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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. năn ‘here’ [near me the speaker], wannăn + NP, NP-n/r-năn/năn ‘this NP [near me the speaker]’). Chapter 3 is concerned with the basically addressee-proximal deictics (e.g. nan ‘there [near you the addressee]’, wannan / wānnan + 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 addresssee]’, wâncân + NP, NP-n/r-cân/cân ‘that NP [distant from speaker and addresssee]’), and their remote-distal counterparts (e.g. can ‘over there [remote from speaker and addresssee]’, wâncan / wāncan + NP, NP-n/r-can ‘that NP [remote from speaker and addresssee]’). 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.
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# ungrammatical
? marginally acceptable
* underlying (historical) form
< derived from
= equivalent in meaning
\# not equivalent in meaning
\rightarrow changes to
\leftrightarrow 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
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Transcription

For all the Hausa citations, the tone and vowel marking system is as follows: L(ow) tone = (a or åa), F(alling) tone = (åa or å), H(igh) tone is unmarked; long vowels are indicated with double vowels, e.g. (åå) vs. short (å). The glottalised consonants are represented by the so-called ‘hooked letters’ b/B, d/D, k/K, and the apostrophe ( ’ ) is used to signify the glottal stop; ’y 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 nän ‘here’.
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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) superfamily, 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 Howeidy (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. 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 nān 'here' (§2.1.), pre-head demonstrative HL tone wannān etc. (+NP), and post-head NP-n/-r-nān/nān '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) wannān vaarinvaa and (post-head) vaarinvā-r-nān '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 nān gàba ‘in future’ (lit. 'here/now in front'), nān dà ‘from now’ (lit. 'here/now and'), and the modal pro-form hākà ‘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. \textit{this} $\leftrightarrow$ \textit{that}). Adverbial H nân, pre-head demonstrative LH wannàn etc., FH wannàn 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 nân and LH wannàn etc. [+ proximal] in relation to the addressee. (These essentially addressee-based deictics have a more generalised speaker-distal coding in many of the \textit{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 di-n (§3.3.1.1) and referential F tone di-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 felicitious 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. 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’, *ahi* ‘(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 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

1 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).

2 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 nān ‘here’, pre-head demonstrative HL wannān+NP and post-head NP+ -n/r-nān/nān ‘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 nān is pragmatically identical to the HL demonstrative wannān+NP:NP+ -n/r-nān/nān. The analysis also extends to temporal adverbial phrases such as nān gāba (lit. ‘here/now in front’) ‘in future’, nān dā ... (lit. ‘here/now and’) ‘in the next...’, as well as the deictic pro-form haka ‘thus’.

2.1. F nān = speaker-proximal adverbial

The Standard (Kano) Hausa F nān locative adverbial is traditionally glossed as ‘here’, as distinct from H nan (chapter 3) which is glossed as ‘there’. F nān is identical to its demonstrative counterparts, HL wannān+NP:NP+ -n/r-nān/nān (§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. kadâ 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. âjiyee shi nân, ‘place it here’, kàawoo shi 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 Audû 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 tâkârdâkà? ‘where’s your paper?’, A: gàa ta nân cikin lîttaâffi ‘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. inaa zàume à nân ‘I live here’.

Table 1 summarises these descriptions:
Table 1: summary of previous descriptions of F nän-adverbial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Kraft and Kirk Greene</th>
<th>Cowan and Schuh</th>
<th>Newman and Newman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F nän</td>
<td>(=nän) 'here' (no tones provided)</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here', e.g. kadà kà zoo nän 'don’t come here'</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here', e.g. äñjye shi nän 'place it here'</td>
<td>[+proximal] 'here', e.g. gàñ Audù nän 'here's Audu here' (nearby)</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here', (there), e.g. yanà nän 'he is here'</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here' (nearby), e.g. inàa zàune à nän 'I live here'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What emerges from these descriptions is a simplistic view of F nän 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). Thus F nän is generally taken to pragmatically encode the following features:

1. F nän = [+visible], also [+proximal], e.g. gàñ shi nän ‘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 nän 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), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F nân</th>
<th><strong>Spatial</strong></th>
<th><strong>Anaphoric</strong></th>
<th><strong>Symbolic</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker-proximal, e.g. [+ gesture], e.g. gaa shi nân kusa dà nii 'here it is here close to me.'</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wântòò dâi muu nân ... 'in short, for us here (in this pre-mentioned area)....'</td>
<td>([cataphoric], e.g. shawawâr dà zân baa kà à nân ita cèe... 'my advice to you here is ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. nân gâbâ kâdân zaa kl ji šâkâmâkon gâaâwâr 'soon, you'll hear the result of the interview'</td>
<td>([&lt; speaker-proximal]) ... in na yi nân yà yi nân '...if I move here, he moves [t]here'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) 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’. 5

Examples:

(2) [A wants B to tell him the location of A’s pen]:
   a) A: inaa ka ga na ajiyee biiròona?
      ‘where did you see me put my pen?’
   
   b) B: gaa biirònkà nàn inàa riikè dà shii 6
      ‘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. 7 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: gaa ni nàn, tàaraa koo baashii?
      ‘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):
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]:

\[\text{kaa ga nân indà nakèè bugà kafàataa, tôò à nân nee akà kafà iyaakaa tsàkaanin fiilàayenmu} \]

'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]:

\[B: \text{ô nân ka tatar dà nii, tôò kuma à nân zaa kà bar nì} \]

‘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 nān 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 yīi nān kuma?

‘what’re you here for again?’

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

bāa naa cēe kadā in saakè ganinkà à nān bàakin tītīi ba?

‘didn’t I say I must never again see you here by the roadside?’

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

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

nān dà nān kēe yi mini ciiwōo

‘the pain is here and [t]here’

In certain contextual uses, F nān 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 **nâñ** yânzu, àmmma **nâñ** mukèè sôò mû kai kàafin raanaa tà fâaâfî
‘we are **here** now, but we want to be **here** before sundown (sunset)’

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

niì née **nâñ**, kai kuma gàa ka **nâñ**, sànnan gàa Hâlliimà **nâñ**
‘**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 **nâñ** akà yankè kâfâr 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* **nâñ** ‘**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* **nâñ** 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: âshee kai maa **nâñ** kakèè dà zamaa?
‘oh, so you live **here** as well?’
b) B: ii, ai naa jumàa nànn
‘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 kakèe?
‘Musa! Musa! where are you?’

Son: nà’am, gàà ni nànn cikin wannàn dàaki8
‘yes, I’m here, in this (other) room’

(15) [mother calls upon her daughter]:

Mother: Zàinabù! Zàinabù!
‘Zainabu! Zainabu!’

