accompanied by the movement of the head from right to left.

4 The term *speaker* is used here to cover *writer* as well, and the term *addressee* is to be interpreted as including *hearer* or *reader* of a text. But see Green (1989:1) for the distinction between *addressee* and *hearer*.

5 Even a cursory look at this phenomenon will reveal that, at least, in a canonical situation there is an important connection between deictics and gestures. But a strict interpretation of gestures in relation to the object of reference will surely force us to admit of the possibility of gestures being considered as a fundamental part of human language behaviour. And if such a correlation is plausible, then the present orthodoxy of defining language as a verbal auditory system of communication will either have to go, or be modified in such a way as to admit of other sign systems belonging to a general universal symbolic system. Sebeok (1991: 65) seems to have this in mind, when he argues that '... non-verbal sign systems are 'wired into' the behaviour of every normal neonate; {and that} this initial semiotic endowment enables children to survive and both to acquire and to compose a working knowledge of their world *before* they acquire verbal signs' (italics mine). According to Rauh (1983b:45 n.28), 'this explains why in cases where by means of a deictic expression a referent is selected out of its homogenous surroundings, in the context of *demonstratio ad oculos* an indicating gesture is always needed, e.g. if by using '**here**' reference is made to a point on a

map, or if out of several articles displayed in a shop one is picked out (*this one*) or if out of a group of people on a photograph one is identified (*this is my brother*), etc' (p. 45). Lyons (1977:638) seems to suggest that gestures are originally linguistic tools. They '... developed for communication in face-to-face interaction ... [since] so far as deixis is concerned many utterances which would be readily interpretable in a canonical situation of utterance are subject to various ambiguities or indeterminacy'. In fact, at the core of Bühler's deictic field theory is the use of **this**, **here**, and **I** in a 'pointing' situation. Bühler (1990[1934]: 99) argues that '... it is primarily gestures and psychologically equivalent sense data that mediate this understanding of the utterance on the basis of the details of the situation'. He adds: 'whoever goes along with this watchword, 'one thing after another and gestures first of all', has the key in his hand and is bound to find the deictic field' (p. 99). However, Maclaran (1982:61) has argued that '... those supposedly paradigm cases of direct deictic uses are comparatively rare'. See also Wales (1986) for a detailed description of the nature of the relationship between gestures and deixis in the context of language acquisition.

6 F nân can be used with a preceding prepositional particle à to indicate an even greater specificity than is encoded with bare F nân, as in gàa biirònkà à nân inàa rìfè dà shii 'here's your biro right **here**, I'm holding it'. See Abraham (1959:87-8) for further discussion.

7 Interestingly, Hanks (1989:116) has argued that a presentative predicator like gàa '... is maximally focal ...', and that this '... focality is well reflected in native speaker metalinguistic glosses of this form, which consistently associate it with acts of manually handing the referent to the addressee'.

8 Sometimes the actual spatial distance between speaker and addressee(s) may be no more than a projection of the speaker's point of view. This could explain why a face-to-face confrontation between mother and son in the utterance below is encoded with a series of F nân usage, although the spatial distance between the speaker's and addressee's position in relation to the referent [Ibrahim] is clearly variable:

[mother tries to describe the insolence of her son to other relatives seated about the same place, and says as she points out the locations]:

yànzù kà dùubi rashìn mutuncìn Ìbraahim; tun yanàa nân, ya daawoo nân  
har ya daawoo nân [TG]

---

'I mean, look at the insolence of Ibrahim; he was **here** at first, until he moved [t]**here**, then moved [t]**here**'.

Rauh (1983b:13) has pointed out that this space assumed by the speaker to be the 'center of orientation' is indeed a cognitive construct which '... according to specific criteria, domains surrounding a central point of orientation are differentiated' (p. 18), and that it is within this perceived space that the speaker 'relates something which may be called 'non-ego' to his 'ego' ' (p. 13). Citing Spanish use of *aquí* and *este*, Hottenroth (1982:145) has added another supporting dimension to the so-called objective theory of deixis. The writer points out that 'the concept of nearness ... is not an objective concept but a relative one'. Thus, the region referred to as near the speaker when F nân is used, may turn out to coincide with the speaker's narrow 'objective region', but may also '... extend beyond such an objective region' (p. 139).

<sup>9</sup> The same speaker-centred orientational principle constrains a verb of motion whose spatial orientation is away from the location of the speaker from co-occurring with spatial F nân, e.g. # jee nân! '#go **here!**'. But jèe ka nân is permissible in a symbolic context (§2.2.4.), where the speaker intends to give the addressee an idea of the relative proximity of the unspecified location to the spatial position occupied by the speaker at the coding time. See also Fillmore's (1975) interesting deictic study of 'come' and 'go'. Note however that unlike Spanish where *venir* always assumes movement to the speaker (Hottenroth 1982:144f), the deictic orientation of Hausa zoo 'come' can in fact be directed towards the addressee, e.g. a note left for the addressee: naa zoo àmmaa bàn tarar dà kai ba 'I came, but didn't meet you'. English and French allow the use of such deictic directionals to engage the addressee in certain contextual usages of, for example, 'come'. See also Grimes (1975:79).

<sup>10</sup> I use the term *anaphoric* in the sense of Lyons (1977:659), to cover '... both normal backward looking anaphoric reference' and the less normal forward-looking, or anticipatory, anaphoric reference. But unlike him, I use Bühler's term *cataphoric* to specify the latter strategy. However, the use of the term *anaphoric* to talk about deixis is not to be taken for granted, since many scholars do not consider anaphora as anything more than the relationship of coreference between an expression with its (intra) textual antecedent. For instance, Weissenborn and Klein (1982:54) have pointed out that 'German distinguishes between deictics and strict anaphora' (p. 54), and in the same volume, Ullmer-Ehrich adds: 'the

---

distinction between strict deixis and strict anaphorics is sensible and necessary for German' (p. 55). The writer further points out that while German '*hier* and *dort* always point to the utterance place even when they are used in the phonic bindings, *da* ... is neutral in this respect, which makes it a strict anaphora' (p. 58). Yet I am of the deictic-anaphoric convergence persuasion that anaphora involves 'the transference of what are basically deictic, and more specifically spatial notions to the temporal dimension of the context of utterance and the reinterpretation of deictic existence in terms of what might be called TEXTUAL EXISTENCE... Anaphora should be seen as, in principle derivable from deixis' (Lyons (1968:82, 275ff). For Fleischman (1991), 'space and time often function as convertible linguistic currencies, providing us with two powerful macro-metaphors for mapping our conceptualizations of discourse onto the metalanguage we use to orient our addressees with respect to the architecture of our texts' (p. 293). Indeed, if we look closely at the Hausa demonstratives and adverbials, we may have to arrive at the same conclusion, since they are essentially spatial deictics. See also Hottenroth (1982:146) and Hauenschild (1982:67) for corroborative statements and data for Spanish and Czech respectively.

<sup>11</sup> This is the basic premise upon which the localist hypothesis rests, according to which spatial expressions are seen to be linguistically more basic, '... in that they serve as structural templates ... for other expressions' (Lyons:1977:718). Specifically, localist theoreticians will point to the fact that '... temporal expressions, in many unrelated languages, are patently derived from locative expressions' [1977:718]. Crow (1989:2) stresses the point made by Lyons (1977:718) that 'in all cases in which prepositions exhibit both spatial and temporal use, the temporal meaning developed later ... even prepositions such as for, since, till, which in Modern English are temporal rather than spatial, derive historically from locatives' (p. 2). Lyons (1977:718) adds: 'As **here** can be analysed as meaning 'at **this** place' ... so '**now**' can be analysed as meaning 'at **this** time'.' In Hausa F nân performs both the spatial and temporal role of English '**here**' and '**now**'.

<sup>12</sup> See Nunberg (1993) for an exhaustive description and analysis of the indexical coding of the equivalent English 'we' pronoun.

<sup>13</sup> One can in fact imagine the speaker of the utterance deictically pointing to himself, a gesture which often accompanies the first person nii 'I' to 'self nominate from a group ...' (Levinson 1983:66). The pronominal system as a

---

whole is very much compatible with the kind of tripartite participant-based system of deictic anchoring within which I am working. Thus, according to Levinson (1983:69) what is needed to accomplish this compatibility ‘... would crucially include for first person, speaker-inclusion (+S); for second person, addressee-inclusion; and for third person, speaker and addressee exclusion, [although] the third person ... does not correspond to any specific participant-role in the speech event.’ See also Ingram (1978), Burling (1970), and Lyons (1977).

14 Chafe (1976:25) defines ‘newness’ in terms of his notion of ‘givenness’, which he defines as ‘... that knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance. So-called new information is what the speaker assumes he is introducing into the addressee’s consciousness by what he says.’

15 Cf. Rauh’s (1983b:48) remark on the way in which this deictic transference is accomplished:

Establishing a center of orientation in discourse is possible because the coding of discourse is a continuous process along which at any point the encoder may potentially stop and establish a center of orientation. Since a continuous process of discourse may be looked upon as having either temporal or (in writing) local extension, the fixing of temporal or local points of orientation is respectively possible (p. 48).

Consider the use of ‘**now**’ in the following example quoted in Rauh (1983b:49):

Examine your heart, my good reader, and resolve whether you believe these matters with me. If you do, you may **now** proceed to their exemplifications with me (H. Fielding, Tom Jones).

Fleischman (1991:299) comments: ‘words like ‘**here**’ and ‘**now**’ need no longer point to a world outside the text and to the real-world situation in which the utterance containing them were produced; in written discourse a deictic *can* refer only to the discourse itself or to particular points in its elaboration.’ In his discussion of ‘now’ Bühler (1990 [1934]:148) notes its local as well as global relationship to the adverbial ‘here’:

---

As does *here*, the isolated word *now* indicates its place value itself when it is pronounced. It need not be conceived as an unextended (mathematical) point, as a limit in the strict sense of the word any more than *here* does, but rather it can assume a lesser, but also an arbitrarily large extension according to the no-longer-now concomitant to the conception of the now. Just as a devout Christian who says *here* includes the entire world (the surface of the earth or even more), one who thinks in terms of geological time measurement can include the entire period since the last ice age in his 'now'. And just as the here-point, so too can the now-point be displaced within the imagination to any arbitrary point...

Similarly, Nunberg (1993:29, footnote 30) has demonstrated that in the instances which are used by Levinson (1983) to denote the meaning of **now** '... 'as the pragmatically relevant span that includes [the coding time]', *now* and *here* actually denote the time and place of utterance, but that these may be construed as indefinitely large.' And although he did point to contexts where he considers it 'a stretch to identify referents with the place and time of utterance', Nunberg makes it clear that '...there is no principled way of distinguishing between the uses of *here* and *now* that denote the immediate vicinity of the utterance and those that denote intervals of progressively larger dimension' (p. 29).

16 This is not a deictic phenomenon restricted to Hausa. Lyons (1977:677) for example, has observed that in English '[i]t frequently happens that 'this' is selected rather than 'that', 'here' rather than 'there', and 'now' rather than 'then', when the speaker is personally involved with the entity, situation or place to which he is referring or is identifying himself with the attitude or viewpoint of the addressee'. But he is quick to caution that the conditions underlying the choice are not altogether clear. Lakoff (1974:346) recognises this difficulty, and admits that the 'metaphor of 'emotional deixis' is harder to pin down: we can't quite figure out the relationship between the concepts'. Nevertheless Lakoff does provide a working definition of 'emotional deixis' as '... generally linked to the speaker's involvement in the subject-matter of his utterance...' (p. 347). She argues that in the following utterances, the choice of **this** and **that** depends on the extent to which the speaker wishes to indicate involvement (= **this**) rather than distance (= **that**): 'Kissinger made his long-awaited announcement yesterday. **This/that** statement confirmed the speculations of many observers' (from Maclaran 1982:83).

---

According to Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993:279) ‘**this**’ can be used to encode a referent ‘not activated by the speaker ... to convey special effects such as solidarity, e.g. ‘**this** is Chris you’re talking about, right?’; ‘**this** is true’, used by the speaker when s/he ‘appropriates an idea introduced by the addressee’ (p. 279). Rauh (1983b:41) also shares Lyons’ (1977) uncertainty, pointing out that in Fillmore’s example ‘Get **that** beaver out of this house’, ‘it may turn out that the effect of emotional distance is not a result of the use of **that**, but rather of the strong accent on **that**’ (p. 41).

Nevertheless, I agree with Lyons that the ‘speaker’s subjective involvement’ is a relevant factor. Chafe (1976:54) adds: ‘... if a speaker himself plays a role in the sentence, he can be expected to empathize with himself ...’. See also Kuno’s (1976:419-444) work on speaker empathy and relativisation phenomena.

17 According to Grimes (1975:76) ‘tense systems are defined at least partly in terms of this correspondence between time relations that are inherent in what happens and the relation of the happening to the telling’. For Fillmore (1975:36) the tense system represented as ‘past’, ‘present’ and ‘future’ ... are notions related to deictic time’, serving to distinguish ‘... between the time of event or condition ... and the time or time period that is taken as the background or setting for time indications in the clause...’ (p. 36f). For details of the role of tense in deictic interpretation, see Lakoff (1970:838-849); Huddleston (1969:777-806); also Rauh (1983c:229-275) for a comparative study of English and German tenses as deictic categories. Time is also the main focus of Klein (1994).

18 Some speakers can use nân gâba ‘in future’ to code a time preceding the moment of utterance, e.g., à cikin jàwaabìnsà na kwaanana baaya, Shùugàbaa yaa cêe nân gâba zâi bayyànà manufar saabuwar dòokâr, àmmaa sai gâa shi yaa faasâa ‘in his recent statement, the President said he would explain the new law **sometime later**, but he failed to do so’. F nân also combines with the locative adverb baaya ‘behind’, e.g. ... nân baaya bàa dà jumàawaa ba ... ‘... only a while ago...’. These strategies are however rarely encountered in discourse. Of equal rarity is the possibility of using ?nan gâba — noted briefly in Jaggar and Buba (1994:418) — though its occurrence is at best peripheral. Subsequent checks with other native speakers from the same dialect area have proved negative. None of the informants allow H #nan gâba for marking temporal reference. They point out that F nân gâba ‘in future’ is in fact an evasive, non-durative, futuristic strategy, often used by a speaker to avoid committing himself to a time span. And if this is

---

the case, then H #nan gàba may not be felicitous, since it does not add any qualitative information to the fact that the speaker is, at best, evasive (deceptive, at worst), for which F nân gàba will suffice. However, H nan gàba ‘there, in front (of you)’ is possible where a *spatial* rather than a temporal (*anaphoric*) reference is encoded, e.g.: nan gàba kàdàn akà kaamàa shi ‘he was caught **there a little way** (from where you are)’.

19 Halliday and Hasan (1993 [1976]:75) view English ‘this’, ‘these’, and ‘here’ as ‘the only sources of cataphoric cohesion ... in English which regularly refer forward TEXTUALLY, to something to which they are not linked by a structural relationship.’ Maclaran (1982:83) adds: ‘the proximate tends to be forward-looking not only in finding its referents, but also temporally ...’. F nân performs this role in these contexts.

20 F nân in this context becomes a symbolic representation of an underlying speaker-oriented imaginative deixis (in the sense that it now moved to a realm of experience), which, according to Bühler (1990 [1934]:141), ‘... is when the narrator leads the hearer into the realm of what is absent and can be remembered ... and treats him to the same deictic words as before so that he may see and hear what can be seen and heard there (and touch, of course, and perhaps even smell and taste things). Not with the external eye, ear, and so on, but with what is usually called the ‘mind’s’ eye or ear in everyday language...’ (p. 141). Like Bühler, Anderson and Keenan have mentioned in passing the ‘variety of metaphorical extensions’ that can be made with deictic forms. They argue that speaker-proximal deictics such as English ‘**this**’ fulfil such possibilities, when used to encode ‘nearness’ to domains other than literal spatial location, *at this time, in this way*. Indeed they go so far as to say that ‘notions such as ‘near to the speaker’ may be interpreted not only in the literal, physical sense, but also by extension to ‘psychological proximity’, i.e., vividness to the mind of the speaker’ (p. 278); this seems to be the essential symbolic function performed by F nân in (47) and elsewhere.

21 As pointed out in Jaggar and Buba (1994:415), Sokoto Hausa L nân may be used in the second clause, i.e. in akà yi dà nii nân òn yi nân, to code the same symbolic reference.

22 It is a measure of the intricacy and complexity of deixis in Hausa that even native speakers like Bagari (1986) and Mohmed (1977) could make such

---

erroneous remarks concerning the alleged symmetry between the speaker's and addressee's positions.

23 There is a view which considers the term proximal as a binary value, helping to distinguish objects marked proximal in relation to the egocentric (speaker-centred) orientation [+proximal], and those which are not [-proximal]. Lyons (1968:73f) argues in support of this claim within the context of English semantics: 'In English, *this* and *here* are semantically marked in relation to *that* and *there*: the opposition is proximal vs. non-proximal, not proximal vs. distal (distal vs. non-distal) ... As *bitch* is to a *dog* with respect to the lexicalised opposition of sex, so *this/here* is to *that/there* with respect to the opposition of deictic proximity'. But the moment one looks into languages like Hausa, Japanese (Coulmas 1982), and even Spanish, one realises that the term 'proximal' cannot be assumed to apply egocentrically all of the time (Saeed 1997:174). As we shall see in chapter 3, LH wànnan, and H nan are construed as proximal deictics, but in relation to the addressee. In other words, they necessarily locate referents within the hearer's 'objective' region.

24 As Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993) themselves acknowledge, 'to the extent that syntactic structure and prosodic form encode topic-comment structure and serve to highlight constituents whose referents the speaker wants to bring into focus, membership of the in-focus set is partially determined by linguistic form' (p. 279). Thus, the psychological notion of 'in-focus' as employed by the authors is linguistically manifested in the 'position of prominence' accorded to the item being focused. They further note that 'the two senses [of focus] are related ... in that elements tend to be linguistically focused because the speaker wants to bring them into the focus of attention' (footnote 10).

25 See Contreras (1976:3-5) who argues that presupposition and focus are restricted versions of the concepts of given and new. It is the former concepts, however, that she replaced with Firbas' (1966) concepts of theme and rheme, in order to account for word-order variation in Spanish. Lyons (1977:508-9) has observed that while theme and rheme are commonly defined as parts of utterance containing given and new information respectively, they are to be associated with 'information-structure' rather than 'thematic-structure'. For details of the relevant discussion, see Halliday (1967b, 1970).

---

26 I have relied heavily on my reading judgement, and sometimes that of other native Hausa speakers who have volunteered to read these stories (see acknowledgement). I subsequently transcribed the extracts used in this dissertation.

27 There are, however, contexts in which pre-head demonstrative HL wannàn can be used temporally for unique reference in a specialised day-word usage, e.g. à wannàn saafiyaa/daree/raanaa/watàa màì àlbarkàa ‘on **this** blessed morning/night/afternoon/month’; sai gòodiyaa gà Allàh à wannàn daree/raanaa màì àlbarkàa ‘let’s give thanks to God on **this** (special) blessed night (eve)/day’, where wannàn saafiyaa/daree/raanaa ‘**this** morning/night/day’ is restricted to the description of nights and days of special significance in the community’s life, but not in (101)-(107). Note also that the post-head -nân/nàn is not possible in this specialised context, for as Newman (forthcoming) observed the pre-head strategy is pre-modifying a nominal, while in (101)-(107), post-head -nân/nàn is modifying an adverbial phrase.

## CHAPTER THREE

### The Semantic-Pragmatic Features of Addressee-Centred Deixis in Hausa

#### 3. 0. *Introduction*

In this chapter, I shall examine the pragmatic features of the addressee-centred demonstratives FH wànnan (pl. = HLH wadànnan), LH wànnan (pl. = LLH wadànnan), NP-n/r-nan ‘**that, those** [near you the hearer]’ and the adverbial H nan ‘**there** [near you the hearer]’ counterpart, all of which are essentially hearer-centric. Unlike English, and numerous European languages, where deictic structures are organised in terms of a minimal, two-step, system of adverbials and demonstratives, encoding objects proximal or distal to the speaker, Hausa encodes the addressee position with a distinct lexeme, hence strengthening the view that the hearer’s position has an equally vital role to play in an interactive context.<sup>1</sup> The above Hausa deictic forms show precisely how this process of encoding and decoding of information is directly related to a lexically-expressed, addressee-specific (sometimes speaker-distal) perspective.

#### 3. 1. *Adverbial H nan = Addressee-proximal (= spatial) or Speaker-distal (= non-spatial).*

At the basic *spatial* level, adverbial H nan draws the attention of the addressee to his/her location at the moment of utterance. Note that the speaker’s orientation is immaterial to its interpretation, for by its very nature only the addressee location can be inferred from the choice of H nan ‘**there** near you’. But as in all other cases of the study of Hausa deictic forms, previous descriptions largely overlooked this critical feature.

### 3. 1. 1. *Previous descriptions of H nan*

In early grammars of Hausa, e.g. Robinson (1925 [vol. II]:256), and Taylor (1959 [1923]:37), no distinction was drawn between the tonally distinct speaker-centred F nân (Chapter 2) and addressee-centred H nan adverbials. Although distinctive tones went unmarked, (as noted in chapter 2), Robinson (vol. 1) has nan (no tones) coding a wide range of meanings, ‘**this, that, these, those, and here**’ (p. 312). Furthermore none of these early writers understood the participant orientation of the respective *NAN/CAN* adverbial forms.

Abraham (1962:132 [1946]; 1959:55) proposed a form-meaning correlation based on the oppositions [ $\pm$  distant] and [ $\pm$  visible]. Abraham incorrectly identified H nan as synonymous with both F cân and H can (see Chapter 4), e.g. naa bi ta can = nan ‘I passed through **there** (visible)’ (1962:132); (also in Abraham (1934:17)) yaa bi ta nan = yaa bi ta cân ‘He passed through **there** (visible)’; naa ga kaayaa cân = naa ga kaayaa nan ‘I saw a load **there** (visible)’. And since Abraham (1934:17) has argued that ‘nearer distance has falling tone (= nân/cân)’, equating H nan ‘**there** [near you the hearer]’ with can/cân ‘(way) over **there** [distant from you and I]’ is clearly a contradiction of this proposed correlation.<sup>2</sup> Abraham was also aware that H tone nan has important temporal and conjunctive usages (= -visible), e.g. dàgà nan sai ... ‘the next thing that happened was ...’, gàba nàa nan ‘tomorrow is another day’, and added that ‘*NAN* with high tone indicates ‘availability’’, e.g. dooki yanàa nan ‘a horse is available’.

Bargery’s (1934:814) dictionary definitions are roughly the same as Abraham’s, except that he does not equate H nan with F cân and H can. Also, his interpretation of H nan is neutral as to its participant orientation, e.g. nan = ‘**there**’ bàr shi nan ‘leave it where it is’, but without the additional participant information that that is also where the addressee is located. He was also aware of the non-spatial usages (anaphoric, temporal) of H nan, e.g. kaa san wurii kàzaa, tòò à nan gidansà yakè.

'you know such-and-such a place; well, **that** is where his home is'; anàa nan anàa nan 'it came to pass that ...'; also the emphatic shi kèe nan 'that's all'. Gouffé (1970/71:299), and Jungraithmayr and Möhlig (1976:95) suggest a straightforward tone-meaning correlation, with H tone nan/can coding non-visible referents and F nân/ cân mapping visible objects.

Kraft and Kirk-Greene (1973:52) claim: 'The high-tone forms typically indicate a greater distance from the speaker than do the falling-tone forms, e.g.: gàa Audù nân 'here's Audu **here** (nearby)', gàa Audù nan 'here's Audu **here** (in the vicinity)''—notice too that in the latter example, Kraft and Kirk-Greene actually gloss the addressee-proximal H nan '**there** (near you the hearer)' adverbial with speaker-proximal English '**here**'.

Cowan and Schuh (1976:299) consider the distinction between H nan/can and F nân/cân mainly in terms of an oppositional visible/non-visible criterion: 'With a falling tone, the place indicated is in sight; with a high tone, it is a place referred to, but not physically indicated by some gesture' (p. 299). Cowan and Schuh provide the following dialogue to illustrate the distinction:

(1) a) Question: ̀naa takàdarkà?

'where is your paper?'

b (i) Answer 1: gàa ta nân cikin littaaifi

'**here** it is in my book (the student shows it to the teacher)'

b (ii) Answer 2: tanàa can à gidaa

'it's **there** at home (the student didn't bring it to school)'

It seems that the argument relating to the visible/non-visible distinction of F nân/cân and H nan/can was based on this dialogue in (1), as I could not find any use of adverbial H nan in Cowan and Schuh's *Spoken Hausa*. But notice that the context of use of b (i) and b (ii) is in fact not the same. Had they used the b(i) frame for both examples, they would have realised that the presentative particle gàa (look!) can combine with H nan/can to code a visible entity, e.g., gàa ta nan cikin littaañi 'there it is in the book [student pointing to the book close to the teacher]'. Thus, contrary to Cowan and Schuh's examples, it is possible both to see and to point out visible objects or a place 'in sight' using H nan/can. (In a number of cases too, the tone-marking is at odds with the tones actually produced by the speaker on the accompanying tapes — e.g. drills 9C, 11, (p. 77ff); drill 3B (p. 88), where F nân is wrongly used instead of the informant's correctly produced H nan form.

In Newman and Newman (1979:94), and Newman (1990:122, 276), H nan is defined as [-proximal] and/or [±visible] = 'there (distant or previously mentioned)', e.g. (pointing) tanàa nan kusa dà wàccan bishiyàa<sup>3</sup> 'she is over there by that tree', jîi nakèe yanàa nan har yànzù 'I think he is still there (where we were talking about before)'. Notice that in the gloss: 'nan adv. over there (nearby)', the anomalous use of 'nearby' orientates the referent in relationship to the speaker's position rather than the addressee's. As I shall show, H nan serves to pick out referents that are proximal to the addressee, just like F nân (chapter 2) identifies objects as being proximal to the speaker. Newman and Newman were also aware of the temporal use of H nan in such temporal phrases as nan dà nan 'at once' (p. 94). Table 8 below summarises the major descriptions of H nan in the literature:

Table 8: summary of previous descriptions of H nan-adverbial

	Robinson	Abraham	Bargery	Kraft/Kirk Greene	Cowan/ Schuh	Newman/ Newman
H <u>nan</u>	<u>n a n</u> (no tones) 'here, there'	[±visible] [+distal] (= # <u>cân</u> / # <u>can</u> ) 'there', e.g. yaa bi ta <u>nan</u> = # <u>cân</u> 'he passed through there'  also <u>d à g à nan</u> sai ... 'the next thing that happened was ...'	[±visible] 'there', e.g. bàr shi <u>nan</u> 'leave it where it is'  kaa san wurii kàzaa, tòo à <u>nan</u> gidansà yakè 'you know such-and-such a place; well that is where his home is'	[+distal] # 'here', e.g. gàa Audù <u>nan</u> 'here's Audu # here' (nearby)	[-visible],  no examples	[±visible, [-proximal]] 'there', (distant or previously mentioned') e.g. tanàa <u>nan</u> kusa dà wàccan bishiyàa 'she's over there by that tree'  jîi nakèe yanàa <u>nan</u> har yànzù 'I think he is still there (where we were talking about before)'

The above summary shows that there is an enormous amount of confusion and sometimes misinformation concerning the precise semantic-pragmatic contexts for H nan. The real problem for these writers, however, is an inability to move out of a simple Eurocentric speaker-distance based framework to a participant-based, context-dependant model that could explain all of the usages. This model has been proposed and effectively used in Jaggar and Buba (1994) to capture the addressee-based strategy employed by the speaker for coding the deictic orientation of adverbial H nan.

Before Jaggar and Buba (1994), Hausaists (native and non-native speakers) have overlooked the functions of H nan in everyday communicative interaction. It is curious that Bagari (a native Hausa scholar (1986)) elects to leave the *NAN/CAN* adverbials out of his descriptive grammar altogether. Similarly, although Zaria (another native Hausa scholar (1981:28-32)) has a chapter on adverbs, H nan does



Table 9: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based H *nan* adverbial

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
H <i>nan</i>	addressee-proximal, e.g. gàa shi <i>nan</i> kusa dà kai 'there it is <b>there</b> close to you'	(speaker-distal < addressee-proximal) e.g. wàatò dai kuu <i>nan</i> ... 'in short, for you <b>there</b> (in that pre-mentioned area) ...'  [cataphoric], e.g. kuma à <i>nan</i> mukèe sàukaa gidan Àlhajì Roorò 'and it's <b>there</b> at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'  [temporal], e.g. <i>nan</i> dà <i>nan</i> sai ya yàrda 'he agreed <b>there</b> and <b>then</b> '	(speaker-distal << addressee-proximal) e.g. ganii <i>nan</i> barii <i>nan</i> 'as it's seen <b>there</b> , so shall it be left <b>there</b> '

### 3. 1. 2. *Spatial H nan*

Numerous languages have a deictic system which lexically encodes the addressee (or at least a medial) position. Fillmore (1982:49), for example, includes Latin, Greek, Japanese and Spanish in the list of languages having a three-way contrast. Coulmas (1982:211ff) documented the Japanese *soko* adverbial as designating 'the place where you [the addressee] are'. Spanish *ahí* has also been categorised by Hottenroth (1982:135) as referring '... either to the addressee's location, to a location near him, or to one at a medial distance', e.g. : *ahí, en ese lugar, donde tu estás* '**there** in **that** place where you are' (cf. *à nan wurîn nan dà kakè*). Italian *costì* also encodes a parallel region of proximity to the addressee as H *nan* adverbial. Frei (1944:115) includes French and Portuguese as other Romance languages featuring the middle (= medial-neutral) term in their local deictic system, as well as Ronga (Bantu) and Bisaya (Austronesian). Denny (1978:73f) reported Kikuyu (Bantu) as having an eight-term local deictic system, of which *hau* is the term picking out reference-object(s) that are close to the addressee, e.g. *Iga hau* 'put it **there**' ('put it in your **here**' is how Denny glossed it). Citing Frei

(1944:115), Rauh (1983b:15) notes that the middle term is attested in Portuguese and French, as well as in German. Zawawi (1971:64) writes that in Swahili 'h-o' can be classified as coding an object which is in a 'location near the listener' (see also Hinnebusch and Mirza 1979:175).

Locative H nan in Hausa is employed by the speaker to pick out visible referents within the hearer's field of vision or orientation, as in the following face-to-face encounters:

(3) [speaker reminds addressee]

ai biirònkà shii nèe nan kakèè rìfè dà shii

'your biro, that's it **there**, you're holding it'

(4) [speaker responds to the addressee's question: inaa ka ga ya bi? 'where did

you see him going?']:

ta nan ya bi dà saafe

'it was via **there** [where you the addressee are] that he passed by in the morning'

(5) [speaker orders addressee]:

gàa dookìi nan, hau mù tàfi

'**there** is a horse **there** (near you), get on it and let's go'

(6) [speaker invites addressee to take a seat]:

zàunaa gàa kujèeraa nan

'sit on the chair **there** [where you are]'

(7) [speaker preempts addressee's move towards a particular location which he has

already booked for himself, so s/he says]:

naa yi nan kaa yi nan, yàayàa kèe nan?

'I'm headed **there**, and you're headed **there**, what's happening?

In all the above contexts, H nan is spatially anchored on the addressee's location, and the non-necessity of a supporting gesture will indicate that that is the intention of the speaker. If the speaker wishes to point out a location other than the addressee's, the resources of the language (including gestures) provide him/her with ample means of doing so. A speaker could, for example, contrast his/her position with that of the addressee in the same proposition, as in (8-9):

(8) [speaker appeals to addressees]:

tòo kuu na nan kù matsoo nân

'well, you **there** [where you are now], move over **here** [where I am as I speak now]'

(9) [speaker corrects the addressee]:

à nan ka tarar dà nii bàa nân ba

'you met me right **there** [where you are presently located], not **here** [where I am, as I speak]'

And, as additional evidence for its addressee-specific interpretation, H nan would be pragmatically anomalous in the following motion-oriented (spatial) contexts, e.g.:

(10) # jèe ka nan            '# off you go **there** [where you are]'

(11) # zoo nan            '# come **there** [where you are]'

(12) # tàfi nan            '# get **there** [where you are]'

(13) # màtsaa nan            ‘# move **there** [where you are]’

(14) # tùuraa nan            ‘# push **there** [where you are]’

The anomaly of (10)-(14) is to do with the requirement of movement in-built in the motion verbs. An addressee must necessarily be present in a location in the first place before H nan is used to identify him/her with the reference object, which is why a supporting gesture locating a referent object using H nan is usually not required. With appropriate motion-verbs, however, H nan will be perfectly felicitous, as in (15-17):

(15) bàr shi nan!            ‘leave it **there**! [where you are]’

(16) tsàyaa nan            ‘stay put **there** [where you are]’

(17) fitoo dàgà nan            ‘come out from **there** [where you are]’

Thus, the generalisation seems to be that hearer-centred (*spatial*) H nan is neither compatible with centrifugal verbs, e.g. # tàfi nan ‘go **there**’, nor with centripetal verbs, e.g. # zoo nan ‘come **there**’ when used with a second person addressee.

The deictic pro-form hakà ‘thus, this, so’ can also combine with H nan to code an addressee-oriented modal state, e.g.:

(18) a) [A is drawing on the board, and asks B]:

shîn yàayàa maa zân zaanà hòotôn?

‘how did you say I should draw the diagram?’

b) [B indicates to A to continue to draw the way he starts]:

hakà nan zaa kà yi

'**that**'s the very way to do it'

(19) a) [A has been shown how to operate some electronic equipment by B, but wants to be sure about the procedure again, and so tries it as the question is asked]:

hakà ka cêe ìn yi koo?

'**this** is the way you said it should be done, isn't it?'

b) [B then queries A's trial-and-error approach]:

hakà nan dà kakèe yîi, ai sai kà laalàataa shi

'**that/the** way you're operating it, you might spoil it'

But hakà may also occur *after* the adverbial in spatial contexts, e.g.:

(20) [A is holding something which B does not want to be close to him, so B says to A]:

yi nan hakà (# hakà nan) dà shii kâr kà shaafâa mîn shii

'keep moving **there** to your side with it, because I don't want it on my clothes'

(21) [A alerts B about an obstruction]:

hattarâa! gâa kùnaamâa nan hakà (#hakà nan) dà kai

'watch out, there's a scorpion **there** close to you'

There is a way in which hakà '**thus, so**' could be interpreted as essentially a speaker-centred deictic) For example, A might respond to B's statement with hakà nee '**this [that]** is so', with the inference that A has independently thought of the idea (= speaker-centred); if A had responded with hakà nan nèe '**that** is so', the

implication would be that A is confirming B's original statement (= hearer-centred); hakà can also combine with speaker-proximal F nân, but only to physically specify a location/direction, e.g. [said to driver] hakà nân zaa mù bi 'we should go **this** way'. Jaggar (1992b:15 footnote 2) has also observed that hakà may combine with the definite determiner -n '... to provide a close link-up with the events in the immediately preceding discourse-context'. Interestingly, bare hakà regularly attracts a '**this**' gloss (see 19a above), but may be interpreted differently when used in conjunction with other deictic forms, e.g. hakà nan 'also, in addition'; nan hakà '**that** (very) way', in reply to a previous speaker's inquiry. Deictic hakà also occurs in a reduplicated form with a '**this**' gloss assigned to it to postmodify plural nouns with a distributive sortal sense. Consider these extracts from Galadanci (1969:162, 172):

(22) [speaker indicates with his hands the size of things he's seen]:

wadansu akwaatunàa hakà-hakà à ðaakìn Audù can fàrkashin gadoo kùlle fam  
dà kwaadfunàa ...

'some suitcases of **this** sort of size in Audu's room right under the bed,  
securely padlocked ...'

(23) [same context as above]:

wadansu nùnannuu hakà-hakà à ràafin Bàlaa can cikin rùmbuu ...

'some ripe ones, **this** sort of size, in Bala's garden deep in the granary ... [sic]'

(24) [same context as above]:

wadansu gwandoojii hakà-hakà à ràafin Audù ...

'some pawpaws **this** sort of size, in Audu's garden ...'

### 3. 1. 3. *Anaphoric H nan*

Apart from its basic *spatial* addressee-centred interpretation, H nan also functions in non-spatial contexts, where it appropriates a medial perspective with a speaker-distal (*anaphoric*) interpretation, i.e. with no commitment to distance. As we have noted in Jaggar and Buba (1994), Anderson and Keenan (1985) have documented a number of languages, where the addressee-based *spatial* deictic creates a similar medial perspective when used anaphorically.