Daughter: nà’am, gàà ni nànn zaurèn dakàa
‘yes, I’m here in the grinding hut’

F nànn 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: shin nànn hakà ka cèe in bi zuwàa jaami’àa?
‘did you say I should follow here/this way to the university?’
b) B: nan hakà dai na cée kà bi har zuwàà 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 nan 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 nan. Both of these interpretations are available in determining the deictic orientation of F nan in (17):

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

kaa ga dàgà nàn zuwàà nàn har àbin dà ya kai cân, sààree

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

F nan 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 nàn

‘come here’

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

kàawoo shi nàn

‘bring him here’

and can equally be used with verbs indicating motion away from the speaker’s physical location, as in (20)-(21):
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(20) [speaker threatens to leave if his request is not met]:

zan ficèe dà gà nān ìdan bà kù yi shiruu ba

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

(21) [speaker insists]:

bàa zān dà gà dà gà nān ba, sai an biyaa nì laadar aikliinaa

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

In the above contexts (20)-(21), only F nān 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 nān 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 (performatve) 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 nān 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 nān 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 nān exhibits a capacity to collocate with essentially presentative and/or local spatial deictics, thereby specifying the delimitation of the usage of F nān in the ‘canonical situation of utterance’. Its participant orientation is firmly anchored
on the speaker, for whom all referents coded with F *nàn* 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 *nàn* where the ‘pointing’ is achieved by means other than gestures.

### 2.1.3 Anaphoric F *nàn*

The basic spatial meaning of F *nàn* ‘*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’. Anaphoric cross-reference is crucially dependent on the co-text for interpretation, and these discourse deictic usages of F *nàn* 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. Examples (22)-(26) illustrate the speaker-proximal derived anaphoric use of F *nàn*:
(22) [writer explains the social context of his novel]:

talakaawaa suu ya kàmaatà sü zoo sü canjà al'amuràa kànsù ... tòò àmõmaa à nàn an takàítaa shi nèe à kàn ma'àiàtàn gwànnatì

‘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]:

...wàâtòó dai, muu nàn , Allàh yaa sauƙàƙàr dà ál'ämàrì

‘...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]:

tòò à nàn sai à tsayàà ài nazàrìi kàn lamàrìn

‘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 cée koo bà à kwàarëe kà bà

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

b) B: ìnaa fa kwàaràà à nàn

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

---

(26) [broadcaster continues the narration]:

jàma’àà dai sun gâlààbài tà ainùn à Nàajeeriyyàà ... tòò nàn maa kuma dàllilàn bàà à bòoye sukë bà
‘people are really suffering in Nigeria ... and here too the reasons are not obscure’

In (22)-(26) the deictic proximal \( F \) means ‘here’ refers to the speaker-established proposition in the immediately preceding clause. As long as \( F \) means 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. \( H \) means (chapter 3, §3.2.2.) could be used as a deictic substitute for \( F \) means 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’ is deictically used to encode a speaker-proximal reference, reinforced by the choice of \( F \) means. As for (24), \( F \) means is deployed in a cataphoric capacity, although its antecedent is clearly the whole of the prior text. Thus, the choice of speaker-based \( F \) means in these contexts, is crucial evidence that \( F \) means requires speaker-activation (coding at the moment of utterance) for it to be felicitous, in contrast to \( H \) means 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):

tōo, à duk lookàcin zamansà à nân Birtaaniyà dai, Úumarù Dikkò yaa shaa naanàatà cêewaa shii baì sàaci kudii nairàa milliyan bîlaa àdadìn ba ta hanyàr gàdàa-gadar shînkaafaa (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 nān ‘here’ can also be used as a strategy for cataphorically anticipating new information,14 as in (28)-(32):

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

tòo, nii dai, shaawaràr dà zân baa kà à nān ita cèe... [TG]
‘well, my advice to you here is...’

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

shūugàbàn yaa taboo màngàngànuu dà daamàa dàngàne dà matsaloolin kasan nān. Tòo à nān gàà kà̄sàn dàgà cìkìnsù
‘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 nān dà akèe cèe wà Kwàlkwálàawàa, zàa kà tàràr ànàa sayàr dà gàlàn nàiràà tàlààtìn
‘even now, if you go over here to Kwàlkwálàawà (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 nān Landàn nee à wàta ànguwàa dà akèe kàráà Streatham, nān kudàncìn Landàn ...
‘and, it’s here in a London district called Streatham, here in the south of London …’
(32) [speaker continues his description]:

wààtòò shii Gareth, lauyà nee à nààn Mid-Glamorgan ...  
‘Gareth is a solicitor, here in Mid-Glamorgan ...’

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

The basic locative speaker-proximal ‘here’ value of F nààn 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 nààn is extended to the temporal domain, where proximity in space is analogically transferred to proximity in time:15

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

a) A: yàùùshè zàn daawoo kèe nààn?
   ‘when should I come back then?’

b) B: dàgà nààn zuwàà kààrshen wannààn maakòò
   ‘between now and the end of this week’

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

ai nii då àa gaafàrtaa mà Màànsùràr har ààbàddàa. Dàgà nààn mun faarà gaàbàaa kèe nààn (MJC:106)
   ‘I'll never forgive Mansur. Our enmity starts from now’

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

zàn kammàlàìì aììkìn nààn bàà da jumààawaa bà
   ‘I'll finish the work soon [after now]’

38
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\textsuperscript{16} — cf. dàgà nân, where H nân 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 wannän 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 jìyà nee ta haihù
      ‘well, it was just yesterday she gave birth’

(38) [speaker A asks addressee B]:

   a) A: yàushè nee zaa kû tàfi?
      ‘when are you going?’