In extended narrative, H nan is prototypically used to anaphorically map referents — already mentioned in the prior discourse and so presumed to be known to the addressee — in terms of their place in the mainline foregrounded segments of the story. H nan is in fact the default discourse-*anaphoric* adverbial and denotes something that does not include what F nân would normally refer to, e.g.:

(25) [newsreader continues an analysis of a topical issue]:

talakaawaa dai sunàa shân wàhalàa ainùn à Nàajeeriyàa ... tòo nan maa dai dàlilân à fiilii sukè

‘ordinary people are really suffering in Nigeria ... and **there** again the reasons are clear’

(26) [Dolo is handing over his meat to Sarkin Fada’s dog]:

tôo, gàa shi, àmmaa fa baayan kwaanaa ukù, ... kà tahoo minì dà kudiinaa; tun dà saafe kà zoo minì dà suu. Kaa dai san gidân à nan areewacin masallaacin jumma’aa (MJC:81)

‘well, **here** it is, but in three days time, you should bring my money; first thing in the morning you should bring them. And of course, you know the house, **there** to the north of Friday prayer mosque’

In (25), the speaker's intention is to indicate the direction of the current on-line information, hence enabling the reader/addressee to make the necessary associative leap to a parallel state of affairs pre-mentioned in the text. Notice that although the speaker may decide to reveal the connection of the 'ordinary people ... in Nigeria' mentioned in (25) with another group in a previously mentioned country, the addressee may have already anticipated it from the choice of H nan. For it to be used, the speaker must hold the belief that both the current information, and its latent antecedent are in the present consciousness of the addressee in the sense of Chafe (1976:30). Interestingly, in (26) such clues are not even apparent in the text, despite the speaker's choice of H nan to anaphorise gidân 'the house'. Clearly, what the speaker hopes to achieve by using H nan here is to trigger the (shared, real world) knowledge s/he believes the addressee must possess of such familiar local landmarks as the 'Friday prayer mosque', thereby further reducing the chances of misconstrual.<sup>4</sup>

In (27)-(29), H nan is anaphorically used to anchor the prementioned locations:

(27) [A broadcaster in London describes how a telephone message is relayed to certain parts of Africa]:

sànnan sai yà tàfi zuwàa ' Montreal' à gabashin Kyanadàn [tò] ... dàgà nan  
nèe zaa à aikàa dà sàakôn ... (AHR:32)

'**then**<sup>5</sup> it [telephone call] goes to Montreal in eastern Canada ... it's from **there** that the message will be sent ...'

(28) [A meets B, a stranger, who happens to have come from a place she and fellow traders used to visit, and tries to establish more concrete grounds for shared affinity with him]:

kuma à nan mukèe sàukaa gidan Àlhaji Roorò [YDG]

'and it's **there** (precisely) at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'

(29) [The stranger, in turn, tries to find out where the women come from, and the following dialogue ensues]:

a) A: kaa san Bàakayà?

‘do you know Bakaya (village)?’

b) B: Bàakayà, bàa nan mukèe zuwàa kòokawàa ba?

‘Bakaya, isn’t it **there** that we used to go for wrestling matches?’

c) A: tòò, ai nan nèe gàrinmù [YDG]

‘well, it’s **there** that is my town

In (28)-(29), the location of both addressee and speaker is in South-West Nigeria, hundreds of miles away from the far North, from where they come to trade. The choice of H nan here, in addition to its purely anaphoric/cataphoric function, is an attempt at establishing rapport with a fellow Hausa person in a predominantly Yoruba-speaking area. Notice that H can (chapter 4) is possible instead of prolocative H nan in (27)-(29), but would situate the event at an even greater distance from the speaker/addressee (= English ‘way over **there**...’). Equally important is the fact that the choice of H can in these contexts would remove the empathetic dimension of affinity that is encoded by the speaker with the choice of H nan in these contexts, for apart from the speaker’s intention to empathise with his listeners, there is no constraint on the speaker from choosing H can instead of anaphoric prolocative H nan in (27)-(29). Both deictic adverbials could have fulfilled the role of situating the action at a distance from the speaker/addressee(s). Moreover, since in this case, the broadcaster knows that his/her listeners are concentrated in locations other than Eastern Canada in (27), H can would have been acceptable. H nan is thus used to capture the addressee perspective regarding the story.<sup>6</sup>

H nan can also be used by the speaker to direct the addressee's attention to an anticipated (i.e. cataphoric) outcome (for which s/he should be ready). Thus, although H nan is employed to situate the event at a distance from the speaker, it is equally distal to the addressee at the moment of utterance. But unlike the speaker, the addressee can expect to be *there* at the reference location in a shortwhile, e.g.:

(30) [speaker sends addressee to collect money from a usual source, but warns her of a new development]:

yâu dà dare kì koomàa, àmmaa in kin jee kadà kì kiraa Zàiraƙanii don baa shì nan (MJC:37)

'you should go back tonight, but when you go, don't call Zairaƙani, because he's not **there**'

(31) [Waziri informs his son, Aboki, that Sarki is about to kill someone]:

bà kà sanli ba, àkwai fa wata takàrdaa nàa nan àljiihun Sarkii, ya sâa na rubùutaa zâi sâa à kashè wani ... (MJC:143)

'you don't know (but) there's a letter (**there**) in Sarki's pocket, (which) he made me write in which he would indicate that someone be killed'

(32) [A calls B over to her office on the phone, and A responds]:

tôo, gàa ni nan tàfe (Jaggar and Buba 1994:406)

'OK, I'm on my way **there**'

In example (33) below, the speaker uses H nan as a confirmatory anaphoric device, so as to affirm what the addressee has just said:

(33) [A has made a point in discussion and B agrees with him]:

naa yàrda dà kai à nan

'I agree with you **there** [on **that** point]'

Notice that the speaker could employ F nân in (33), but only if s/he wishes to subjectively be involved as having independent knowledge of the claim prior to the utterance.<sup>7</sup>

H nan may also combine with (preceding) hakà ‘thus’ as a confirmatory device in a discourse (*anaphoric*) context, as in (34)-(37), where the speaker affirms a previous statement attributable to the addressee:

(34) [A has been describing the benefits of a vaccination programme and B

confirms that he agrees with A]:

lallee hakà nan nèe Audù (ZRN:2)

‘certainly **that is so** Audu’

(35) [A then explains how smallpox can blind and uses the propositional hakà

nan]:

kanàa sôo kà zama hakà nan? (ZRN:8)

‘do you want to become (like) **that**?’

(36) [A indicates enthusiastic support for B’s idea]:

hakà nan nèe kùwa

‘**that**’s quite right indeed

(37) [speaker acknowledges the soundness of B’s advice]:

nii maa dai inàa jîn hakà nan zâi yi àmfâanii ainùn ...

‘I too think **that** would be very useful’

See also the following *anaphoric* connective usages of deictic hakà nan:

(38) [A is describing the troubles that have taken place in a certain country and then switches the discussion to Nigeria and says]:

hakà nan à bàara dîn wani lauyà na Ma'aikatar Harkookin Cikin Gidan Birtaaniyà yaa gayàa wà Ùmarù Dikkò cêewaa ... (AHR:3)

'in addition to that, last year, a lawyer from the British Home Office told Umaru Dikko that ...'

(39) hakà nan kuma manàzàrtaa sun baa dà shaawaràr cêewaa kàmaatàa ya yi à lùura dà haalin ruwan Tafkìn Nyos ... (AHR:70)

'in addition to that, experts suggested that the condition of Lake Nyos water should be looked into'

In (38)-(39), hakà nan acts as an additive conjunction 'similarly, so, thus, in the same way, in addition etc)', providing a cohesive tie within the text by linking propositions/statements. Hakà may also occur with a following (m.) definite determiner -n + H nan, e.g. hakà-n-nan bâa shi dà àmfàanii 'that [way] is not desirable' (Galadanci, 1969:139), as a synonymous alternative to hakà nan. (Note too the consistent use of 'that' to gloss hakà nan).

Adverbial H nan (sometimes with hakà) also has important functions as a temporal marker in discourse, where it functions as a cohesion marker, directing the addressee as the scene and events shift around, e.g.:

(40) [narrator continues with the exploration of Kona's search for a child]:

yanàa nan hakà, sai Allàh ya bâa màatarsà cikii (MJC:180)

'he remained **that** way [i.e. without a child], then by Allah's will, his wife got pregnant'

(41) [narrator signals a shift to a different scene in which Farke meets his brothers again]:

munàa nan hakà, rân nan inàa yaawòo cikin kàasuwaa inàa tàlla, bàa sai gàa su Àzlamù ba, ... (MJC:171)

‘we remained **that** way [i.e. as an apprentice to a Weaver], then one day I was hawking my wares about in the market, and there was Azlamu and others’

(42) [Maisango has found a potential ally in an ensuing royal struggle]:

anàa nan anàa nan, rân-nan ... sai Màisàngoo ya ga wani bàakon bookaa (MJC:64)

‘as times went by, **one** day Maisango met a new sorcerer’

(43) [narrator describes the boy’s adventure after his shooting training]:

sai ya fita dà tsakad daree rân-nan, ya shigèe dòokad daajìi shii kaɗai (MJC:157)

‘ ... then he went out at midnight on **that** day, and disappeared into the wilderness alone’

(44) [narrator describes the mood of the king]:

sai Wàziirìnsà ya isoo, ya yi gaisuwaa, ya ga lallee Sarkii yanàa jîn nìshaadfi rân-nan

‘then his Vizier arrived, bowed, and realised that the king was definitely in a good mood **that** day’ (MJC:194)

(45) yanàa nan kân aikìnsà, sai akà zoo masà dà làabaarìn ràsuwar mahàifinsà

‘he was **there** working away at his job, when the news of his father’s death reached him’

(46) [Sususu's wife is making an invisible gown for him as he look on]:

ta yi kàmar tanàa dínkìn wani àbu, àlhaalii kùwa bâa koomee hannuntà. Dattijòn  
naakà nàa nan dai dùrkùshe nàa kalloo (MJC:204)

'she made as though she's sewing something, when in fact there's nothing in  
her hand. And **there's** the fellow, watching in a squatting position'

Notice the tonal distinction between non-specific rân-nan 'one day' in (42) and  
specific ràn-nan 'that day' in (43)-(44). (Jaggar (1985a:127) confuses the two  
variants, wrongly glossing rân-nan as #'that day' and ràn-nan as #'one day', but  
corrects this mistake in his Hausa Reader, e.g. tun (dàgà) ràn nan bàn saakè shàn  
taabàa ba 'I haven't smoked again ever since **that** day' (AHR:68).)

Pro-temporal H nan can also combine with prepositionals and adverbials to  
specifically index a preceding time-point (see Fillmore 1975:40; Levinson 1983),  
as in (47)-(50):

(47) [it's Dolo's turn to get back at Sarkin Fada]:

Sarkin Faadà ya biyaa kuḍin buulaalàa, akà bâa Dooloo ràbonsà ya yi gidaa  
Dàgà nan darajàr Sarkin Faadà ta ràgu wajen Sarkii (MJC:85)

'the chief coutier paid the fine (in place of) strokes of the cane, Dolo got his  
share, and went home. From **then on** he lost the king's favour'

(48) [Sarki (now turned into a bird) decides to check out a room from where he  
thinks the cry is coming from]:

yà sâa bàakii yà buudèe, sai gâa wata muujjyaa à zàune, ... dàgà nan Wàziiri ya  
biyoo (MJC:197)

'no sooner had he put his beak and opened [it, the door], and there was an owl  
sitting, ... it's **then** that Waziri followed suit'

(49) [Galadima has been conned into following Maisango for fear of his life]:

nan tàake ya bii shì, sukà gayàa wà sauraa àbin dà akèe ciki ...(MJC:72)

‘he followed him **there and then**, and told the rest [of the people] what has been happening’

(50) [Lawal is planning to avenge his brother’s banishment by Maisango]:

sabòodà hakà koo dà akà làalàbee shì dà bàtun sàrautàa, nan dà nan sai ya yàrda  
(MJC:74)

‘thus, when he was approached about succeeding to the throne, he **immediately** accepted’

A possible addressee orientation in all these pro-temporal nan-marked deictic adverbials is easier to see if we think of the choice of H nan as a strategy by the speaker to maximise the possibility of the addressee making the right temporal inference. H nan keeps the addressee on track, and instructs him/her to look out for its (temporal) antecedent in the story.

Another specialised usage of H nan is in the compound deictic expression (shii) kèe nan ‘**that**’s it, **that**’s all, OK’ (again observe the use in English of speaker-distal ‘**that**’). Cowan and Schuh (1976:167), for example, claim that kèe nan is synonymous with the copula nee/cee, e.g.:

(51) haalin yâaraa nèe                      ‘it’s childish behaviour’

=

(52) haalin yâaraa kèe nan              ‘**that**’s just the way kids are’

The problem with Cowan and Schuh’s identification, however, is that it overlooks the context of use in which (51)-(52) differ. Example (51) may be used to affirm

either the speaker's own previous claim or that of the addressee, but kèe nan in (52) is used only in response to a previous statement of the addressee. The choice of addressee-centred Hi nan here reflects its derivative empathetic usage, whereby the speaker tries to show solidarity with the addressee's point of view.

Consider also these kèe nan usages (and note the inappropriateness of copula nee in these contexts as well):

(53) [father describes the mock death of a well-sought daughter to a potential suitor who responds]:

ai maagànkù kèe nan (#nee). An cêe kù yi matà auree sôn saatàa yaa hanàa ku  
(RBJ:14)

'that's it **then** [the solution to your problem]. You've been advised to marry her off, and greed has prevented you'

(54) [Sani has been cheated by some merchants while hawking kebab, and Sarkin Fawa is furious about it]:

Sarkin Faawà ya sàamee shì dà zaagii, ya cèe laadansà kèe nan (#nee) ya saacèe  
(MIC:225)

'Sarkin Fawa kept on abusing him, saying that **that** was his pay that he stole'

(55) [broadcaster describes the box containing an abducted politician]:

à jìkin àkwàatín sai akà rubùutaa zuwàa gà Ma'aikatar Harkookin Wàje,  
gwamnatín tàarayàr Nàajeriyaà, Ìkko, wàatò ìndà zaa à kai shì kèe nan (#nee)  
(AHR:1)

'written on the box was: to the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of Nigeria, Lagos, where he was to be taken, **that** is'

The more explicit shii kèe nan emphatic-deictic is also used anaphorically as a marker of text cohesion, temporally linking sequential episodes in a narrative, as well as acting as a terminal deictic (57), e.g.:

(56) [speaker concludes his narration]:

shii kèe nan sai na koomàa gidaa

**‘that** was **that**, then I left for home’

(57) [speaker assures addressee]:

shii kèe nan, an gamàa

**‘that** was that/OK, it will be done’

#### 3.1.4. *Symbolic H nan*

An example of the sort of *symbolic* (= technically non-*spatial*, non-*anaphoric*) deictic expression that Fillmore has in mind is a telephone inquiry of the form (58):

(58) is Johnny **there**? = koo Johnny nàa nan?

where **‘there’** connotes the location of the hearer at the moment of the call: ‘in the place where you [hearer] are’, as Fillmore (1975:40) notes.

The function of adverbial H nan in the symbolic sphere parallels that of speaker-proximal F nân (Chapter 2), i.e. it makes the subjective and/or imaginative facets of speaker intention much more vivid to the addressee. In performing this role, however, H nan continues to operate as a medial, neutral deictic, and is again non-committal as to the relative (metaphorical) distance from the interactants e.g.:

(59) [the narrator has been describing the effects of a volcanic eruption on the inhabitants of a nearby village]:

àmmaa gàa fuskookinsù dà kiràajansù nan duk à sàale (AHR:69)<sup>8</sup>

‘but their faces and chests are **there** all blistered’

(60) [the narrator describes his adventure on a small boat in the Nile]:

gàa ni nan inàa ta tuukìi ... (RBJ:40)

‘and **there** I was just rowing ...’

(61) [Sumale has been sent to as far as Kano, so as to train him to become streetwise]:

Sumale ya kaamà hanyàa, gàa shi nan, gàa shi nan, har ya ìsa Siiriyàn Kwatàa à Birnin Kando (MJC:159)

‘Sumale set off on his journey, **there** he is, **there** he is [on his way] till he reached the Syrian Quarter in Kano city’

(62) [Farke and the princess are on the run to another town]:

mukà shiryàa, mukà gudù, gàa mu nan har wani gàrii dà akèe kiràa Maroogo (MJC:173)

‘we got ready to elope, and **there** we are [travelling] till we got a town called Marogo’

Consider also the use of symbolic H nan in a typically addressee-oriented perspective in (63):

(63) [ A sees something of B’s which he covets, and B responds]:

ganii nan barii nan [TG]

‘as it’s seen **there**, so shall it be left **there**’

anticipating A’s request with a dismissive symbolic H nan, as is the case with the precautionary warning in (64):

(64) [A warns B not to tell anyone what he's about to say]:

jîi nan, barîi nan 'listen **there**, leave it **there**'

H nan may also be symbolically used by the speaker as an adversative means of chastising the addressee for not following the speaker's advice. In such instances, the addressee is being made to feel the full impact of his decision which has now turned out to be a wrong step to take, e.g.:

(65) [A tells B of the unfortunate outcome of his decision, and B says]:

tôo, ai gàa irintà nan ...[TG]

'well **there** you have it (i.e. the product of your misjudgement) ...'

The addressee would now know from the adversative H nan frame that no sympathy is intended by the speaker, who clearly seems to feel triumphant about the negative outcome.

In a similar dialogue context, H nan may be symbolically used to mark off the area of divergence between speaker's point of view and that of the addressee, as in (66)-(70):

(66) [the chief has been engaged in a protracted argument with his wife

regarding the death of a couple, and heard the good news that his opinion is the right one]:

tôo, gàa ta nan, bà kù san àbu ba kù tsayàa dà gardamàr rainìn wàayoo

(MJC:59)

'well, **there** it is, you [people] don't know anything, but keep on arguing insolently'

(67) [A shows his displeasure to B]:

gàa shi nan gàa ka, tun dà yakè baa kàa jîn màganàr mutàanee  
'**there**, you go with him, since you don't listen to people's plea'

(68) [in answer to inquiry about A's daughter]:

gàa ta nan sai yàddà takèe sôo takèe yîi  
'she's just **there**, doing what she feels like'

(69) [speaker feels that s/he's been vindicated]:

bàa gàa irintà nan ba, wandà bàì jì bàrì ba, ai yâa jì hoohòo  
'well, **there** you have it, he who does not listen to 'stop', is bound to listen to  
'sorry' '

(70) [Ashiru comments on Sarki's tyrannical rule]:

yà jee yà yi. Ai duuniyàa cee, gàa shi nan gàa ta, koowaa ta àuraa yâu, gòobe  
kâa jì taa ràbu dà shii (MJC:133)  
'let him (continue to) do it. That's life, **there**, leave him with it (the world),  
whoever she marries today, tomorrow you'll hear that she has left him'

In (66)-70) H nan psycholinguistically reinforces the validity of the speakers' utterance, and distances him from addressees' position/behaviour in (66)-(70) above. H nan is used in these contexts to reinforce a pre-existing state of affairs, or generalised sequence of events, locatable in the psychological space of the addressee.

Sometimes, adversative H nan represents a point of departure for the respective views of the speaker and the addressee, such that while clearly making reference to a previous statement (therefore *anaphoric*, technically), the speaker is also

undermining it by creating a *symbolic* distance in held opinions, expressed again by H nan:

(71) [an arranged marriage has turned sour, and parents of the husband are trying to make excuses, so the girl retorts]:

bâa wani nan, ai dâa man kun san inâa dà wandà nakèe sôo [TG]

‘hold it **there**, you’re already aware that I’ve got someone that I love’

Again, there are pragmatically-determined situations in which the more general, medial speaker-distal semantic coding of *symbolic* H nan takes on a narrower context-sensitive hearer-proximal reading (deriving from the basic hearer-proximal interpretation of spatial H nan). Consider (72), where its hearer-proximal interpretation crosses into the *anaphoric-symbolic* domain, e.g.:

(72) [the prince is angry that palace hands are not doing a particularly dirty job he has asked them to do with the enthusiasm that they normally show]:

dâa àbinci nèe Sarkii ya kaawoo mukù dâa yànzù kunâa nan kunâa hannuu bakà hannuu kwaryaa (RBJ:21)

‘if it were food that the chief brought, you would now be **there** dipping in and out of it’

Similarly, existential H nan has a *symbolic* reading in (73), a context in which it combines with presentative particle gàa:

(73) [A is already thinking of the title he would be selecting upon the

enthronement of his favourite candidate, but then has second thoughts on this]:

àmmaa dà ya tunàa dà cêewaa tsoohon Sarkin nànn gàa shi nan garau kàmar  
koowàcè raanaa kaaràa masà karfii akèè yîi ... (MJC:65)

‘but when he remembered that this old king is **there** and (looking) healthy as  
though he’s being powered anew everyday...’

H nan is also symbolically manipulated to express what Lakoff (1974) and Lyons  
(1977:677) refer to as ‘empathetic’ and ‘emotional’ deixis respectively, and Lyons  
notes that the factors which govern the emotional use of the English ‘**here/there**’  
deictic opposition are difficult to stipulate with any precision. In conversational  
situations, for example, symbolic H nan is used with its more opaque speaker-  
distal value as a formulaic response to standard Hausa greetings, e.g.:

(74) A: yàayàa iyaalii?                      B: sunàa nan laafiyàa lau  
‘how are the family?’                      ‘they’re **there**, just fine’

(75) A: ìnaa Uwaani? Na cêe koo tanàa laafiyàa?                      B: tanàa nan laafiyàa  
(MJC:129)  
‘how’s Uwani? Is she alright?’                      ‘she’s **there**, just fine’

The reason behind the *symbolic* use of existential H nan in (74)-(75) are naturally  
explicable in terms of our model. F nân (chapter 2) would be situationally  
inappropriate, since it would force its default speaker-proximal reading, and use of  
F cân or H can [chapter 4] would similarly induce an inappropriate spatial-physical  
meaning. Respondent B therefore uses H nan to reference a (non-visible) location  
presumed to be also known to the addressee, with no commitment as to  
(metaphorical) distance from the interactants. Cf. too the conventionalised use of H

nan in a comparable social act in the following standard student exchange in (76a-b):

- (76) a) A: yàayàa kàràatuu?            b) B: munàa nan munàa ta taɓàawaa  
          ‘how’s the studying?’                ‘we’re **there** doing our bit’

where B again responds to A’s phatic query with existential speaker-distal H nan, at the same time keeping the addressee in the frame and maintaining conversational interaction and emotional solidarity where conversational politeness is expected (Koike 1989).

In this section (§3.1.), I have explained the distribution of H nan-adverbial (which has eluded most Hausaists) in terms of a participant-based model. The variety of its functions serve to show its crucial role in lexically coding addressee-oriented entities, particularly at the basic *spatial* level. In *anaphoric* context, H nan-adverbial is analysed as a speaker-distal deictic, not so much because of any significant semantic-pragmatic shift of meaning, but because, by their very nature, narratives mirror the attitudes and beliefs of the writer-narrator, which in turn gives scope for seeing events as either proximal or distal (or medial) with respect to the narrator’s ‘space’ in the discourse contexts. H nan also has an important psychological role in the *symbolic* sphere, where abstract entities are imbued with a vividness perspective that can also be addressee-oriented.

**3. 2. Addressee-proximal LH wànnan, LLH (pl.) wàɗànnan, FH wânnan, HLH (pl.) wàɗànnan (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan demonstratives**

Analogous to the addressee-based deictic adverbial H nan are the pre-head demonstratives LH wànnan/ FH wânnan and the post-head demonstrative -nan variant, all used basically to convey addressee-based information about a referent

object. As with adverbial H nan, previous descriptions of these demonstratives are wide of the mark.

**3.2.1. Previous Descriptions of LH wànnan etc. (+NP), FH wânnan etc. (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan**

Bargery (1934:1081) identified LH wànnan [**that**] as coding a distal space relative to the speaker's position, e.g. tàfi dà wànnan dookì 'take **that** horse', wànnan bàà nàawa ba nèè '**that** one is not mine'. LH wàncan (chapter 4) is also glossed by Bargery as '**that** one' (p. 1078) with the result that the essential participant-based distinction between addressee-based LH wànnan and speaker/addressee-remote/distal LH wàncan is completely unaccounted for. Nor was he able to distinguish LH wànnan '**that**', which has an intrinsic hearer-based focus in its *spatial* use, from HL wannàn '**this**', which is speaker-centred (chapter 2).

Abraham (1959:54f) claimed that 'the one in question or the one referred to are expressed by either nan or can' (p. 54). With regard to LH wànnan, Abraham (1941:80-82) presented us with illustrations of a hawk and a snake in an 'upward direction ... [in which case] they represent *acts out of sight* of the speaker ... [i.e.] the one in question' (p. 54). It is on the basis of this description that (77) is derived:

(77) wànnan shaafò = shaafò-n-nan 'the hawk in question'

Abraham (1962:924) also implies that LH wànnan shaafò 'the hawk in question' and LH wàncan shaafò are semantically equivalent (cf. also dookì-n-nan = dookì-n-can '**that** horse in question' (Abraham, 1959:135). Abraham in fact analysed a whole range of (tonally distinct) pre-head *WANNAN* and *WANCAN* demonstratives as synonymous alternatives:

There are also long forms e.g. wànnan shaafòo = wànnan shaafòo ‘the hawk in question’. Alternatives are: wàncan shaafòo = wàncan shaafòo; wànnan gàrii = wànnan gàrii = wàncan gàrii = wàncan gàrii ‘the town in question’; wàdànnan dawaakii = wàdànnan dawaakii = wàdàncan dawaakii = wàdàncan dawaakii; ‘the horses in question’ (Abraham, 1959:136).

However, we can straightway refute the claim that LH wànnan and LH wàncan encode the same deictic field, as well as the proposition that they have an essentially ‘out of sight’ interpretation. Notice too that all of the English glosses given as ‘near to us ... in the near or far distance but visible ... [and] out of sight’ take only the speaker’s position as the default, zero-point of deictic orientation. I shall also show that post-head demonstrative nan in shaafò-n-nan is not pragmatically synonymous with its pre-head LH wànnan counterpart in wànnan shaafòo ‘that hawk’; the choice between the two strategies is dependant upon the set of assumptions that the speaker formulates concerning the addressee’s background knowledge of the reference object. Later, I show that even the formally distinct addressee-based pre-head LH wànnan and FH wànnan forms are also distinguishable in a contrastive environment.

Cowan and Schuh (1976:298) define both the adverbial and demonstrative deictic forms in terms of a division between ‘(1) demonstratives referring to things in sight which one can point to (i.e. wannàn/wancàn = [+visible]); and (2) demonstratives referring to something mentioned or understood in a conversation or narrative (i.e. wànnan/wàncan = [-visible]).’ Thus, *spatial* demonstratives have a high-low (HL) tone pattern (= HL wannàn /wancàn), whereas *anaphoric* demonstratives, according to Cowan and Schuh, have a low-high [LH] tone pattern (= LH wànnan/wàncan), e.g. :

(78) wànnan bàraawòo yaa kwaashèe manà kaayaa

‘**that** thief stole our goods’ (p. 298)

However, this LH = exclusively [-visible] identification is erroneous. Elsewhere, Cowan and Schuh documented post-head -nan in an anaphoric context, e.g. yàayàa saabon ìngarmà-n-nan? ‘how’s **that** new stallion?’ (p. 313).

Howeidy (1953:31) was perhaps the first Hausaist to specify the participant-based role of distinctive tone in his analysis of *WANNAN*. His relatively accurate description shows that pre-head LH wànnan ‘is used only if a) the person spoken to and the article being referred to are together in one place and few yards away from the speaker or b) if the article referred to is not in sight, but is known to both speakers-not necessarily because they have seen it, but because they have mentioned it previously’ (p. 31f). However, Howeidy provides no examples of LH wànnan usage. Post-head (toneless) -nan is documented in Howeidy (1953:32), but the English glosses of his examples indicate that they in fact exemplify the speaker-proximal post-head -nân/nàn variants, e.g. (p. 216 [no tones supplied]) Mu shaa ruwa-n-nan? ‘may we drink **this** water?’, ’N ari kujera-n-nan? ‘may I borrow **this** chair?, etc)

Galadanci’s (1969) analysis supports Howeidy’s semantic conditions governing the choice of addressee-based LH wànnan, FH wânnan. But they differ on an important point, because for Galadanci, pre-head LH wànnan is only deployable in a *spatial* context (= condition (a) for Howeidy), defined simply as ‘**that** (near you) deictic’ (p. 283). The *anaphoric* function is signalled by FH wânnan, but also its post-head demonstrative -nan variant, i.e. wânnan dookìi = dookìi-n-nan ‘**that** horse we know about’. Galadanci went on to claim that pre-head demonstrative FH wânnan and the post-head -nan variant are functionally available for both deictic (spatial) and anaphoric roles, with the participant coding ‘**that**, (near you) or which

we know about' (p. 283). Now, although the present study cannot make a clear-cut deictic distinction between LH wànnan and FH wânnan it shows that for Hausa speakers (including the present writer), pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan is the first-choice spatial form in a deictic-*spatial* context, and is also available as an anaphor, but with a far less frequency than FH wânnan which is the default *anaphoric* strategy.

Kraft and Kirk-Greene (1973:51f) wrongly assume that post-head-nan may be used only anaphorically 'to indicate previous reference'. They also erroneously claim that 'if the tone of the syllable preceding the specifier [= demonstrative] is high, it [i.e. nan/can] becomes falling', but provided only the correct H nan form, e.g. rìigâ-r-nan #'**this** gown (previously referred to)', aikì-n-nan #'**this** work (previously referred to), kujèerâr-can #'**this** chair (previously referred to)'. Notice too the incorrect 'this' gloss, as well as the mistaken assumption that addressee-based post-head -nan is identical with the speaker/addressee-based (remote-distal) post-head -can. Curiously, there is no mention of any of the pre-head addressee-based forms in their tabulation of Hausa specifiers.

Jaggar (1983, 1985b) are significant developments in the semantic study of referential forms in Hausa, because they present the first systematic description of the factors governing the speaker's use of referential expressions. Jaggar (1983:423) wrongly claims that '... the *nan*-marked demonstrative ... [LH wànnan etc] encode entities which are non-visible', with no appeal to the intrinsic addressee-proximal value of LH wànnan etc. In his dissertation, however, Jaggar correctly underscored this fact by including a table listing what he referred to as 'the so-called nan-demonstratives (i.e. LH wànnan, LLH wàfànnan, NP-`n-nan , NP-`r-nan )' (p. 145). According to Jaggar (1985b:145):

The nan-demonstratives may be exploited to code referents which are either visible or non-visible... and when specifying entities locatable in physical space, these demonstratives encode referents *which are closer to the addressee than to the speaker* — a usage not reported in descriptive grammars of the language.<sup>9</sup>

The problem with this description, however, is that it seems to preclude the possibility of including pre-head HL wannàn, and its post-head -nân/nàn counterpart in anaphoric contexts (chapter 2). There is an implicit (and often explicit) assumption that only (FH wânnan) LH wànnan and post-head H nan demonstratives in Jaggar (1985b:145) have a true referential-anaphoric function, which even by the English glosses (i.e. '**this, these**', etc) of the Hausa examples therein is not the case. The fact that Jaggar (1985b) has elected to leave out tone-assignment seems to indicate that the all-important cognitive variation in the interpretation of these forms has been overlooked. And although Jaggar (1985b:174f) has recognised the possibility of using HL wannàn anaphorically, 'in direct speech contexts', and symbolically, *... yà kai wannàn gàrii ... yà kai wannàn...*, he seemed to imply that the LH wànnan and H -nan demonstratives are the default narrative deictic anchors. But, in fact, my own check with native informants reveal that they consistently use HL wannàn in contexts similar to those where Jaggar coded LH wànnan. Quite apart from Schuh's personal comment concerning speaker/dialectal variation (reported in Jaggar (p. 175), and the relatively few occurrences of LH wànnan, FH wânnan in extended broadcast reports, my own study shows that informants often assume an authorial voice when reading texts, thereby reliving the discourse events as though they are occurring at the moment of speaking. Thus, HL wannàn is perfectly acceptable in most of the examples cited in Jaggar (1985b), whenever the narrator/reader wishes to convey the story in a time-now context, and not the time-then scenario, which is encoded by FH wânnan, (LH wànnan and post-head -nan).

My data will show that the choice of form hinges on whether or not the narrator wishes to give the story a here-and-now or a there-and-then perspective. More often than not, it is a mixture of both strategies, which helps in transporting the reader-addressee through what Jaggar (1985b) describes as ‘the twist and turns’ of the story, in order to capture such nuances as the order, sequence, and hierarchy of the unfolding narrative.

Mohmed (1977:144ff) assumes that LH wànnan has no other function than to code ‘the referent of N [which] is neither physically present nor within sight of the speaker/hearer, yet both know who/what is being referred to: it has been mentioned directly before ...’ (p. 145). He also equated LH wànnan with LH wàncan, e.g. wànnan/wàncan Ø [nèe]ya gudù ‘that particular/very (boy) was the one who ran away’ (Mohmed, 1977:145). Both of these claims are wrong: LH wànnan has a basic *spatial* orientation, locating referent objects near the addressee, and is not to be confused with speaker/addressee-distal LH wàncan (chapter 4). But there is an interesting account of noun modification by adjectives in Mohmed’s study. Of particular significance for our purpose is his finding that ‘post-position is the ‘unmarked’ or ‘favourite’ order of the adjective in Hausa, hence its preponderance in our data’ (p. 89).<sup>10</sup> One of the central arguments I will be making in this section is that post-head -n/r-nan (≠ pre-head LH wànnan etc.) is the unmarked or normative order of addressee-based (*anaphoric*) demonstratives, and this observation is validated by a distributional analysis of the use of these forms in written narratives.

Bagari (1986:114 ), like Mohmed (1977), makes a distinction between spatial (indicative) demonstratives, lámìiran nuunìn jìbìntakàa and the referential ones lámìiran tsookàcii. This is however incorrect, but Bagari even goes on to make a further erroneous claim that: bambancìn lámìiran nuunìn jìbìntakàa dà takwaroorinsù màasu nuunìn tsookàcii shii nèe kawàì karìn sautìnsù (tones

supplied) ‘the difference between spatial demonstratives and their referential counterparts is in their tonal variation *only* (italics mine)’ (p. 114) i. e. HL wannàn = wancàn [= *spatial*]; LH wànnan = wàncan [= *anaphoric*]. Notice that LH wànnan has no *spatial* function in this claim, nor is it identified as coding an addressee-based orientation, all of which are crucial semantic-pragmatic features to the interpretation of LH wànnan. Bagari also mentions the post-head -n/r-nan counterpart, but with an *anaphoric* only meaning, e.g. A: kaa tunàa dà mutàanê-n-nan dà mukà gani jiyà? B: li, wàdànnan màasu jaajàayen ruugunà-n-nan (= riigunà-n-nan)? (tones and vowel length supplied) A: ‘do you remember **those** people we saw yesterday?’ B: ‘yes, **those** with **those** red gowns?’.

In two recent dictionaries of Hausa (Newman and Newman 1979: 131-2; Newman 1990: 275-7), LH wànnan [pl. LLH wàdànnan] is glossed as: ‘1. **that, that** one (nearby). 2. **That, that** one (the one referred to) (p. 132), e.g. wànnan itàacee = itàacê-n-nan ‘**that** (specific) tree’, kaa tunàa dà gidâ-n nan dà mukà yi màganàa à kâi? ‘do you remember **that** house that we were talking about?’ (Newman:1990:275). As these definitions stand, there is no way of ascertaining whether pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan or NP-n/r-nan encode any distinctive participant-based meaning at all.

As we saw with adverbial H nan (§ 3.2.1), the addressee-based value of LH wànnan, FH wànnan demonstratives was missed by most Hausaists, because they were unaware of the existence of a participant-based, addressee-specific, reading for the demonstrative (and some were distracted by the deictic system (European) languages they spoke). Table 10 is a concise representation of the previous descriptions discussed above:

Table 10: summary of previous descriptions of LH wànnan, FH wànnan, NP-n/r-nan demonstratives

	Bargery	Abraham	Cowan and Schuh	Howeidy	Galadanci
LH <u>wànnan</u> (+NP)	<u>wànnan</u> [+distal], e.g. tàfi dà <u>wànnan</u> dookii 'take <b>that</b> horse'	[-visible] e.g. <u>wànnan</u> shaafòo = shaafò- <u>n-nan</u> 'the hawk in question'  <u>wànnan</u> = <u>wàncan</u> shaafòo 'that hawk'	[-visible] e.g. <u>wànnan</u> bàraawòo ' <b>that</b> thief'  yàayàa saabon ìngarmà- <u>n-nan</u> 'how's <b>t h a t</b> new stallion?'	[±visible], addressee-proximal e.g. <u>wànnan</u> ' <b>that</b> '  post-head - <u>nan</u> (no examples)	[±visible], addressee-proximal e.g. [visible] <u>wànnan</u> dookii ' <b>that</b> horse'  [±visible] <u>wànnan</u> dookii = dookì- <u>n-nan</u> ' <b>that</b> horse'

	Jaggar	Mohmed	Kraft and Kirk-Greene	Bagari
LH <u>wànnan</u> (+NP)	[±visible], 'closer to the addressee', e.g. <u>wànnan</u> yaaròo = yaarò- <u>n-nan</u> ' <b>that</b> boy'	[-visible] <u>wànnan</u> = <u>wàncan</u> nèe ya gudù ' <b>that</b> was the one who ran away'	[-visible] rīgâ-r- <u>nan</u> # ' <b>this</b> gown' <u>wànnan</u> (no examples)	[-visible] <u>wànnan</u> = <u>wàncan</u> yaaròo ' <b>that</b> boy'  mutàanê- <u>n-nan</u> ' <b>those</b> people'

In the rest of this chapter, I shall be focusing on the primary role performed by the position of the addressee in the selection of the pre-head demonstratives LH wànnan, FH wànnan and the post-head demonstrative -nan, within the following pragmatic paradigm:

**Table 11: summary of the semantic-pragmatic functions of addressee-proximal LH wànnan, FH wânnan, NP-n/r-nan (also speaker-distal) demonstratives**

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Demonstrative (pre-head)  LH wànnan, FH wânnan +NP	addressee-proximal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ], [+gesture] bàa ni wànnan takàrdaa 'give me <b>that</b> paper'   In a contrastive context, FH wânnan encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. bàa wànnan ba, wânnan 'not <b>that</b> (one), <b>that</b> (closer one)'	(speaker-distal < addressee-proximal) ... wânnan 'yar faatàa kadai sulèe tàlàatin sukà sàyeè tà '... <b>that</b> small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them'  [ <i>in focus</i> ] [short distance anaphor] In a contrastive context, [ <i>activated</i> ] LH wànnan encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. ai doolè nee à sookè wànnan zàabee 'it was inevitable that <b>that</b> election was cancelled'.	(speaker-distal << addressee-proximal) FH wânnan (only) ... in na cêe wànnan yà cêe bàa wânnan ba. In kuma na cêe wànnan yà cêe bàa wânnan ba 'if I say <b>this</b> (one), he'll say not <b>that</b> (one), he'll again say <b>that</b> (one)'
Demonstrative (post-head)  NP-n/r-nan	addressee-proximal [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [-gesture] bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me <b>that</b> pen'	(speaker-distal < addressee-proximal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me <b>that</b> pen'	Not applicable

**3. 2. 2. Spatial LH wànnan etc. (+NP), FH wânnan etc (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan**

Addressee-proximal demonstratives can occur pre-head, in which case they have the form LH wànnan (pl. LLH wàdànnan), FH wânnan (pl. HLH wàdànnan)+NP 'that/those', or post-head NP-n (m./pl.)/-r (f.)-nan 'that, those'.<sup>11</sup>

Pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan etc and its post-head demonstrative -n/r-nan counterpart, like the adverbial H nan, are essentially addressee-centred deictics, where the intention is to direct the addressee's attention to a reference object in his/her vicinity. In this case, both speaker and addressee can see the object but it is perceived as addressee-proximal relative to the speaker's position at the moment of utterance, as in (79)-83):<sup>12</sup>

(79) [speaker informs addressee]:

wànnan yaaròo/ yaarò-n-nan nèè na ganiì

'it's **that** boy (near you) that I saw'

(80) [speaker directs addressee]:

kàrbi wànnan kwaanòo/ kwaanò-n-nan kà kai cikin gidaa

'collect **that** plate and take it into the house'

(81) [speaker asks addressee]:

bàa ni wànnan fensirrii/fensirí-n-nan dà kakèè rìkè dà shii

'let me have **that** pencil that you're holding'

(82) [speaker informs addressee]:

ta wànnan hanyàa/hanyà-r-nan na ga ta bi

'it's on **that** road that I saw her pass'

(83) [speaker warns addressee]:

yi gàba can kâr kà shaafàa hannuwànkà màasu daunii à kân wànnan

mootàa/mootà-r-nan

'move away so that you don't rub your dirty hands on **that** car'

In all of the above examples (79)-(83), it is the addressee's position which serves as the centre of orientation for the location of the reference object. And as regards the choice of (pre- or post-head) strategy, my judgement and those of other native speakers on the post-head demonstrative -nan form point to the important fact that this strategy is available to the speaker only if there is one and only one referent in the vicinity of the addressee, in which case there is no ambiguity, i.e. the referent is *uniquely identifiable*, hence *familiar* to the addressee, which is why a supporting gesture is unnecessary in a spatial context. For the speaker to use post-head

demonstrative -nan in (79)-(83), s/he must believe that the location of the referent in the vicinity of the addressee is both ‘unambiguous and undeniable’, as one informant puts it.