   [B replies]:

   b) B: ai nân gôobe née zaa mú yi haramàa
      ‘well, it’s as soon as tomorrow that we’re setting off’

In (37b) the speaker further delimits the deictic day-word jìyà ‘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 gôobe with the future zaa, showing once gain that deixis is the key interface between language and context.17 Fragment (39) also illustrates the correlation between a deictically-specific past time point and the use of the focus perfective:

(39) [speaker points out]:

tôo èmmaa nân bâara nèe gwamnatîn Nàajeeriyàa ta bâyànà manufoofin saabon tsaarin siyaasàa
‘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 göba ‘hereafter, in future’ (gòba is an adverbial place-deictic meaning ‘in front’):

(40) [tradesman promises a client]:

zân kammàlà aîkin nân göba18
‘I’ll finish the work (some time) in the future’
(41) [a news item on the Bosnian crisis]:

zaa à miiƙà shirin gà Saabiyaawaa nàñ gàɓa à yàu
‘the plan will be presented to the Serbs later today’

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

nàñ gàɓa kàɗan, gwànnatì zaa tà bayyànnà sàakàmakon bìnciken dà tà 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 nàñ follows the deictic adverbial gàɓa to code essentially the same temporal projection (from the time of utterance) as nàñ gàɓa ‘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 mijin nan naaki yaa amsà suunansà
‘that husband of yours has really lived up to his name’

[wife B responds]:

b) B: inaa kikà san yaa amsà suunansà tùkùn? Tsàyaa daì kì ga àbaìn
dà zài àuku gàɓa nàñ (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 nàñ (+ dà ‘with’) to code an interval with a definite end-point starting from the
moment of utterance production. F \( \text{nân} \) in such a context also provides the means for making cataphoric reference, thereby adding to text cohesion,\(^{19}\) hence to utterance comprehension. Consider (44)-(46):

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

\[ \text{anàa sàa rài nân dà shèekàràa bìyar, bugà wàyàr tsàkaanìn kàsàashen kudàncìn Afirkà zài yi sauküi (AHR:44)} \]

‘it is expected that \textit{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]:

\[ \text{mìsaallì, tànàa iyà cèewaa, tòo nìi bàÀ nì dà shìi; nàn dà shèekàrùù hàmsìn zàn dingà biyàn kwàbbù-kwàbbù} \]

‘for instance, she could say, well, I don’t have it; \textit{over the next} fifty years, I’ll be paying a penny (at a time)’

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

\[ \text{zaÀ à gùdaanàr dÀ saàbòn zààbëe nàn dà wàtànnìi shìdà} \]

‘a new election is to be held \textit{within} six months \textit{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 nan (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 bullëè nân; in an datsëè nân, sai kà bullo
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’20 and ‘psychological proximity’ respectively. The use of speaker-proximal F nān 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 nān 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 këe fitòowaa, in ta duubaa nān, ta duubaa nān bā tā ga koowaa ba sai tā cēe ‘wūce-wūce’

‘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 nān tarāi-tarāi, na yi nān tarāi-tarāi, duk gàbaanaa nāa faadòwaa

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

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

in akā yi dā nii nān in yi nān21

‘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]:

45
a) A: yàaya, in ta haihù, sôo kikèe ìn jee nân ìn ci baashìi, ìn jee nân ìn ci baashìi, 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 haka ba nêe, yàaya; in na bullo nân kì cêe bàa haka ba, in na bullo nân kì cêe bàa haka 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 haka ‘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 natsu, an yi shiruu, na shaare ëasaa, sai kà cêe mài shirin haddìì, na zaanà wata àlaamàà haka....: (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 wuta nán då 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 nán, kaa faadì 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 nàn à cikin gidaa. Tà kai nán, tà kai cân
(Gemu: 14)

‘Binta then set about the house chores. She will go here, she will go there’

In certain contexts F nán 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: inaa zuwàa? b) B: zân jee nán
‘where are you going?’ ‘I’m off [t]here’

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

Interestingly, a speaker can also use F nán 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]:

Allâh yaa nuunàa mukû halinkû... nân, nân, nân, bâa âbin dâ bâ kû wâa yaarinyàr nan ba...nân na zoo na cêe dâ kuu bâa hakà akèe harakàr duuniyâa 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 wannan, HLF (pl.) wadannan (HHL wadannan) (+NP), NP+-n/-r-nan/nan demonstratives

Speaker-proximal demonstratives can occur either pre-head, in which case they have the form HL wannan + NP 'this' (m./f./s.), and HLF wadannan (also HHL wadannan) + NP (pl.) 'these', or post-head, in the form NP-definite determiner -nan/nan (definite determiner = -h/-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 nan 'here'. As I have shown in the treatment of F nan, 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 wannan 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 wannan, 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 bà nèe

‘this one is not mine’

(58) a) tafi dà wannàn dookii = b) tafi dà dooki-n-nàn

‘take this horse away’

(59) aikì-n-nàn bàa shi då wūyaa

‘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/nàn] 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 nàn and argued that the tonal variation of the forms [-nàn/nàn] 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 nàn is absorbed, leaving a L tone nàn, as in gārii, ‘town’ —> gāri-n-nàn ‘this town, āku ‘parrot’ —> āku-n-nàn ‘this parrot’; but if the final syllable is low, then post-head nàn remains F, e.g. dookìi ‘horse’—> dookì-n-nàn ‘this horse’, jaakunàa ‘donkeys’—> jaakunà-n-nàn ‘these donkeys’ (see also below). He also claimed that wannàn +NP may be used in place of NP+ -n/r-nàn/nàn, e.g. (cf. above examples) wannàn gārii ‘this town’, wannàn dookìi ‘this horse’, wàdànnàn 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 và dìùubi wannàn, wannàn và dìùubi 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 bin wannàn ‘all this in the right sequence’ (lit. ‘this (one) follows this (one)’ (p. 924). However, his post-head HL wannàn usage in #laasàfi (=?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 lìitaafii nèe ‘this is a book’, and wannàn gàsìiyaa 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]:

\[\text{wannàn fensir nee?}\]

‘is this (one) a pencil?’

b) [student answers]:

\[\text{#aa’aa, wannàn àlkalâmii nee}\]

‘no, this (=that) (one) is a pen’

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

\[\text{wannàn shii nèe fensir (p. 57)}\]

‘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 \text{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 \text{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]:

\[\text{kùjèeràr tanàa baayan wannàn daakii}\]

‘the chair is behind this hut’
(62) [speaker answers addressee]:

an dínkà wannàn riigaa à Kátsina (p. 84)

‘this gown was sewn in Katsina’

(63) [speaker points to different objects]:

wadànnànn kàftàaanai kùwà dàggà Zaariyà akà zoo dà suùn

‘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 -nàn/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, nàn [has] a falling tone ... naamà-n-nàn [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) wannàn bàraawòò 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 [± visible] dichotomy is incorrect.
Bagari (1986:114) makes a similar distinction between the spatial demonstratives, làmìiran nuunin jìbìntakàa, and the referential ones làmìiran tsùokàcìì, defined in terms of a combination of their [+proximal, ±visible] characteristics, i.e.:

(66) ‘àkwai làmìiran nuunin jìbìntakàa, wàatòò wàdàndà sukèe nuunii gà Àbìn
da kèè kusa gà mà màgànàa (wandà mà màgànàa koo mà jìì kèè ijà
gàninsà koo tábàa shì à lóokàcìn dà akèè màgànàr [italics mine]), e.g.
wànnàn yaaròn, ‘this boy’; wàdànnàn yààràn, ‘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-NAH demonstrative forms is erroneous in its basic assumption — addressee-proximal referents are coded by the tonally-distinct pre-head LH
wànnàn etc. In two recent Hausa dictionaries (Newman and Newman 1979:131-2, Newman 1990:275-7), HL. wànnàn 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. wànnàn in wànnàn riigàa ‘this gown’, is deictically related to the position of the speaker, hence Galadanci’s description of the gown as ‘near me’. In this connection, Howeidy (1953:32) has claimed that the post-head demonstrative -nàn/nàn strategy ‘riigà-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 wannan and its post-head -nān/nān variant. He also argues (wrongly) that there is a basic semantic [±visible] distinction between HL wannan etc. (= ‘within sight’) and LH wannan etc. (= ‘neither present nor within sight’) demonstratives (p. 145).

Jaggar (1985b:174) suggests that HL wannan NP (= NP-n/-n-nān/nān) is used in Hausa ‘to map referents which are either physically visible or abstract and non-visible to the encoder or decoder, e.g. wannan yaaroo ‘this boy’ [+visible], vs. wannan gaskiyaa ne ‘this/that is true’ (p. 174). He also pointed out that within the [-visible] anaphoric usage of HL wannan, there is an abstract (=symbolic?) function, which the speaker may use to anchor an imaginary state of affairs, e.g. ... yà kai wannan gàrrì yà wucēe, yà kai wannan yà wucēe ...’ he arrives at this town and passes, and arrives at this [that] and passes’ (Imam 1970 [1939]:58, quoted in Jaggar (1985b174f). However, Jaggar underestimated the high frequency of anaphoric HL wannan 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 wannan 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Abraham Cowan and Schuh</th>
<th>Bagari Galadanci Mohmed Jaggar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL wannàn (+NP)</td>
<td>speaker-proximal tāfi dà wannàn dookîi (= dookî-n-nân) 'take this horse away'</td>
<td>speaker-proximal wannàn ’this (near us)', e.g. wannàn dookîi = dookî-n-nân, 'this horse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+visible], e.g. wannàn littaaffi nee ’this is a book’; wannàn gaskiya nee ’this/that is true’</td>
<td>[+visible] wannàn yaarôn ’this boy (near us)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker-proximal wannàn rīgaa ’this gown (near me)’</td>
<td>[+visible] wannàn (wancân) etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[±visible], speaker-proximal, e.g. wannàn yaaròo ’this boy’; wannàn gaskiya nee ’this/that is true’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-nän/nän demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative (pre-head)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wannàn + NP</td>
<td>speaker-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. gaa wannàn maalamii (# da ka cee ...) 'here’s this teacher (# that you said...')</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) [-identifiable] [-familiar], e.g. yayaâ zân yi da wannàn maalamii? 'what am I going to do with this teacher'</td>
<td>(&lt;&lt; speaker-proximal) [+gesture], e.g. fàa’aa wajen wannàn bookaa, gângàraa wajen wannàn maalamii... 'he would go to this sorcerer, and shift to this [that] Islamic teacher...'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative (post-head)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-nän/nän</td>
<td>speaker-proximal [+familiar] [+identifiable] [-gesture], e.g. gaa maalamí-n-nän (da ka cee ...) 'here’s this teacher (that you said...')</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) [+identifiable], [+familiar], e.g. yayaâ zân yi da maalamí-n-nän 'what am I going to do with this teacher?'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

Pre-head wannàn (pl. wadannàn/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: mèe nee nèe kakèe riìè dà shii?
      ‘what’s it you’re holding?’

   [B replies]:
   b) B: wannàn åku/ âku-n-nàn nèe ka ganii.
      ‘it is this parrot that you saw’

(68) [speaker seeks clarification]:
   a) mèe kakèe sòo in yi?
      ‘what would you like me to do?’

   [reply]:
   b) ungo wannàn cèefanee/cèefane-n-nàn kà kai cikin gidaa
      ‘here, take these grocires into the house’

(69) [same context as (68)]:
   a) mèe kuma zaa mù yi yànzù?
      ‘what else are we going to do now?’
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 wadànnàn with HHL wadànnàn [as below], with no apparent difference in meaning:

(70) [mother to her child]:
   a) tòo, gàa tufaa fin òìà bàabankà ya ðìñkà màkà bàna
      ‘well, here are the clothes made for you by your dad this year
   
   [child replies]:
   b) mààama, nìi baa nàa sòn sàa wàdànnàñ/wàdànnàñ.
      ‘mum, I don’t want to wear these (pointing or holding them)’

(71) [speaker making inquiries]:
   inàà neeman wandà zài kài wà Òsmàñ wàdànnàñ/wàdànnàñ kaayan sàawàa
   ‘I'm looking for someone who will take these clothes to Usman’

I myself prefer the HHL wàdànnàñ 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 wàdànnàñ seems to be the preferred speaker-proximal plural form.

In (72)-(73) below, both adverbial F nàñ 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! inaa kakè?
‘Musa! Musa! where are you?’

Son: nà’am, gàa ni nân cikin wannân daakì
‘yes, I’m here in this (other) room’

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

A: kee Zàinabù! Zàinabù! inaa kikè?
‘hey, Zainabu! Zainabu! where are you?’

B: aì gàa ni nân baayan wannân daakì
t‘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 \( \text{wànnan} \) (also FH \( \text{wànnan} \)) +NP vs. NP-\(n\)-\(nan\) (chapter 3), and applies (albeit in a less direct way) to speaker/addressee-distal \( \text{WANCAN} \) NP vs. NP-\(n/\iota\)-\(CAN\) (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in focus &gt;</th>
<th>activated &gt;</th>
<th>familiar &gt;</th>
<th>uniquely identifiable &gt;</th>
<th>referential &gt;</th>
<th>type identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{it}</td>
<td>{that}</td>
<td>{that N}</td>
<td>{the N}</td>
<td>{indefinite this N}</td>
<td>{a N}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 \(\text{in focus}\) to the least restrictive \(\text{type identifiable}\), with respect to the set of possible referents they include’ (p. 276).

Briefly, \textit{type identifiable} merely requires that ‘the addressee is able to access a representation of the type of object described by the expression...’, \textit{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. [± *familiar*] and [±*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 –*nànn/nànn*.