Use of pre-head LH wànnan in (79)-(83), on the other hand, implies that although the referent is addressee-proximal, the presence of competing references or the belief that addressee’s attention is being directed to a non-presupposed referent necessarily forces the speaker to not only use gestures but also to add extra descriptive content for proper identification, i.e. it is not assumed (by the speaker) to be necessarily and immediately identifiable.

Thus, unlike most Hausaists who insist that the pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan (FH wânnan), and the post-head demonstrative -nan are completely synonymous, we can expose the pragmatic-referential distinction between the two variant strategies, as we demonstrated for HL wannàn+NP vs. NP-n-r-nân/nàn ‘this NP’ in chapter 2.

Table 12: Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski’s (1993: 275) The Givenness Hierarchy

in focus >	activated >	familiar >	uniquely identifiable >	referential >	type identifiable
{it}	{that} {this} {this N}	{that N}	{the N}	{indefinite this N}	{a N}

In using this framework, it will be pertinent to add that Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski conceive of English referring expressions (and other languages in their study) as lexically, and cognitively distinct entities, making it far more easy to specify their cognitive statuses than when one is dealing with semantic equivalents (pre- and post-NP strategies).

In (84)-(91), the shift in word-order (i.e. pre-and post-head) reflects the differing interpretation that the addressee is expected to derive from the requests expressed in these utterances:

(84) kàawo wàdànnan (= wadànnan) kùjèeruu dà kèe nan kusa dà kai  
'bring **those** chairs (near you) that are right there close to you'

(85) kàawo kùjèerû-n-nan à nân 'bring **those** chairs (near you) here'

(86) bàa shi wànnan (= wànnan) wàsiikàa dà kèe gàbanki yà kai mà Ûsmân  
'give him **that** letter that is in front of you to take to Usman'

(87) bàa shi wàsiikà-n-nan yà kai mà Ûsmân  
'give him **that** (only) letter to take to Usman'

(88) don Allàh jàawoo mîn hankàlin wànnan (= wànnan) maalàmîn màì  
farin kaayaa  
'please, call the attention of **that** gentleman in white towards me'

(89) don Allàh jàawoo mîn hankàlin maalàmî-n-nan  
'please, call the attention of **that** gentleman in white towards me'

(90) bìyoo mîn dà wànnan (= wànnan) kwaalin àshaanaa  
'bring me **that** packet of matches along'

(91) bìyoo mîn dà kwaalin àshaanâ-n-nan  
'bring me **that** packet of matches along'

The contrast between pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan and post-head NP-n-nan is based on whether or not the referent is presumed to be [+*identifiable*] and/or [+*familiar*] to the addressee at the moment of speaking (= post-head -nan). And a speaker who chooses the pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan strategy signals to the addressee that the referent is [-*identifiable*] and/or [-*familiar*], because s/he is only being made aware of the existence of the reference i.e. not presupposed (previously mentioned) object. And the supporting gesture serves to underscore the uniqueness of the referent. Examples (84), (86) (88) and (90) are only interpretable through additional gestures and/or extra locational/descriptive information. In fact, the referents in these utterances are addressee-new, and without additional (gestural/descriptive) clue for the addressee, may simply generate the questions:

(92) wàdànnè kùjèeruu/wàcè wàsiiKàa/wànè maalàmii?

‘which chairs/letter/ teacher?’

because the addressee is unable to make any useful connection between his/her space and the location of the intended referent.

None of these conditions apply to the post-head demonstrative -nan strategy exemplified in (85), (87), (89) and (91) (= [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*]), because it is sufficient for its interpretation that the referent is in the vicinity of addressee for a successful identification to be achieved. The fact that post-head -nan requires neither additional information nor a supporting gesture, shows that the speaker is aware that the reference object is obvious and immediately locatable by the addressee.

In these spatial contexts (85, 87, 89 and 91), there is often a pragmatic overlap in the deictic function of post-head -nan, as its choice is presupposed via prior mention, and therefore implies the co-presence of the referent and prior instantiation in the addressee. Hence the response (93):

(93) zoo nân kà ðaukàa                    ‘come **here** and pick it up’

which is both confirming that the referent is physically proximal, as well as indicating the addressee’s prior knowledge of it. (In fact, for many speakers, including the present writer, it is the anaphoric interpretation that is primary in the interpretation of post-head -nan in all cases of its use (see § 3.2.3).) In any case, there is no way in which post-demonstrative -nan can generate the question in (92), because the speaker would only resort to choosing post-head -nan if s/he believes that the referent is *identifiable* and *familiar*, and if such a belief is not validated by the addressee, then the reference will simply fail to trigger any response from him/her.

As a *spatial* pronominal, LH wànnan ‘**that** one (near you the hearer)’ is the only possible referring expression, e.g.:

(94) [speaker reiterates his preference]:

wànnan nakèe sôo                    ‘it’s **that** [very] one that I like’

(95) [speaker warns the addressee]:

kaa ga wànnan dà kakèe ganii, kà kiyàayee shì  
‘you see **that one** [i.e. the person near you], beware of him’

(96) [speaker-trader goes for a hard-sell tactic to assure his customer]:

dùubi wànnan dai sòosai kì ganii koo yanàa yi miki  
‘look at **that one** [i.e. the thing near you] carefully, and see whether it is suitable for you’

There is also a frequently heard pronominal variant, FH wânnan, and it usually contrasts with LH wànnan to distinguish between two conflicting addressee-centred

referents. In such a contrastive *spatial* context, FH wânnan is the form used to indicate the referent which is closest to the addressee, while LH wànnan encodes the referent furthest from the location of the addressee, e.g.:

(97) [carpenter orders his apprentice]:

a) bàa ni wànnan sùkùddireebà?

‘give me **that** screwdriver’

b) [apprentice picks up the wrong one, and carpenter redirects him]

bàa wànnan nakèe bùkaatàa ba, wânnan na kusa dà shii

‘it’s **not that** screwdriver [which you’ve just picked up] that I need, but **that** [other] one near it.’

Where there is no (implied) contrast, then the natural *spatial* choice will be LH wànnan as in (98)-(99):

(98) [speaker advises addressee]:

wànnan bà tà daacèe dà kee ba

‘**that** one (e.g. colour) does not suit you’

(99) [same context as above]:

kadà maa kì gwadà wànnan , don bàa zâi yi mikì ba

‘don’t even try **that** one (e.g. ring), because it won’t fit you’

In the plural forms of addressee-based *spatial* deixis, three possibilities are available to the speaker in order to direct addressee’s attention to more than one referent located in his/her context-space. And these are HLH wadànnan (= pl. of FH wânnan), LLH wadànnan (= pl. of LH wànnan), and the post-head demonstrative -nan (which while spatially possible, it still is assumed to be first an anaphoric

reference marker, then a (marginal, less favourite) spatial form). The distinction between pre-head LH wànnan and FH wânnan is neutralised in the post-head -nan:

(100) [child protests at mother's choice]:

màama, nii baa nàa sôn wàdànnan (wadànnan) tufaafii

'mum, I don't like **those** clothes (that you're about to hand over to me)'

(101) [A orders B]:

dàuki wàdànnan (wadànnan) kùjèerûn kà kai cân

'take **those** chairs over there'

(102) [A tells B]:

fàdaa wà mutàanê-n-nan sù isoo 'tell **those** people to come'

Informants' judgements of the addressee-based spatial forms in (100)-(101) favours the pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan etc. Post-head demonstrative -n/r-nan in (102) is the least expected form to occur in coding a visible referent, because Hausa speakers will often favour an *anaphoric* reference for post-head -nan rather than the intended *spatial* encoding. And it is to this group that we must turn for answers to the pragmatic import of the word order variation discussed here.

### 3. 2. 3. *Anaphoric FH wânnan etc. (+NP), LH wànnan etc. (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan*

Of the two explicit pre-head demonstrative determiners, I will show that FH wânnan (pl. HLH wadànnan) is the default pre-head *anaphoric* form with the feature *in focus*, at the same time documenting attested examples of anaphoric LH wànnan (pl. LLH wàdànnan). However, the normative *anaphoric* strategy is the *familiar* [*< identifiable*] post-head -nan demonstrative, and as I shall show below,

the tokens in Imam (1970) corroborate this distributional preference. Recall in this regard that the parallel speaker-proximal (also *familiar, identifiable*) post-head -nân/-nàn strategy (chapter 2) turned out (statistically) to be the more frequently employed *anaphoric* option than its pre-head wannàn counterpart (=204/91).

Table 13 summarises the counts:

Table 13: Frequency count of speaker-distal (< addressee-proximal) anaphoric demonstratives in Imam's Magana Jari Ce.

Demonstrative form	Demonstrative from
Post-head NP+ <u>-n/r-nan</u>	Pre-head FH <u>wânnan</u> (LH <u>wànnan</u> ) + NP
369	29

The post-head demonstrative -nan strategy, therefore, is by far the most favoured strategy. The same criteria of establishing or assuming familiarity with the topic of discussion is the motivating factor here as well. That there is such a wide-ranging gap between post-head -nan and pre-head demonstrative FH wânnan (LH wànnan) tokens in our written text (post-head = 369, pre-head (mostly pronominal) = 29 tokens) should not come as a surprise, considering that the aim of a writer must surely be to keep the attention of the reader at a maximum by using such techniques as flashbacks, which not only help to create a thematic bonding of ideas, but also serve to offer the reader-addressee with an important point of reference linking the present scenario with either an earlier mentioned one, or a mutually recognisable frame to which both writer and reader have access. Jaggar (1985b:144ff) has come to the same conclusion with regard to the use of post-head -nan in a written narrative context. He showed that 'the N + demonstrative (= post head -nan) configuration has the highest average scores for both the intervening clauses ... and the number of intervening referents' (p. 146). From this, Jaggar (1985b:146) concludes that 'one of the major factors motivating selection of a coreferential high

deixis demonstrative is a relatively substantial degree of discontinuity within the text.' I have gone further to claim that post-head demonstrative -nan is not only the default long-distance [*familiar, identifiable*] *anaphoric* form, it is also the discourse-deictic that the writer uses to code culturally-specific information, as well as referents which can be inferred from the instantiation of a related frame of reference. Below, I concentrate on the normative post-head -nan.

In (103)-(106), post-head -nan is employed by the speaker to indicate both the speaker's belief that the referent is *familiar* to the addressee, as well as its relevance in the present discourse-context:

(103) [Waziri has found a way to make Abdun Ugu lose favour with the king]:

sai Wàziirì ya sâa akà sàami àlbasàa ... Wàziirì ya cêe, 'Murà! Ai làabaarìn murà sai ìn gayàa wà wani. Kù kaawoo masà àlbasà-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan àlbasàa)' (MJC:10)

'Waziri then ordered for onions to be made available ... Waziri said, 'Flu! well, I'm the one to tell about flu. Bring **that** onion for him'

(104) [narrator describes the gathering of the most eligible bachelors for the princess]:

bàri ta 'yaa'yan sarkii, har màasu tàakamaa dà sulèe sun tàaru ... tòo cikin 'yaa'yan saraakunà-n-nan (#wadânnan / #wàdânnan'yaa'yan saraakunàa) dà Màmama ta kunyàtaa, kaa tunàa dà wani ... gàjeeree ... ? (MJC:30f)

'forget about princes, even those who boasts of wealth were present ... well among **those** princes that Mama humiliated, do you remember a short (one)?'

(105) [narrator situates the event within a time-frame]:

sukà yi sallamàa, ðan sarkii ya koomàa gàrinsù ... lookàcî-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan lookàcii) dà sukà ràbu kòo dà àsàlaatù nee ... (MJC:35)

'they said goodbye, and the prince went back to his hometown ... and **that** time when they parted company was at dawn'

(106) [Maisango devised a way to get rid of the incumbent king]:

ya sàami laayàr yîn kurciyaa ... sai ya d̄auki laayà-r-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan laayàa) ya d̄auràa matà (MJC: 69)

'he found a dove amulet (to make people aimless wanderers) ... and then took **that/the** amulet and tie it round her neck'

The discontinuous contexts of (103)-(106) necessarily constrained the writer from choosing pre-head FH wànnan (also LH wànnan), which typically requires that the referent be explicitly mentioned in the immediately preceding context. Extracts (107)-(109) also illustrates the use of *familiar* presupposed post-head -nan in discontinuous discourse:

(107) [Sule narrates the story of a conspiracy between a prince and his father's concubine]:

sai ya gamà kai dà wata makulliyar sarkii ... 'tòò m̄èè ya yi wà makulliyâ-r-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan makulliyaa)?' (MJC:67)

'then he conspired with a concubine of the king ... 'well what did he do (in return) for **that/the** concubine?'

(108) [narrator establishes the contextual time-frame of two consecutive events]:

can zuwàa tsakad daree, Jàkaadiyaa ta zoo ta gayàa wà baayii ... cikin darê-n -nan (#wànnan / #wànnan daree) màasu dawaakii sukà hau sukà bi hanyooyii (MJC:70)

'much later in the night, Jakadiya came to tell the slaves ... **that** very night, horsemen saddled up and followed the trail'

(109) [narrator describes Bawa's fall from grace]:

sukà kai wani gidaa kango-kango à kàrshen gàrii ... Dà shìgarsù sai Baawà ya ga àshee ciki sai kà cêe gidan wani sarkii nèe ... Can yaa farkàa, sai ya gan shì kuyaa cikin raanaa. Gidâ-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan gidaa) mài kyâu duk yaa ɓacèe (MJC:123f)

'they reached some bare-looking house outside the town ... As soon as they entered, Bawa realised that inside is like a palace ... Much later he woke up and found himself bare in the sun. **That** beautiful house has completely disappeared'

Post-head -nan's requirement that the referent be *familiar* to the addressee allows the speaker to employ it without any overt (text) antecedent. This is especially true of culturally-specific referents, but also those that are assumed to be shared due to mutual knowledge of the events under discussion. Consider (110)-(112) below, where the addressee is expected to access the referent via shared extralinguistic information:

(110) [Maisango's explanation of the sudden disappearance of the king]:

tun ran dà mukà daawoo goonaa sarkii ya bar mù baaya ya sakoo tàakamaa ya zoo gìndin tsaamiyâ-r-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan tsaamiyaa) ... ya sàuka yà yi sallàa. Dà na zoo na gan shì nan, duk ràinaa ya ɓaacì (MJC: 70)

'since the day that we came back from the farm' the king left us behind galloping and got to the foot of **that** tamarind tree, ... (where) he dismounted to pray. When I came and saw him there, I felt very bad'

(111) [the tell-tale signs of poverty are appearing in Inna's household]:

dà ... ya ga sun koomàa shân laamii bâa roomoo dà tàushee, ya lùura kuma ya ga tsoohuwâr bâa ta dà fara'âa kàmar dâa, sai ya cêe, 'Innà hàlaamàa kudî-n-nan (#wadânnan / #wadânnan kudîi) sun kaarè?... (MJC:37)

‘when he saw that they were back to having (tasteless) gravy without meat and vegetable gravy, and the old woman was not as cheerful as before, he said, ‘Mum, is **that** money finished?’ ... ’

(112) [Waziri seeks ways of parting Abdun Ugu from a letter from the king]:

dà Wàziiri ya ji hakà sai ya yi tsàmmaanii maakircin dà ya kullàa wà Abdùn Ugù kwaanàn nànn yaa ci turàa, tun dà gàa shi màimakon à kòoree shì har zaa à yi masà kyàutaa, don yà jee yà kwaaso ìyaalìnsà. Sai ya faarà tùnàanin yaddà zâi yi masà wàayoo yà karbè takàrdâr, shii yà kai, in am baayar shii yà saacè rabii, yà bâa Abdùn Ugù rabii. Sabòodà hakà ya cêe wà Abdùn Ugù, ‘Ai kòo hanyà-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan hanyàa) bâa ta dà kyâu, àkwai ‘yam fashii cikin òan daaji-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan daaji) na tsàkaanin Yanà dà Bùgàabiri’ (MJC:14)

‘when the Waziri heard this, he then thought his latest plan against Abdun Ugu has failed, since instead of being sacked, he had even got a present for him to go and bring his family. So he (Waziri) began to think about how he was going to trick him to get hold of the letter; he’d then take it, and when he got it, would steal half, and give Abdun Ugu half. And so he said to Abdun Ugu, ‘In fact, **that** road is not safe, there are robbers about in **that** forest between Yana and Bugabiri’.

Notice that in (110)-(112), there is no explicit antecedent to the post-head demonstrative -nan strategy. The narrator simply assumed that the addressee can correctly identify the referent. In (110), the addressee’s knowledge of tsaamiyâ-r-nan ‘**that** tamarind’ comes from the widely-held belief that the tamarind tree is home to all sorts of jinns and spirits, hence its culturally-determined *familiar* (presupposed) status. In (111), it is the change in diet which leads the speaker to realise that the old woman is running out of kudfi-n-nan ‘**that** money’ which she got through him (no overt text antecedent). As for (112), post-head -nan anticipates

the fact that since the addressee is being sent on an important errand, then he must somehow know his way around. Hence the invocation of a *familiar* frame in hanyà-n-nan ‘**that** road’, daaji-n-nan ‘**that** forest’ (all are along Abdu’s road). My claim that FH wànnan (also LH wànnan) is an immediate (short-distance) *anaphoric* marker holds for these contexts as well. For a pre-demonstrative FH wànnan to be acceptable in all the above cases, there must be an explicit antecedent nominal with which it is co-referential in the immediately preceding linguistic context. Further constraint on the choice of FH wànnan in (110)-(112) is imposed by the cataphoric (forward-looking) implication of the relevant situation.

Evidence of the currency of this cataphoric [*familiar, identifiable*] usage of post-head -nan in Hausa narrative is to be found in Jaggar (1992b), e.g. :

(113) [at the beginning of a news report on Prince Charles’ visit to West

Africa]:

gà maffi yawàn ’yan Nàajeeriyàa, bullôowar jirgin ruwâ-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan jirgin ruwa) màì suunaa ‘Britannia’ à gaabàr tèekun Ìkko kwaanan baaya, ita cèè àlaamàa ta farkoo dà ta nuunà cêewaa ’yan gidan sàrautàr Birtaaniyà sunàa zìyaaràr Nàajeeriyàa (AHR:8)

‘to most Nigerians, the appearance of **that** ship, called Britannia, at the Lagos shore a few days ago, is the first indication that a member of the British royal family is on a visit to Nigeria’

(114) [police action against armed robbers in Nigeria]:

’yan sàndaa ... sun kuma wargàzà kungiyar bàbban bàraawò-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan bàbban bàraawò) màì suunaa ‘Lawrence Anini’... (AHR:15)

‘the police has also disbanded the armed gang of **that** notorious robber ‘Lawrence Annini’

(115) [a report on the reaction of Nigerian muslims to the Gulf War]:

Sarkin Mùsùlmii ... yaa yi kiràa gà jàma'arsà dà sù yi bìris dà wasu tàkàrduu dà akèe rarràbâawàa) ... gàme dà rìkicî-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan rìkicîi) na Tèekun Paashà (AHR:76)

'the Sultan... has called on his people to ignore some leaflets being distributed about **that** conflict of the Persian Gulf'

In (113)-(115), FH wànnan (LH wànnan) will not be felicitous, because it needs to be situationally evoked in the immediately preceding context. Again, post-head demonstrative -nan here anticipates its referent, which is assumed by the speaker to be sufficiently (temporally) removed from the present context as to warrant its cataphoric mention. But the speaker is in no doubt that the referent is mutually known, and the addressee can therefore correctly identify it without a preceding explicit mention. In other words, post-head -nan encodes inferrable (hearer-old, *familiar*) entities, which are deducible from extra-linguistic context.

Extracts (116)-(119) also illustrates the speaker's belief that the referent is part of the shared real-world knowledge of the addressee as well, a context which predictably rules out the choice of FH wànnan (pl. #wadànnan), LH wànnan (pl. #wadànnan):

(116) [a report about a snake that remains uncookable]:

yanàa ðaya dàgà cikin irìn màciizâ-n-nan (#wadànnan / #wadànnan màciizai) nèe màasu dafin gàske (AHR:44)

'it's one of **those** snakes which are poisonous'

(117) [broadcaster refers to Rushdie's Satanic Verses which is being translated into Japanese]:

zaa à bugà littaaŋi-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan littaaŋi) na Salman Rushdie, ...  
wàatòò marùbùucin littaaŋi-n-nan na Aayooŋin Shàidŋan (AHR:49)

'**that** book of Salman Rushdie, that is, the writer of **that** book of Satanic Verses is to be published'

(118) [broadcaster refers to the musical instrument most associated with the Nigerian musician, Fela Kuti]:

tòò àmmaa irìn mabuusâ-r-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan mabuusaa) mài kàmaa dà àlgaitàa dà akèe kiràa 'saxophone', ita cèe koowaa ya fi dangàntà kàde-kàden Fela dà ita (AHR:63)

'but it's **that** 'algaita'-like flute called 'saxophone' that everyone associates with Fela's music'

(119) [a report on the female mortality rate during birth]:

À lookàcîn dà likitoocii sukà yi wani tàaroo à Àbuujaa, ... dukànsù sun yàrda cèewaa àkwai matuŋar bùkaatàr ragè irìn haŋurà-n-nan (#wàŋànnan / #wàŋànnan haŋuràa) dà baa gairà baa dàliili dà maataa kèe fùskantàa wajen haihùwaa (AHR:105)

'when the doctors met in Abuja, all of them agreed that there is an urgent need to reduce **those** unnecessary risks that women faced during birth'

The speaker's assumption that the referent can be identified by the addressee stems from the reinforcement provided by the facilitative additive (cataphoric) conjuncts. Such 'remember-conjuncts',<sup>13</sup> as indicated in (115)-(119), include wàatòò '**that** is', irìn '**the** kind of' (see Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik 1972:627). These conjuncts are effectively used cataphorically to trigger the knowledge that the addressee is believed to possess prior to the speaker's utterance. See also (120)-(122):

(120) [at the beginning of a news report on AIDS]:

cùutâ-r-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan cùutâr) mài karyà gàrkuwar jìkii — wàatòo  
AIDS—cùutaa cèe dà akèe bazàawaa ta jìinii dà màniyyii; ... (AHR:20)

**'that/the** disease which destroys the immune system — that is AIDS — is a  
disease which is spread through blood and sperm; ...'

(121) [broadcaster further explains the sort of 'rubber' he is referring to]:

... akà cèe yaa hadiyee hoodàr ... wàddà takè à cikin roobàa — wàatòo  
àbî-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan àbîn) dà akèe àmfàanii dà shii don hanà  
haifùwaa (AHR:87)

' ... it was said that he swallowed the powder ... which is in a condom, i.e.  
**that/the** thing used to prevent pregnancy'

(122) [reference to the Nigerian journalist, Dele Giwa, murdered by a parcel

bomb]:

... an daurè wasu jàamì'an tsàron kasar Nàajeeriyàa biyu wafàndà akà zàrgaa  
dà láifin kashè Dele Giwa, wàatòo òan jàriidà-r-nan dà ya rasà rãnsà à dàliilìn  
wani bàm dà akà aikoo masà ta cikin wàsìikuu tun shèekaràr alif dà òarii tarà dà  
tàmàanin dà shidà (AHR:27)

' ... two Nigerian security officials, accused of murdering Dele Giwa, the  
journalist who lost his life through a letter bomb sent to him in 1986, have been  
jailed'

But where a scene shift occurs, there is a recognisable contrast between the post-  
head demonstrative -nan and the speaker-proximal pre-head demonstrative HL  
wannàn. Consider the following:

(123) [narrator describes a failed suitor's attempt at revenge]:

Màama ta cêe, 'Zân tàmbàyee sù ìnaa nèe raanii kèe shèekaràa, kuma ìnaa dàaminaa kèe shèekaràa'... Tòò cikin 'yaa'yan saraakunà-n-nan (#wàdànnan / #wàdànnan) 'yaa'yan saraakunàa) dà Màama ta kunyàtaa, kaa tunà wani d'án gàjeeree dà ta cêe masà kàmar an kifèe dà kwàndoo? Àshee duk yaa fi saurân zuuciyaa. Koo dà ya tàfi gidaa, dâa maa duk tùnàanin àbin dà zâi yi wà yaarinya-n-nan yakèe don yà raamàa, bàì saamùu ba) ... [tòò] yanàa nan sai ya ji bàtun wànnàn tàmbayàa ... (MJC:31-2)

'Mama said, 'I'll ask them where it is that the dry season spends the year, and where it is that the wet season spends the year ... Well, among **those** princes that Mama humiliated, do you remember the short one whom she described as though he were a basket turned upside-down? In fact, he's the most vindictive of the lot. As soon as he got home, he was already thinking of what to do to **that** girl in order to revenge, but to no avail ... [so] as he remained there, he heard something about **this** question ...'

Clearly, wànnàn tàmbayàa '**this** question' is aimed at bringing back what is now an activated reference, after the narrator has established a *familiar* frame of reference to an associated topic for the addressee —'yaa'yan saraakunà-n-nan. (Note too that tàmbayâ-r-nân '**this** question' is not felicitous in this context, because it requires that it is situationally evoked in the immediate co-text of interpretation, and must also relate to an ongoing speaker-instantiated referent.) Again, this is consistent with the notion that a post-head demonstrative -nan is always preferred by the narrator when s/he wishes to bring into the communicative equation something which s/he knows or believes is represented in the memory of the addressee, although not at the centre of current at the moment of speaking. Perhaps, more importantly, FH wànnan is infelicitous in (123) as its antecedent referent is neither explicitly mentioned in the immediately preceding context, nor is it a *spatial* context, both of which would have made FH wànnan the first natural choice.

But in the following extracts, repeated from chapter 2, we see how the speaker-based post-head -nân/-nàn pragmatically differs from its addressee-based -nan counterpart:

(124) [Bamaguje pays a visit to Anunu, the dishonest butcher]:

Bàmaagujèe ya nùfi wajen Ànuunu, ya tarar dà shii dà kân àkuyàa gàbansà yanàa sayârwaà ... Tòò yâu Jumma'âa, duk mutàanen kàuyèe sun waawàashee, sauraa ðaya-n-nàn (ðayâ-n-nan, #wannàn / #wânnan ðaya)...

(MJC:47f)

'Anunu found him selling a goat head in front of him ... Well, today is Friday, [so] the villagers have bought all of it, except **this** one'

(125) [speaker informs addressee]:

hudu-n-nàn (hudû-n-nan, #wadànnân / #wàdànnan hudu] kafai sukà ragèe dàgà cikin màalàmân dà ka yi zaamàni dà suu à nân

'**these** four are the only ones left from the teachers that you know here'

(126) [speaker warns addressee]:

suu ukù ði-n-nàn (suu ukù ði-n-nan, #suu wadànnân / wàdànnan ukù) dà ka bâa aikin kwàasar shàaraa bà zaa sù iyàa ba

'**these** three whom you gave the job of taking out the rubbish won't be able to do it'

Predictably, both post-head [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*] strategies turn out to be felicitous, while their pre-head counterparts are unacceptable by these contexts. For pre-head FH wânnan to be felicitous, it must have an antecedent in the immediately intervening context, which leaves us with post-head -nan. The crucial distinction between the post-heads -nân/nàn and -nan in (124)-(126) is that the former triggers a coding time-now interpretation, while the latter a reference time-then

identification. And this is true in many other contexts that we have examined above. Notice also the (collocational) use of the post-heads -nân/nân and -nan strategy (only) as slot-fillers in: yàayàa suunan àbî-n-nân (àbî-n-nan, #wannân/#wânnan àbù) dà maataa sukèe shaafàawaa à lèbbansù? ‘what’s **the/this** thing that women put on their lips called?’. See also (121) above.

At the beginning of this section, I indicated that pre-head FH wânnan requires an explicit antecedent reference point in the immediately preceding context, and encodes the pragmatic feature [*in focus*]. Below, I examine how this feature interacts with the intrinsic addressee-based (participant) orientation of FH wânnan.

Exploitation of the *in focus* function of FH wânnan in (127)-(131) leads pragmatically to the exclusion of post-head -nan, as this strategy does not indicate the reaction of the speaker to a previous statement:

(127) [Mama ridicules the physical appearance of potential husbands]:

dùubi wannân baawàn Allàh, gàa shi yaarò sàrdiidii, àmmaa gàjartàa kàmar an kifèe dà kwàndoo. ‘Dan dàgizgèè! Dàa wânnan tsòooloolòn (#tsòooloolò-n-nan) na kusa dà kai yaa sam makà tsawonsà kàdàn dàa an yi sàmàarii (MJC:31) ‘look at this poor guy: dashingly young but short as if a basket is turned over. What a shorty! Had it been possible for **that** tall and skinny one to give you a bit of his tallness a perfect young man would have emerged’

(128) [Telu Fari is excited by the price that his animal skin has fetched]:

jiyà dà ka kashèe minì nàawa, naa dàuiki faatàr naa kai kàntinsù. Wânnan ‘yar faatàa (#‘yar faatà-r-nan) kafai sulèe tàlàatin sukà sàyee tà (MJC:115) ‘yesterday, when you slaughtered mine, I took the skin to their shop. **That** small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them’

(129) [Telu Fari evokes a mutually-held belief]:

ai bà kà san halin tùuràawaa ba ... wafànnan mutàanee (#mutàanê-n-nan)

hikimàrsù sai à yi shiruu (MJC:116)

'you don't really know Europeans ... **that** people's ingenuity is  
indescribable'

(130) [A feels that the intense heat is a sign of some rain to come, and muses]:

a) A: kâi zaafin nân kiilà àlàamun yawàn ruwaa nèe

'hey, it seem that this heat is a sign of a big downpour'

[B then responds to A's monologue]:

b) B: in Maalàn ya zoo kiilà yà baa mù bàyaanli gàme dà wànnan lamàrii

(#lamàrî-n-nan) [ZMA]

'perhaps, if Malam arrives he'll explain **that** issue to us'

(131) a) A: dàgà nân har keetarèe yakèe tàfiyàa yanàa neeman tsoohuwar leedàa

'from **here**, he goes right up to the other end looking for used bags'

b) B: naa ga mazàajee sunàa wànnan himmàa (#himmà-n-nan) [ZMA]

'I saw men making **that** effort'

In (127)-(131), pre-head demonstrative FH wànnan is employed by the speaker to enable the addressee make a direct connection to the immediately preceding utterance. There is an automatic cognitive constraint imposed on the addressee from associating (127)-(131) with any other context which may be relevant to the focus of the discussion. And this cognitive constraint is related to the fact that the referents encoded by pre-head FH wànnan in these contexts happen to be the most relevant reference point at the moment of utterance, and is therefore prominently stressed by the speaker for the benefit of the addressee. In Gundel et al's cognitive

model, all of the referents underscored here are *in focus*. As a result, post-head -nan is not felicitous in these contexts, because it is not ordinarily used to refer to an object or idea which has just been mentioned. But where the speaker intends to make a non-specific, non-localisable response to, for example (132)-(133), a post-head demonstrative -nan is appropriate, and is interpreted by the addressee as being a response which highlights the addressee's general familiarity with the topic, and not necessarily directly responding to the overt antecedent in the immediately preceding discourse context, e.g.:

(132) in Maalàm ya zoo kiilà yà baa mù bàyaanì gàme dà lamàrì-n-nan

'perhaps, if Malam arrives he'll explain **that** issue to us'

(133) na ga mazàajee sunàa himmà-n-nan

'I saw men making **that** effort'

The rest of the 20 or so tokens of FH wànnan in Imam (1970) are pronominal usages, a function which is the most restrictive reference to objects and events that the speaker can make. Like English *it*, pronominal FH wànnan must be coreferential to an immediately preceding antecedent. But unlike *it*, it still retains most of its intrinsic addressee-based (participant) orientation. Thus, it is perfectly acceptable to use (bare) pronominal FH wànnan in (134)-(138) without any loss of its *in focus* and addressee-based interpretation:

(134) Faasih: àshee maa mìsàalân sun fi gàrgàdii daadîi. À kaaràa minì ...

Fasih: 'so, examples are more enjoyable than advice. I want more ...'

Wàziirì: kai dai rìke wànnan ... (MJC: 17)

Waziri: 'you memorise **that** (one) first ...'

(135) Sarkii: yàushè zâi sàami daamar yà zoo mù gan shì?

Sarki: 'when is he going to be free so that he can come and we can see him?'

Tsoohuwaa: wànnan fa shii kèè dà wùyaa ... (MJC: 39)

Tsohuwa: 'that (one) is going to be difficult ...'

(136) Màisàngoo: Allàh yà baa kà nasaràa

Maisango: 'may God grant you victory (i.e. Your Majesty)'

Lawàl: 'Allàh yà baa kà nasaràa', wànnan ai taakù cee ... (MJC: 71)

Lawal: 'may God grant you victory', well **that** (one) is for you all ...'

(137) Nwanko: wannàn àl'amàrii wai baa inkè, shàiduunaa bakwàì nàa nan, duk

kòo màalàmai. Dâa àlkaalin Randagi har yaa cèè ìn yankàa, Bàlaa ya cêe bàì yàrdà dà shàri'ar koowaa ba sai taakà

Nwankwo: 'this is certainly the case, and my seven witnesses are available, and all of them knowledgeable. Judge of Randagi had agreed that I cut a bit (of him), Bala said he wouldn't accept anyone's judgement except yours'

Àlkaalii: tsàyaa, nii bàn tàmbàyee kà duk wafànnan ba (MJC: 100)

Alkali: 'stop it, I didn't ask you about all those'

(138) Ûbaa: baa wani gàrgàdii dà zân Kaaràa makà dà ya fi abuuuwà-n-nan

ukù dà na gayàa makà tun kanàa kàramii ... Àmmaa fàdee sù mù jì in kaa rikèè

Uba: 'there's no more advice to add to those three things that I told you as a child ... But mention them, and let's find out whether you've memorised them

Sumale: wafànnan ai koo inàa barciì akà taa dà nii, nâa fàdee sù (MJC: 158)

Sumale: 'I could state **those** (ones), even if I've just been woken up from sleep'

Let me now turn to another dimension of the contrast which seems to manifest itself between the speaker-distal pre-head demonstratives FH wânnan (= *in focus*) and the variant LH wànnan (= *activated*). Recall that in *spatial* context (see example 97b), whenever a contrast is to be signified between two objects which are relatively proximal to the addressee, FH wânnan is the preferred choice for coding the most addressee-proximal object. In the *anaphoric* sphere, there is an analogous usage that reflects this inherent contrast. Consider these examples:

(139) [speaker A is reiterating a final point he wishes to make concerning an issue, he feel strongly about]:

a) A: mataakii gùdaa ya ragèe mù ðaukàa ìdan munàa sôn mù yì nasaràa;  
wànnàn shii nèe mù yì bòoren nuunà kîn jinin saabuwar gwamnatìn  
'we've got only one option to take if we want to succeed, and this is to protest against the new regime'

[speaker B then responds in agreement with A's statement]:

b) B: wânnan (#wànnan) màganàr hakà takè  
'that statement is the correct one'

(140) [A has heard some story but is convinced that it is a rumour, to which B responds in disagreement]:

a) A: shîn kaa ji làabaarìn wai gwamnatìn soojì zaa tà sàki mulkèi?  
'did you hear the news that the military government is apparently going to step down?'

b) B: wànnan (#wànnan) làabaarìi fa bàà jìita-jìita ba nèe [ZMA]  
'look, that story is not a rumour'

In (139)-(140), the speaker is responding directly to an addressee's immediate statement, so s/he chooses the normative *in focus* FH wànnan to indicate this. Moreover, there can be no ambiguity regarding the antecedent reference point given the use of FH wànnan; even where there are other potential referents, the addressee will largely restrict the interpretation of (139)-(140) to not only the immediate context, but also to the last proposition/referent before the responses. The infelicitousness of LH wànnan in (139)-(140) is to do with its more remote, *activated* status. Pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan may even be ambiguous in certain contexts, e.g.:

(141) [In a radio interview discussing the problem of cancellation of elections]:

ai doolè nee à sookè wànnan zààbee.

'it was inevitable that **that** election was cancelled'

(142) [another radio interview, where the speaker refers to the banning of political parties by the military in Nigeria]:

wànnan rìgimàa ta cêewaa bà à yàrda dà suu ba ita cèe ta haifar dà wannàn  
'**that/the** confusion exemplified by their being rejected was the cause of this (present one)'

In both (141)-(142), the context is a radio interview conducted over a long distance. What is noticeable in these interviews is that the referent of LH wànnan is only remotely connected to the interviewer in the sense that s/he is the one who brought about the topic in the first instance — recall the intermediate status of pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan — and it is neutral in this case as well. The true antecedent of (141) might even be a previous position taken by the speaker, and is therefore merely reaffirming it. In (142) too, the reference is to a general belief held by some people, perhaps including the interviewer, but the reference of LH wànnan is not tied to the interviewer's (addressee) statement in the same way as pre-head

FH wànnan would infer. Notice also that in this particular interview, reference has been made to numerous other (potentially ambiguous) zàabee 'election(s)' However, post-head demonstrative -nan is not a potential candidate here, since the antecedent referent is assumed to be at the centre of the present discourse context.

Examples (143)-(144) also exemplify the *activated* function of pre-head LH wànnan:

(143) [interviewer asks a farmer about his impression concerning the nature of the village farmlands, since his arrival there]:

wàatò cikin lookàcin dà ka zoo Baari, shîn dà wànnan lookàcîn dà yànzù, kaa lùura dà wani canjìn yanàyin yàddà kasar goonaa takè?

'so, since you've arrived in Baari, have you noticed any change in the nature of the farmland between **that** time and now?'

(144) [newsreader reports that a scientist has claimed to have been surprised at the discovery that a similar toxic gas disaster has occurred in the surrounding area, and the newsreader observes]:

à wànnan lookàcìi mutàanee tàlàatin dà bakwài nee sukà mutù (AHR:69)  
at **that** time, thirty-seven people died'

A footnote in Jaggar (1992b:69) on this incident reads: 'A reference to the release of toxic gas at Lake Monon...', which clearly underscores that it was a digression from the main on-line narrative context.

I myself will allow the use of LH wànnan in an anaphoric context, but largely in this intermediate *activated* role between *in focus* FH wànnan and *familiar* post-head demonstrative -nan (see Jaggar 1985b:133).

In pro-nominal co-referencing, the overwhelming choice between FH wânnan and LH wànnan is the former. Anaphoric FH wânnan picks up on only the most recent antecedent, as in:

(145) [speaker responds disagreeably to a proposition]:

tôo, wânnan (#wànnan) bàa nân ba kuma

‘well as for **that**, not **here** (you can’t get away with **that here**)’

(146) [speaker corrects an impression]:

wânnan (#wànnan) ai bàa aikìn jàm’iyyàr NRC ba nèe

‘as for **that**, it’s not the job for the NRC (political party) to do’

(147) [an agreement to disagree with the addressee’s present suggestion]:

wânnan (#wànnan) kuma koowaa nàa dà ra’àyinsà

‘as for **that**, everyone has his/her own opinion [about it]’

The underlying assumption informing the speaker’s choice of FH wânnan in (145)-(147) is that s/he is directly responding to an immediate utterance context attributable to the addressee. Of course, the speaker has the option of choosing LH wànnan, but it will apply irrespective of who made the last preceding statement.

The correctness of the above explanation is further validated by a similar contrast existing between the plural HLH wadânnan (s. = wânnan) and LLH wadânnan (s. = LH wànnan). Notice that the specific choice in (148a)-(148b) below is conditioned by a shift in participant orientation, for while (148a) responds to addressee’s prior point of view, (148b) does not, and is, in fact, picking up on the reported statements of respondents other than the addressee. HLH wadânnan (= pl. of FH wânnan) is, however, the default anaphoric form in all cases. Notice also the unacceptability of the post-head demonstrative -nan strategy, which is only

felicitous where the speaker wishes to convey to the addressee the belief that the referent object is cognitively *familiar* to both of them, and therefore *identifiable*:

(148a) [speaker provides further information on addressee's prior statement]:

wadānnaṅ/wadānnaṅ likitoocii (#likitoocî-n-nan) dà ka àmbàtaa suu sukà  
bincikoo aibìn dà cùutâr kèe janyôowaa

'**those** doctors that you've mentioned are the ones who discovered the complication that are brought about by the disease'

(148b) [speaker addresses issues raised by other respondents]:

wadānnaṅ/wadānnaṅ likitoocii (#likitoocî-n-nan) dà akà àmbàtaa suu sukà  
bincikoo aibìn dà cùutâr kèe janyôowaa

'**those** doctors that have been mentioned are the ones who discovered the complication that are brought about by the disease'

Similar interpretation can be made with regard to the use of the above plural demonstratives as pronominal forms, e.g.:

(149) tòo, wadānnaṅ/wadānnaṅ nèe na tùntubàa lookàcîn dà na kàamu dà cùutâr

'well, **those** [that you have just mentioned] are the very ones that

I consulted when I caught the disease'

(150) dà sanìn wadānnaṅ/wadānnaṅ likitoocii nèe akà yi ta dūuràa wà maràsaa

laafiyàa jiniì ...

'it was with the knowledge of those doctors that patients were continually being injected'

(151) tòo, ai wadānnaṅ/wadānnaṅ màgàngànûn maa suu su kèe dadâ zugà

jâma'âa

‘but, in fact, those statements are the type that further infuriate the people’

An interesting fact that pre-head FH wànnan shares with its pre-head HL wannàn counterpart is the relatively high proportion of FH wànnan tokens in the spoken medium (= 111) than in the written one (=73). Again, the observation I made in chapter 2 concerning the influence of English seem also to apply here. And although I claim that LH wànnan is anaphorically possible, it too has a far less frequency of occurrence than it is for FH wànnan. In one transcription of an extended interview conducted between Graham Furniss and the Hausa novelist/broadcaster, Suleiman Katsina, the Hausa interviewee used LH wànnan only on two occasions to code what appears to be a new referent, e.g. tòò shii nèè ya kèè mìn wànnan bàyaanì yanàa cêewaa ... ‘well, **that**’s why he was explaining to me that ...’. In this interview alone, I counted 69 tokens of FH wànnan, all of which are used to anchor references that have just been introduced, or are continuing to be the main focus of the interview.

### 3. 2. 4. *Symbolic FH wànnan (only)*

As I have shown in (chapter 2, §2.2.) dealing with symbolic HL wannàn, this function is an attempt to capture those deictic nuances which are strictly neither spatial nor anaphoric, but a mixture of the visible and the imaginary. It represents a speaker’s way of projecting a subjective, emotional and/or belief structure in the presentation of a viewpoint. Recall also that one of the important functions of this device for the speaker is to enable him/her to screen their subjective attitude by providing the barest minimum of information for the interpretant. This will be the case either because the speaker believes that there are enough contextual clues in the discourse to engender the right sort of interpretation, or s/he is trying to avoid responding directly to a request for information. Although FH wànnan has a low text frequency, the context of (152) below is one in which the speaker has reached

a point where s/he believes that the addressee knows that it is no longer necessary to make further explicit statement on a given issue, hence the desirability of summarising using both HL wannàn ... FH wânnan:

(152) [speaker describes an incident to the addressee]:

hakà dai mukà yi ta yîi; in na cêe wannàn yà cêe bàa wânnan ba; in kuma na cêe wannàn yà cêe bàa wânnan kuma ba; kâi har dai na gâji na yi tâfiyàataa)

‘that’s the way we kept on doing; if I say **this** (one) he’ll say **that** (one); and if I again say **this** (one), he’ll again say, **that** (one). You see, it went on until I got tired and left’

Symbolic FH wânnan in (152) is used to contrast with *symbolic* (< speaker-proximal) HL wannàn (chapter 2).

Just as I noted that *symbolic* uses of plural speaker-oriented demonstratives are uncommon, so too the addressee-based plural forms (LLH wàḍànnan / HLH wàḍànnan) and the post-head demonstrative -nan are not attested in symbolic usage, mirroring the unacceptability of the speaker-proximal HLF wàḍànnân and post-head demonstrative -nân/nàn in a symbolic context.

In (§ 3. 1.)-(§ 3. 2. 4), I have provided a unified account of the addressee-based adverbial nan and demonstratives FH wânnan +NP and NP+-n/-r-nan. I demonstrated that:

(a) H nan spatially locates referent in the vicinity of the addressee, but has a more general, derivative speaker-distal interpretation in anaphoric context H nan is also available for deployment in symbolic referencing.

(b) pre-head LH wànnan etc. and post-head -nan demonstratives are pragmatically distinguished by virtue of the differing effect that they trigger in the addressee. Pre-head demonstrative FH wànnan and LH wànnan may be used only where there is an explicit reference in the discourse context, with FH wànnan typically encoding [*in focus*] referents. The choice of post-head -nan strategy, on the other hand, assumes that the addressee can correctly identify the referent object without additional contextual clues (= presupposed [+*familiar*, +*identifiable*]). The presuppositionality of this strategy is indicated by the fact that gestures are not normally used to individuate objects in the *spatial* domain, since the speaker must have assumed that the referent is unambiguously addressee-proximal before resorting to this strategy.

(c) in a situation where two referent objects are being contrasted, it is FH wànnan (pl. wafànnan) which is used by the speaker to indicate the object closest to the addressee. *Activated* LH wànnan (pl. wàfànnan) encodes the more remote object in such contrastive context. However, in the absence of an implied contrast, of the two explicit forms LH wànnan is the default *spatial* deictic, as is FH wànnan the default *anaphoric* form.

Table 14 summarises the distinctive referential-pragmatic properties of the deictic elements we have examined:

Table 14: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based deictics

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
<p>Adverbial</p> <p>H <u>nan</u></p>	<p>addressee-proximal, e.g. gàa shi <u>nan</u> kusa dà kai 'there it is <b>there</b> close to you'</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. wàatò dai kuu <u>nan</u> ... 'in short, for you <b>there</b> (in that pre-mentioned area) ...'</p> <p>[cataphoric], e.g. kuma à <u>nan</u> mukèe sàukaa gidan Àhaji Roorò 'and it's <b>there</b> precisely at Àhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'</p> <p>[temporal], e.g. <u>nan</u> dà <u>nan</u> sai ya yàrda 'he agreed <b>there</b> and <b>then</b>'</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. ganii <u>nan</u> barii <u>nan</u> 'as it's seen <b>there</b>, so shall it be left <b>there</b>'</p>
<p>Demonstrative (pre-head)</p> <p>LH <u>wànnan</u>,</p> <p>FH <u>wànnan</u> +NP</p>	<p>addressee-proximal [-<i>identifiable</i>] [-<i>familiar</i>] bàa ni <u>wànnan</u> takàrdàa 'give me <b>that</b> paper' [+ gesture] [non-presupposed]</p> <p>In a contrastive context, FH <u>wànnan</u> encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. bàa <u>wànnan</u> ba <u>wànnan</u> 'not <b>that</b> (one), <b>that</b> (closer one)' [= <i>in focus</i>]</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) ... <u>wànnan</u> 'yar faatàa kaɗai sulèe tàlàatin sukà sàyee tà '... <b>that</b> small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them'</p> <p>[<i>in focus</i>] [short distance anaphor]</p> <p>In a contrastive context, [<i>activated</i>] LH <u>wànnan</u> encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. ai doolè nee à sookè <u>wànnan</u> z à a b ee 'it was inevitable that <b>that</b> election was cancelled'</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) <u>wànnan</u> (only) ... in na cêe <u>wànnan</u> yà cêe bàa <u>wànnan</u> ba; in kuma na cêe <u>wànnan</u> yà cêe bàa <u>wànnan</u> ba 'if I say <b>this</b> (one) he'll say not <b>that</b> (one); and if I say <b>this</b> (one), he'll again say not <b>that</b> (one)'</p>
<p>Demonstrative (post-head)</p> <p>NP+ -n/r-nan</p>	<p>addressee-proximal [+<i>identifiable</i>], [+<i>familiar</i>] [-gesture]</p> <p>bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me <b>that</b> pen' [presupposed]</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) [+<i>identifiable</i>], [+<i>familiar</i>]</p> <p>bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me <b>that</b> pen' [presupposed]</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

### 3. 3. *Deictic DIN*

The deictic particle *DIN* (= H dī-n or F dī-n) is frequently used in Hausa. Although no formal analysis has been made of it, there are attempts in the grammars and dictionaries to provide examples of the environments in which *DIN* occurs. Thus, Bargery (1934:256) notes that F dī-n may occur as a demonstrative to mean ‘that, those’ following a numeral, e.g. (morphological segmentation added) littàttàfankà suu ukù ?dī-n ‘those three books of yours’. It may also follow an ‘emphatic or personal pronoun’, e.g. tàfi dà wannàn ?dī-n ‘take this away’, as well as the pro-sentential deictic hakà in hakà dī-n zaa à yi ‘this/that is the way to do it’. Bargery also has a H dī-n variant with the possessive pronoun suffixes, e.g. inàa sòn goomà ?dī-n-sà ‘I want ten like it’. As I will demonstrate later, the configuration dī+-n+possessive pronoun is normally only permissible following unassimilated foreign words, e.g. zân zoo dà ‘friend’ dīi-n-aa in bà kà dàamu ba ‘I’ll come with my friend if you don’t mind’. Notice that the following example from Bargery is also marginal: littàttàfankà suu ukù #dī-n nân [= ?dī-n nân] ‘these three books of yours’. This clearly shows that Bargery is confusing the H dī-n possessive morpheme with the referential deictic F dī-n (see below).

Abraham (1962:214) writes: ‘(A) (*DIN*) = F dī-n (1) a) the one in question, bakii ?dī-n ‘the black one’; shii dī-n ‘yes, he is the one’; ?wannàn (= ?wānnan) dī-n bân san shì ba ‘I don’t know that one’; Audù dī-n ‘yes, that Audu’; b) mùtûm #dī-n-nân Kt. ‘this very person’; c) (with suffixed pronoun) dookii #dī-m-mù [= #dī-m-mù] ‘this horse of ours’; d) any numeral may add dī-n, but those ending in a consonant preferably add it, in order to indicate ‘the one in question’, e.g. ukù-n = ?ukù dī-n ‘the three in question’; bìyar ?dī-n ‘the five in question’; hakà dī-n ‘exactly thus’. (B) (*DIN*) = H dī-n 1. particle suffixed to form genitive of numerals, e.g., a) ?bìyar dī-n-sù ‘five of them’; bìyar-i-n-sù ‘five of them’; ?ukù dī-m-mù = ukù-m-mù ‘thrice (the size) of us’.’ Elsewhere, Abraham equates the definite determiner -n/r with F dī-n (Abraham 1959:55).

Parsons (1981:36-38) points out that ‘the alternative linker ɗɪ (= F ɗi-n)’, is used in Hausa to ‘... further specify a noun that has already got another genitive after it’ (p. 38), e.g. magìnin tukwàanee ‘a potter (lit. builder of pots)’; magìnin tukwàanê-n (-nan) ‘the maker of the(se) aforementioned pots’; ?magìnin tukwàanee ɗi-n (-nan) ‘the/this aforementioned potter’. However, Parsons acknowledges that this proposal is based on a hunch rather than hard evidence of the use of F ɗi-n within a demonstrative phrase. He also pointed out that ‘... a whole relative complex, ... or a subordinate temporal clause introduced by dà can — at least in the colloquial — be specified in the same way under the same conditions ... ’ (p. 38), e.g. (tones supplied):

(153) mùtumìn dà ya zoo jiyà-n (-nan) /jiyà ?ɗi-n (-nan)

‘**the** man who came yesterday (you know him)’

(154) wàndà ya batà-n (-nan) / batàa ?ɗi-n (-nan)

‘**the** missing one’

(155) dà sukà zô-n/ zoo ?ɗi-n (-nan)

‘when they came (as we have **just** told you they did)’

Cowan and Schuh (1976:99) cite ‘a special marker ɗi-n (ɗii before first person singular possessive pronouns) ... often used instead of the normal linker after foreign borrowings ending in a consonant’, e.g. nawà nee karàs #ɗi-n-kì? ‘how much are your carrots?’, ìnaa teebùr #ɗii-n-aa ‘where is my table?’. However, informants’ judgements on this frequently cited use of possessive H ɗi-n indicate that it is mainly used in conjunction with unassimilated foreign words (or assimilated consonant-final words which do not have a final -ii variant), rather than those that have been Hausaised, e.g., ‘brother’ ɗii-n-aa ‘my brother’, bàabûr / màashîn [#bàaburii / #màashinîi] ɗii-n-aa ‘my motorbike’, cf. teebùr-ii-n-aa [#

teebùr ðii-n-aa] ‘my table, (làadân) làadàan-ì-n-mù [#làadân ði-n-mù] ‘our muezzin’, fensìr-i-n-tà [#fensìr ði-n-tà] ‘her pencil’.

Bagari’s descriptive grammar (1986:118) contains examples of F ði-n contextual usage without any analysis or tones, e.g. (tones supplied):

(156) wàdânnan dà ka jeeфар (?ði-n) sun fi kyâu  
‘those that you’ve thrown away are better’

The context indicates that he is using F ði-n to encode a previously mentioned item.

Although Galadanci (1969:139-142) does not define deictic *DIN*, he specifies certain contexts of its use. He wrongly claims that: a) items ending in diphthong -au will attract a following H ði-n, e.g. tsiidau #ði-n ‘the tsiidau plant’; b) items ending in a consonant require a following H ði-n form, e.g. fensùr ?ði-n (= fensùrin) Audù ‘Audù’s pencil’, teebùr #ði-n-kà (= teebùrinkà) ‘your table’, also #bàabur ði-n ‘the motorcycle; c) following a proper noun, e.g. Lawàn #ði-n (= ði-n) ‘the Lawan’; and (d) where F ði-n may be used, e.g. wàndà ya zoo ?ði-n (= zô-n) ‘the one who has come’. Galadanci also provides other examples of the use of deictic *DIN*, (falling tone on the post-*DIN* demonstrative clitic becomes low following absorption, e.g.:

(157) ðan nii ði-n-nàn naa ìsa rainàa ka?  
‘can a little creature (like) me here despise you?’

(158) ðaya saaboo fil ði-n ‘the other brand new one’

He then concludes his discussion with the claim that there is no semantic difference between teebùr-ì-n and teebùr #ði-n ‘the table’ (p. 141). Notice, however that, like

many other writers, Galadanci is confusing the H dī-n form marginally used in a possessive construction with the deictic referential F dī-n. In all of the starred #*DIN* forms Galadanci confused the two tonally-distinct allomorphs, although he documented both forms.

For Kraft and Kirk-Greene (1973:53), F dī-n is to be construed as equivalent to the definite determiner -n/r, both of which mean 'the one previously referred to ... with essentially the same meaning' (p. 53). They adopt the conventional description and emphasise the alleged importance of using F dī-n following 'borrowed words especially those ending in a consonant', e.g.:

(159) inàa sôn fensìr # dī-n 'I want **the** pencil'

(160) yaarò #dī-n nan, bàì daawoo ba 'that boy has not returned'

However, they are wrong to state that 'a possessive pronoun may also be suffixed to F dī-n'. What they have in mind is the H dī-n variant that they exemplify in (161)-(162), although it too is in fact unacceptable in these contexts:

(161) naa kaawoo kèeke #dī-n-kà [= #dī-n-kà] (= kèeke-n-kà)  
'I brought your bicycle (the one we were discussing)'

(162) inaa fensìr #dīi-n-aa? (= fensìr-ii-naa)  
'where is my pencil?'

Newman and Newman (1979:32) distinguish two forms of deictic *DIN*: a) H dī-n which is referred to as '*gen. link* (used with nouns ending in a consonant', e.g. kwâs dī-n-sù 'their course'; b) F dī-n (= demonstrative) meaning 'the very one

referred to: #wànnan dī-n ‘that very one’, ?ukù dī-n ‘the three in question’, #mùtumìn nân dī-n ‘this very man, hakà dī-n ‘exactly so’.

### 3.3.1. The Two DIN Forms

*DI* is here analysed as a semantically empty morpheme which acts as a host for two clitics. Firstly, the masculine possessive -n can attach to the morpheme dī- to form an alternative possessive construction, e.g. ‘girlfriend’ dī-n-sà (= bùdurwa-r-sà) ‘his girlfriend’, ‘brother’ dīi-n-aa (= dan’uwaa-n-aa) ‘my brother’. In such constructions, it is invariably H dī-n. Secondly, when the masculine definite determiner -̀n is suffixed to it, F dī-n ‘the/that one in focus’ is a definite reference marker, which often competes with the -n/-r determiner as an alternative (pragmatic) means of coding previously mentioned or locatable referents (see below).

#### 3.3.1.1. Possessive H dī-n

H dī-n + possessive pronoun is most commonly used by Hausa-English bilinguals to post-determine unassimilated English NPs in genitive constructions. Madaki (1983:124-220) has a number of these usages in his corpus of Hausa-English code-switching, e.g. (tone supplied):

(163) àkwai wata ‘close friend’ dī-n-mù ...,

‘there’s one close friend of ours (we are family friends)’

(164) mun daawoo dàgà ‘teaching practice’, koowaa yanàa sôo yà ji ‘result’

dī-n-sà

‘we were back from teaching practice and each of us was eager to know his result’

(165) kuma kaa san inàa zàton mùtùm ðaya nèe zâi ‘determining degree’

ði-n-kà

‘besides, you know I think only one person determines the award of your degree’

(166) yàayàa zâi cêe wai kà jee kà yi ‘supporting’ ði-n-sà yà yi ‘Dean’?

‘how could he say that you should go and support him (in his attempts) to become (the) Dean?’

(167) wai ‘all of a sudden’ fa zuwàn E ði-n-nan, nii bàn san ìndà sukà

hàðu ba, kurùm D sai ya zama wani ‘hero’. Wai har dà shii fa akài ‘nominating’ ði-n E à ‘Vice Chancellor’ na A ‘University’  
‘fancy that all of a sudden D became a hero after E’s arrival. I don’t even know what the two have in common. Imagine, D was among those who nominated E for the post of Vice Chancellor of A University’

In these extracts, the nouns are non-Hausaised English words, a context where H ði-n usage is the default strategy. It does not, however, preclude the use of ‘friend’ + independent possessive pronoun naamù (163), ‘result’ naasà (164), ‘determining degree’ naakà (165), ‘supporting’ naasà (166), ‘nominating’ + possessive marker na E. (167). However, there are no comparable instances of assimilated loanwords + possessive ði-n, for example, # teebùr ðii-n-aa ‘my table’ in Madaki’s corpus.<sup>14</sup> Compare the following fully integrated English loans which readily suffix the linker + pronoun (but do not naturally accept the possessive ði-n + pronoun option: kaa ga fensir-ii-n-aa/mootàa-t-aa/tiibii-n-aa? ‘did you see my pencil/car/TV?’.

Some nouns (mostly Arabic or English loans) allow two isolation forms — either a consonant-final or -ii/-ì (mas.) final variant, e.g. laasìn = laasìnii ‘licence’ maalàm = maalàmii ‘teacher’, àhàmîs = àhàmiishii ‘Thursday’, làadân = làadaanii

‘muezzin’, mùtùm = mùtumì ‘man, person’—and the postthetic vowel appears before the -n linker and possessive pronoun (Newman and Jaggar, 1989:245-246). With such nouns, the dī-n possessive is unacceptable, e.g.:

(168) [speaker inquires]:

inaa oofishi-n-kà [#oofis dī-n-kà]/fensiri-n-kà [#fensir dī-n-kà]/kaamùshi-n-kà  
[#kaamùs dī-n-kà] yakè?

‘where’s your office/pencil/dictionary?’

(169) [speaker introduces a third person to the addressee]:

gàa làadaanì-n-mù [# làadân dī-n-mù]/maalàm-i-n-mù [# maalàm dī-n-mù] can  
tàfe

‘there’s our muezzin/teacher way over there coming’

(The final vowel can be -u if the vowel of the final syllable of the noun is -u-, e.g. (168) kaamùs-u-n-kà ‘your dictionary’). However, consonant-final (loan) nouns without a final -ii alternant in isolation, e.g. bàabûr/màashîn ‘motorcycle’, kwâs ‘course’, only allow dī-n + pronoun in possessive phrases, e.g. bàabûr dī-n-kì ‘your motorcycle’, kwâs dī-n-tà ‘her course’. Note, however, that the majority of (especially Arabic) foreign words enters the language with a final -ii/ii, e.g. coocìi ‘church’, cekìi ‘cheque’, aadàlii ‘honest man’, jaahìlii ‘ignorant man’, jaarùmii ‘brave man’, kaafirij ‘unbelieving man, etc., in which case only the linker -n is acceptable.

Possessive dī-n may be used to postmodify a numeral in possessive-partitive ‘of’ phrases as an alternative to the simple linker + pronoun:

(170) [speaker claims]:

sun yi biyu dī-n [= biyu-n] àbin da mukèe bùkaatàa  
'they were twice as many as we needed'

(171) [speaker agrees to buy the addressee's goods]:

bàa ni goomà dī-n-sù [= goomà-n-sù] / bìyar dī-n-sù [= bìyar-i-n-sù]  
'give me ten/five of them'

(though many speakers, including the present writer prefer the bare nominal in (171).)

In (172), possessive dī-n idiomatically links an independent pronoun to the following noun banzaa 'uselessness':

(172) [speaker dismisses addressee]:

kai (kuu/shii/suu) dī-n banzaa!  
'you (you [pl.]/he/they) are nothing!'

### 3.3.1.2. *Deictic F dī-n*

Deictic F dī-n 'the /that one in focus/question' is composed of the semantically empty morpheme dī- (the same morpheme dī- which suffixes the possessive linker -n, §3.4.1.1) plus the masculine definite determiner -n (with a floating L tone). Deictic dī-n is typically encountered in the following contexts (as an alternative to the -n/l determiner):

a) Following independent pronouns, e.g.:

(173) [a news report on an anti-publication demonstration]:

àshee suu (maa) dī-n samsam baa sàa sôn à bugàa shi ... (AHR:50)

'but they too (under discussion) do not want it to be published at all ...'

(174) [speaker confirms]:

shii/ita/suu dī-n 'him/her/them (under discussion)'

(175) [speaker assures addressee]:

ɗan nii dī-n-nàn naa àshee kà

'a little creature like me is match for you'

(where dī- has H tone following cliticisation of the -nàn demonstrative).

b) F dī-n is especially common following deictic time- and modal-adverbials, e.g.:

(176) hakà nan à bàara dī-n [bàarâ-n], wani lauyà na Ma'aikatar Harkookin

Cikin Gidaa yaa gayàa wà Ùmarù Dikkò cêewaa ... (AHR:3)

'also in the same last year, a certain Home Office lawyer told Umaru Dikko that ...'

(177) à gòobe kuma zaa à bugà littaaɗin à cikin Japanancii. Àmmaa sabòodà

rikicîn dà akà yi à birnin 'Tokyo' à kân wannàn littaaɗin dà akà fassàraa dà harshèn Japanancii, dà àlaamàa bàa zaa à sàami daamar à bugàa shi gòobe dī-n [gòobê-n] ba ... '(AHR:49)

'and tomorrow is to be the publication date of the book in Japanese. But because of the conflict which has ensued in Tokyo as a result of the move to publish this book in Japanese, it is unlikely that it will be published [the] tomorrow [in question] ...'

(178) ... à yâu dfi-n [yâ-n] kuma ðaya dàgà cikin shùugàbànnin wannàn  
kungiyaa ta Mùsùlmii yaa cêe lallee suu bàa zaa sù kyaalè Gianni Palma dà  
rânsà ba (AHR:50)  
'... and on this same [to]day, one of the leaders of this Islamic group said they  
will surely see to the death of Gianni Palma'

(179) tòo à raanar Àlhàmîs dfi-n [Àlhàmiishi-n] nakèe faatar ìn taashì dàgà  
Kandò  
'well, it's on [the] Thursday [in question] that I hope to fly out from Kano'

(180) hakà dfi-n [hakà-n] ya kàmaatà à yi  
'**that**'s what should be done'

c) F dfi-n may also follow proper names (persons, places, languages, etc.), e.g.:

(181) Audù dfi-n [Audù-n] dà ya màaree kà, shii nèe ya màaree nì  
'**the** Audu who slapped you is the one who slapped me too'

(182) ìnaa Lawàn dfi-n [Lawàn-î-n] dà ka cêe yaa zoo?  
'where's the Lawal that you said has come?'

(183) mée kukèe gani danganèe dà hukuncin kisan dà akà yankèe wà Salman  
Rushdie dfi-n [Rushdi-n]? (AHR:52)  
'what do you think of the death sentence passed on (the) Salman Rushdie'

(184) ... yaa yi kiràa gà dukkàn mùsùlmii dà sù taashì tsàye sù bayyànà ra'âyinsù à  
gàme dà rikicin Tèekun Paashà dfi-n [Paashà-n] (AHR:76)  
'... he called on all Muslims to come out and express their feelings about  
the Gulf crisis'

(185) Sarkin Gumèl/Kanò/Zaariyà ɗî-n [Gumèl-î-n/Kanò-n/Zaariyà-r] yanàa  
dàgà cikin mânyan saraakunàn kasar Hausa  
'the Gumel/Kano/Zaria king [in question] is one of the important kings of  
Hausaland'

(186) mun hau Dàala ɗî-n [Dàalâ-r] bana  
'we climbed Dala Hill [in question] this year'

(187) à BUK ɗî-n [Biiyuukè-n] na hàɗu dà ita  
'it was at BUK (Bayero University Kano) that I met her'

(188) à kòogin Kwaarà ɗî-n [Kwaarà-r] anàa saamùn mânyan kiifàayee  
'and large fish are found in the river Niger'

(189) ai Gaskiyaa Taa Fi Kwabò ɗî-n [Kwabò-n] taa shàharà  
'well, Gaskiya Ta Fi Kwabo is famous'

(190) sun fitoo kân tiitunàa sunàa zàngà-zangà ta kîn jinin wannàn littaaɗi dà  
akèe sôn bugàawaa à harshèn Japanancii ɗî-n [Japanancî-n]  
'they were out on the street demonstrating against this book that is being  
published in [the] Japanese [in question]

d) As already noted above (§3.4.1.1.), F ɗî-n is regularly used (by bilingual  
Hausa-English speakers) to post-determine unassimilated loanwords:

(191) kuma akà cêe yaa haɗiyee hoodàr 'cocaine' ɗî-n [# kòokenî-n], wàddà  
takè à nànnàɗe cikin roobàa ... (AHR:87)  
'and it was said that he swallowed the cocaine (in question), which is  
contained in a condom ...'

(192) D nee 'progressive' dî-n [# -n]? Shii ya sâa yàamùtse-yàamùtsenkù na

'progressives' kukà jaawo F ya yankàa ku

'do you call D a progressive (as per the discussion)? That is why in your confusing and mixing people up as progressives, you brought F (into your fold) and he did you in' (Madaki, 1983:49)

(193) tanàa shirìn sauyà tsaarìn mulkìn jùmhuriyar 'Niger' dî-n [# Nìjâr-î-n]

don à sàamu daamar kafà tsaarìi màì jàm'iyuu dà daamaa (AHR:99)

'... it's planning to change the constitution of Niger Republic (under discussion) so that a multi-party system could be established'

(194) ... yaa kiraawoo manèemaa làabàarai à 'club' dî-n (nan) [# 'club'ì-n-nan]

na 'yan jàariiduu na kasàashen wàje (AHR:49)

'... he called a press conference at **the/that** foreign press club'

e) Complex NPs (e.g. relative clauses) also allow a following F dî-n determination, as an alternative to the definite determiner -n:

(195) kaa san mutàanên dà sukà shigoo dî-n [shigô-n]?

'do you know the people who have come in?'

(196) naa san dāalibān dà sukà zoo dî-n [zô-n]

'I know the students who have come'

Now, although both F dî-n and the definite determiner -n are possible in many of the above contexts, with no meaning difference, they are not pragmatically synonymous in other contexts. F dî-n may only be used referentially, either if the referent has been explicitly mentioned in the preceding context, or it is at the current centre of attention. In other words, it must have an antecedent within the preceding

discourse context — hence ‘discourse-old, hearer-old’. Thus, in all of the examples that we have examined above, there must have been a first-mention antecedent to the referent before F dî-n is anaphorically used. Moreover, only F dî-n can be used to spatially locate an object (not the definite determiner -n), e.g.:

(197) [pointing<sup>15</sup> to something that the addressee missed the first time]:

shii dî-n [#shî-n] fa

‘that’s (precisely) the one’

Notice also that the definite determiner -n is possible with a first (new) mention (but inferrable) referent, but not anaphoric F dî-n, as in:

(198) [A arrives in B’s place, and he first asks B]:

yàayàa gàrî-n [#gàrii dî-n]?

‘how’s the town?’

Extract (198) is in fact ‘phatic’ in the sense of Malinowski (1969[1923]:315), since by using gàrî-n ‘the town’, the speaker may be asking the addressee about his weather, his health, or even his financial affairs. If, however, there is a prior discussion of the town in question, then F dî-n is perfectly permissible, e.g.:

(199) [speaker asks addressee about his journey]

yàayàa gàrii dî-n [#gàrî-n]?

‘how’s the town [that you’ve visited]?’

However, in all cases where F dî-n is used, it is necessarily linked to an antecedent, hence a given referent (i.e. assumed to be in the consciousness of the addressee). The absence of a following F dî-n usually indicates that the item has not been previously introduced, and is therefore new to the addressee, which explains the

infelicitousness of (200), as there is no prior mention of kàmfiê ‘campaign’ in the text:

(200) zubar dà cikii dai wani àbù nee dà dòokaa ta haràmtaa à Nàajeeriyàa,  
kuma à haalîn dà akèe ciki yànzù an waatsar dà kàmfiên #dî-n [= dî-n  
possessive] neeman dòokaa tà amìnnee dà zubar dà cikii à kasâr (AHR:105)  
‘abortion is something which is prohibited by law in Nigeria, and right now,  
the campaign seeking to legalise abortion in the country has been abandoned’

Interestingly, in none of the examples that I cite are both the definite determiner and F dî-n compatible. I assume, therefore, that they are mutually exclusive with respect to their acceptable usages, e.g.:

(201) #suu ukù-n dî-n dà sukà zoo malàalàataa nèe  
‘those (very) three who came are useless’

We can now come up with a useful generalisation concerning the use of DIN. The natural Hausa environment for using referential F dî-n is: a) following the independent pronouns (where the definite determiner is not acceptable); b) following deitic time- and modal-adverbials; c) after proper names; and d) following unassimilated (foreign) English words, as well as complex NPs.

Thus, contrary to conventional wisdom, I have demonstrated that the use of DIN involves a more interesting picture than was previously presented. In §3.3.1.1., DIN is realised as H dî-n + possessive pronoun, although there are cases where it alternates with the linker -n/r. F dî-n does not always have the same functional use as the definite determiner -n/r, e.g.: yàayàa gàrî-n [#gàrii dî-n]?’ ‘how’s the town?’, although both forms are possible in many deictic referential contexts.

### 3.4. Summary

In this chapter, my aim has been to analyse the categorial function of adverbial *H nan*, LH *wànnan*, FH *wânnan* +NP; NP-*n/-r-nan* within the participant-based model of deictic interpretation. I have argued that these forms demonstrate that Hausa lexically codes addressee-oriented entities, an important fact that have been overlooked by most Hausaists. Equally significant is our finding that contrary to the traditional view which looks at the pre-head LH *wànnan*, FH *wânnan* and post-head *-nan* as alternate synonymous forms, these deictics trigger different cognitive inferences in the addressee. The cognitive hierarchy model of Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski (1993) has once again proved invaluable in this respect. We must now begin to see the deictically-driven word-order variation between these demonstrative forms, not as alternate ways of encoding the same information, but as an important discourse strategy by which the speaker informs the addressee about the set of assumptions s/he is projecting with the two forms, i.e. *wànnan* / *wânnan*+NP (= spatially non-presupposed, anaphorically activated); NP-*n-nan* (= spatially and anaphorically presupposed). My data has also partly corroborated Galadanci's (1969) intuition that LH *wànnan* (= pl. *wàdànnan*) is largely a *spatial* deictic, whereas FH *wânnan* (= pl. *wadànnan*) is employable in both the *spatial* and *anaphoric* domain. Finally, I have provided new insights relating to the distribution of the (referential, possessive) deictic particle *DIN* (= H *dî-n* or F *dî-n*).

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted in chapter 2, a number of scholars have followed Bühler (1990[1934]), in proposing that the speaker, or in his term 'the origo', is the pivot upon which all forms of deictic interpretation are anchored. See also Rauh's (1983b:19ff) concentric circles, where, following Schmid (1983 [1972]:61-78), she outlines what she considers a formalistic systematisation of the nature of deixis and its participant-based orientation.