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.24 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]:

`tòò, gàa wannàn guzurii kù shìga moötà dà shìì
‘well, here, take this provision (of money) for you to pay your fare’
(75) [speaker hands an expected gift to the addressee]:

\[ \text{tōo, gàa gùzurī-n-nān kù shaa ruwaa dà shii} \]

‘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]:

\[ \text{wannān mootāa tanàa baa nì wàhalāa} \]

‘**this** car is giving me a hard time’

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

\[ \text{mootā-r-nān tanàa baa nì wàhalāa} \]

‘**this** car is giving me a hard time’

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

\[ \text{dùubi wàdānnān jumloolī sānnan kà yì bāyaanīn bāmbancīnsù} \]

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

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

\[ \text{dùubi jumloolī-i-n-nān sānnan kà yì bāyaanīn bāmbancīnsù} \]

‘examine **these** sentences and comment on their differences’

By choosing the pre-head demonstrative HL wannān 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 wannān. 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 gùzurī ‘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, identifiablity 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 duùbàa
‘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 takàrdà-r-nàn kà duùbàa
‘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 goodèe ‘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 -nàn\(^{25}\).

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

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

\[gàa \text{ geero-n-nàn/daawà-r-nàn/masàra-r-nàn } [\#\text{wannàn} \text{ geero/daawàa/masàraa}] \text{ kà kai mareedii} \]

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

(84) [father to his daughter]:

\[\text{ungo ruwa-n-nàn/fura-r-nàn/àbinci-n-nàn kì kai wà bàkoo} \]

‘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 såa ni cikin rikicii
‘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 làlàlace
‘look at this one [girl], a wasting thing’

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

gàà 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 rigimàa!
‘this, this, [one] is really meddlesome!’

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

Like adverbial F nàn, the pre-head wannàn etc. and post-head -nàn/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 -nàn/nàn 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative form</th>
<th>Demonstrative form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-head NP+-nân/nân</td>
<td>Pre-head HL wannân+NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/-n-n-an/n-an 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 -n-an/n-an linear variant, e.g.:

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

wai an yi wani bâbban taajirii née, wândà yakè dà ðan ðansà ðaya, Hassân.
Baayan âtaajiri-n-n-an yaa yi wà Hassân auree dà wata wai ita Rakiyaa, 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 tâ yi àbinci irii-irii, shii kùwa yà ìtì kàn hanyàr fatàakee yà tsayàà, in ya ga fatàakee zaa sù shiga gà里斯 sai yà jaa sù yà kai gidansà, yà kaawo àbinci-n-n-an sù zaunàà 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]:


‘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 isàrsù sai sukà tarar dà wàdànsù fàtàakee cìkì cìkì fàtàake-n-nàn dà kèsì rùmfàas sai sauroo ya dàami ìdaya (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 âttàajìri-n-nàn ‘this merchant’, âbìncì-n-nàn ‘this food’, Jàkaadiya-r-nàn ‘this Jakadiya’ and fàtàake-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 -nàn/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 -nān/nān, 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]:

nān gabās wajen kāsāashen Bārno an yi wani Shaihūn Maalāmī ... maalāmī-n-nān ya cēe ā kirāa masā ḍānsā...Baayan kwaannya bakwāi [dā gamā jānaaʾizārsā] akā zoo rabā gaadōn ābin dā maalāmī-n-nān ya barii (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]:

Wōwū wānā cīkā tāfīyyā ... sai ya gāmu dā wani bāakōn dān tsoohū dā gafakārsā ... Koo dā Wōwū wāa ga dān tsooho-n-nān bāi raatsēe masā ba, sai ya taasam masā hāi[kān ... yaa[-n-nān bāi kullā wātāa gūdaa ba dāgā gāmonsā dā tsooho-n-nān sai dā ya haukāce (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 -nān/nān strategy. Cf. also:
(95) [Tsōhuwa decides to do something with the money she’s getting]:

Tsōhuwaa ta cèe, ‘lálee kudi-n-nànn bàà su dà niyyàr kàarèewaa. Bàri mìttùm yà yi gidan katangaa, kadà yà bar banzaa tà wucèe’ (MJC:37)

‘Tsōhuwa 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]:

kudi-n-nànn na jàama’àa hàràamùn nee à tabàà su

‘it’s unlawful to touch this public money’

(97) [Speaker wonders]:

ruwa-n-nànn dà akèè ta labtàawaa zaa sù dȁukee kùwa?

‘is this downpour ever going to stop?’

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

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

Bàmaagujèe ya nùfi wajen Ànuunu, ya tarar dà shii dà kàn àkûyàà gàbànsà yanàa sayàrwaa ... Tòò yàu Jumma’àa, duk mùttàanen kàuỳèè sun waawàshee, sauràa daya-n-nànn.[#wànnànn daya]... (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]:

huďu-n-nànn [#wàñwànn hudu] kadài sukà ragèè dàggà cìkìn màålàmàn dà ka yi zaamànnì dà suu à nànn

‘these four are the only ones left from the teachers that you know here’
(100) [speaker warns addressee]:

suu ukù di-n-nàn [#suu wadānnàn ukù] då ka bāa aikin kwàasar shàaraa bà za a 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 -nàn/nàn, it is the only strategy available for time-adverbs indicating temporal proximity to the utterance, as in:27

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

‘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 då hankàlinkà. Jiyà-n-nàn [#wannàn jiyà] då baa kàa nan, Sarkii yaa aikoo akà yi wà Bàlee mài cèewaa mun fayè bidi’àn nan buulaalàa dàrii… (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]:

yà cèè, à 'yan kwàanàki-n-nàn [#wàdànnàn 'yan kwàanàkii] dàakàrrun màjàlisàr dìnkìn duunìyàà suñ yì ayyükàn tàìmakòo dà jìràgen sàmà à Bosniyà.

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

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

tòò ìmmàa à 'yan kwàanàkin baaya-baaya-n-nàn [#wàdànnàn 'yan kwàanàkin baaya-baaya] jààriìðùn Nàajëeriìyàà suñ shaa bugà sharhìì dà këe suukàr gwànnàti (AHR:76)

‘but recently, Nigerian papers have been publishing editorials that criticise the government’

(105) [speaker informs addressee]:

yànu-zu-n-nàn [#wànnàn yànu-zu/yànu-yànu-n-nàn [#wànnàn yànu-yànu]
mukà ràbu dà shìì

‘we’ve just parted company with him’

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

dàazu-n-nàn [#wànnàn dàazu/dàazu-dàazu-n-nàn [#wànnàn dàazu-dàazu] ya biyoo tà oofìshiìnàa

‘he was in my office just a while ago’

(107) [speaker asks addressee]:

à cìkin dare-n-nàn [#wànnàn daree] zàa kà tàfì?