Pragmatists like Sperber and Wilson (1986) and Wilson (lecture notes) have taken the radical view that in order for the hearer to come to an appropriate interpretation of speaker's utterance, s/he has to go through a series of decoding procedures that rely not only on the message structure being conveyed, but also on the hearer's own background knowledge. In her notes, Wilson argues that in arriving at the correct interpretation of the speaker's utterance, the hearer has to ask himself the following questions: '(a) what did the speaker intend to say? (b) what did the speaker intend to imply? and (c) what was the speaker's intended attitude to what was said and implied?' (p. 3). In Hausa, this central role of the hearer (= addressee) is lexically encoded in the (spatial) deictic domain with the H nan adverbial and LH wànnan / FH wànnan demonstratives [= addressee-proximal]. Recall that the notion of the origo has been conceived by Bühler and others (e.g. Rauh (1983a), Parette (1980), etc.) as an objective region built up around the speaker, and to this extent, it looks as if the speaker's relation to this orientational centre is fixed. But it is clear from Jakobson (1971:131f) that it is precisely because of the 'mobility' of deictic terms, such as 'this' and 'that' that the term 'shifters' (ascribed to Jespersen) is applied to describe them. Benveniste (1971) has underscored this fact by arguing that in fact it is not the deictic form that shifts, but its participants' anchoring. In this connection, he argues that the only relevant positions are those of the utterer of I (= speaker) and the person addressed (= You [addressee]), 'indicators' as he calls them, and are interpretable largely because they encode the respective spatio-temporal (discourse) orientation of the speaker and addressee. Like Sperber and Wilson (1986), Benveniste evokes the concept of 'intersubjective communication' to point out the crucial role of the You part of the communication chain (p. 219). According to Benveniste (1971:225) 'consciousness of self is only possible if it is experienced by contrast. I use *I* only when I am speaking to someone who will be *You* in my address... *I* posits another person, the one who, being, as he is, completely exterior to 'me', becomes my echo to whom I say *You*...' (p. 224f). Interestingly, however, Benveniste locates the oppositional pair, speaker-addressee, in the act of communication itself rather than outside of it, the latter

---

position being the main reason why Lyons (1975) sees 'deixis as the source of reference' (see his article of the same title in Keenan 1975). And notably, both Benveniste and Jakobson seem to argue that the personal pronouns *I* and *You* are much more basic than the designators *speaker* and *addressee*.

2 Presumably what Abraham had in mind is the generalisation that (taking the speaker as the pivot) referents coded with H tone nan and can are indeed distant from the speaker (relative to F nân and F cân). However, this needs to be qualified with the proviso that H nan can in fact code referents which are not necessarily distant from the speaker, but only much more connected to the addressee's position. Note also that given the Hausa children's rhyme: nân bàa nan ba, cân bàa can ba 'here not there (near you), over there not way over there', F nân/cân are indeed more proximal to the speaker than H nan/can, and this may lead one to assume that there is a (deictic) distal symmetry between the forms, with respect to the speaker's position at the time of utterance.

3 If this example is used by Newman (1990) to code visible referents, then it is a contradiction in terms. Since H nan is intrinsically addressee-specific, locating a referent object in the addressee's objective space, use of the demonstrative LH wàccan is inappropriate. LH wànnan is the appropriate demonstrative here. This is because LH wàccan is defined as remote-distal relative to the position of both speaker and addressee (see chapter 4 for details). Notice too that the 'pointing' gesture would be a requirement for the spatial use of LH wàccan in this context, but a redundant one for H nan, as addressee and referent are in the same location.

4 In their detailed discussion of 'definite reference and mutual knowledge' Clark and Marshall (1981:35) argue that a speaker relies heavily on the addressee's knowledge of certain kinds of information, which by virtue of their common membership of a community can be taken to be mutually known. According to Clark and Marshall the concept of *community membership* is based on the idea that 'there are things *everyone* in a community knows and assumes that everyone else in that community knows too' (p. 35). Thus, for what they refer to as 'the broad community of educated Americans', the following *generic* things are taken to be known: 'Cars drive on the right; senators have terms of six years and representatives terms of two years', but also these *particular* things: 'George Washington was the first president of the United States; there was a great depression between World Wars I and II' (p. 35). Elsewhere they pointed out that the definite reference of the sentence: 'I wonder where the city hall is', is justified

---

by the fact that Americans ‘take it for granted that big American towns have city halls.’ (p. 21). Supporting claims are to be found in Rommetveit (1968) who argues that ‘... successful deixis... presupposes some commonality of sender and receiver of the message with respect to cognitive organisation of the external world’ (p. 53f). See also Christopherson’s (1939) and Jespersen’s (1992[1924]) discussion of the uses of the definite article. The additional use of cataphoric H nan in (26) derives from the community-based knowledge that in average Hausa towns, there is one and only one mosque in which the Friday prayer is conducted, and even where there may be more than one, it is the one patronised by the Emir/Chief which can be used as a frame for securing knowledge on the basis of Clark and Marshall’s *community comembership* assumption.

<sup>5</sup> See Greenbaum (1969:50f) for examples of the use of English ‘then’ as an additive conjunct (= Hausa sànnan).

<sup>6</sup> Citing examples from Spanish, Hottenroth (1982:148) has argued that ‘... the motivation for choosing ... *ahí* [‘**there**’] instead of ... *aquí* [‘**here**’], may be a purely emotional attitude towards the indicated object’ (p. 148). As Chafe (1976:54) has noted, empathy is an important category in the ‘packaging phenomenon’, as he puts it. He goes on to describe why language provides the speaker with the possibility of indicating empathy in his speech:

Its cognitive basis appears to lie in the fact that people are able to imagine themselves seeing the world through the eyes of others as well as from their own point of view, and that this ability has an effect on the use of language (Chafe 1976:54).

<sup>7</sup> There are other interpretative constraints informing the choice of H nan instead of F nân in (33). Some informants are of the opinion that H nan in (33) is to be understood as ‘... up to the point at which you are in your discussion prior to my interpretation’, and may in fact be followed by an adversative ‘but’. F nân (chapter 2), however, implies not only the speaker’s knowledge of the event, but also his support of the prior utterance. A typical follow-up statement would reinforce rather than show disagreement with whatever sentiments may have been expressed by the addressee of (33).

<sup>8</sup> Even here, some speakers feel that H nan maintains its underlying (< *spatial*) addressee-centred force, with examples like (59) enabling the addressee to sense

---

and visualise the experience as though s/he were the affected party. In (59) H nan is a powerful means of bringing home to the addressee the intensity of Lake Nyos disaster. Notice that the presentative particle gàa ‘there’ is basically a spatial deictic predicator, and its role in this [and subsequent symbolic] examples is to present a vivid, believable account of events (see also Hanks 1989:116).

<sup>9</sup> But see the description of Galadanci (1969:283), Howeidy (1953:31) above, who have accurately defined the ‘nan-demonstratives’ as ‘near you’ — cf. Jaggar’s (1985b:145) ‘closer to the addressee ...’ description. Jaggar (1985b) and Jaggar & Buba (1994) inadvertently overlooked these works, especially Howeidy’s Concise Hausa Grammar which has explicitly mentioned this particular addressee-proximal meaning of pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan.

<sup>10</sup> Note, however, that Mohmed’s study did not specifically address the word-order variation of deictic forms, but it still shows that word order variation in Hausa cannot be reduced to a simple picture of an alternative way of coding the same referent with a shorter variant demonstrative, as I have discussed in chapter 2. In this connection, Hawkins (1983:89ff) has argued that his Heaviness Serialisation and Mobility Principles (HSP and MP) have an ‘ultimately’ psycholinguistic explanation, which is that ‘... all things being equal, the earlier the head appears within the NP, the better from the point of view of processing load.’ See also Clark (1973:37) for a discussion of the notion of markedness in linguistics.

<sup>11</sup> As with speaker-proximal HL wannàn and F nân (Chapter 2), both pre-head LH wànnan, FH wànnan and post-head demonstrative -nan forms are directly relatable to the H nan (hearer-proximal) adverbial. Structurally, the post-head construction is analysable as NP-determiner-nan, i.e. NP plus determiner (m./pl. = -n, f. = -r) plus the cliticised H nan adverbial, and the pre-head LH wànnan is made up of wà- + determiner + adverbial nan. The tones on the post-head nan result from a phonological rule by which the initial L tone of the H (< LH) nan spreads leftwards and is absorbed into a preceding H tone syllable, leaving H nan, and LH-LH bùhu-n-nan ‘that sack’ → LF-H bùhù-n-nan, following L tone absorption (see Newman 1992:69ff., and Newman 1995:766ff for details).

<sup>12</sup> It is worth noting that while it is almost impossible for the speaker to use speaker-proximal *spatial* HL wannàn ‘this’ without an accompanying gesture pointing out the object for the hearer, it is acceptable for him/her to use post-head

---

demonstrative -nan without physically specifying the spatial orientation of the object of reference. The reason for this lies in the addressee-specificity of this term; the gesture of pointing may be redundant in certain situations. One must focus on the hearer to be able to make the correct inference about the deictic centre of addressee-proximal yaarò-n-nan 'that boy (near you)' in (79), for example.

13 Notice that the 'forceful reminding' which Kirsner (1979:364) relates to German *deze* **this/these** is here accomplished by the post-head demonstrative -nan 'that', because the speaker believes that the referent is mutually known to the addressee as well, but that the addressee needs reminding that that is the case. For Hausa, the participant-based approach adopted here is superior to Kirsner's paradigm, since its expectation that *deze* 'this/these' '...will be more appropriate when such forceful reminding is called for (p. 364)' is not corroborated by the Hausa facts; it is the addressee-based form that the speaker uses to facilitate a successful hearer-inference in our data.

14 It is interesting to note that many informants have pointed out to me that H dî-n + possessive pronoun is a major identifying feature of second language Hausa speakers in northern Nigeria, even though most of these speakers are unable to pronounce the implosive [ɗ] sound.

15 Note that a gesture of pointing is in fact required for the felicitous use of F dî-n in a spatial context, and may be used in a discourse context as well. Referential -n cannot normally be used with an accompanying (pointing) gesture.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### The Semantic-Pragmatic Features Of Speaker/Addressee- (Remote-) Distal

#### Deixis in Hausa

#### **4. 0. Introduction**

As in the previous chapters, I shall be examining a set of deictic adverbials and demonstratives in order to properly outline their basic *spatial* role as deictic indicators of participant-oriented relationship in a communicative context. My aim here is to unravel complex layers of semantic and pragmatic meaning encoded in the forms represented as *WANCAN* and *CAN*. Pre-head demonstrative HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn (pl. HLF wadàncân, HLH wadancàn), LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàdàncan, FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLH (pl.) wadàncan), post-head NP+-n/r-cân/càn, NP+-n/r-can ‘**that, those**’, adverbial F cân ‘**there**’ and H can ‘**over there**’ are all defined under Jaggar and Buba’s (1994) original participant-based model as distal with respect to both the position of the speaker and addressee. How these deictics differ in relation to the way they encode the physical space of the interlocutors in addition to their *anaphoric* and *symbolic* functions, is the concern of this chapter.

#### **4. 1. CAN-adverbial deictics**

The choice of a *CAN*-adverbial deictic shifts the centre of orientation of the utterance away from both the speaker *and* addressee — situated either as a group in the same vicinity, or equidistant from each other at the moment of utterance — to an external object sited at varying degrees of distance from the interactants, and its use often indicates an explicit or implicit contrast with a *NAN* deictic (either speaker-proximal F nân [chapter 2], or addressee-proximal H nan (chapter 3). F cân is a more speaker-proximal deictic relative to the more distal H can, but it is a

speaker-distal deictic in relation to speaker-oriented F nân. Equally, distal H can is partially analogous to addressee-oriented H nan, but only to the extent that both are used by the speaker to individuate objects that s/he perceives to be located in a space other than the one s/he occupies at the moment of utterance. It is this apparent (partial) symmetry which has somehow influenced the majority of Hausa scholars into accepting a largely unsubstantiated position that there is very little else that can be said about the distal F cân and H can.

#### *4. 1. 1. Previous descriptions of CAN-adverbials*

In the earliest books on Hausa grammar, e.g. Robinson (1941 [1897]:78), no distinction is made between the two CAN-forms (F cân , H can ), and were simply glossed as '**there**' (no tone supplied).

For Abraham (1962:132), the most important distinction between the two is one that relates to the variation in tones and whether or not the object is in sight of the speaker. Thus, F cân is defined as '**there**' and '*visible*', while H can gets the interpretation '**there**', but '*invisible*' e.g. : gàa shi cân 'he's over **there**'; naa gan shì can 'I saw him **there**' (in a previous reference location). So far as the examples are concerned, they seem to fit in with the claims, but had Abraham carried out a substitution test for F cân, he would have come up with gàa shi can 'he's way over **there**', which is also indexing an object in sight, but more remote from the interlocutors' position at the moment of utterance. He also wrongly equated addressee-proximal H nan (also '**there**' for English speakers) with H can, presumably, because he believed both to code non-visible referents (with parallel H tone). Of course, as we have shown in chapter three, the only way to sustain the putative analogy is to link them inextricably to the speaker position as speaker-distal deictics. But even if we discount the addressee-proximal value of H nan, we still have to contend with the fact that H can and H nan (chapter 3, § 3. 2.) code

differing spatial dimensions, and are certainly in no way substitutable. Abraham was also aware of the (temporal) anaphoric function of H can in such contexts as tun can dâa maa ‘even in **those** days’, can sai sukà farkàa ‘then [much later] they woke up’.

Bargery (1934:149) defines the *CAN*-adverbials in much the same way as Abraham, wrongly proposing that F cân and H can have roughly the same meaning except that the former encodes a visible referent and the latter an invisible one. Again, our earlier argument still holds, in that both F cân and H can may be used to individuate visible objects of reference.

According to Kraft and Kirk-Greene (1973:51-52), there is a general tone-meaning correlation which holds across the adverbials (*CAN* /*NAN*). Thus, they correctly identify H can to ‘indicate greater distance from the speaker’ than does F cân. And this suggests that they are thinking of the distance only in terms of physical objects in sight, e.g. gàa Audù cân ‘there’s Audu over **there**’, but gàa Audù can ‘there’s Audu in the distance’.<sup>1</sup>

Cowan and Schuh (1976:70, 299) argue that only F cân can possibly be used with an accompanying gesture in the *CAN*-adverbials, e.g. sunàa cân ‘they’re **there**’, and that ‘this will generally be the case when (nân or) cân refers to a place visible to the speaker’ (p. 70). As for H can, ‘it is a place referred to, but not being physically indicated by some gesture’, e.g. tanàa can à gidaa ‘it’s **there** at home’ (p. 299). Thus, their own version of tone-meaning correspondence wrongly excludes the possibility of using H can to pick out visible referents.

Newman and Newman (1979:18) and Newman (1990:276) maintained the visible/non-visible distinction between F cân and H can, although the latter recognises the possibility of using H can ‘in pointing’ at something or somebody, e.g. inaa tiitìn

Dantàata? gàa ta can kusa dà wàccan ginii ‘where is Dantata Road?’ — ‘**there** it is over there by that building’ (p. 276). They have also identified H can as the only possible option in an anaphoric context, where it is used to refer to a distant and/or previously mentioned referent, e.g. à can gàrín akà gan shì ‘it was in **that** town that he was seen’ (Newman and Newman 1979:18).

For the most part, adverbial F cân and H can have been defined in terms of a [ $\pm$ visible] dichotomy. F cân ‘over **there**’ is generally taken to be the visible referent encoder, while H can ‘way over **there**’ is wrongly assumed to apply only in a non-visible (anaphoric) context, as the following table of previous descriptions shows:

Table 15: summary of previous descriptions of CAN-adverbials

	Robinson	Abraham	Bargery	Kraft/Kirk-Greene	Cowan/Schuh	Newman and Newman
F <u>cân</u>	<u>cân</u> (no tones) = ‘ <b>there</b> ’	[+visible, -proximal], e.g. yanàa <u>cân</u> ‘it is over <b>there</b> (= # <u>nan</u> )’	[+visible, -proximal] ‘yonder, over <b>there</b> (fairly distant but visible)’ e.g. yanàa <u>cân</u> ‘it’s <b>there</b> ’	[+visible] ‘ <b>there</b> ’, e.g. gàa Audù <u>cân</u> ‘there’s Audu over <b>there</b> ’	[+visible, -proximal], ‘ <b>there</b> ’, e.g. sunàa <u>cân</u> ‘they’re <b>there</b> ’	[+visible, -proximal] ‘over <b>there</b> ’  no examples
H <u>can</u>	<u>can</u> (no tones) = ‘ <b>there</b> ’	[-visible, -proximal] ‘ <b>there</b> ’, e.g. naa bi ta <u>can</u> (= # <u>nan</u> ) ‘I passed through <b>there</b> ’	[-visible, -proximal] ‘yonder, over <b>there</b> (distant and invisible)’ e.g. yanàa <u>can</u> ‘he’s <b>there</b> ’	[+visible, -proximal] ‘ <b>there</b> ’, e.g. gàa Audù <u>can</u> ‘ <b>there</b> ’s Audu in the distance’	(-visible), e.g. tanàa <u>can</u> à gidaa ‘it’s <b>there</b> at home’	[ $\pm$ visible] ‘ <b>there</b> ’, e.g. gàa ta <u>can</u> kusa dà wàccan bishiyàa ‘there it is over <b>there</b> by that tree’  <u>à can</u> gàrín akà gan shì ‘it was in <b>that</b> town that he was seen’

I now present a descriptive model which is powerful enough to explain the respective deictic roles of *CAN*-adverbials, an explanation which provides additional insights into the all-important participant orientation of these deictic forms, a task which has clearly been overlooked by previous writers. As in the previous chapters, I describe these forms in terms of their *spatial* (§4.1.2.), *anaphoric* (§4.1.3.) and *symbolic* (§4.1.4) functions:

Table 16: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of *CAN*-adverbials

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
F <u>cân</u>	speaker/addressee-distal, e.g. gàa shi <u>cân</u> à ìndà ka bar shì 'there it is over <b>there</b> where you left it'	Not applicable	e.g. (indicating) zân jee <u>cân</u> nee ìn daawoo 'I'm going over <b>there</b> (not far away), and will be back'  in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>cân</u> 'if I move <b>here</b> , he'll move <b>there</b> '
H <u>can</u>	speaker/addressee-remote/distal, e.g. màtsaa zuwàa <u>can</u> gàba tükùna 'move way over <b>there</b> for now'	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) anaphoric : ... à <u>can</u> na sàami wata yaarinyàa 'it's <b>there</b> that I met a girl'  cataphoric: <u>can</u> à gàrin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajeeriyàa ... 'way over <b>there</b> in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi ...'	<u>can</u> dai, muugùn bàakinkà yà bii kà 'well, <b>there</b> may your evil mouth follow you'

#### 4.1.2. *Spatial F cân and H can*

F cân indexes readily visible referents which are at a distance relative to the space occupied by both the speaker and addressee, but not distal-remote enough to require a coding with H can. Although I am using the cover-term 'distal' for F cân, it should be noted that cân may actually also have a proximal coding in relation to the position of objects referenced by H can. So, F cân can index a referent object that is in the relative vicinity of the interactants, but not

sufficiently close to either speaker or addressee position to trigger the choice of F nân or H nan respectively. Notice that F cân is parallel to F nân 'here (near me the speaker)' in indexing referents which are relatively close to the speaker. The distinction between F cân and H can in the *spatial* context is indicated by the following contrastive (a/b) examples:

(1) [speaker points out an object to the addressee]:

a) gàa shi cân, à ìndà ka bar shì

'there it is **there** (over there), where you left it'

b) gàa shi can, à ìndà ka bar shì

'there it is **there** (way over there), where you left it'

(2) [speaker insists on the validity of the direction he gave to addressee earlier on]:

a) ta cân fa na ga ya bi d̄aazu

'it's over **there** that I saw him pass through just now'

b) ta can fa<sup>2</sup> na ga ya bi d̄aazu

'it's way over **there** that I saw him pass through just now'

(3) [speaker directs addressee to move further]

a) màtsaa zuwàa cân tükùna

'move over **there** for now'

b) màtsaa zuwàa can tükùna

'move way over **there** for now'

(4) [speaker responds to the question ‘where’s Audu?’]:

a) shii nèe cân à kîshìngìdè gîndin bishiyàa

‘he’s the one over **there** lying by the tree

b) shii nèe can à kîshìngìdè gîndin bishiyàa

‘he’s the one way over **there** lying by the tree’

In addition to these distal cân, can adverbials, Sokoto and Niger Hausa has the more proximal L càn ‘there’ which is tonally conditioned by a preceding high tone, as in:

(5) [speaker shows his surprise at the unexpected sighting of some acquaintances]:

su wàa naa nikà ganii càn?

‘who’re those that I’m seeing **there**?’

(6) [speaker directs addressee to the referent]:

gàa ya càn zàmne

‘there he is seated **there**’

The L càn pragmatic coding mirrors the use of L nàn (chapter 2), which is the more intimate speaker-proximal form than its F nân counterpart.

F cân and H can are often used in contrastive contexts, e.g.:

(7) [speaker is re-routing the crowd]:

wadãndà kèè can, kù bi ta cân

‘those way over **there**, follow **there**’

(8) [speaker points out a location to the addressee who is close by]:

dàgà cân zuwàa can ai yaa kai taakii goomà shâa biyu

'from over **there** to way over **there** should be up to twelve feet'

Examples (9)-(10) contrast *NAN*-adverbials with both speaker/hearer-distal F cân and more remote H can:

(9) [speaker points to his own location]:

a) à nân ka tarar dà nii bàa cân ba

'it's **here** that you met me not over **there**'

b) à nân ka tarar dà nii bàa can ba

'it's **here** that you met me not way over **there**'

(10) [speaker directs the addressee to a position other than the one the addressee is located]:

a) bàa nan ba, cân

'not **there** (where you are), over **there**'

b) bàa nan ba, can

'not **there** (where you are), way over **there**'

This is a clear indication that F cân and H can have distinctive roles to play within the deictic-adverbial paradigm. F cân and H can in (7)-(10) will usually combine with a physical gesture pointing out the referent place, but not addressee-centred H nan, since its very choice necessarily situates a referent object in the vicinity of the addressee. Notice also that the speaker-distal semantics of *CAN*-adverbials prevent the so-called ventive-centripetal verbs combining with F cân or H can for the purpose of encoding a directional path towards the speaker. Thus:

(11) a) #zoo cân

# 'come over **there**'

b) #zoo can

# 'come way over **there**'

(12) a) # mâtsoo cân

# 'move over **there** (closer to me)'

b) # mâtsoo can

# 'move way over **there** (closer to me)'

(13) a) # rùugoo cân

# '(come) running over **there**

b) # rùugoo can

# '(come) running way over **there**'

(11)-(13) are anomalous because they encode a speaker-distal goal with motion towards the speaker. There is no constraint, however, in using either F cân or H can with a verb where the movement is to a place other than the speaker's location, as in:

(14) [speaker suggests to addressee to place his shoes at the indicated location]:

àjìyè tàakàlminkà cân

'put your shoes over **there**'

(15) [speaker orders someone to disperse a crowd of children]:

wàatsè yâaran dà kèè wàasaa à cân

'disperse the children playing over **there**'

(16) [speaker wants addressee to move further away]:

yi dai can gàba

'go [way] over **there**'

(17) [speaker is allocating people to various places]:

kai yi cân, kai kuma yi can gàba

'you move over **there**, and you move way over **there**'

H can can also come after the deictic spatial gàba ‘further’, as in yi dai gàba can ‘just move way further (from where you are now). But notice that F cân cannot co-occur with gàba in (17), because they both redundantly encode the same approximate space with respect to the position of the speaker at the moment of the utterance. H can can also be further (spatially) specified through reduplication, e.g. yi can-can (# cân-cân) dà shii ‘move it way out **there**’, signalling a greater distance than simple H can. (this usage of reduplicated H can also has a *symbolic* (warding off) usage (§4.1.4.). *Spatial* H can baaya ‘way at the back, behind’ is also attested in contexts where the speaker wishes to encode a greater distance from the encoding place than can be covered by F cân baaya, e.g. gàa su Audù cân/can baaya ‘there’s Audu and company over **there**/way over **there** at the back’. The combination of a *CAN*-adverbial with another locative adverbial signals a greater distance from the speaker and the hearer.

F cân and H can are also distinguishable in terms of an interior:exterior opposition in relation to a bounded space/location. Where a speaker intends to make a contrast between two referent objects, e.g. one inside the office (door), and the other just outside it, but within the interlocutors’ visible field, the interior referent will attract an F cân coding and the exterior referent an H can one, regardless of distance from interlocutors as in (18) and (19) respectively:

(18) gàa hùularkà cân bàakin koofàa  
 ‘your cap is over **there** by [inside]the door’

(19) gàa hùularkà can wàje  
 ‘your cap is out **there**’

In non-contrastive contexts, however, the speaker may use H can to point out objects at the periphery of an enclosure (e.g. a room), e.g.:

(20) gàa littaaŋkà càn lungùu

‘there’s your book in a corner over **there**’

Similarly, both F càn and H càn can combine with deictic hakà ‘thus’ (before or following) to further specify a directional orientation. The modal hakà ‘thus’ in this context functions as a disambiguation device, directing the addressee to a location other than the one in which s/he is presently located:

(21) [speaker A seeks direction to a location]:

a) A: dòn Allàh ìnaa nèe hanyàr zuwàa kwaleejìn SOAS?

‘please, where is the road to SOAS?’

[speaker B redirects A to the appropriate way]:

b) B: i) ai ta càn hakà zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejìn SOAS =

ai ta hakà càn zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejìn SOAS

‘you should follow [way] over **there**, up to SOAS’

ii) ai ta càn hakà zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejìn SOAS =

ai ta hakà càn zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejìn SOAS

‘you should follow over **there**, up to SOAS’

It is clear, then, that a spatial context can accommodate both F càn (L càn) and H càn in order to specify the distinctive location of a referent which is distal from both participants’ position.

#### 4.1.3. Anaphoric H càn (only)

In this function, only H càn is attested. Its function in this context is to encode a general, non-participant, distal remoteness of objects of reference in space (or

time). In other words, it occupies those areas of deictic assignment where H nan would be inappropriate, because the reference is to a more remote-distal place (or time) outside the domain of anaphoric H nan. Consider the following examples:

(22) [Alhaji is about to set off in his search for the curative water, Ruwan Bagaja]:

naa yi niyyàa na taashì, sai wani gàrii wai shii 'Dandago. À can na sàami wata yaarinyàa... (RBJ:14)

'I set out till I reached a town called 'Dandago. It's **there** that I met a girl'

(23) [Wowo becomes mad as a punishment for humiliating an elderly person, and the narrator describes his condition at the time]:

bàa shi dà koo wajen kwaanaa sai kàasuwaa. Can uwarsà kàn rikà kai masà ðan àbinci (MJC:27)

'he's not even got anywhere to sleep except at the market. It's **there** that his mother used to take some food to him'

(24) [Maisango has hatched a plan to ensure that Sani succeeds his father as king, and now expects a reward]:

Màisàngoo fa tun dà ya ga yaa sàami fuskàr Saanii, sai ya makàlee masà. Kullum can nèe wajen hiira (MJC:65)

'and now that Sani appears friendly with Maisango, he's clung to him. Every day, he's **there** [i.e. at Sani's place] for a chat

(25) jàma'aa dai à wàhàlce sukè à Nàajeeriyàa. Can maa sunàa neeman gudùmmawarkù

'people are suffering in Nigeria. They need your assistance **there** as well'

(26) [a thief is killed by Alhaji's host, so Alhaji devised a strategy to get rid of the corpse without being caught]:

... sai na sâa yà dâuki gaawan nân, mukà tàfi wàjen gàrii mukà ajìyee shi can  
(RBJ:23)

'... then I made him pick the corpse up, went outskirts of town, and placed it  
**there**'

(27) ya ruugàa buzu-buzu wajen Sarkii. Ya faadfi gâbansà, ya kwàashi  
miyàagun màgàngànuu ya cèe Dolo kèe can wàje kèe fadfi (MJC: 1970: 84)  
'he ran to the king's palace, bowed before him, and made some damaging  
remarks, which he said it was Dolo who's out **there** making them'

In examples (22)-(27) the writer could have decided to use H nan in place of distal-remote H can. But in so doing, s/he is clearly trying to localise the reference in such a way as to create the impression that the incidents happened only recently. Choice of H nan will also subjectively involve the addressee to examine the facts for themselves. *Anaphoric* H can, however, has the distinction of being both a natural choice for referring to events located in a greater spatio-temporal (anaphoric) distance, as well as subjectively allowing the writer (speaker) to achieve the necessary detachment from the story. H can is therefore appropriate when the speaker's intention is to create a more remote-distal non-participant oriented anaphoric reference, a usage which clearly flows from its function as a remote-distal locative adverbial (§4.1.2.), where it is used to code (visible) remote objects.

In the following extracts, H can is employed in a cataphoric role:

(28) [a radio broadcast from London]:

à yâu kuma zaa mù soomà shirìnmù dà làabaarìn rìkicìn dà akèe yîi can  
Nàajeeriyàa (AHR:38)

'and today we will begin our programme with news of a problem **way over there** in Nigeria

(29) [another broadcast from London]:

can à gàrin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajeeriyàa ... (AHR:124)

'**way over there** in the northern Nigerian town of Bauchi ...'

Note, however, that in the case of (28)-(29), H nan is possible, but only when the intention is that the broadcast is exclusively aimed at Nigerian listeners, in which case the broadcaster is evoking H nan's natural coding as an addressee-specific deictic to speak to them.

Adverbial H can also has remote-distal temporal uses, e.g.:

(30) ... can sai na ga yaa dùubi saakòn dà gaawan nàn takè (RBJ:17)

'**then**, I saw him look at the corner where the corpse was'

(31) dà na ji hakà na koomàa ðaakii, na kaasà barcii...can ... sai wata

dàbaaràa ta faadfoo minì (RBJ:16)

'when I heard this I went back to my room; I couldn't sleep... **then** ... I thought of a solution'

Another important cataphoric function performed by H can (but not F cân or H nan) is as a temporal deictic marker, again serving to anchor a remote, non-specific time-frame, e.g.:

(32) [Alhaji is under Sarkin Zagi's bed as part of a plot to stop him from

humming all night, something that is irritating the king]:

can zuwàa tsakad daree sai na ji yaa faarà àbin dà Sarkin nàn ya baa dà làabaarìi dà raana (RBJ:22)

'**much later on**, towards midnight, I then heard him begin the thing that the chief talked about in the afternoon'

(33) [Fasih is prevented from seeing his father, Waziri, who is asleep]:

Faasih ya koomàa zaurèe. Can zuwàa àzahàr Wàziirì ya farkàa (MJC:18)

'Fasih went back to the entrance room. **Much later on**, towards afternoon, Waziiri woke up'

(34) [Alhaji is up to his tricks against Zurke by delivering a wrapped object at the latter's house as though he is Zurke himself]:

na fitoo na miiKèe don ìn yi dàariyaa. Can kusan àsùbâa, sai gàa màigidân yaa koomoo ... (RBJ:25)

'I came out to stretch myself, and to have a good laugh. **Much later on** towards dawn, the husband returned ...'

(35) [Fasih is overwhelmed by the music he is hearing]:

ya yi ta kwaaso kudii yanàa ta baayâr waa, yanàa ta shân waaKàa dà kidâa. Ya màntaa dà kàràatuu sai can zuwàa màgàribàa ... (MJC:167)

'he kept on giving money, as he enjoys the music. He forgot about studies until **much** later towards dusk ...'

(36) [Alhaji has accepted Zandoro's challenge, and the end of the seven-day

grace coupled with the stories that he has heard about Zandoro's ancestors is making him uneasy]:

dà na ji hakà na koomàa òaakìi, na kaasà barciì don zullùmii. Can an yi kwaanaa bìyar sai wata dàbaaràa ta faadfoo minì (RBJ:16)

'when I heard this, I went back to the room, couldn't sleep because of anxiety. Five days **later**, I thought of a solution'

H nan is not a possible choice in (30)-(36), because it cannot be used as a remote-distal pro-temporal in such cataphoric contexts. Cf. also the following fragment which nicely illustrates the different anaphoric discourse functions of H can and H nan:

(37) Ruwan Bagajaa dai yanàa cikin ƙasar Irami nèe, ƙasar Irami kùwa kasaa

cèe ta àljànnuu. Ruwan Bagajaa kùwa maa bàa nan ƙasâr yakè ba, yanàa can bisà wani doogon duutsèe dà akèe kirànsà Duutsèn Kaf. Baabù màhàluukìn dà yakèe iyà zuwàa can sai àljànnuu (RBJ: 35)

Ruwan Bagaja is found **there** in the land of Irami, and Irami is a land of the jinns. But Ruwan Bagaja is not even **there**, it is way up **there** on top of a mountain called Mount Kaf. No other being could get up to there, except the jinns'

While anaphoric H nan could be used in this context to anchor a shorter spatio-temporal distance, a cataphoric frame can only be projected by H can.

H can is also anaphoric in (38):

(38) [speaker inquires from a friend who has just arrived from a long trip]:

a) A: yàayàa can? 'how's **there**?'

b) B: can nàa can 'there is **there**'

Now, although there is no explicit antecedent for H can in (38), it is still anaphoric (via inference), since the speaker must know precisely where the addressee is

coming from for it to be felicitous (I owe this observation to Mansur Abdulkadir, who is among my principal sources of judgements on Hausa extracts).

A typical coding-time cataphoric usage of H can is (39)-(41), also a context where all other deictic adverbials (i.e. F cân, F nân and H nan) cannot occur in this (temporal) frame:

(39) [speaker promises addressee]:

zân kaawoo makà can an jumàa

‘I’ll bring (it) to you **later on**’

(40) [speaker’s request for more time]:

kà daawoo can dà jumàawaa

‘come back, **much later on**’

(41) [speaker reflects on the source of the problem]:

kâr kà zoo sai can dà dare

‘don’t come until **much later on** at night’

where the time-frame implied begins from the moment of the (direct speech) utterance.

In line with its basic remote-distal *spatial* semantics, H can<sup>3</sup> also occurs with the (spatial) adverbs gàba ‘in front’, baaya ‘behind’ to express extreme temporal distance (future or past) as in (42)-(45):

(42) [speaker informs the addressee of his intention to pay a visit]:

sai can gàba in naa sàami sùkuunì zân zoo in shaa Àllaahù

‘I’ll come **sometimes later**, when I get the chance, God willing’

(43) [a futuristic look at a developing country]:

anàa sâa rân cêewaa can gâba, koowaa zâi sâami taasà mootàa

'it's expected that **(later) in (the) future**, everyone will own his own car'

(44) [broadcaster analyses a politician's about-turn]:

can baaya taa yi ìkìraarìn zamaa hàlàrtacciyar mataimakiyar shùugàban

kasaa, tòò àmmaa sai gâa shi à yànzù ita cèè 'yar kazagin gwamnatì màì cîi

'**previously**, she's claimed to be the lawful vice-president, but now she's a staunch supporter of the present regime'

(45) [commentator offers her offbeat forecast on a nation]:

can gâba zaa kà ga cîi gâban dà bà kà tabà gani can baaya ba

'**(later) in the future**, you'll see developments that you've never seen **in the past**'

The use of can gâba with an accompanying preposition à adds greater definiteness to its remote coding, e.g.:

(46) [writer talks about his writing priorities]:

koodàyàushè àbin dà zân rubùutaa, tòò zâi shàafi haalin dà mutàanee sukèe ciki nèe à lookàcîn; kàmar yà zama taariihì-taariihì nee, à can gâba, na haalin dà akèe ciki à wannàn lookàcii

'whatever I write always mirrors the condition of the people at the time; it's like a kind of legacy for the **distant future** about the condition of the people at **this time**'

#### 4. 1. 4. Symbolic F cân and H can

The general function of *CAN*-adverbials here remains largely linked to symbolic/psychological distance, to evasive (mis-) communication, as well as to deliberate imprecision in the information provided by the speaker. Thus, there is a recognisable metaphorical extension of the distal (spatial) meaning of *CAN*-adverbials to the symbolic domain, though F cân and H can differ in function. For instance, F cân is used in a context where the speaker wishes to be non-specific and/or to avoid answering directly wh-inquiries of the form: inaa zuwàa? ‘where to?’, inaa ya tàfi? ‘where did he go?’, etc., as in (47)-(48) respectively:

(47) [speaker uses F cân (with some sort of pointing gesture) to produce a phatic response]:<sup>4</sup>

zân jee cân nee ìn daawoo

‘I’m going **over there** (not far away), and will be back ’

(48) [speaker wishes to conceal the whereabouts of a friend who’s being asked for]:

yaa jee cân (bàa dà jaayàawaa ba)

‘he went **over there**, (not far away)’

At this point, the addressee must now realise that the speaker of both (47)-(48) does not expect any further query regarding the intended location — further probing may be interpreted as intrusive, and therefore, offensive.

F cân is also the preferred choice of some (Hausa-English bilingual) speakers in such metaphorical projections, as in:

(49) [speaker is concerned about the constant shift in the addressee's argument]:

naa yi nân kaa cèe bàa nan ba, naa yi cân kaa cèe bàa can ba. Tòo yàayàa kèe nan?

'I moved here, you said not there; I moved (over) **there**, you said not way over there. Well, what then?'

Interestingly, both H nan and H can are anaphoric in (49), i.e. referring back to the symbolically proximate location indicated by the frame F nân ... cân.

The maximal (*spatial*) remote-distal interpretation of H can is also available for the speaker when s/he wishes to create a *symbolic* (adversative) distancing of an addressee's statement from him/her, because the socio-religious boundaries are believed to have been overstepped, e.g.:

(50) [A responds to B's blasphemous statement]:

can dai, muugùn bàakinkà yà bii kà!

'well **there**, may your evil mouth follow you!'

H can may also be used as a marker of departure between two people involved in a heated argument, or as a stern rebuff of a child's misdemeanour, as in (51)-(52) respectively, which is also a distancing strategy:

(51) [A shrugs off B's insulting remarks]:

ii, naa ji dai, àmmaa à yi can dà muugùn halii

'yes, I get you, but **there** (away) with bad manners'

(52) [A (a child) is trying to convince his parents that his mistake is not deliberate, but ended up even aggravating them, and so is dismissed, thus]:  
tâfi can<sup>5</sup> kà baa mù wurii!            ‘off you go **there**, out of our way’

The *symbolic* (metaphorical) interpretation of H can in the above contexts is justified by the fact that there is no inference to a location (spatial or temporal) to which it can refer to. In fact, it is this non-specific, warding-off force of H can which validates the hand gesture accompanying it in these symbolic-metaphorical utterances.

Clearly, then, *CAN*-adverbials, far from being symmetrical to *NAN*-adverbials, function to dissect the physical space in such a way as to cover all of those domains that are neither speaker-proximal, nor addressee-proximal. Moreover, even in the anaphoric context, we noticed that H can plays an important and distinctive role in maintaining its intrinsic spatial orientation as a distal-remote deictic marker. Both F cân and H can can encode spatial referents, but only the latter is anaphorically deployable. In the *symbolic* function, both F cân and H can occur, with H can coding greater degrees of metaphorical distance.

#### 4.2. *WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives*

Distal *WANCAN*, *NP-CAN* are the demonstrative counterparts of the *CAN*-adverbials, in that the former also encode a physical space other than the one occupied by the speaker and the addressee. In other words, (remote) distal *WANCAN (+NP)*, *NP-CAN* are assigned the same participant coding as adverbial *CAN*. But as we shall see below, even in the deictic category represented by these forms, there are interesting variations as to how the various demonstratives are to be interpreted.

#### 4. 2. 1. Previous descriptions of WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN

According to Robinson (1925:12-13) pre-head demonstrative WANCAN simply means ‘**that** (over **there**)’ (no tones marked). Robinson also documented the alternative post-head NP-CAN demonstrative usage, e.g. wachan (waccan) hanya; hanyar chan (can) ‘**that** way’ (p. 12), implying (wrongly) that the two options were synonymous. (As in other cases, we must assume that the distal interpretation of demonstrative WANCAN is solely anchored on the speaker.)

Howeidy (1953:30-32) notes HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, LHL (pl.) ?wàḍancàn as ‘**that, those** (one(s))’, observing that the post-head CAN strategy (i.e. litaaḥin CAN ‘**that** book’ [tones supplied]) ‘... is more popular and is preferable’ — hence his decision not even to provide examples for pre-head demonstrative WANCAN. Since the post-head CAN is the (normative) preferable strategy for Hausa speakers, Howeidy advised that ‘the student should, therefore, adhere to it as much as possible’ (p. 32). Later, I show the pragmatic reasons for the ‘popularity’ of the post-head demonstrative NP-CAN strategy. Neither LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàḍancan, nor FH (m./f.) wāncan/wāccan, HLH (pl.) wàḍancan were documented by Howeidy.

Bargery (1934:149, 1078) correctly describes the *spatial* distinction between the pre-head demonstrative HL wancàn and LH wàncan in terms of increasing (visible) distance from the position of the participants at the moment of utterance. Thus, pre-head HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, LLF (pl.) ?wàḍancân in wancàn dookii ‘**that** horse’, waccàn goodiyaa ‘**that** mare’, are defined as ‘**that** one; **that** one yonder’. As for the pre-head LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, HLH (pl.) ?wàḍancan, Bargery assigned the same meaning ‘but at a greater distance than implied by HL wancàn’ (no examples provided (p. 1078). Elsewhere, he documented post-head -cân/càn and -can, with identical meaning ‘**that**’, e.g.

dookì-n-cân ‘**that** horse’, gàrî-n-can ‘**that** town’ (tones and glosses supplied) (p. 149). However, no examples of FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan and LLH (pl.) wàḍāncan were found.

For Abraham (1962:919), however, the distinguishing feature between pre-head HL wancàn and LH wàncan relates to the [±visible] dichotomy. He claimed that HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, HLF (pl.) wadāncân mean ‘in the near or far distance, but visible’, e.g.: wancàn dookìn (= dookì-n-cân) ‘**that** horse’, with LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàḍāncan used to individuate (non-visible) object(s) ‘... referred to ... the one in question’, e.g. à cikin wàccan shèekaràa ‘during the year in question’. He also documented FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLH (pl.) wadāncan as equivalent to LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàḍāncan (p. 919f). Elsewhere, Abraham (1959:54f) provides only the post-head demonstrative -can, and wrongly equates it with post-head demonstrative -nan, e.g. à cikin shèekarà-r-can (= # à cikin shèekarà-r-nan) ‘in **that** year past’. Abraham has thus consistently taken the position that all (most) deictic forms can be defined in terms of a binary [± visible] contrast. But as I argued in (chapters 2 and 3), there is nothing intrinsically non-visible about the use of a deictic form such as LH wàncan ‘**that**’, since Hausa speakers do use it in a *spatial* context, where the referent is visible. However, there is no doubt that an object encoded by LH wàncan is further away from the interlocutors’ position than those that are indexed by HL wancàn at the moment of utterance.

Galadanci (1969:283) provides an interesting tabulation in which he specifies not only the tonal features of *WANCAN*, but also its varying semantic interpretation. Thus, while waccàn rìigaa (= rìiga-r-càn) ‘**that** gown’ is described as ‘**that** (gown) not near you or me, deictic’, wâccan rìigaa (= rìigâ-r-can) is shown to be both ‘deictic’ (i.e. *spatial*) or *anaphoric*. But according to Galadanci, LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan is only felicitous in a (contrastive) *spatial* context, with the

meaning **‘that** not the near one [sic]’. As I shall show below, although LH wàncan/wàccan is used much more frequently as a *spatial* deictic, it does have *anaphoric* usages.

Kraft and Kirk-Greene’s (1973:51-52) table of ‘demonstrative specifiers’ identifies HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, HLF (pl.) wadàncân as **‘that, those’**. They also documented the post-head -cân/càn variants, pointing out that these are ‘the most typical ways in which these specifiers occur [with the] ... meaning ... non-emphatic’ (p. 51), e.g. mùtumì-n-cân **‘that** man’, àbinci-n-càn **‘that** food’. However, they were wrong to claim that ‘the tones on nân and cân may be high, falling or low, with or *without* [my italics] slight differences in meaning’. In fact, it is tones which help us to designate the participant orientation of these deictics. Curiously, post-head -can is said to be ‘employed to indicate previous reference’, e.g. kujèerâ-r-can **‘that** chair (previously referred to)’, thereby showing that tones are crucial in marking out how the various deictic forms are to be interpreted. Distal pre-head LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wadàncan are documented in the vocabulary section, but wrongly given a non-spatial (*anaphoric* only) definition as ‘the one in question’ (p. 368). Kraft and Kirk-Greene did not document the variant remote-distal FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLH wadâncan demonstratives.

Cowan and Schuh (1976:57, 114, 165, 298) return to Abraham’s division between visible and non-visible referents. Thus, HL (m./f.) wancàn/wancàn, HLF (pl.) wadàncân are said to be ‘largely restricted to great physical distance from the speaker’, e.g. waccàn bàa taagàa ba cèe **‘that** is not a window’ For them, an object can only attract a LH wàncan/wàccan (and LH wànnan [chapter 3]) demonstrative if it is used to refer to ‘something mentioned or understood in a conversation or narrative’ (p. 298), e.g. wannàn ita cèe makarantaa wàccan makarkataa cèe ‘this (school where we are now located) is the real school, **that**

(school that *you have just mentioned* [italics mine]) is a place of deviation' (p. 298). (Note, however, the appropriate form for the italicised gloss the appropriate form should have been LH wànnan 'that [= *anaphoric*] which you have just mentioned'). If the reference is to some remote (temporal) event, then speaker-distal FH wâccan would be felicitous). The *spatial* usages of speaker/addressee-remote-distal LH wàncan/wâccan etc. are neglected. The post-head demonstrative -CAN variants are also distinguished along the visible/non-visible dichotomy, e.g. dabboobi-n-càn 'those animals (over there)', duutsè-n-cân 'that rock (over there)', and 'these tone patterns apply to physical beings or objects that can be seen by the speaker' (p. 165); à cikin shèekarà-r-can (# = -nan) an yi ruwaa dà yawàa 'in that year, it rained a lot', meaning 'this/that one in question' (p. 298). Cowan and Schuh (p. 336) also claim incorrectly that an explicit demonstrative determiner can postmodify its head noun, e.g. #kì yankà kubèewaa waccàn 'cut up that okra'. This is only possible with a few specialised time-words (and only with LH wâccan), e.g. bàara wâccan 'the year before last', dàamanaa wâccan 'the wet-season before last' (see §4.2.3.2.). No examples or description of FH (m/f) wâncan/wâccan, HLH (pl.) wadâncan were found.

Newman and Newman (1979:131) continued the tradition of distinguishing HL wancàn from its remote-distal LH wàncan variant on the basis of the factor of visibility (HL wancàn 'that [distant but visible]; LH wàncan 'that [not visible]'). Additionally, they implied that only the latter can be used anaphorically, i.e. 'the one referred to'. Yet Hausa speakers consistently use HL wancàn to code (non-visible) anaphoric reference in normal discourse, as I shall show in the following section. See also their post-head NP+ -n/r-cân/càn description: daakunà-n-cân 'those rooms over there [distant but visible]', and NP+ -n/r-can 'that, those [not visible]' (no examples) (p. 18).

In her most recent dictionary, Newman (1990:275) erroneously equated HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, HLF (pl.) wadàncân with post-head -càn/cân (= ‘there’), and LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàdàncan with post-head -can (= ‘way over there’), e.g. wancàn dàbiinò = dàbiinò-n-cân ‘**that** date-palm-tree’, waccàn tsaamiyaa = tsaamiya-r-càn ‘**that** tamarind tree’, wadàncân gìginyuu = gìginyu-n-càn ‘**those** deleb-palms’; wàncan ginli = ginli-n-can ‘**that** building’, wàccan makarantaa = makarantâ-r-can ‘**that** school’, wàdàncan rumbunàa nee ‘**those** are granaries’.

Table 17: summary of previous descriptions of WANCAN (+NP) NP-CAN demonstratives

	Robinson	Howeidy	Bargery	Abraham	Galadanci
HL <u>wancàn</u> (+NP)	<u>wachan</u> ( <u>waccàn</u> ) hanyàa	<u>wancàn</u> ‘ <b>that</b> ’	[+visible] <u>wancàn</u> dookii	[+visible], e.g. <u>wancàn</u> <u>dookii</u>	[+visible], <u>waccàn</u> riigaa
..... NP- <u>n/r-cân/càn</u>	= hanyà- <u>r-ghan</u> ( <u>cân</u> ) ‘ <b>that</b> way’ (no tones)	..... <u>littaafi-n-cân</u> ‘ <b>that</b> book’ (no tones)	..... = dookì- <u>n-cân</u> ‘ <b>that</b> horse’	..... = dookì- <u>n-cân</u> ‘ <b>that</b> horse’	..... = riiga- <u>r-càn</u> ‘ <b>that</b> gown (not near you or me)’
LH <u>wàncan</u> (+NP)			[+visible], <u>wàncan</u> ‘ <b>that</b> o n e yonder’	[-visible] <u>wàccan</u> shèekaràa	[+visible] <u>wàccan</u> riigaa ‘ <b>that</b> gown’
..... NP- <u>n/r-can</u>			..... [-visible] <u>gârî-n-can</u> ‘ <b>that</b> town’	..... = shèekarà- <u>r</u> <u>-can</u> # <u>-nan</u> ‘ <b>that</b> year in the past’	..... [±visible] <u>riigâ-r-can</u> ‘ <b>that</b> gown’
FH <u>wàncan</u> (+NP)		Not recorded	Not recorded	[-visible] <u>wàccan</u> (= <u>wàccan</u> ) <u>shèekaràa</u> ‘ <b>that</b> year in question’	[±visible] <u>wàccan</u> riigaa = <u>riigâ-r-can</u> ‘ <b>that</b> gown’

Table 17: (continued)

	Kraft and Kirk- Greene	Cowan and Schuh	Newman and Newman	Newman
HL <u>wancàn</u> (+NP)	[+visible] <u>waccàn</u> goonaa	[+visible] <u>waccàn</u> goonaa	[+visible] (distant) <u>wancàn</u> 'that' (no examples)	[+visible] (distant) <u>wancàn</u> dàbiinò
..... NP-n/r-cân/càn	= goona-r-cân 'that farm'	= goona-r-cân 'that farm'	ɗaakunà-n-cân 'those rooms over there'	= dàbiinò-n-cân 'that date-palm tree'
LH <u>wàncan</u> (+NP)	[-visible] <u>wàncan</u> 'the one in question'	[-visible] <u>wàccan</u> makarkataa cèe 'that is a place of deviation'	[-visible], <u>wàncan</u> 'that, that one' (no examples)	[+visible], <u>wàncan</u> ginii
..... NP-n/r-can	kujèerâ-r-can 'that chain'	à cikin shèekarà-r-can/ # nan 'in that year'	NP-n/r-can 'that (not visible, the one referred to)'	= ginii-n-can 'that building (way over there)'
FH <u>wàncan</u> (+NP)	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded

It seems to me, therefore, that we must move our analysis from simplistic, e.g. [±visible] interpretations of *WANCAN* (+NP) and *NP-CAN*, to a wider discussion of the way in which the factors interact with the participants' spatial position or discourse context to code differing deictic meanings. In the rest of this section, I provide new insights into distal *WANCAN* (+NP) and *NP-CAN*, and the distinctions between the pre- and post-head demonstrative strategies as summarised in the following table:

Table 18:summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
(Demonstrative) (pre-head) HL <u>wancàn</u> (+NP)	speaker/addressee-distal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. kujèèrâr tanàa baayan <u>wancàn</u> ðaakii 'the chair is behind <b>that</b> hut'  [non-presupposed]	[contrastive] tòo danganèe dà <u>waccàn</u> màganàa kuma... 'as for <b>that</b> (other) issue...'	anàa faðàa tsàkaanin <u>wannàn</u> zùri'aa dà <u>waccàn</u> (zùri'aa) 'there's conflict between <b>this</b> clan and <b>that</b> (clan)'
Demonstrative (pre-head) LH <u>wàncan</u> , FH <u>wâncan</u> (+ NP)	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. à <u>wàncan</u> wurîn mukà tarar dà shii 'it's at <b>that</b> place over there that we met him' [non-presupposed]  [contrastive], e.g. bàa <u>wâccan</u> mootàa ba, <u>wàccan</u> tà gàba 'not <b>that</b> car (you're approaching), <b>that</b> (other one) way in front'	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à <u>wâncan</u> / <u>wâncan</u> lookàcii yaa ki yà amsà láifin 'at <b>that</b> (other) time, he pleaded not guilty'  [long distance]	Not applicable
Demonstrative (post-head) NP+ <u>-n/r-cân/càn</u>	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. anyàa kôo bàì yì wà yaarò- <u>n-cân</u> [yâara- <u>n-cân</u> ] nauyii ba? 'is it not too heavy for <b>that</b> boy/ <b>those</b> boys?'  [presupposed]	Not applicable	Not applicable
Demonstrative (post-head) NP+ <u>-n/r-can</u>	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. mutàanê- <u>n-can</u> nèe dà kèe gudùu na ganiì jiyà 'it's <b>those</b> people running that I saw yesterday'  [presupposed]	(speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. ya sâa kuma à kashè iyàayenmù maataa don mafarkî- <u>n-can</u> dà na gayàa mukù 'he ordered our mothers to be killed because of <b>that</b> dream I told you about'  [non-contrastive] [presupposed]	Not applicable

#### 4. 2. 2. *Spatial WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives.*

At the most basic *spatial* level, pre-head HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, HLF (pl.) wadàncân and LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàdàncan are equally accessible to the participants in a context signifying a reference to objects that are distal from both interlocutors. This also applies to their post-head NP-n/r-cân/càn and NP-n/r-can variants. Basically, pre-head demonstrative HL wancàn is used by the speaker to point out a distal physical object (relatively more visible) to the speaker and addressee. Pre-head LH wàncan designates remote-distal (less visible) referents, as I shall show below.

##### 4. 2. 2. 1. *Spatial HL wancàn etc. (+NP), NP-n/r-cân/càn = speaker/addressee-distal*

Both pre-head wancàn/waccàn/wadàncân (wadancàn)+NP and NP-n-cân/càn are used to anchor referents that are spatially distal for speaker and addressee (the L tone -càn clitic is the output of the same tonal absorption rule which produces L -nàn, see chapter 2). But like the pre-head *WANNAN* (non-presupposed) discussed in chapters 2 and 3, it is the pre-head strategy that is usually employed with an accompanying gesture, e.g.:

(53) [father to his child]:

d̩aukoo waccàn buutàa

‘bring **that** kettle’

(54) [speaker gives additional directional information to addressee]:

kujèrâr tanàa baayan wancàn d̩aak̩i

‘the chair is behind **that** hut’

(55) [A points to a book that is away from him and B]:

a) A: bàa wancàn littaaŋi nee kakèe neemaa ba?

‘is **that** not the book you’re looking for’

(56) [A asks B]:

su wàa nee nèe wafàncân mutàanee?

‘who’re **those** people over **there**?’

Notice the tonal symmetry between the demonstratives HL wancàn and adverbial F cân, a correlation that has been observed between speaker-proximal HL wannàn and F nân and between addressee-based LH wànnan and H nan (see chapters 2 and 3 for details). See also LH wàncan and H can in § 4.3.2.2.

Like its pre-head HL wannàn (chapter 2) counterpart, HL wancàn has two semantically equivalent plural (HLF, HHL) forms, as the extracts below exemplified:

(57) [speaker alerts the addressee, as s/he points to the referents]:

inàa jîi wafàncân/wafàncàn maataa dàgà gidankù sukà fitoo

‘I think **those** women are from your home’

(58) [speaker sends addressee]:

jèe-ka kà gayàa wà wafàncân/wafàncàn òaalibai cêewaa bàa laccà yâu

‘go and tell **those** students that there’s no lecture today’

Although HLF wafàncân is the preferred choice for many speakers, I myself prefer the HHL wafàncàn variant.

Turning now to the distinction between pre- and post-head distal demonstratives, I will show that the analytical framework employed to distinguish between *WANNAN* + NP and NP-*NAN* in the previous chapters is the one required here as well. Recall that in my analysis of these forms, I adopted Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski's (1993) cognitive model to argue that there is a crucial pragmatic distinction between the Hausa pre- and post-head demonstratives. Previous descriptions wrongly assumed that pre-head HL wancàn, for example, is pragmatically equivalent to post-head NP-n-cân/càn. This is wrong, since as table 18 shows, the post-head variant is not even attested in an *anaphoric* context, where only pre-head HL wancàn is appropriate. But in those (*spatial*) contexts where both forms are acceptable, the post-head demonstrative -cân/càn is the deictic form used by the speaker spatially to index referents that s/he believed to be known by the addressee prior to the moment of speaking [= *+identifiable, +familiar*]. And this is why a pointing gesture is not normally required, since before employing this strategy the speaker must hold the belief that the intended referent is locatable either because of (a) its uniqueness, or (b) the fact that addressee's attention is assumed to be directed at the intended spatial location. Use of pre-head HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, HLF (pl.) wadâncân, on the other hand, indicates that the referent so identified is new to the addressee [= *-identifiable, -familiar*], e.g.:

(59) [speaker points out a referent to the addressee]:

bàa wancàn yaarò wannàn sadakàa  
 'give this alm to **that** boy (over there)'

(60) [speaker instructs addressee]:

bàa yaarò-n-cân wannàn sadakàa  
 'give this alm to **that** boy (over there)'

(61) [speaker reminds addressee]:

gàa wancàn yaaròo dà mukà gamà màganàrsà d̄āazu-d̄āazun n̄an

‘there is **that** (over there) boy we’ve finished talking about a while ago’

(62) [speaker reminds addressee]:

gàa yaarò-n-cân dà mukà gamà màganàrsà d̄āazu-d̄āazun n̄an

‘there is **that** boy we’ve finished talking about a while ago’

(63) [speaker points out the girls for the addressee]:

dùubi wad̄āncân ’yan maataa sunàa zàanee à kân bangon makwàbcinmù!

‘look at **those** girls scribbling on the wall of our neighbour’s home!’

(64) [speaker reminds addressee]:

gàa fa ’yan maata-n-càn sunàa zàanee à kân bangon gidankà

‘there are **those** girls (still) scribbling on the wall of your home!’

Pre-head demonstratives HL wancàn, HLF wad̄āncân in (59), (61) and (63) are used by the speaker to point out the intended referents on which s/he believes the addressee’s attention is not focused. Thus, yaaròo ‘boy’, ’yan maataa ‘girls’ in (59) and (63) are assumed to be new to the addressee, and the accompanying gesture towards the referents is an additional directional aid to help the addressee to pick them out from some (possibly) competing referents. As for (60), (62) and (64), the speaker’s choice of the post-head -càn/cân strategy is informed by, among other things, addressee’s focus on the referents prior to the moment of utterance and/ or the fact that the referents are the only ones of their types — hence the redundancy of a pointing gesture. Both of these factors indicate that the referent is old i.e. [+ *uniquely identifiable*, + *familiar*], in the sense of Chafe (1976). Notice also that the use of post-head demonstrative strategy in a *spatial*

context often carries with it the implication that the addressee is aware of the existence of the reference object before speaker's utterance (see relevant details in chapters 2 and 3). Similarly, in (65)-(66) below, the responses of speaker Bala demonstrate how the two demonstrative strategies influence speaker's response:

(65) [Audu points out a man in the distant to his boss Bala]:

gàa wancàn maalàmii yanàa sôn ganinkà  
'(here's) **that** man (who) wants to see you'

[Bala responds]:

wànè maalàmii, à kân mèè?  
'which man, what about?'

(66) [Audu reminds Bala]:

yaarinyà-r-cân kai fa takèè sôn gani  
'**that** girl (really) wants to see you, you know'

[Bala responds]:

ii, tõe, ai naa san dà ita  
'yes, well, I'm aware of her'

Apart from the fact that the referent maalàmii 'man' in (65) is new to Bala, his response also serves to indicate to Audu is that he is too busy to even to look at the man being pointed out, and that he is not interested in the reason for the visit. In (66) however, Audu's choice of the post-head -cân/càn clearly indicates that he knows that Bala is aware of the girl. What he questions is whether Bala knows that she is waiting for him, which he does. Post-head -cân/càn would not prompt the kind of response we saw in (65), since Audu must hold the belief that the girl is *identifiable* to Bala, which is why Bala needs not look towards the girl's

direction, nor is Audu required to further specify the girl with a pointing gesture. See also the following dialogue, highlighting how the two variants are to be differently interpreted in a *spatial* context:

(67) a) A: bàa wancàn yaaròj cèfànên yà kai cikin gidaa  
'give **that** boy the shopping to take inside the house'

b) B: anyàa kòò bàì yì wà yaarò-n-cân nauyì ba?  
'is it not too heavy for **that** youth?'

(68) a) A: inàa mutuwàr sôn sauràyì-n-càn  
'I'm dying for **that** boy'

b) B: Laadì, bàa kee cèe na ganiì kinàa tsaarà wancàn sauràyìj ba?  
'Ladi, was it not you that I saw chatting up **that** (other) boy?'

In (67b), the uniquely *identifiable, familiar* statuses of the referent is signalled by the choice of post-head demonstrative -cân, since the background for its givenness has already been established in (67a) by virtue of the choice of pre-demonstrative HL wancàn — in the terminology of Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski, a speaker's use of a deictic form under this status presupposes that 'the addressee is able to uniquely identify the intended referent...' (p. 278). The co-indexing of the two variants correctly shows that both forms are referring to the same boy in (67a) and (67b). But in (68), there is an additional referent brought into the dialogue by the speaker of (68b). Notice that the post-head demonstrative -càn strategy in (68a) requires some mutual knowledge of the referent prior to the statement, and this is a requirement for the use of post-head strategy. So, the choice of pre-head demonstrative HL wancàn in (68b) is attributable to the fact that a new, non-presupposed referent has been introduced into the discussion. Hence the differing

indexing of the two NPs. And in (69) below, HL wancàn is used to point out a new object to the addressee. Interestingly, even the speaker's accompanying gesture may sometimes fail to identify a referent, as the addressee's response indicates:

(69) [A point to a piece of clothing in a corner]:

a) A: Kâi, waccàn màataa àkwai kyâu gàree tà!

'boy, **that** woman is beautiful!'

b) B: wàcè màataa?

'which woman?'

A post-head demonstrative -cân/càn strategy, e.g. kâi! màata-r-càn àkwai kyâu gàree tà!, however, would have generated an affirmative response that will clearly show that the addressee acknowledges the speaker's presupposition that the referent has actually been seen by speaker B, hence known to him.

And as with (the speaker-nân/nàn and addressee-based -nan) post-head strategies, non-count (mass) nouns normally attract post-head -càn/cân irrespective of the identifiability of the referent, e.g.:

(70) gâa shînkaafa-r-càn/waake-n-càn/roogò-n-cân kî kai mareedaa

'there's **that** rice/beans/cassava for you to take to the grinding mill'

(71) kai ruwa-n-càn/fura-r-càn/âbinci-n-càn wurin bàakon dà kèe zaurèe

'take **that** water/porridge/food to the guest that is in the front room'

Only the explicit pre-head HL wancàn (pl. HLF wadâncân, HHL wadancàn) can function as a *spatial* pronominal. As such its referent can be [ $\pm$  *identifiable*,  $\pm$  *familiar*] depending on the context, e.g.:

(72) [speaker A is satisfied with the labourer he has just hired]:

a) A: *yâuwaa*, *tò kaa ga đan aikii kàm*

‘well, now here you’ve got a (suitable) labourer’

b) B: [speaker B responds]:

wancàn *fà?* ‘and what about **that** one?’

(73) [A sees the wife of a neighbour moving about while her husband is away on a trip, and directs B’s attention to her]:

waccàn *bàa Raabi ba cèe màatar makwàbciinaa?*

‘is **that** not Rabi, my neighbour’s wife?’

(74) [speaker A to B]:

*su wàa nee nèe wadâncân/wadancàn*, *kàmar Bintà dà Làamîi*

‘who’re **those** over there, looks like Binta and Lami’

(75) [speaker A to B]:

*mèe wadâncân/wadancàn sukèe neemaa cikin juujî?*

‘what’re **those** looking for in the tip?’

where speaker B in (72) points to different (or new) referents to the addressee. Notice the possibility of using two plural pronominals in (74) and (75), with no apparent meaning difference. For many speakers, however, it is HLF wadâncân which is their default plural pronominal form, although I myself use the HHL wadancàn variant more frequently.

4. 2. 2. 2. *Spatial LH wàncan etc. (+NP), FH wâncan (+NP), NP-n/r-can = speaker/addressee-remote-distal*

The remote-distal features of these forms are exploited in the *spatial* context to index referents that are significantly far away from the location of the speaker and addressee. And contrary to [±visible] distinction made by most Hausaists between these remote-distal forms and the distal deictics discussed in § 4.2.2.1. it is distance which distinguishes them at this level. Thus, all the indexed referents in (76)-(82) are visible to speaker and addressee, but way further from their utterance-time location:

(76) [speaker instructs addressee]:

jèe-ka wajen wàccan bishiyàa kà jiraa mù

‘go to **that** tree and wait for us’

or

(77) [same context as above]:

jèe-ka wajen bishiyà-r-can kà jiraa mù

‘go to **that** tree and wait for us’

(78) A: ìnaa ka ajìyee mootàr taakà?

‘where did you park your car?’

B: a) gàa ta can gàban wàncan ginii à daama dà kai

‘there it is there in front of **that** building to the right of you’

or

B: b) gàa ta can gàban ginì-n-can

‘there it is there in front of **that** building ’

(79) [additional instructions to the addressee]:

a) kà kuma biyoo dà wàccan tàabarmaa  
'and bring **that** mat with you as well'

or

b) kà kuma biyoo dà tàabarmâ-r-can  
'and bring **that** mat with you as well'

(As with the H -nan post-head clitic, a final H tone changes to falling before H -can, i.e. tàabarmaa → tàabarmâ-r-can.)

(80) [same context as above]:

a) tòo àmmaa sai kaa jee baayan wàncan d'aaiki na gàba ìdan kanàa sôn  
zamaa kân mài kyâu  
'but you'll have to go to **that** hut further away if you want to sit on a good  
one'

b) tòo àmmaa sai kaa jee baayan d'aaiki-n-can ìdan kanàa sôn zamaa kân mài  
kyâu  
'but you'll have to go to **that** hut if you want to sit on a good one'

(81) [A points to a book that is away from him and B]:

a) A bàa wàncan littaaifi nee kakèe neemaa ba?  
'is **that** not the book you're looking for?'

[ and B replies]:

b) (i) aa'aa, wàncan kundîn nee dà kèe baayankà na nèemaa  
'no, it's **that** volume behind you that I looked for'

b) (ii) aa'aa, kundî-n-can nèe na nèemaa  
'no, it's **that** volume that I looked for'

(82) [A inquires from B]:

- a) A: su wàa nee nèe wadàncân mutàanee?  
'who're those people over there?'

[B replies]:

- b) B: bàn san sù ba, àmmaa naa san wàdàncan  
'I don't know them, but I know **those** (ones) further away'

Whilst the LH wàncan etc. demonstratives may be said to denote less visible referent objects, their basic function is to pick out more remote objects, leaving distal HL wancàn etc. to encode less remote (more visible) referents.

In chapters 2 and 3, and in § 4.2.2.1. above, I have argued that the word-order choice between pre- and post-head demonstratives in Hausa pragmatically indicates the extent to which the speaker believes that the indexed referent is *identifiable* to the addressee. Choice of the pre-head variant normally encodes speaker's belief that the addressee is not aware of the existence of the referent prior to his/her utterance [= *-identifiable, -familiar*]. A post-head deictic, on the other hand, indicates that the referent is mutually known to both interlocutors prior to the moment of utterance. Consider the following utterances:

(83) [speaker warns addressee]:

- a) gàa mootà-r-can zaa tà shigèe  
'there's **that** (way over there) car about to disappear'

b) [speaker points out a referent to the addressee]:

- dùubi wàccan mootàa zaa tà shigèe  
'look at **that** car about to disappear'

(84) [speaker asks]:

a) wàa kèe dà riiḡâ-r-can dà iskàa kèe jâa?

‘who owns **that** gown that is being dragged by the wind?’

b) [speaker alerts the addressee(s)]:

wàa kèe dà wàccan riiḡaa dà iskàa kèe jâa?

‘who owns **that** gown that is being dragged by the wind?’

(85) [speaker wonders]:

a) yàayàa kikā barii wàḏāncan sāmāarii sukà sulàalee manà?

‘how come you let **those** guys slip away from us?’

b) yàayàa kikā barii sāmāarī-n-can sukà sulàalee manà?

‘how come you let **those** guys slip away from us?’

(86) [B watches as A is dealing with a group of boys attempting to tamper

with his car, and as A arrived at B’s place, the following dialogue ensued]:

a) A: [shaking his head] kâi! yâaran yâu sai hàkurii

‘oh, one need patience in dealing with boys nowadays’

b) B: wai yâarâ-n-can dà kèe gudùu dà na ga kaa tsàawatàa?

‘you mean **those** boys running away that I saw you tell off?’

The ‘car’, ‘gown’, ‘guys’ and ‘boys’ identified by post-head -can in (83)-(86) are believed to be sufficiently unambiguous to the addressee as to require no pointing gesture, otherwise pre-head LH (m./f.) wāncan/wàccan, LLH wàḏāncan will be used to point out the referent object, possibly from competing objects in the vicinity (as in (83b)-(86b)). Additional information or gestures will also

accompany pre-head LH wàncan etc. usages in (83)-(86) which helps to further restrict the range of referents for the addressee.

Only the complex pre-head forms are available for autonomous pronominal reference, whether the referent is [ $\pm$  *identifiable*], e.g.:

(87) [speaker points out the referent to addressee]:

shîn wàncan àlkalàmii dà kèe kàrshen teebùr bàa nàawa ba nèe?

'is **that** (way over there) pen at the far end of the table not mine?'

(88) [speaker responds]:

aa'aa, wàncan nàawa nèe 'no, **that** (one) is mine'

(89) [speaker is asked to make his choice]:

wàncan na fi sôo 'I prefer **that** (one)'

(90) [mother warns her child]:

kâr in saakè ganinkà tàare dà wàdàncan

'don't let me ever see you together with **those** (ones)'

(91) [speaker reminds addressee]:

wàncan fa shii nèe mùtumìn dà ya zoo jiyà

'**that** (one) is indeed the guy who came yesterday'

(92) [speaker points to a man walking]:

a) A: wancàn bàa Bàlaa ba nèe kùwa?

'is that (one, over there) not Bala?'

b) B: aa'aa, wàncan nèè Bàlaa, wancàn ai Saabo nèè

'no, **that** (one, way over there) is Bala, **that** (one, over there) is actually Sabo'

(93) [speaker points to the direction of the referent]:

wàa cee cèè wàccan dà kèè kòòkarin tsallàkà tiitii iddò-rùfe?

'who's that (far away) trying to cross the road blindly?

(94) [speaker threatens addressee, as he points to a group of policemen]:

dàa wàdàncan zaa sù biyoo ta nân, dàa naa kai kaararkà à gàree sù!

'were **those** to come this way, I'd have reported you to them!'

Where the speaker wishes to make a contrast between an addressee-located object and another one which is close by, but not close enough to attract addressee-centred LH wànnan (chapter 3), then the natural choice is (remote-distal) LH wàncan, as in (95)-(96):

(95) à wàncan wurîn mukà tarar dà shii, bàa à wànnan ba

'it's at **that** place over there that we met him, not at **that** one (where you're presently located)'

(96) bàa wànnan ba, wàccan mootàr dà kèè gàbantà na cêe kà wankèe

'not **that** one (in your present location), it's **that** car in front of it that I asked you to wash'

Notice that in (95)-(96), the distance between the speaker and the object of reference attracting LH wàncan/wàccan needs not be necessarily remote-distal from him. The motivation for the choice is to do with the speaker's perception of the referent's location in relation to the addressee's, as well as the need to employ

a contrastive strategy to maximise the possibility of the addressee identifying the intended reference object..

Remote-distal demonstratives, LH wàncan etc. and FH wâncan etc., share many of the characteristic distinction between addressee-based LH wànnan and FH wânnan (chapter 3). Informants judgements on the use of LH wàncan is that, like LH wànnan, it is the normative spatial remote-distal deictic, as the above examples illustrates. However, like FH wânnan etc., the deployment of FH wâncan etc. in this sphere is largely restricted to a contrastive environment, where the speaker wishes to further individuate the intended remote referent in the face of other competing remote-distal referents, and in this role FH wâncan identifies the closer one, e.g. :

(97) [speaker points to a plate as she instructs a child]:

a) *d̥aũkoo m̥n wàncan f̥arant̥i in yaa gamàa dà shii*

‘get **that** (further away) plate for me if he’s finished with it’

[child goes towards the wrong plate, and is redirected]:

b) *bàa fa wâncan ba, wàncan na hagu dà shii*

‘not **that** (one), but **that** (one) to the left of it’

In all the examples of the use of *spatial* LH wàncan above, it is employed by the speaker to direct the addressee’s attention to a remote-distal referent, but FH wâncan may only be used in a contrastive environment like (97b).

The similarity of LH wàncan and FH wâncan to LH wànnan and FH wânnan (chapter 3) also extends to the plural forms of these speaker/addressee-distal deictics. LLH wàd̥àncan is the (default *spatial*) plural form of LH wàncan, while HLH wad̥àncan functions as the plural form of FH wâncan used spatially to

contrast remote-distal referents (cf. the addressee-based LLH wàdànnan, HLH wadànnan (chapter 3):

(98) [speaker inquires]

wàdàncan kùjèerûn hàlâa bà zaa à yi àmfàanii dà suu ba?

'aren't **those** (way over there) chairs going to be used?'

(99) [A redirects B]:

bàa fa wadàncan kùjèerûn ba, wàdàncan dai na geefènsù

'look, not **those** (way over there) chairs, but those (ones) next to them'

(100) [speaker requests addressee]:

don Allàh, kîraa wàdàncan mutàanee màasu tàllar lèemoo

'please, call **those** (way over there) people who are hawking oranges'

(101) wadàncan gidàajee dà kakèe hàngaa à daama dà muu suu nèe na

'Dantàata, bàa wàdàncan ba

'**those** (way over there) houses that you can see to our right are the ones belonging to 'Dantàata, not **those** (ones) way over there'

Interestingly, all the above forms share only one plural post-head remote-distal -can variant, very much like its addressee-based post-head -nân/nàn/nan, e.g.:

(102) [speaker observed]:

kaa ga mutàanê-n-can sunàa duukàn àlmaajìrii!

'just look at **those** people hitting a beggar!'