‘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. jiyâ-n-nân ‘just yesterday’, 'yan kwâanâki-n-nân ‘recently’, yânzu-n-nân ‘just now’, dâazu-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. vàayàa suunan àbi-n-nân [#wannân àbîn] dà maataa sukèe shaafàawaa à lëbbansù? ‘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 wannân 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 duuniyàa-n-nân / ?wannàn duuniyàa ta tåaru à nân wurfìn/wurï-n-nân/ ?wannàn wurfìn, ai bâa yaddà zaa à yankâa mini tsookâr jikii. (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 zai ñagàa ñagà nân wajën/waje-n-nân / ?wannàn wajën sai an fâdi gaskiyar âl’amârin

‘no one should move from this place, until the fact of the matter is stated’
The unacceptability of the pre-head HL \textit{wannan} 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 -n\textit{ān}/-n\textit{ān} usage is assumed by the speaker to be uniquely identifiable to the addressee at the moment of utterance. Now, although pre-head demonstrative HL \textit{wannan} 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 \textit{wannan} is fully exploited to highlight this relationship, e.g.:

(111) [an news report]:

\begin{quote}
\textit{an sàami rashin jiituwar dà koo kusa bài daacèè yà fàaru ba. Tòò, wannàn bàrákàà \footnote{#bàrákàà-r-n\textit{ān}} tsàkaanin jàm\textit{ī}yyûn biyu gwamnatìn mulkin sooji cee ta ruuràa ta.}
\end{quote}

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

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

\begin{quote}
\textit{Wòòwòò ... ya cèè, ‘Kùrwaataa Kur! Mun ci mun shaa bàa dòominkà ba. Sai dài in ga àlheerìi. Kà ci kànkà, kà shaa baùn ruwaa, dàn neeman tsoohon fàzaamìì!’ Tsoohoo ya wucèè yanàa kuukaa, don \textit{wannàn} baùn cikìi}
\end{quote}
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]:

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, wannan bakin ciki [#bakin ciki-n-nan] '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-nan 'this old man' is possible in (113), its presuppositionality/givenness will rule out co-reference with kai (human) 'head' with the lexically encoded new information that the mentioned head is an old (human) one. Wannan tsoohoo 'this old man' in (113) thus helps to provide the addressee with (new) supplementary descriptive information about the 'head'.

76
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 taashi, sukà yi gaisuwaa. Ya diùubi Bàlaa, ya ga duk sun yi cukuu-cükúu dà shii. Ya cèe, ‘wannàn baawàn Allàh [#baawàn Allà-n-nàn] 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 -nàn/nàn 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 -nàn/nàn 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]:
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The anomaly of post-head demonstrative -nän/nän 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 zän yi dà wannàn mùtumin?

‘what am I going to do with this guy?’

In (116), pre-head HL wannàn is used to index a non-identifiable referent (mùtumin) 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 và ràbàa ka dà wannàn rashin laafiyàa (?rashin laafiyà-r-nàn ‘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 mùtumin ‘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 -nän/nän, 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 kadâ kà kulâa dà shii, kai dai kà taasam mà duutsên dà takòbîn nan tsïraaraa. Dà kaa shîga gârfû kà yi ta reérà 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]:

Wàziiri ya taashi … ya tàfî gîdàa [yanàa] bàfîn cikîi … ya cèe ‘tun dà akà muuzântaa ni … sabòdà wannàn Bàharaajèn banzaa [#Bàharaajèn banza-n-nàn] wai shii Abdûn 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. wadànnàn [wadànñàn]) to code new (sometimes cataphoric) information is often exploited in Hausa readers to guide and/or instruct the reader/student, e.g.:


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

(120) tòo, yànzu kàrántà wannàn jàwaabìn [#jàwaabì-n-nàn] kuma don kà kwatántaa su

‘now, read this essay also so that you can compare them’ (JNH:21)
(121) kàrràntà wannànn làabaarì [#{làabaarì-n-nànn}], sànnànn kà rubùutà jàwaàbìn tambayoyoŷn dà àkà yi à kàrshen làabaarìn dà kyàkkyyaawar 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 shëekaràà biyàr dà cìkar saämûn mulkìn kànn wannànn jìhàr, inàa sòo ìn bà wà koowànnè dàya dàgà cìkinkù koo’Ìnàa yakè wannànn aikì [#{ aikì-n-nànn}: inàa sòo koowàà dà koowàà ... yà shuûkà bishiyàà (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 wannànn 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 inàà kànn hanyàatàa ta zuwààa gidàà saì na hàdù dà wannànn dànn Nàajeeriyyàà (#{ dànn Nàajeeriyyàà-r-nànn}) tààre dà wàni tsùoonà àbookkiinaa sunàà neèannà wàndà zài nuunàà mússù hànyààr zuwàà Oofìshìjn Jìkààdàncìn Nàajeeriyyàà
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'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 wannan ruwaitōowaa (# ruwaitōowa-r-nàn) dāgā kundin Galaadancii...

‘there’s this quotation from Galadanci’s dissertation …’

Notice that a post-head strategy (i.e. #dan Nàajeerivà-r-nàn ‘this Nigerian’, #ruwaitōowa-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 -nàn/nàn in (123)-(124). Note also that it would be possible to use the specific indefinite determiner (wani m., wata f., wa(dan)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]:

waddannan suu née māhimman abuubuwân dà marūbūucín ya ginà jāwaabin à kânsù. Yi nazarin 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 irin ... sai à cèe gàa kamfànìn hayâr askaa biyu. In sallàa ta zoo mûtûm bàa shi dà haalîi sai yà jee ... kà jee kà yoo hayâr rîgakâkà askaa biyu...inàa ganin wannàn kamfànín ya kàmaatà mutàanee sù buudëe ...

‘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]:

kwàrârrùn sun cèe wannàn nee zâi kasàncee gînshîfîn wàrkà dà shànîyeewàr jikìi

‘the experts say that this will be the basis for curing paralysis’

(128) [a warning to Inna]:

tòo kàdà kî barîi in kaaràa mîki 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 cèe wà gùdàa... (MJC:54)

‘when he heard this, he said to one of them ...’
(130) baaya gà haka [= wannàn] kuma, wai gàa shi inàa hanàa su barcii dà
dooguwar hiira dà mutàanan 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 bân yàrda dà haka [= wannàn] ba
‘I totally reject this’

(132) wannàn [= haka] nàa fàaruwaa in kànnà tsàye misaalin yàaadì hàmsin ko
ffi dàgà tsaujin, koo duutsèe, koo katangaa, koo baùn daajìi 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 mutàanan yàayàa zaa mù yi dà suu?
‘what’re we going to do with these (this) people?’