### 4. 2. 3. Anaphoric WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives

#### 4. 2. 3. 1. Anaphoric HL wancàn etc. (+NP) (only)

Among the speaker/addressee-distal deictics, only pre-head HL wancàn etc. (not NP-n/r-cân/càn) has been attested in an *anaphoric* context. Curiously, even the pre-head plural HLF wafàncân, HHL wafancàn forms are only marginally acceptable. But the fact that both pre-heads and post-head -càn/cân are employable as *spatial* deictics is strong evidence that this function is the primary means of deictic reference. It seems that the *uniquely identifiable* role which normally should be played by post-head -cân/càn here has been incorporated into the *anaphoric* function of addressee-based post-head -nan (see chapter 3). As for pre-head HL wancàn etc., its *anaphoric* role is largely contrastive, whereby a new or non-presupposed referent is brought into the main on-line narrative. However, the tokens of pre-head HL wancàn found in Imam's Magana Jari Ce — just five tokens of which only two are true *anaphoric* references<sup>6</sup>—are too few to justify any generalisation beyond its contrastive use. Below, I document some of the contexts in which HL wancàn has been attested in Hausa. In (103)-(104), HL wancàn is used by the speaker to bring into the narrative a contrastive referent (object, event) of some kind:

(103) [Waziri insists on teaching Fasih a different style of reading the Quran]:

naasù kàràatuu dàbam nèe, nii iriì dàbam nakèe sôo ìn kooyàa  
makà...wancàn kàràatuu dà ka ji sunàa yîi... (MJC:3)

'their own reading style is different from the one I want to teach you...**that**  
(other) reading that you heard them...'

(104) [Waziri's advice to Sarki]:

Wàziirè ya cêe, 'Bâa àbin dà ya fi, sai kà cêe auree dai yaa yi, àmmaa bà kà yàrda ba dà wancàn sàdâakii dà sukà yankàa' (MJC:189)

'Waziri said, 'the best thing to do is to say that the marriage is lawful, but you don't agree with **that** (other) dowry that they fixed' '

Contrastive HL wancàn etc. may also be used as an anticipatory strategy, and in (105) below it is intended to preempt the addressee's subsequent request for assistance:

(105) tòo, danganèe dà waccàn màganàa kuma, inàa jîm sai dai kà yi hàkurii

har nân gàba

'as for **that** (other) issue, I think you'll have to be patient until sometime in the future'

In (105), HL waccàn serves to shift the conversation to a different issue which has been introduced by the speaker. Since the referent of HL waccàn is not the focus of (105), FH wâccan is not acceptable in this context. Nor is FH wânnan allowed, as it is only possible if the speaker is responding to a statement that has just been made by the addressee (see chapter 3).

#### 4. 2. 3. 2. *Anaphoric FH wâncan etc. (+NP), NP-n/r-can*

Like adverbial H can, pre-head FH wâncan etc. and post-head -n/r-can are both possible in an *anaphoric* role. However, neither form has the frequency of speaker-based HL wannàn etc., NP-n/r-nân/nàn or addressee-based LH wânnan etc., FH wânnan etc., NP-n/r-nan. In fact, the *anaphoric* tokens found in the two main Hausa sources (Imam, 1966, 1970 [1939]) are just five, an additional indication that the speaker/hearer-distal demonstratives discussed in this chapter

perform a far less prominent deictic role in Hausa. In spite of this limitation, it is still possible to distinguish between pre-head FH wāncan etc. and post-head -can on the basis of the factor of presuppositionality (i.e.  $\pm$  *identifiable*,  $\pm$  *familiar*), albeit in a less direct way. The deictic *anaphoric* role of post-head demonstrative -n/r-can seems to be to reintroduce remote-distal, non-contrastive but still identifiable referents. In this case, the purpose is to bring back a pre-mentioned textual referent into the main on-line narrative, but is assumed to be sufficiently removed as to require a remote-distal -can post-head anaphor. Consider these extracts:

(106) [At the end of a story, Waziri is not happy with Fasih's progress, so he resorts to a new admonitory method he has learnt]:

Wāziirì ya fūsaatà dà wannàn màganaa ta Faasih. Ya taashì ya màngàree shì,  
yàddà ya ga mutàanê-n-can nàa yi wà 'yaa'yàayensù (MJC:7)

'Waziri got angry about Fasih's statement. He got up and poke him on the head, like he saw **those** people doing to their children'

(107) [narrator meets his lost brother]:

Sakimu sai na ji àshee dai wān nan nàawa nèe Sàkiimù, agòolan ùbanmù,  
wàndà ya kashèe shi, ya sàa kuma à kashè iyàayemmù maataa don mafarkî-n-  
can dà na gayàa mukù yaa yi na òan dàbiindò (RBJ:36)

'then I heard that it was in fact that brother of mine, Sakimu, our father's adopted son, who killed him, and also ordered our mothers to be killed because of **that** dream that I told about concerning a seed of date'

The choice of post-head enclitic demonstrative -can in (106) and (107) is informed by the need to code remote anaphoric reference. The dream referred to by the narrator in (107) has been mentioned at the very beginning of the text, and therefore needs an escalated remote demonstrative for the reader/addressee to

associate the narrator's brother, the dream, and the present scenario. Similarly, the people coded by post-head -can in (106) have been mentioned some seven pages earlier, which makes it the only appropriate form in this context as well. Note that both pre-head demonstrative LH wàncan mafarkii 'that dream', HLH wafàncan mutàanee 'those people' can occur in these contexts, but only where there is a contrast with another similar referent ('dream', 'people') which has just been mentioned. Since there is only one dream, one set of people to which the narrator refers to, he uses post-head demonstrative -can. Notice, however, that if the referents are believed to be both unique and recent, then the appropriate deictic will be the post-head demonstrative -nan (chapter 3), which is the most frequently encountered form in an *anaphoric* role.

The main *anaphoric* function of pre-head FH wàncan etc. (also LH wàncan etc.) is to index (?non-presupposed) referents, which are then contrasted to the present on-line ones, e.g.:

(108) [a report on an official's denial of corruption]:

à wàncan/wàncan lookàcii yaa fi yà amsà lâifin yîn zàmba

'at **that** (other) time, he denied the charge of fraud'

(109) [speaker tries to convince addressee]:

bambancìn shii nèe cêewaa à wàncan / wàncan karòn, bàn fàhìmcì yaddà

lamuràa kèe tàfiyàa ba

'the difference is that on **that** (other) occasion, I didn't understand how things are going'

The contrast between LH wàncan etc. and FH wâncan etc. in the *spatial* context is neutralised in the *anaphoric* domain, and the two variants are semantically equivalent in this contrastive *anaphoric* role.

The contexts in which pronominal FH wâncan etc. (also LH wàncan etc.) is used is an extension of its basic *spatial* meaning. Whenever FH wâncan etc. variant is used in an anaphoric sense, the reference must be to some remote (long distance) *anaphoric* context, which usually may have a direct bearing on the interpretation of the present narrative context, e.g.:

(110) [narrator has had his leg bound to another person's whom he had

falsely implicated on a pervious occasion]:

na dùubee shì tun dàgà kasà har bisà, sai na ga yaa yi kàmaa dà Maalàm  
Zùrkee ðam Mùhammàn, wâncan / wàncan dà na sâa akà yi wà àturèe à  
Sàabùri ... (RBJ:12)

'I looked at him top to bottom, and seem to look like Malam Zurke ðan  
Muhamman, **that** one that I set people to drive away at Saburi ...'

Clearly, the narrator realises that he needs to use FH wâncan (LH wàncan) if he is to enable the addressee to make the right inference, since this particular incident has been narrated a long while ago.

Additional clues may be added to make addressee's recollection even more immediate. An instance of this strategy is when the narrator parenthesises the remote reference within the on-line referential focus in order to maximise rapid association of two or more removed scenarios. Consider (111):

(111) [Alhaji had asked the king to gather the elders of the town, so that he could ask them about Ruwan Bagajaa and one of them turned out to be an older brother who has been mentioned in a previous gathering]:

na tàmbàyee shì gàrinsù, ya cêe à Nasaraawaa akà hàifée shì, (wàatàu wân wàncan/wàncan dà fanènsà ya baa nì làabaarìnsà) (RBJ:34)

'I asked him about his hometown, and he said he was born at Nasarawa, (that is, [he is] the older brother of **that** [one] whose younger brother told me about him)'

With certain specialised time-words, LH (f.) wàccan occurs post-positionally to express a temporal contrast (the only environment where this NP+ explicit demonstrative order is permissible):

(112) [Interviewer is interested in finding out whether the farmer's part-time work affects his general output]:

shín koo kaa bar wani wurii yà kwaacèe makà à aikìn dàamanaa wàccan ...?

'I wonder whether you allowed a particular place to distract you during the work of (**that**) **harvest season before last** ... (ML)'

(113) bàara wàccan an tafkà ruwaa màì tsananin gàske, àmmaa bana kàm

sai dai à cêe an goodè Allàh

'there was a heavy downpour (**that**) **year before last**, but the only thing to be said about the present year is thanks to God (ML)'

#### 4. 2. 4. Symbolic HL wancàn etc. (+NP) (only)

Only pronominal HL wancàn etc. is available to the speaker for use as a *symbolic* distal demonstrative (cf. *symbolic* F cân in § 4.1.4.). In this context, it provides a means of contrasting an earlier referent from the same set (usually codified with speaker-proximal (*symbolic*) HL wannàn):

(114) [narrator is describing the various language groups in South Africa]:

àkwai sauran yaarurrukàn asalin jàma'ar kasâr, àmmaa sun kàrkàsu dàgà  
wannàn yankii zuwàa wancàn

'there are other indigenous language groups, but they differ from **this** region  
to **that** region'

(115) [narrator describes the clan conflict in Somalia]

àmmaa anàa saamùn aman wutar bindigoogii à fadàn dà akèe yfi tsàkaanin  
wannàn zùri'aa dà waccàn

'but there's been gunfire in the fight between **this** clan and **that** (one)'

(116) [writer describes Alhaji's movement between the three houses he built

especially for meeting up with women other than his three wives. Sometimes,  
there may be prostitutes in all these houses waiting for Alhaji]:

In ya jee wancàn gidaa ya gaanàa dà waddà kèe can, àmmaa bàì sàllamàa ba,  
yanàa iyà zuwàa faya gidân yà sàllàmi waccàn yà daawoo. Duk kùwa dà  
cèewaa maatansà ukù (Katsina, 1982:11)

'if he gets to **that** house, and meets up with the one who is **there**, but does  
not let her go, he may go to the **other** house and let go of **that** one and  
returns. He has three wives though'

(117) [narrator describes a confusing scenario]:

dàgà nan sai lamàrîn ya ruudèe, wannàn yà cèe wannàn nee, wancàn yà cèe  
wannàn nee

'from **then** on, the issue turned to confusion, **this** (one) will say it's **this**  
(one), **that** (one) will say it's **this** (one)'

However, this strategy of using HL wancàn etc. to signal contrasting *symbolic*  
referents is equivalent to English, where '**this**' and '**that**' are used in the same

context. There are no examples of *symbolic* HL wancàn in the main texts that I use (i.e. Imam 1966, 1970 [1939]), and extracts (114)-(117) are in fact either from translated materials that are originally in English, or bilingual Hausa-English speech, both of which points to the possible influence of English in the use of *symbolic* HL wancàn in Hausa. The natural choice outside this context seems to be the *symbolic* HL wannàn form, in which case the speaker's position (i.e. wannàn ... wannàn) is the only relevant orientational point. Note also that in this context too the post-head demonstrative -n/r-cân/càn is not attested in a *symbolic* role. This is consistent with our findings in chapters 2 and 3 that neither the post-head -n/r-nân/nàn speaker-based demonstratives nor the addressee-based -nan demonstratives are acceptable in *symbolic* roles.

#### 4.3. Summary

In this chapter, I examined the speaker-addressee (remote) distal deictics represented here as *CAN* (§4.1.) and *WANCAN* (+NP), *NP-CAN* (§4.2.) within the participant-based model originally presented in Jaggar and Buba (1994). In §4.1., I provided a detailed description of the uses of the adverbials F cân (distal) and H can (remote-distal) in *spatial*, *anaphoric* and *symbolic* contexts, and noted that F cân has no *anaphoric* role (see Table 18). In §4.2., I discussed the range of uses of the speaker-addressee distal HL wancàn etc. and remote-distal LH wàncan (also FH wâncan) etc demonstratives. In their *spatial* roles, the remote-distal forms (§4.2.2.2) differ from their distal demonstrative counterparts (§ 4.2.2.1.) by coding more remote (but visible) referents. I pointed out that contrary to the pre- = post-head demonstrative strategy claim by Hausaists, use of pre-head *WANCAN* (+NP) strategy indicates the speaker's belief that the referent is non-presupposed [-*identifiable*, -*familiar*] to the addressee. The post-head *NP-CAN* strategy, on the other hand, indexes a presupposed [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*] referent, i.e. physical objects which the speaker believes are contextually

identifiable to the addressee. This important semantic-pragmatic distinction has never been described before, and it repeats identical correlation between (*spatial*) pre-head *WANNAN* (+NP) coding non-presupposed [-*identifiable*, -*familiar*] referents, and NP-*NAN* with presupposed [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*] referents. In the *anaphoric* domain, both pre-head HL wancàn etc. and FH wâncan etc. are essentially contrastive anaphors, operating over long (text) distances. As for the post-head NP-*CAN* strategies, we noted that there are no attested tokens of enclitic post-head -n/r-cân/càn in an *anaphoric* context (see also F cân which does not occur as a pro-locative anaphor). However, remote-distal post-head -n/r-can does have an *anaphoric* role, where it maintains its basic *spatial* [+*identifiable*, +*familiar*, presupposed] features. Similarly, post-head NP-*CAN* has no *symbolic* application, a context where pre-head LH wâncan etc., FH wâncan etc. are also not attested. Thus, only pre-head HL wancàn has any *symbolic* role, although it is more commonly used by bilingual Hausa-English speakers to complement the normative (*symbolic*) role of speaker-proximal HL wannàn etc. (see chapter 2). Indeed, the marginality of speaker/addressee- (remote) distal *WANCAN* (+NP), NP-*CAN* is indicated by the small number of tokens in the corpus, which in turn suggests their minimal semantic-pragmatic function in both spoken and written Hausa. Compare this situation with speaker- and addressee-based *WANNAN* (+NP), NP-*NAN* all of which have a high text-frequency (see chapters 2 and 3).

Table 19 summarises the main findings in this chapter:

Table 19: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal deictics

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Adverbial F <u>cân</u>	speaker/addressee distal, e.g. gàa shi <u>cân</u> à indà ka bar shì 'there it is over <b>there</b> where you left it'	Not applicable	e.g. (indicating) zân jee <u>cân</u> nee in daawoo 'I'm going over <b>there</b> (not far away), and will be back'  in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>cân</u> 'if I move <b>here</b> , he'll move <b>there</b> '
Adverbial H <u>can</u>	speaker/addressee-remote-distal, e.g. màtsaa zuwàa <u>can</u> gàba tükùna 'move way over <b>there</b> for now'	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) anaphoric: ... à <u>can</u> na sàami wata yaarinyàa 'it's <b>there</b> that I met a girl'  [cataphoric] <u>can</u> à gàrin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajeeriyàa ... 'way over <b>there</b> in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi ...'	<u>can</u> dai, muugùn bàakinkà yà bii kà 'well, <b>there</b> may your evil mouth follow you'
Demonstrative (pre-head) HL <u>wancàn</u> + NP	speaker/addressee-distal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. kujèerâr tanàa baayan <u>wancàn</u> daakii 'the chair is behind <b>that</b> hut'  [non-presupposed]	[contrastive] tòo danganèe dà <u>waccàn</u> máganàa kuma ... 'as for <b>that</b> (other) issue ...'	anàa fadàa tsàkaanin <u>wannàn</u> zùri'aa dà <u>waccàn</u> (zùri'aa) 'there's conflict between <b>this</b> clan and <b>that</b> (clan)'
Demonstrative (pre-head) LH <u>wàncan</u> +NP/ FH <u>wâncan</u> +NP	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. à <u>wàncan</u> wurîn mukà tarar dà shii 'it's at <b>that</b> place over there that we met him'  [=contrastive] bàa <u>waccan</u> mootàa ba, <u>wàccan</u> tà gàba 'not <b>that</b> car (you're approaching), <b>that</b> (other one) way in front'  [non-presupposed]	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à <u>wâncan/wàncan</u> lookàcii yaa ki yà amsà láifin 'at <b>that</b> (other) time, he pleaded not guilty'  [long distance]	Not applicable

Table 19 (continued)

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
NP- <u>n/r-cân/cân</u>	<p>speaker/addressee- distal [+<i>identifiable</i>] [+<i>familiar</i>] [-gesture], e.g. anyàa kôo bàì yì wà yaarò-<u>n-</u> <u>cân</u> [yâara-<u>n-cân</u>] nauyî ba? 'is it not too heavy for <b>that</b> boy [<b>those</b> boys] ?'</p> <p>[presupposed]</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
NP - <u>n/r-can</u>	<p>speaker/addressee- remote-distal +<i>identifiable</i>], [+<i>familiar</i>] [-gesture], e.g. mutàanê-<u>n-can</u> nèè dà kèè gudùu na ganii jiyà 'it's <b>those</b> people running that I saw yesterday'</p> <p>[presupposed]</p>	<p>(&lt; speaker/addressee- remote-distal) [+<i>identifiable</i>] [+<i>familiar</i>] ya sâa kuma à kashè iyàayenmù maataa don mafarkî-<u>n-can</u> dà na gayàa mukù 'he ordered our mothers to be killed because of <b>that</b> dream I told you about'</p> <p>[non-contrastive]</p> <p>[presupposed]</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

A participant approach of the kind undertaken in Jaggar and Buba (1994 [also adopted in this dissertation]) recognises the importance of seeing all deictic forms not just in terms of a simplistic [ $\pm$ visible,  $\pm$ distal] distinction, but more importantly with respect to the position of the speaker as well as that of the addressee.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> It is certainly not correct to suggest as Kraft & Kirk-Greene do that ‘only high- and falling tone forms occur in this usage’ (p. 52). As I have shown in chapter 2, a phonologically conditioned L-tone nàn occurs after a preceding H tone in Sokoto (as well as Niger and Katsina) Hausa., and is also attested in the CAN-based distal adverbials (see examples (5)-(6)). Newman (1995) has shown that this L-tone form is only attested following a H-tone syllable, otherwise it is invariably F cân for all dialects, e.g. gàa Audù cân (# cân) ‘there’s Audu **there**’. This is also true of F dī-n, which is realised as L dī-n following a high tone in Sokoto Hausa, e.g. shii dī-n nakèè sôo, ‘he’s the (very) one I like’.

<sup>2</sup> See Galadanci (1969: 265-272) on the additional pragmatic information coded in a speaker’s use of such focus-modal particles as fa, maa, kàm, kùwa, dai, etc. Note that the modal fa is tonally different from interrogative L fà. Thus, I can say cân fà? ‘and what about **there**?’ to anchor a request for more information, (some speakers state that both interlocutors must be familiar with the location anaphorically coded by H cân). Note also that F cân fà? ‘and what about (over) **there**?’ is also felicitous, but only in a *spatial* context.

<sup>3</sup> But see nân gàba (chapter 2, § 2.1.2) which codes a relatively closer time to the moment of utterance than H cân gàba. Notice, however, that neither H nân (chapter 3) nor F cân (this chapter) is possible in (39)-(42), because while the former cannot be used in this temporal (cataphoric) context (#nân gàba), the latter is constrained by the very fact that it encodes an equivalent distance to the one encoded by bare gàba ‘in front’ or baaya ‘behind’, making the temporal phrases #cân gàba, #cân baaya necessarily tautological.

<sup>4</sup> Malinowski (1969 [1923]:315-6) used the term *phatic communion* to describe ‘purposeless expressions of preference or aversion, accounts of happenings, comments on what is perfectly obvious... a type of speech in which ties of union are created by a mere exchange of words’. Such exchange, according to Malinowski, has ‘... a social function, and that is their principal aim, but they are neither the result of intellectual reflection, nor do they necessarily arouse reflection in the listener’ (p. 315). But, of course, one must add that this whole process of phatic communion can also be consciously conceived and executed by the speaker with a specific purpose in mind, which in this case is to deter the addressee from unnecessary intrusion. But see the full supplement in Ogden & Richards (1969)[1923]:296-336). Yokoyama also touched on other purposive

---

function of this phatic, metainformational (her term) kind of mutual knowledge establishment. She argues that it ‘contributes essentially to ... discourse situation’. In defining precisely what this discourse situation might be, she quotes Jakobson (1976) as pointing out that phatic conversation (e.g. ‘Hello, do you hear me?’) serves ‘to establish, to prolong, or discontinue communication, to check whether the channel works, to attract ... or to confirm attention’ (see Yokoyama, 1986:14).

5 Compare this H can usage with another adversative (distancing) strategy of the adverbial phrase can hakà : yi can hakà dà shii kâr kà shaafàa minì shii ‘move way over **there** with it, so as not to rub it on me’, where it can even be argued that this is a metaphorical usage, since the speaker is not indicating a specific ‘away’ location by can hakà.

6 The remaining three tokens are all in quoted direct speech, and at the moment of utterance, their context of use is *spatial* rather than *anaphoric*, e.g.:

dà Wàziirì ya lùura dà shii, sai ya cêe wà mutàance, ‘wàanee nè wancàn?’  
(MJC:219)

when Waziri noticed him, he asked the people, ‘who is **that**?’

dà Hassàn ya hangoo tà tàfe, sai ya cêe wà Rakiyaa, ‘lallee waccàn uwargidaa  
cèe ta aikoo tà (MJC:59)

‘when Hassan saw her coming from afar, he said to Rakiya, ‘no doubt, **that**  
(woman) has been sent by Madam’ ’

dà hangoo shì sai ... ya cêe wà ‘yan’uwansà, ‘shîn wancàn ... Bàhaushèe  
nee, koo kùwa?’ (MJC:43)

‘when he saw him coming... he said to his mates ‘is **that** a Hausaman or  
not?’ ’

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The aim of this thesis has been to account for a range of (related) deictic phenomena in Hausa within a systematic paradigm of referential interpretation. The explanatory model used was originally formulated by Jaggar and Buba (1994) to explain the distribution of the (basically locative) adverbials *NAN* and *CAN*, and I have extended the analysis to encompass the demonstratives *WANNAN* (+NP), NP-*NAN*, and *WANCAN* (+NP), NP-*CAN*. I have also addressed the function and interpretation of some important spatio-temporal and modal deictic particles, e.g. *hakà* ‘thus, this, so’, *nân gâba* ‘in future’, and referential *DIN*. My main thrust has been to further validate the claim that only a person-centric approach of the kind adopted in this work can account for the context-sensitive uses which these deictic forms fulfil in Hausa. (That this model has cross-linguistic relevance, moreover, is indicated by analogous facts in other languages, e.g. Fillmore 1975, 1982; Rauh 1983a.) We have also seen that Hausa, like many other languages, uses the same deictic forms to encode (basic) spatial, anaphoric and symbolic reference (see below), the *spatial* function being the primary mode of deictic inferencing, the other two functions being derivative (see Lyons 1979, 1982, 1991; Traugott 1978).

One of the major discoveries is that, contrary to the traditional view amongst Hausaists (native and non-native speakers), the word-order variation between the pre- and post-head demonstratives, e.g. (determinative) *wannân yaaròo* vs. *yaaròo-n-nân* ‘this boy’, is not an arbitrary feature of the system. Using Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski’s (1989, 1993) model of a hierarchy of cognitive statuses, I have shown that there are important cognitive constraints on the selection of the two variants in naturally-occurring discourse—pre-head position = [-identifiable], post-head = [+identifiable]—co-variables which must be accounted for in

explaining the ‘packaging’ knowledge of native Hausa-speakers. Using language (which is what native speakers do), as opposed to describing it (as the linguists do) is about two or more people interacting within a maximally relevant, face-to-face context, and it is this situational context which informs the various strategies employed by the rational speaker in his/her interaction with the addressee (Clark and Marshall 1982).

In Chapter 2 I analysed adverbial F nân ‘**here**’, the pre-head demonstratives HL wannàn etc. (+ NP), NP+-r/-n-nân/-nàn ‘**this, these**’, and the pro-form hakà ‘**thus, this, so**’ as speaker-based deictics which serve to identify a referent (or action) in a spatial context as proximal to the speaker (a maximally speaker-proximal L tone nàn variant was also documented for Sokoto, Katsina and Niger Hausa). I pointed out that, in more general terms, the notion of proximity must be expanded to include the ‘perceptual’ region that the speaker sees himself/herself belonging to. In addition to their *spatial* functions, these deictics also have derivative *anaphoric* and *symbolic* usages, both of which entail basically speaker-oriented reference (even in their most abstract, symbolic usages, F nân and HL wannàn etc. are clearly weighted towards the metaphorical position of the speaker). Equally interesting is the discovery that F nân has an important temporal (< spatial) function, serving to encode either the place at which the speaker makes his/her utterance (= ‘**here**’) or the time at which the utterance is made (= ‘**now**’).

Chapter 3 underscores the degree to which the addressee position is lexicalised in Hausa. Like Japanese, Spanish, and many other languages, Hausa exploits the adverbial H nan ‘**there** [near you the hearer]’, the pre-head demonstratives LH wànnan etc. (+NP) and FH wànnan etc. (+NP), and post-head NP+-r/-n-nan ‘**that, those** [near you the hearer]’, to encode addressee-based referent objects. With the exception of Howeidy (1953), Galadanci (1969) and Jaggar (1983, 1985b), this critical semantic feature had been overlooked, an omission largely

attributable to the primitive two-term (e.g. 'here/there') deictic systems present in languages such as English, French and German. As with the speaker-based demonstratives (Chapter 2), I also showed how the explicit pre-head (wànnan etc.) demonstrative determiners differ pragmatically from their post-head NP+-r/-n-nan counterparts in exactly the same way—pre-head option = [-identifiable], post-head = [+ identifiable]. It was also shown that the pre-head demonstratives LH wànnan etc. (+NP) and FH wànnan etc. (+NP), and post-head NP+-r/n-nan had no attested uses in the (derivative) symbolic domain. The possessive and referential functions of the deictic particle *DIN* were also explicated in greater detail than before. I also made passing reference (as in Chapter 2) to the tendency of (bilingual) Hausa speakers to utilise the pre-head demonstrative strategy more frequently in speech than in writing, where the post-head demonstratives predominate (an interesting skewing which is worth further investigation).

In Chapter 4, I described the range of *CAN/WANCAN* deictics, the attested forms of which show that Standard (Kano) Hausa presents the following overall form-meaning system: a four-way cut in both the *NAN/CAN* adverbials and post-head *-n/r-NAN/CAN* demonstratives, and a six-way cut in the pre-head *WANNAN/WANCAN* demonstratives, thus invalidating Fillmore's (1975) claim there are no languages with more than three terms in their basic deictic system. (If one includes the dialectal L nàn/càn adverbials, Hausa also has a six-term (person-centric) deictic adverbial system.) Adverbial H can and demonstrative LH wàncan etc. were shown to index referent objects more remote from the location of speaker and addressee than F cân and HL wancàn etc. This fact has never been mentioned before Jaggar and Buba (1994), and it was often erroneously assumed that H can could not be used to code visible referents (H cân can also be used for the extremities of bounded enclosures and for exterior locations). Again, as with the speaker-based (Chapter 2) and hearer-based (Chapter 3) demonstrative determiners, pre-head explicit *WANCAN* +NP is used to index [-identifiable] referents, and the

post-head NP-CAN variant references [+ identifiable] entities. In terms of distribution, there were no attested examples of *anaphoric F c̄an* in the language, and the post-head NP-CAN demonstrative determiners were also shown to be defective in the (non-spatial) anaphoric and symbolic spheres.

The importance of a study of this kind to the description of natural language is as follows: linguistically significant generalisations about language need to be informed by detailed, cross-linguistic studies, and even then one must be careful not to overgeneralise on the basis of concrete levels of analysis. Any theory of language must confront and account for the specific design-features of individual languages, and research on languages universals requires linguists who are willing to investigate less well-researched and/or unknown languages, with a view to confirming the relevant thesis they set out to demonstrate. It is hoped that this thesis contributes towards the building of a bridge between our knowledge of the structure of language and the functions which that structure fulfils.

## Appendix

Table 1: summary of previous descriptions of F nân-adverbial

	Robinson	Abraham	Bargery	Kraft & Kirk Greene	Cowan & Schuh	Newman & Newman
F <u>nân</u>	(= <u>nân</u> ) ' <b>here</b> ' (no tones provided)	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. kadà kà zoo <u>nân</u> 'don't come <b>here</b> '	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. àjyee shi <u>nân</u> 'place it <b>here</b> '	[+proximal] ' <b>here</b> ', e.g. gàa Audù <u>nân</u> 'here's Audu <b>here</b> ' (nearby)	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> , (there)', e.g. yanàa <u>nân</u> 'he is <b>here</b> '	[+visible, +proximal] ' <b>here</b> ' (nearby), e.g. inàa zàune à <u>nân</u> 'I live <b>here</b> '

Table 2: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal F nân adverbial

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
F <u>nân</u>	speaker-proximal, e.g. [+gesture], e.g. gaa shi <u>nân</u> kusa dà nii 'here it is <b>here</b> close to me.	(< speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wàatò dai muu <u>nân</u> ... 'in short, for us <b>here</b> (in this pre-mentioned area)...'  [cataphoric], e.g. shaawarà dà zân baa kà à <u>nân</u> ita cèè... 'my advice to you <b>here</b> is ...' [temporal], e.g. <u>nân</u> <u>gàba</u> kà'dan zaa kì jì sàakàmakon gaanàawâr ' <b>soon</b> , you'll hear the result of the interview'	(<< speaker-proximal) [±gesture], e.g. ...in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>nân</u> '...if I move <b>here</b> , he moves [t] <b>here</b> '

Table 3: summary of previous descriptions of HL wannàn, NP-n/r-nân/nàn demonstratives

	Bargery	Abraham	Cowan & Schuh	Bagari	Galadanci	Mohmed	Jaggar
HL <u>wannàn</u> (+NP)	speaker-proximal tàfi dà <u>wannàn</u> dookii (= dooki-n-nân) 'take <b>this</b> horse away'	speaker-proximal <u>wannàn</u> 'this (near us)', e.g. <u>wannàn</u> dookii= <u>dooki-n-nân</u> 'this horse'	[±visible], e.g. <u>wannàn</u> littaaafii nee 'this is a book'; <u>wannàn</u> gaskiyaa nee 'this/ <b>t h a t</b> is true'	[+visible] <u>wannàn</u> yaaròn 'this boy (near us)'	speaker-proximal <u>wannàn</u> riigaa 'this gown (near me)'	[+visible] <u>wannàn</u> ( <u>wancàn</u> ) etc	[±visible], speaker-proximal, e.g. <u>wannàn</u> yaarò 'this boy'; <u>wannàn</u> gaskiyaa nee 'this/ <b>t h a t</b> is true'

Table 4: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal HL wannàn, NP-n/r-nân/nàn demonstratives

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Demonstrative (pre-head) HL <u>wannàn</u> + NP	speaker-proximal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gestural], e.g. gàa <u>wannàn</u> maalàmii (#dà ka cêe ...) 'here's <b>this</b> teacher (#that you said...')	(< speaker-proximal) [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. yàayàa zân yi dà <u>wannàn</u> maalàmii? 'what am I going to do with <b>this</b> teacher'	(<< speaker-proximal) [±gesture], e.g. fàadaa wajen <u>wannàn</u> bookaa, gàngàraa wajen <u>wannàn</u> maalàmii.. 'he would go to <b>this</b> sorcerer, and shift to <b>this</b> [that] Islamic teacher...'
Demonstrative (post-head) NP-n/r-nân/nàn	speaker-proximal [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. gàa maalàmi-n-nân (dà ka cêe ...) 'here's <b>this</b> teacher (that you said...')	(< speaker-proximal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. yàayàa zân yi dà maalàmi-n-nân 'what am I going to do with <b>this</b> teacher?'	Not applicable

Table 5: Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski's (1993:275) The Givenness Hierarchy

in focus >	activated >	familiar >	uniquely identifiable >	referential >	type identifiable
{it}	{that} {this} {this N}	{that N}	{the N}	{indefinite this N}	{a N}

Table 6: Frequency count of speaker-proximal (anaphoric, non-spatial) demonstratives in Imam's Magana Jari Ce 3

Demonstrative form	Demonstrative form
Post-head NP+ <u>-n/r-nân/-nân</u>	Pre-head HL <u>wannân</u> +NP
204	91

Table 7: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal deictics

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Adverbial F <u>nân</u>	speaker-proximal [+gesture], e.g. gâa shi <u>nân</u> kusa dà nii 'here it is <b>here</b> close to me'.	(< speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wàatò dai muu <u>nân</u> ... 'in short, for us <b>here</b> (in this pre-mentioned area)...'  [cataphoric], e.g. shaawarâr dà zân baa kà à <u>nân</u> ita cêe... 'my advice to you <b>here</b> is ...'  [temporal], e.g. <u>nân gâba</u> kàðan zaa kî ji sàakàmakon gaanàwâr 'soon, you'll hear the result of the interview'	(<< speaker-proximal) [±gesture], e.g. (indicating) ...in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>nân</u> '...if I move <b>here</b> , he moves [t] <b>here</b> '
Demonstrative (pre-head) <u>wannân</u> + NP	speaker-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. gâa <u>wannân</u> takârdaa (# dà ka cêe...) 'here's <b>this</b> paper (# that you said...)'	(< speaker-proximal) [-identifiable] [-familiar], e.g. àmsà <u>wannân</u> tàmbayàa ta kà sà 'answer <b>this</b> question below'	(<< speaker-proximal) [±gesture], e.g. yà wucè <u>wannân</u> zaurèe, ...yà wucè <u>wannân</u> zaurèe 'he would pass <b>this</b> room...and he would pass <b>this</b> room'
Demonstrative (post-head) NP- <u>n/r-nân/nân</u>	speaker-proximal [+identifiable] [+familiar] [-gesture], e.g. gâa takârda- <u>r-nân</u> (dà ka cêe...) 'here's <b>this</b> paper (that you said...)'	(< speaker-proximal), [+identifiable], [+familiar], e.g. bàa dà amsàr tàmbayà- <u>r-nân</u> ta samà 'answer <b>this</b> question (above)'	Not applicable

Table 8: summary of previous descriptions of H nan-adverbial

	Robinson	Abraham	Bargery	Kraft/Kirk Greene	Cowan/ Schuh	Newman/ Newman
H <u>nan</u>	<u>n a n</u> (no tones) 'here, there'	[±visible] [+distal] (= # <u>cân</u> / # <u>can</u> ) 'there', e.g. yaa bi ta <u>nan</u> = # <u>cân</u> 'he passed through there'  also <u>d à g à nan</u> sai ... 'the next thing that happened was ...'	[±visible] 'there', e.g. bàr shi <u>nan</u> 'leave it where it is'  kaa san wurii kàzaa, tòò à <u>nan</u> gidansà yakè 'you know such-and-such a place; well that is where his home is'	[+distal] # 'here', e.g. gàa Audù <u>nan</u> 'here's Audu' # 'here' (nearby)	[-visible], no examples	[±visible, [-proximal] 'there', (distant or previously mentioned) e.g. tanàa <u>nan</u> kusa dà wàccan bishiyàa 'she's over there by that tree', jîi nakèe yanàa <u>n a n</u> har yànzù 'I think he is still there (where we were talking about before)'

Table 9: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based H nan-adverbial

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
H <u>nan</u>	addressee-proximal, e.g. gàa shi <u>nan</u> kusa dà kai 'there it is there close to you'	(speaker-distal < addressee-proximal) e.g. wàatòò dai kuu <u>nan</u> ... 'in short, for you there (in that pre-mentioned area) ...'  [cataphoric], e.g. kuma à <u>nan</u> mukèe sàukaa gidan Àlhajì Roorò 'and it's there at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'  [temporal], e.g. <u>nan</u> dà <u>nan</u> sai ya yàrda 'he agreed there and then'	(speaker-distal << addressee-proximal) e.g. ganiì <u>nan</u> barìi <u>nan</u> 'as it's seen there, so shall it be left there'

Table 10: summary of previous descriptions of LH wànnan, FH wànnan, NP-n/r -nan demonstratives

	Bargery	Abraham	Cowan and Schuh	Howeidy	Galadanci
LH wànnan (+NP)	wànnan [+distal], e.g. tàfi dà wànnan dookii 'take <b>that</b> horse'	[-visible] e.g. wànnan shaafòo = shaafò-n-nan 'the hawk in question'  wànnan = wàncan shaafòo 'that hawk'	[-visible] e.g. wànnan bàraawòo 'that thief'  yàayàa saabon ìngarmà-n-nan 'how's <b>that</b> new stallion?'	[±visible], addressee-proximal e.g. wànnan 'that'  post-head -nan (no examples)	[±visible], addressee-proximal e.g. wànnan dookii 'that horse'  [±visible] wànnan dookii = dookii-n-nan 'that horse'
	Jaggar	Mohmed	Kraft and Kirk-Greene	Bagari	
LH wànnan (+NP)	[±visible], 'closer to the addressee', e.g. wànnan yaaròo = yaarò-n-nan 'that boy'	[-visible] wànnan = wàncan nèe ya gudù 'that was the one who ran away'	[-visible] rìigâ-r-nan # 'this gown' wànnan (no examples)	[-visible] wànnan = wàncan yaaròo 'that boy'  mutàanê-n-nan 'those people'	

**Table 11: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-proximal LH wànnan, FH wánnan , NP-n/r-nan (also speaker-distal) demonstratives**

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Demonstrative (pre-head) LH wànnan, FH wánnan +NP	addressee-proximal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture] e.g. bàa ni wànnan takàrdaa 'give me <b>that</b> paper'  In a contrastive context, FH wánnan encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. bàa wánnan ba, wánnan 'not <b>that</b> (one), <b>that</b> (closer one)'	(speaker-distal < addressee-proximal) e.g. ... wánnan 'yar faatàa kadai sulèe tàlàatin sukà sàyee tà '... <b>that</b> small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them'  [ <i>in focus</i> ] [short distance anaphor]  In a contrastive context, [ <i>activated</i> ] LH wànnan encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. ai doolè nee à sookè wànnan zàabee 'it was inevitable that <b>that</b> election was cancelled'.	Not applicable
Demonstrative (post-head) NP-n/r-nan	addressee-proximal [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture] bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me <b>that</b> pen'	(speaker-distal < addressee-proximal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] bàa ni birò-n-nan 'give me <b>that</b> pen'	Not applicable