(134) wannàn garuuruwàà dà zàn zaanàà duk naa ziyaàrcee sù
‘I’ve visited all of these (this) towns that I’m about to mention’

(135) wannàn rigìngìmun shàri’är dà akèe ta kòôkarìn shaawo
kànsù …’
‘these (this) judicial conflicts for which efforts are being made to resolve …’
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) tōo yāu ināa sōō in yi ḋōokārii in bayyānaa muku 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 mūtūm ukū ‘some three people’, sàna’ār dīnkīi taa baa ni daamar kurdáawaa sāko-sāko na kāsar nān, wāndā (= wāfāndā ) sun hadāa dā... ‘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 -nàn/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 -nàn/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 -nàn/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. wadànnàn/wadànnàn) 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) shin wai yàayàa haalin wannàn taalikii yakè?
    ‘hey, what’s this guy’s situation like?’

    b) tòo, gàa shì nan dai yaa kaasà rìkè aìkìì dìya; 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]:
shiī ya sāa kullum ƙiyayyāa takēe zāune à ƙasan nān ... wannàn baa yāa sōn wannàn, wannàn baa yāa sōn 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]:
gāa ’yar dā zaa tā zoo tā mini wannàn tā mini wannàn à zamaanāa na duuniyāa kā jee kā yoo manā auren käaree-dangii [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]:
mutānce dā jīn hakā ƙa, sai wannàn yā dúubi wannàn, wannàn yā dúubi wannàn. Sarkii ya dúubi Liimān, ya cèe, ‘Liimān, ai sai kā taashi mū tàfì.’ (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 -nànn/nànn 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 fàāhínci juunaa ... wannàn maalámì yà kaawo taasà, wannàn maalámì 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, wài kà dàukàà kàmar gàà wannàn fushii gàà 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]:

Maisàngoo ya taashì tsàye don neeman maagànì. Òòaadàì wàjìì wannàn bookaìì, gààgàraa wàjìì wannàn maalámìì ... (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]:

88
baayii sukà faadì sukà yi gaisuwaa, sukà buudee masà yà wucèe. Yà wucè wannàn zauree ..., yà wucè wannàn zauree ... (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 jìn ‘fitoo’, sai fàarii sukà ruugoo sunàa tseeere, sù hayè wannàn dàn duuutsèe sù gangàree ..., sù hayè wannàn dàn 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 sshàshàafàa à cikì, tà sassaño wannàn itàacee tà baa shì yà sshàafàa (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 yànzu hakà àurułayyàa tsàkaanìn wàdfànnàn/wàdfànnàn ï àbììíûn kásàr dà wàdfànnàn/wàdfànnàn sai dàfà ëàrùwàa takèe yìì
‘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/nân 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/nân, 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/nân = old [+identifiable, +familiar] referent.
Table 7: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal deictics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F nân</td>
<td>speaker-proximal [+&lt;/gesture&gt;, e.g. gaa shi nân kusa da nii 'here it is here close to me'].</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wâatuoo dai muu nân... 'in short, for us here (in this pre-mentioned area)...' [cataphoric], e.g. shaawarâr dâ zân bân kâ à nân ita cèe... 'my advice to you here is ...' [temporal], e.g. nân gâba kâddan zaa kë jë sâakamakon gaanâawâr 'soon, you'll hear the result of the interview']</td>
<td>(&lt;&lt; speaker-proximal) [&lt;/gesture&gt;, e.g. (indicating) ...in na yi nân yâ yi nân '...if I move here, he moves there']</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Demonstrative (pre-head) | wannân + NP | speaker-proximal, [-identifiable] [-familiar] [</gesture>, e.g. gaa wannân takârâa (# dâ ka cèe...) 'here's this paper (# that you said...)' | (< speaker-proximal), [-identifiable], [-familiar], e.g. âmsâ wannân tâmbayâa ta fasâa 'answer this question below' |

| Demonstrative (post-head) | NP-n/-r-nân/nân | speaker-proximal, [</identifiable], [+familiar] [</gesture>, e.g. gaa takârâa-r-nân (dâ ka cèe...) 'here's this paper (that you said...)' | (<speaker-proximal), [+identifiable], [+familiar], e.g. bâa dâ âmsâ tâmbayâa-r-nân ta samâ 'answer this question (above)' |

| Demonstrative (post-head) | NP-n/-r-nân/nân | speaker-proximal, [</identifiable], [+familiar] [</gesture>, e.g. gaa takârâa-r-nân (dâ ka cèe...) 'here's this paper (that you said...)' | 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

1 In 'Western', e.g. Sokoto, Hausa, there is an additional L tone nàn adverbial which encodes a similar deictic orientation to F nàn, although on the scale of proximity, nàn has a more intimate/immediate proximal value for speakers than nàn, 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 nàn 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/nàn kusa dà nii ‘it’s here close to me’


Comparable facts have been documented for other languages. Denny (1978), for example, identified Kikuyu (Bantu) hahaha and gükű as ‘non-extended here’ (=L nàn) and ‘extended here’ (= F nàn) 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 nàn), ‘extended there in the field’ (= L cân), ‘non-extended there out-of field’ (= F cân), and ‘extended there out-of field’ (= H can). 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’.

2 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 nàn gàba ‘in future’ with H #nàn gàba, which can only occur in hearer-oriented spatial usage, e.g. nàn gàba kàdan ‘a bit further (from where you, the addressee, are); on a single page in Kraft (1963:117), all of the four known adverbials NÁN/CAN were assigned the wrong tone (except in the emphatic usage of H nàn as in shií kêè nàn); Jaggar (1992b:126, 149) also misrepresented temporal nàn gàba ‘in future’ with #nàn gàba, together with Awde (1987:52, 59, 67) #nàn gàba ‘in the future’, #dàgâ nàn kuma fàa? ‘then what?’; #nàn gàba kàdan ‘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]) váaváa 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 nān can be used with a preceding prepositional particle a to indicate an even greater specificity than is encoded with bare F nān, as in gāa biir’onkā a nān ināa rīkē 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 gāa ‘... 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 nān 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]:
yānzu kā dūubi rashin mutuncin Ibraahim; tun yanāa nān, ya daawoo nān har ya daawoo nān  [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).

9 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 jee 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 ämmaa bán 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).

10 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 addresseees 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.

11 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 nān performs both the spatial and temporal role of English ‘here’ and ‘now’.

12 See Nunberg (1993) for an exhaustive description and analysis of the indexical coding of the equivalent English ‘we’ pronoun.

13 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.

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).