**Table 12: Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski's (1993:275) The Givenness Hierarchy**

in focus >	activated >	familiar >	uniquely identifiable >	referential >	type identifiable
{ <i>it</i> }	{ <i>that</i> } { <i>this</i> } { <i>this</i> N}	{ <i>that</i> N}	{ <i>the</i> N}	{indefinite <i>this</i> N}	{ <i>a</i> N}

**Table 13: Frequency count of speaker-distal (< addressee-proximal) anaphoric demonstratives in Imam's Magana Jari Ce 3**

Demonstrative form	Demonstrative from
Post-head NP+ -n/r-nan	Pre-head FH wánnan (LH wànnan) +NP
369	29

Table 14: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based deictics

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
<p>Adverbial</p> <p>H <u>nan</u></p>	<p>addressee-proximal, e.g. gàa shi <u>nan</u> kusa dà kai 'there it is <b>there</b> close to you'</p>	<p>speaker-distal (&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. wàatò dai kuu <u>nan</u>... 'in short, for you <b>there</b> (in that pre-mentioned area)...'</p> <p>[cataphoric], e.g. kuma à <u>nan</u> mukèe sàukaa gidan Àhaji Roorò 'and it's <b>there</b> precisely at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'</p> <p>[temporal], e.g. <u>nan</u> dà <u>nan</u> sai ya yàrda 'he agreed <b>there</b> and <b>then</b>'</p>	<p>speaker-distal (&lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. ganii <u>nan</u> barii <u>nan</u> 'as it's seen <b>there</b>, so shall it be left <b>there</b>'</p>
<p>Demonstrative (pre-head)</p> <p>LH <u>wànnan</u>,</p> <p>FH <u>wànnan</u> +NP</p>	<p>addressee-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture] bàa ni <u>wànnan</u> takàrdàa 'give me <b>that</b> paper'</p> <p>In a contrastive context, FH <u>wànnan</u> encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. bàa <u>wànnan</u> ba <u>wànnan</u> 'not <b>that</b> (one), <b>that</b> (closer one)' [= <i>in focus</i>]</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. ... <u>wànnan</u> 'yar faatàa kaɗ'ai sulèe tàlàatin sukà sàyee tà '... <b>that</b> small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them'</p> <p>[<i>in focus</i>]</p> <p>[short distance anaphor]</p> <p>In a contrastive context, [<i>activated</i>] LH <u>wànnan</u> encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. ai doolè nee à sookè <u>wànnan</u> z à a ɓ ee 'it was inevitable <b>that that</b> election was cancelled'</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) <u>wànnan</u> (only) ...in na cêe <u>wànnan</u> yà cêe bàa <u>wànnan</u> ba. In kuma na cêe <u>wànnan</u> yà cêe bàa <u>wànnan</u> ba 'if I say <b>this</b> (one) he'll say not <b>that</b> (one); and if I say <b>this</b> (one), he'll again say not <b>that</b> (one)'</p>
<p>Demonstrative (pre-head)</p> <p>NP+ <u>-n/r-nan</u></p>	<p>addressee-proximal [+identifiable], [+familiar] [-gesture] bàa ni biirò-<u>n-nan</u> 'give me <b>that</b> pen'</p>	<p>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) [<i>identifiable</i>] [<i>familiar</i>] bàa ni biirò-<u>n-nan</u> 'give me <b>that</b> pen'</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

Table 15: summary of previous descriptions of *CAN*-adverbials

	Robinson	Abraham	Bargery	Kraft/Kirk-Greene	Cowan/Schuh	Newman and Newman
F <i>cân</i>	<i>c â n</i> (no tones) = 'there'	[+visible, -proximal], e.g. <i>yanàa c â n</i> 'it is over <b>there</b> (= # <i>nan</i> )'	[+visible, -proximal] 'yonder, over <b>there</b> (fairly distant but visible)' e.g. <i>yanàa c â n</i> 'it's <b>there</b> '	[+visible] ' <b>there</b> ', e.g. <i>gàa Audù c â n</i> 'there's Audu over <b>there</b> '	[+visible, -proximal], ' <b>there</b> ', e.g. <i>sunàa c â n</i> 'they're <b>there</b> '	[+visible, -proximal] 'over <b>there</b> '  no examples
H <i>can</i>	<i>c a n</i> (no tones) = 'there'	[-visible, -proximal] ' <b>there</b> ', e.g. <i>naa bi ta can</i> (= # <i>nan</i> ) 'I passed through <b>there</b> '	[-visible, -proximal] 'yonder, over <b>there</b> (distant and invisible)' e.g. <i>yanàa c a n</i> 'he's <b>there</b> '	[+visible, -proximal] ' <b>there</b> ', e.g. <i>gàa Audù c a n</i> 'there's Audu in the distance'	(-visible), e.g. <i>tanàa c a n à gidaa</i> 'it's <b>there</b> at home'	[±visible] ' <b>there</b> ', e.g. <i>gàa ta c a n kusa dà wàccan bishiyàa</i> 'there it is <b>over there</b> by that tree'  <i>à c a n gàrîn akà gan shì</i> 'it was in <b>that</b> town that he was seen'

Table 16: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of *CAN*-adverbials

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
F <i>cân</i>	speaker/addressee-distal, e.g. gàa shì <i>cân</i> à indà ka bar shì 'there it is over <b>there</b> where you left it'	Not applicable	e.g. (indicating) zân jee <i>cân</i> nee ìn daawoo 'I'm going over <b>there</b> (not far away), and will be back'  in na yi <i>nân</i> yà yi <i>cân</i> 'if I move <b>here</b> , he'll move <b>there</b> '
H <i>can</i>	speaker/addressee-remote-distal, e.g. màtsaa zuwàa <i>can</i> gàba tükùna 'move way over <b>there</b> for now'	(speaker/addressee-remote-distal) anaphoric, e.g. ... à <i>can</i> na sàami wata yaarinyàa 'it's <b>there</b> that I met a girl'  cataphoric: <i>can</i> à gàrin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajeeriyàa... 'way over <b>there</b> in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi...'	<i>can</i> dai, muugùn bàakinkà yà bii kà 'well, <b>there</b> may your evil mouth follow you'

Table 17: summary of previous descriptions of *WANCAN* (+NP) NP-*CAN* demonstratives

	Robinson	Howeidy	Bargery	Abraham	Galadanci
HL <i>w a n c à n</i> (+NP)	wachan (waccàn) hanyàa	wancàn 'that'	[+visible] <i>wancàn</i> dookii	[+visible], e.g. <i>w a n c à n</i> dookii	[+visible], <i>waccàn</i> riigaa
..... NP-n/r-cân/càn	= hanyà-r- <i>chan</i> (cân) 'that way' (no tones)	littaafi-n-cân 'that book' (no tones)	= dookii-n-cân 'that horse'	= dookii-n-cân 'that horse'	= riiga-r-cân 'that gown (not near you or me)'
LH <i>w à n c a n</i> (+NP)			[+visible], <i>wàncan</i> 'that one yonder'	[-visible] <i>wàccan</i> shèekaràa	[+visible] <i>wàccan</i> riigaa 'that gown'
..... NP-n/r-can			[-visible] <i>gàrf-n-can</i> 'that town'	= shèekarà-r-can # -nan 'that year in the past'	[±visible] <i>riigâ-r-can</i> 'that gown'
FH <i>wâncan</i> (+NP)		Not recorded	Not recorded	[-visible] <i>wâccan</i> (=wàccan) shèekaràa 'that year in question'	[±visible] <i>wâccan</i> riigaa = <i>riigâ-r-can</i> 'that gown'

Table 17 (continued)

	Kraft & Kirk-Greene	Cowan & Schuh	Newman & Newman	Newman
HL <u>w a n c à n</u> (+NP)	[+visible] <u>waccàn</u> goonaa	[+visible] <u>waccàn</u> goonaa	[+visible] (distant) <u>wancàn</u> <b>'that'</b> (no examples)	[+visible] (distant) <u>wancàn</u> dàbiindò
..... NP- <u>n/r-cân/càn</u>	= goona- <u>r-cân</u> <b>'that farm'</b>	=goona- <u>r-cân</u> <b>'that farm'</b>	daakunà- <u>n-cân</u> <b>'those rooms over there'</b>	= dàbiindò- <u>n-cân</u> <b>'that date-palm tree'</b>
LH <u>w à n c a n</u> (+NP)	[-visible] <u>wàncan</u> 'the one in question'	[-visible] <u>wàccan</u> makarkataa cèè <b>'that is a place of deviation'</b>	[-visible], <u>wàncan</u> <b>'that, that one'</b> (no examples)	[+visible], <u>wàncan</u> ginii
..... NP- <u>n/r-can</u>	kujèerâ- <u>r-can</u> <b>'that chair'</b>	à cikin shèekarà- <u>r-can</u> / # - <u>nan</u> 'in <b>that</b> year'	NP- <u>can</u> <b>'that</b> (not visible, the one referred to)'	= gini- <u>n-can</u> <b>'that building (way over there)'</b>
FH <u>wàncan</u> (+NP)	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded	Not recorded

Table 18: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal *WANCAN* (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives.

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Demonstrative (pre-head) HL <u>wancàn</u> (+NP)	speaker/addressee-distal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. kujèerâr tanàa baayan <u>wancàn</u> ò'aa kî 'the chair is behind <b>that</b> hut'  [non-presupposed]	(< speaker/addressee-distal) [contrastive] tòo danganèe dà <u>waccàn</u> màganàa kuma... 'as for <b>that</b> (other) issue...'	anàa fa'aa tsàkaanin <u>wannàn</u> zùri'aa dà <u>waccàn</u> (zùri'aa) 'there's conflict between <b>this</b> clan and <b>that</b> (clan)'
Demonstrative (pre-head) LH <u>wàncan</u> , FH <u>wàncan</u> (+NP)	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [- <i>identifiable</i> ] [- <i>familiar</i> ] [+gesture], e.g. à <u>wàncan</u> wurîn mukà tarar dà shii 'it's at <b>that</b> place over there that we met him'  [contrastive], e.g. bàa <u>wàccan</u> mootàa ba, <u>wàccan</u> tà gàba 'not <b>that</b> car (you're approaching), <b>that</b> (other one) way in front'  [non-presupposed]	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à <u>wàncan</u> / <u>wàncan</u> lookàcîi yaa kî yà amsà làifin 'at <b>that</b> (other) time, he pleaded not guilty'  [long distance]	Not applicable
Demonstrative (post-head) NP+ <u>-n/-r-cân/càn</u>	speaker/addressee-distal [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture] anyàa kôo bàì yì wà yaarò- <u>n-cân</u> [yàara- <u>n-càn</u> ] nauyîi ba? 'is it not too heavy for <b>that</b> boy/ <b>those</b> boys?'  [presupposed]	Not applicable	Not applicable
Demonstrative (post-head) NP+ <u>-n/r-can</u>	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture] mutàanê- <u>n-can</u> nèe dà kèe gudùu na ganiî jiyà 'it's <b>those</b> people running that I saw yesterday'  [presupposed]	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. ya sâa kuma à kashè iyàayenmù maataa don mafarkî- <u>n-can</u> dà na gayàa mukù 'he ordered our mothers to be killed because of <b>that</b> dream I told you about'  [non-contrastive] [presupposed]	Not applicable

Table 19: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal deictics

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Adverbial F <u>cân</u>	speaker/addressee-distal, e.g. gàa shi <u>cân</u> à indà ka bar shì 'there it is over <b>there</b> where you left it'	Not applicable	e.g. (indicating) zân jee <u>cân</u> nee ìn daawoo 'I'm going over <b>there</b> (not far away), and will be back'  in na yi <u>nân</u> yà yi <u>cân</u> 'if I move <b>here</b> , he'll move <b>there</b> '
Adverbial H <u>can</u>	speaker/addressee remote-distal, e.g. màtsaa zuwàa <u>can</u> gàba tükùna 'move way over <b>there</b> for now'	(<speaker/addressee-remote-distal) anaphoric : ... à <u>can</u> na sàami wata yaarinyàa 'it's <b>there</b> that I met a girl'  cataphoric: <u>can</u> à gàrin Bauchi na arewacin Nàajeeriyàa ... 'way over <b>there</b> in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi ...'	<u>can</u> dai, muugùn bàakinkà yà bii kà 'well, <b>there</b> may your evil mouth follow you'
Demonstrative (pre-head) HL <u>wancàn</u> (+NP)	speaker/addressee-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. kujèerâr tanàa baayan <u>wancàn</u> d'aakli 'the chair is behind <b>that</b> hut'  [non-presupposed]	tòo danganèe dà <u>waccàn</u> màganàa kuma ... 'as for <b>that</b> (other) issue ...'  [contrastive]	anàa fadàa tsàkaanin <u>wannàn</u> zùri'aa dà <u>waccàn</u> (zùri'aa) 'there's conflict between <b>this</b> clan and <b>that</b> (clan)'
Demonstrative (pre-head) LH <u>wàncan</u> +NP FH <u>wâncan</u> +NP	speaker/addressee-remote-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar], e.g. à <u>wàncan</u> wurîn mukà tarar dà shii 'it's at <b>that</b> place over there that we met him'  [non-presupposed]  [contrastive] bàa <u>wàccan</u> mootàa ba, <u>wàccan</u> tà gàba 'not <b>that</b> car (you're approaching), <b>that</b> (other one) way in front'	(< speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à <u>wàncan</u> / <u>wàncan</u> lookàcìi yaa kí yà amsà láifin 'at <b>that</b> (other) time, he pleaded not guilty'  [long distance]	Not applicable

Table 19 (continued)

	<i>Spatial</i>	<i>Anaphoric</i>	<i>Symbolic</i>
Demonstrative (post-head) NP+ <u>-n/r-cân/càn</u>	speaker/addressee-distal [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. anyàa kôo bàì yì wà yaarò- <u>n-</u> <u>cân</u> [yâara- <u>n-cân</u> ] nauyîi ba? 'is it not too heavy for <b>that</b> boy [ <b>those</b> boys]?' [presupposed]	Not applicable	Not applicable
Demonstrative (post-head) NP+ <u>-n/r-can</u>	speaker/addressee- remote-distal, [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ] [-gesture], e.g. mutàanê- <u>n-can</u> nèe dà kèe gudùu na ganiî jiyà 'it's <b>those</b> people running that I saw yesterday' [presupposed]	(speaker/addressee- remote-distal) [+ <i>identifiable</i> ] [+ <i>familiar</i> ], e.g. ya sâa kuma à kashè iyàayenmù maataa don mafarkî- <u>n-can</u> dà na gayàa mukù 'he ordered our mothers to be killed because of <b>that</b> dream I told you about' [non-contrastive] [presupposed]	Not applicable

## References

Abraham, Roy Clive (1934) *The Principles of Hausa*. Kaduna: Government Printer.

Abraham, Roy Clive (1941) *A Modern Grammar of Spoken Hausa*. London: Crown Agents for the Colonies (published on behalf of the Nigerian Government).

Abraham, Roy Clive (1959) *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: University of London Press.

Abraham, Roy Clive (1962 [1949]) *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*. 2nd ed. London: University of London Press [Reprint of 1949 edition, with name of second author [Mai Kano] omitted.].

Abu-Manga, Al-Amin (1982) Code-switching among the Fulani and Hausa in the Sudan: a case study from Maiurno in the Blue Nile. *Africana Marburgensia* 15(2): 47-58.

Abu-Manga, Al-Amin (1990) Resistance of the western system of education by the early migrant community of Maiurno (Sudan). *Dirasat Ifriqiyya* 7: 9-27.

Anderson, Stephen and Edward L. Keenan (1985) Deixis. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. 3, *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Edited by Timothy Shopen, London: Cambridge University Press (pp. 259-308).

Ariel, Mira (1995) Review of Perkins, Revere D. (1992) *Deixis, grammar and culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 455-467.

Awde, Nicholas (1987) *An Hausa Reader*. London: Centre for African Language Learning.

Awde, Nicholas (1988) A Hausa language and linguistics bibliography 1976-1986 (including supplementary material for other years). In *Studies in Hausa Language and Linguistics* (in Honour of F.W. Parsons). London: Kegan Paul International (pp. 253-278).

Awde, Nicholas (1996) *Hausa-English— English-Hausa Dictionary*. New York: Hippocrene Books Inc.

Bagari, Dauda M. (1986) *Bayanin Hausa (Jagora ga Mai Koyon Ilimin Bayanin Harshe)*. Rabat: Imprimerie El Maarif Al Jadida.

Baldi, Sergio (1977) *Systematic Hausa Bibliography*. Rome: Tip. Pioda.

Bangbose, Ayo (1983) Standard Nigerian English: issues of identification. In *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Edited by Braj Kachru. Oxford: Pergamon Press (pp. 99-111).

Bargery, G. P. (1934) *A Hausa-English Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.

Bargery, G. P. (1993 [1934]) *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary*. 2nd ed. with Supplement and new introduction by A. N. Skinner. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press.

Bello, Ahmadu (1992) *The Dialects of Hausa*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Company.

Benveniste, Emile (1971) *Problems of General Linguistics*. (Miami Linguistics Series.) Translated by Mary Elizabeth Meek. Florida: University of Miami Press.

Booij, Geert, Christian Lehman and Joachim Mugdan (eds.) (forthcoming) *Morphology. A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brugmann, K. (1904) Die Demonstrativa der indogermanische Sprachen. *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 22 (6): 1-144.

Bühler, Karl (1982) The Deictic field of language and deictic words. In *Speech, Place and Action*. Edited by Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd (pp. 9-30).

Bühler, Karl (1990[1934]) *Theory of Language: the Representational Function of Language*. Translated by Donald Fraser Goodwin. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Burks, Arthur W. (1948-9) Icon, Index, and Symbol. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* . 9: 673-689.

Burling, Robbins (1970) *Man's Many Voices: Language in its Cultural Context* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Casad, Eugene D. (1975) Location and Direction in Cora. *Anthropological Linguistics* **19**: 216-241.

Chafe, Wallace L. (1976) Givenness, Contrastiveness and Consciousness. In *Subject and Topic*. Edited by Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press (pp. 25-56).

Christophersen, P. (1939) *The articles: A Study of their Theory and Use in English*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard and London: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Herbert H. (1973) Space, time, semantics and the child. In *Cognitive Development and the Acquisition of Language*. Edited by Timothy Moore. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press (pp. 28-64).

Clark, Herbert, H. and Catherine R. Marshall (1981) Definite Reference and Mutual Knowledge. In *Elements of Discourse Understanding*. Edited by Bonnie L. Webber, Aravid K. Joshi and Ivan A. Sag. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp 10-63).

Clayre, Iain (1973) Notes on spatial deixis in Melanau. *Anthropological Linguistics*. **15** (2):71-86.

Colinson, William Edward (1937) *Indication: A Study of Demonstratives, Articles, and Other 'Indicators'*. Edited by Alice V. Morris. Baltimore: Waverly Press Inc.

Contreras, Hales (1976) *A Theory of Word Order with Special Reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Coulmas, Florian (1982) Some remarks on Japanese deictics. In *Here and There: Cross-linguistics Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp. 1-14).

Cowan, J. Ronayne and Russell G. Schuh (1976) *Spoken Hausa*. Ithaca: Spoken Language Services Inc.

Crow, J.S.M. (1989) *Towards a Semantics for English Spatial Expressions*. PhD, University of Texas.

Crystal, David (1987) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denny, J. Peter (1978) Locating the universals in lexical systems for spatial deixis. *Papers from the Parasession on the Lexicon: Chicago Linguistics Society*. Edited by Donka Farkas, Wesley M. Jacobsen and Karol W. Todrys (pp. 71-84).

Ehlich, Konrad (1982) Anapher and deixis: same, similar, or different. In *Speech, Place, and Action*. Edited by Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein Chichester: Wiley (pp. 315-338).

Federal Republic of Nigeria (1979) *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Lagos, Nigeria: Government Printer.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (1989 [revised]) *National Policy on Education*. Lagos, Nigeria: NERDC Press.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1971) Towards a theory of deixis. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 3 (4): 219-242.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1975) *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1982) Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis. In *Speech, Place, and Action*. Edited by Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein Chichester: John Wiley (pp. 31-60).

Firbas Jan (1966) Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 2:239-256.

Fletcher, Paul and Michael Garman (eds.) (1986) *Language Acquisition: Studies in First Language Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fleischman, Suzanne (1991) Discourse as space/discourse as time: reflections on the metalanguage of spoken and written discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16(4): 291-306.

Frei, Henri (1944) Système de deictiques. *Acta Linguistica* 4: 111-29.

Freidman, Lynn A. (1975) Space, time, and person reference in American Sign Language. *Language* 51(4): 940-961.

Fuchs, Anna (1993) *Remarks on Deixis*. Heideberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

Furniss, Graham (1996) *Poetry, Prose and Popular Culture in Hausa*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Galadanci, Muhammad Kabir Mahmud (1969) *The Simple Nominal Phrase in Hausa*. Ph.D., SOAS, University of London.

Gale, Richard. M. (1968) Indexical signs, egocentric particulars, and token reflexive words. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 4: 151-155.

Gouffé, Claude. (1970/71) Sur les emplois grammaticalisés du verbe "dire" en haoussa. *Comptes rendus du groupe linguistique d'études chamito-sémitiques [GLECS]* 15: 77-90.

Gouffé, Claude (1971) Remarques sur le syntagme démonstratif en haoussa. In *Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen - Ein Querschnitt [Festschrift J. Lukas]*, ed. by Veronika Six et al. Hamburg: Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung (pp. 170-79)

Gouffé, Claude (1981) La langue haoussa. In *Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne. I. Les langues de l'Afrique subsaharienne*. Edited by Gabriel Manessy. Paris: CNRS (pp. 415-428).

Green, Georgia M. (1989) *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Greenbaum, Sydney (1969) *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London: Longmans.

Greenberg, Joseph (1978) (ed.) *Universals of Human Language (Vol. 3): Word Structure*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Grimes, Joseph E. (1975) *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

Gundel, Jeanette, Nancy Heideberg and Ron Zacharski (1989) Givenness, Implicature and Demonstrative Expressions in English Discourse. *Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society: Parasession on Language in Context*. Edited by Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyck and Caroline Wiltshire (pp. 89-122).

Gundel, Jeanette, Nancy Heideberg and Ron Zacharski (1993) Cognitive Status and the form of Referring Expressions in Discourse. *Language* 69 (2): 274-307.

Hair, P. E. H. (1967) *The Early Study of Nigerian Languages: Essays and Bibliographies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1967a) Notes on transitivity and theme in English: Part 1. *Journal of Linguistics* 3:37-81.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1967b) Notes on transitivity and theme in English: Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3:199-244.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1970) Language and language function. In *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Edited by John Lyons. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (pp. 140-165).

Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hanks, William F. (1989) The indexical ground of deictic reference. *Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society: Parasession on Language in Context*. Edited by Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyck and Caroline Wiltshire (pp. 104-122).

Harweg, R. (1968) *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*. München.

Hauenschild, Christa (1982) Demonstrative pronouns in Russian and Czech — Deixis and anaphora. In *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and*

*Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins (pp. 168-186).

Haviland, J.B. (1991) The grammaticalization of motion (and time) in Tzotzil. *Cognitive Anthropology Research Group, Working paper No. 2*. Nijmegen, Holland: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

Hawkins, John A. (1983) *Word Order Universals*. New York: Academic Press.

Heeschen, Volker (1982) Some systems of spatial deixis in Papuan Languages. In *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hinds, John (1971) Personal Pronouns in Japanese. *Glossa* 5: 145-155.

Hinds, John (1973) Anaphoric demonstratives in Japanese. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 8: 1-14.

Hinnesbusch, Thomas J. and Sarah M. Mirza (1979) *Kiswahili*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Hottenroth, Priska-Monika (1982) The system of local deixis in Spanish *Here and There: Cross-linguistics Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp. 134-153).

Howeidy, A. (1953) *Concise Hausa Grammar*. Oxford: George Ronald.

Huddleston, Rodney (1969) Some observations on tense and deixis in English. *Language* 45: 777-806.

Ingram, David (1971) Towards a theory of person deixis. *Papers in Linguistics* 4(1): 37-53.

Ingram, David (1978) Typology and universals of personal pronouns. In *Universals of Human Language*. Edited. by Joseph H. Greenberg. California: Stanford University Press (pp. 213-247).

Jaggar, Philip J. (1983) Some dimensions of topic-NP continuity in Hausa narrative. In *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Edited by T. Givon. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins (pp. 365-424).

Jaggar, Philip J. (1985a) Review of Manual of Hausa Idioms. *Journal of West African Languages*, XV (2):125-133.

Jaggar, Philip J. (1985b) *Factors Governing the Morphological Coding of Referents in Hausa Narrative Discourse*. Ph.D. University of California at Los Angeles.

Jaggar, Philip J. and Paul Newman (1989) Low tone raising in Hausa: a critical assessment. *Studies in African Languages* 20 (3): 227-251.

Jaggar, Philip J. (1993) Hausa. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press (pp. 1527-27).

Jaggar, Philip J., and Malami Buba (1994) The space and time adverbials nan/can in Hausa: Cracking the deictic code. *Language Sciences* 16: 387-421.

Jaggar, Philip J. (in preparation) *Hausa*. (London Oriental and African Language Library) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jakobson, Roman 1971. Shifters, Verbal categories, and the Russian verb. In *Selected Writings II*. The Hague: Mouton (pp. 130-147).

Jakobson, Roman (1976) Metalanguage as a linguistic problem. In *Selected Writings VII: Contributions to Comparative Mythology*. *Studies in Linguistics and Philology 1972-1982*. New York and Amsterdam: Mouton.

Jarvella, Robert J. and Wolfgang Klein (eds.) (1982) *Speech, Place and Action*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Jespersen, Otto (1992 [1924]) *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Edited by James D. McCawley. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Jungraithmayr, Herrmann., and W. J. G. Möhlig. (1976) *Einführung in die Hausa-Sprache (Kursus für Kolleg und Sprachlabor*. 3rd ed., 1986 ed. (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Afrika, 7.) Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Keenan, Edward L. (1975) (ed.) *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk-Greene, A. H. M. (1967) The linguistic statistics of Northern Nigeria: a tentative presentation. *Africa World Review*. **6**: 75-101.

Kirsner, Robert S. (1979) Deixis in discourse: an exploratory quantitative study of Modern Dutch demonstrative adjectives. In *Syntax and Semantics*. Edited by T. Givon. New York: Academic Press (pp. 355-375).

Klein, Wolfgang (1978) Wo ist hier? Präliminarien zu einer Untersuchung der lokalen Deixis. *Linguistische Berichte* **58**: 18-40.

Klein, Wolfgang (1994) *Time in Language*. London: Routledge.

Koike, David April (1989) Requests and the role of deixis in politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* **13**: 187-202.

Kraft, Charles (1963) *A Study of Hausa Syntax*. Hartford: Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Kraft, Charles H., and A.H.M. Kirk-Greene (1973) *Hausa (Teach Yourself Hausa)*. London: The English Universities Press Ltd.

Kramsky, Jiri. (1972) *The Article and the Concept of Definiteness in Language*. The Hague: Mouton and Co.

Kuno, Sosumu (1976) *The Structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Lakoff, Robin (1970) Tense and its relation to participants. *Language* **46**: 838-849.

Lakoff, Robin (1974) Remarks on *this* and *that*. *Papers from the 10th Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistics Society*. Edited by Michael W. Lagaly, Robert A. Fox and Anthony Bruck (pp. 345-356).

Leonard, Robert A. (1982) *The Semantic System of Deixis in Standard Swahili*. PhD, Columbia University.

Leonard, Robert A. (1985) Swahili Demonstratives: evaluating the validity of competing semantic hypotheses. *Studies in African Linguistics* 16: 281-293.

Leonard, Robert A. (1987) Response to Wilt, Discourse distances and the Swahili Demonstratives. *Studies in African Linguistics* 18 (1): 97-105.

Levinson, Stephen (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, Charles N. (ed.) (1976) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Lyons, John (1968) *An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John (1975) Deixis as the source of reference. In *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*. Edited by Edward Keenan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 61-83).

Lyons, John (1977) *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John (1979) Deixis and Anaphora. In *The Development of Conversation and Discourse*. Edited by T. Meyers. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press (pp. 88-103).

Lyons, John (1982) Deixis and Subjectivity: *Loquor, ergo sum?* In *Speech, Place and Action*. Edited by Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein. Chichester: John Wiley (pp. 101-124).

Lyons, John (1991) *Natural Language and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maclaran, Rose (1982) *The Semantics and Pragmatics of the English Demonstratives*. PhD, Cornell University.

Madaki, Rufa'i Omar (1983) *A Linguistic and Pragmatic Analysis of Hausa-English Code-switching*. PhD, University of Michigan.

Malinowski, Bronislaw (1969[1923]) The problem of meaning in primitive languages. Supplement in *The Meaning of Meaning: a Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*, edited by C. K. Ogden and I.A. Richards London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (pp. 296-336).

Malka, Jean-Guy (1978) Nazarin bambance-bambancen da ke tsakanin Daidatacciyar Hausa (Nijeriya) da Hausa Filinge (Jumhuriyar Niger) ta fuskar tsarin fannin furuci [A contrastive study of Standard Hausa (Nigeria) with the Hausa dialect of Filingué (Niger) with regard to phonology]. *Harshe* 1:19-51.

Malotki, Eckehart (1982) Hopi person deixis. In *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp. 223-252).

Matsushita, Shuji (1990) The future of two cities: Hausa dialects of Sokoto and Kano. *African Urban Studies* 1:105-113.

Mohmed, Aliyu (1977) *Aspects of the Syntax and Semantics of Noun Modification by Adjectives in Hausa*. PhD, University of London.

Newman, Paul and Roxana Ma Newman (1979) *Modern Hausa-English Dictionary*. Ibadan: University Press Limited.

Newman, Paul (1987) Hausa and the Chadic Languages. In *The World's Major Languages*. Edited by Bernard Comrie. London: Croom Helm (pp. 705-723).

Newman, Paul (1991) A Century and a Half of Hausa Language Studies. In *Nigerian Languages: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. Edited by Abba Rufa'i. Kano: CSNL, Bayero University (pp. 1-18).

Newman, Paul (1992) The Previous Reference Marker in Hausa: R.C. Abraham's insights and new analyses. In *African Languages and Cultures, Supplement 1 (In Honour of R.C. Abraham)*. Edited by Philip J. Jaggar. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London (pp. 67-77).

Newman, Paul (1995) Hausa Tonology: Complexities in an "Easy" Tone Language. In *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Edited by John A. Goldsmith. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell (pp. 762-781).

Newman, Roxana Ma (1990) *An English-Hausa Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nunberg, Geoffrey (1993) Indexicality and Deixis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16 (1): 1-44.

Ogden, C.K. and I.A. Richards (1969 [1923]) *The Meaning of Meaning: a Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Opalka, Hubertus (1982) Representations of local *ni*-deixis in Swahili in relation to Bühler's Origo des Zeigfelds. In *Here and There: Cross-Linguistics Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp. 65-79).

Parret, Herman (1980) Demonstratives and the I-Sayer. In *The Semantics of Determiners*. Edited by Johan Van der Auwera. London: Croom Helm Ltd (pp. 96-111).

Parsons, F.W. (1971) Hausa, ii - language. In *The Encyclopedia of Islam (new edition, 3)*. Leiden: Brill (pp. 278-80).

Parsons, F.W. (1981) *Hausa*. Edited by Graham L. Furniss. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Peirce, Charles Sanders (1932) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Perkins, Revere D. (1992) *Deixis, Grammar and Culture*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Prince, Ellen F. (1981a) On the inferencing of indefinite-this NPs. In *Elements of Discourse Understanding*. Edited by Bonnie L. Webber, Aravid K. Joshi and Ivan A. Sag. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 231-250).

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Rauh, Gisa (1978) *Linguistische Beschreibung deiktischer Komplexität in narrativen Texten*. Tübingen.

Rauh, G. (1980) Über die deiktische Funktion des epischen Präteritum: Die Reintegration einer scheinbaren Sonderform in ihren theoretischen Kontext. *Indogermanische Forschungen* (im Druck).

Rauh, Gisa (1981) On Coming and Going in English and German. In *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 13: 53-68.

Rauh, Gisa (ed.) (1983a) *Essays on Deixis*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Rauh, Gisa (1983b) Aspects of deixis. In *Essays on Deixis*. Edited by Gisa Rauh. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag (pp. 9-60).

Rauh, Gisa (1983c) Tenses as deictic categories. An analysis of English and German tenses. In *Essays on Deixis*. Edited by Gisa Rauh (pp. 229-276).

Reichenbach, H. (1947) *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. London: Macmillan.

Robinson, Charles H. (1925) *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, Charles H. (1941 [1897]) *Hausa Grammar*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. Ltd.

Rommetveit (1968) *Words, Meanings and Messages: Theory and Experiments in Psycholinguistics*. New York: Academic Press.

Russell, Bertrand (1940) *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Sacks, N. P. (1954) Aquí, acá, allí and allá. *Hispania*, 27: 263-266.

Saeed, John I. (1997) *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Schmid, Wolfgang P. (1983 [1972]) Die pragmatische Komponente in der Grammatik. In *Aspects of Deixis*. Edited by Gisa Rauh. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag (pp. 61-78).

- Searle, John R. (1959) *Sense and Reference*. DPhil, Oxford University.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.) (1960) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. (1991) *A Sign is Just a Sign*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Sperber, Dan and Deidre Wilson (1986) *Relevance*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Strauss, Susan (1993) Why 'this' and 'that' are not complete without 'it'. In *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Compiled and edited by Katherine Beals, Gina Cooke, David Kathman, Sotaro Kita, Karl-Erik McCullough and David Testeri. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society (pp. 403-418).
- Talmy, L. (1988) The relation of grammar to cognition. In *Cognitive Linguistics (Current Issues in Linguistics 50)*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins (pp. 165-205).
- Taylor, F.W. (1959 [1923]) *A Practical Hausa Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. (1978) Spatio-temporal relations. In *Universals of Human language vol. 3*. Edited by Joseph H. Greenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press (pp. 369-400).
- Ullmer-Ehrich, Veronika (1982) Da and the system of spatial deixis in German. In *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Edited by Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp. 43-63).
- Wales, Roger (1986) Deixis. In *Language Acquisition: Studies in First Language Development*. Edited by Paul Fletcher and Michael Garman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp 401-428).
- Webber, Bonnie L., Aravind K. Joshi and Ivan A. Sag (1981) (eds) *Elements of Discourse Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Weissenborn, Jürgen and Wolfgang Klein (eds.) (1982) *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Wilson, Deidre (no date) *Pragmatic Theory*. London: University College, London.
- Wilt, Timothy (1987) Discourse distances and the Swahili demonstratives. *Studies in African Linguistics* 18 (1): 81-95.
- Wolff, Ekkehard (1993) *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa*. Münster & Hamburg: Lit.
- Yahaya, Ibrahim Yaro (1988) *Hausa a Rubuce: Tarihin Rubuce-Rubuce Cikin Hausa*. Zaria: Northern Nigeria Publishing Company.
- Yokoyama, Olga Tsuneko (1986) *Discourse and Word Order*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Yule, George (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zaria, Ahmadu Bello (1982) *Issues in Hausa Dialectology*. PhD, Indiana University.
- Zawawi, Sharifa (1971) *Kiswahili kwa Kitendo*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Zwicky (1977) Hierarchies of person. In *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*. Edited by Woodford A. Beach, Samuel E. Fox and Shulamith Philosph. Chicago: Chicago University (pp. 714-733).

### **Hausa Sources**

- Furniss, Graham (1988) *Interview* (with Suleiman Ibrahim Katsina).
- MJC Imam, Abubakar (1970 [1939]) *Magana Jari Ce (Volume 3)*. Zaria: Northern Nigerian Publishing Company.
- RBJ Imam, Abubakar (1966) *Ruwan Bagaja*. Zaria: Northern Nigerian Publishing Company.
- ZRN Ingawa, A. and A. Musawa (no date) *Zamani Riga Ne*. Zaria, Nigeria: Gaskiya Corporation.

Gemu Ingawa, A. and A. Musawa (no date) *Gemu Ba Ya Hana Ilmi*. Zaria, Nigeria: Gaskiya Corporation.

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

Jaggar, Philip J. (1996) *A Hausa Newspaper Reader*. Maryland: Dunwoody Press.

Katsina, Sulaiman Ibrahim (1982) *Turmin Danya*. Lagos and Zaria: Northern Nigerian Publishing Company for Nigeria Magazine.

MHR Kirk-Greene, A. H. M. and Yahaya Aliyu (1967) *A Modern Hausa Reader*. London: University of London Press Ltd.

ML Lockwood, Matthew (1992) *Interviews* (with local farmers in Kaduna and Katsina States, Nigeria).

Newman, Paul (forthcoming) *Hausa Reference Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

TG *Tumbin Giwa*. A Nigerian Television Authority (Kaduna, Nigeria) TV drama recorded for Owen Jarvis (B.A. SOAS, 1992).

JNH Yahaya, Ibrahim Yaro and Abdulkadir Dangambo (1986) *Jagoran Nazarin Hausa*. Zaria: Northern Nigerian Publishing Company.

YDG *Yau Da Gobe*. Rima Radio Sokoto (Nigeria) play recorded for myself by the Music Archivist of the station, Malam Bello, in 1993.

ZM *Zauren Mai'anguwa*. A Rima Radio Sokoto (Nigeria) play recorded for myself by the Music Archivist of the station, Malam Bello, in 1993.