Some speakers can use ƙan gaba ‘in future’ to code a time preceding the moment of utterance, e.g., à cikin jàwaàinsà na kwaanan baaya. Shàùgààa ƙà zài bààyàà manufar saabuwar dààkkàr, àmìnà sai gàà shì yàà fààsàà ‘in his recent statement, the President said he would explain the new law sometime later, but he failed to do so’. F ƙà also combines with the locative adverb baaya ‘behind’, e.g. ... ƙà baaya bàà dà jumààwàà ba ... ‘... only a while ago...’. These strategies are however rarely encountered in discourse. Of equal rarity is the possibility of using ƙà ƙàba — 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 #ƙà ƙàba for marking temporal reference. They point out that F ƙà ƙàba ‘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 não 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 kàdan akà kaamà 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 nàn performs this role in these contexts.

20 F nàn 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 nàn in (47) and elsewhere.

21 As pointed out in Jaggar and Buba (1994:415), Sokoto Hausa L nàn may be used in the second clause, i.e. in akà yi dà nìi nàn in yi nàn, 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/her* 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 wannän can be used temporally for unique reference in a specialised day-word usage, e.g. à wannän saaфиyaа/daree/raanaа/mài àlbarkàа ‘on this blessed morning/night/afternoon/month’; sai göodiyaа gà Allàh à wannän daree/raanaa mài àlbarkàа ‘let’s give thanks to God on this (special) blessed night (eve)/day’, where wannän saaфиyaа/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 -nàn/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 -nàn/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 wannan (pl. = HLH wad'annan), LH wannan (pl. = LLH wàd'annan), 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. 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 nan (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 [± distant] and [±visible]. Abraham incorrectly identified H nan as synonymous with both F cân and H can (see Chapter 4), e.g. nāa bi ta cân = 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)’; nāa ga kaayaa cân = nāa ga kaayaa nan ‘I saw a load there (visible)’. And since Abraham (1934:17) has argued that ‘nearer distance has falling tone (= nān/cân)’, equating H nan ‘there [near you the hearer]’ with cân/cân ‘(way) over there [distant from you and I]’ is clearly a contradiction of this proposed correlation. Abraham was also aware that H tone nan has important temporal and conjunctive usages (= -visible), e.g. dàgà nan saī ... ‘the next thing that happened was ...’, gàba nāa nan ‘tomorrow is another day’, and added that ‘NAN with high tone indicates ‘availability’’, e.g. döokli 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’ bār shī 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 kàzza, 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 shì 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: inaa takàrdarkà?
   ‘where is your paper?’

   b (i) Answer 1: gàa ta nân cikin littaafii
   ‘here it is in my book (the student shows it to the teacher)’

   b (ii) Answer 2: tanàa cân à gidaa
   ‘it’s there at home (the student didn’t bring it to school)’

105
It seems that the argument relating to the visible/non-visible distinction of F \( \text{nân/cân} \) and H \( \text{nân/can} \) was based on this dialogue in (1), as I could not find any use of adverbial H \( \text{nân} \) in Cowan and Schuh’s \textit{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 \textit{gàa} (look!) can combine with H \( \text{nân/can} \) to code a visible entity, e.g., \textit{gàa ta nan cikin littaafî ‘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 \( \text{nân/can} \). (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 \( \text{nân} \) is wrongly used instead of the informant’s correctly produced H \( \text{nân} \) form.

In Newman and Newman (1979:94), and Newman (1990:122, 276), H \( \text{nân} \) is defined as \([-\text{proximal}] \) and/or \([±\text{visible}] = ‘\text{there} \) (distant or previously mentioned)’, e.g. (pointing) \textit{tanàà nan kusa dà wàccan bishiyàà̄} \(^3\) ‘she is over \text{there} by \text{that} tree’, \textit{jìì nakèè yanàà nan har yànnzu ‘I think he is still \text{there} (where we were talking about before)’}. Notice that in the gloss: ‘\( \text{nân} \) \text{adv. over \text{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 \( \text{nân} \) serves to pick out referents that are proximal to the addressee, just like F \( \text{nân} \) (chapter 2) identifies objects as being proximal to the speaker. Newman and Newman were also aware of the temporal use of H \( \text{nân} \) in such temporal phrases as \( \text{nàn dà nàn} \) ‘at once’ (p. 94). Table 8 below summarises the major descriptions of H \( \text{nân} \) in the literature:
Table 8: summary of previous descriptions of H nan-adverbial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Burgery</th>
<th>Kraft/Kirk Greene</th>
<th>Cowan/Schuh</th>
<th>Newman/Newman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H nan</td>
<td>n a n  (no tones) 'here, there'</td>
<td>[±visible] [-distal] (= # căn / # can) 'there', e.g. ya a bita nan = # căn 'he passed through there' also dà gà nan sai ... 'the next thing that happened was ...'</td>
<td>[±visible] '#here', e.g. gà Audù n a n  'here's Audu # here' (nearby)</td>
<td>[±distal] '#here', e.g. gà Audù n a n  'here's Audu # here' (nearby)</td>
<td>[-visible], no examples</td>
<td>[±visible, [-proximal] 'there, (distant or previously mentioned') e.g. tanàa nan kusa dà wàccan bishiyàa 'she's over there by that tree' jìi nakèe yanàa nan har yànzu 'I think he is still there (where we were talking about before)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
not figure in his description. Galadanci’s (1969:77) examples of H nan, however, show that he was aware of the addressee-specific usage of H nan — nan zàûne daf då kuu ‘there, sitting quite near you’ (p. 77) — however, it is in the demonstrative sphere that this fact is explicitly recognised in his description of addressee-centred LH wànnan, FH wànnan (see §3.3.1).

Undoubtedly, H nan ‘there’ is the most elusive deictic adverbial, but its (locative) function is simply to individuate objects of reference that are in the vicinity of the addressee. A speaker uses H nan in its basic spatial role only when s/he wishes to draw the addressee’s attention to proximal referents relative to his/her position. So, there is a conscious shift of the deictic centre from the speaker’s to the addressee’s orientation as a result of the choice of H nan. However, as we shall see, in its extended non-spatial anaphoric (and symbolic) usages, H nan also encodes a more generalised speaker-distal interpretation, hence the following participant-oriented cline for H nan:

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearer-proximal H nan</th>
<th>Speaker-distal H nan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤____________________________________________________≥</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Non-spatial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more general schematic description of the functions of addressee-based H nan is the following:
Table 9: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based H nan adverbial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H nan</td>
<td>addressee-proximal, e.g. gaa shi nan kusa då kai 'there it is there close to you'</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. wàtàòò dai kuu nan ... 'in short, for you there (in that pre-mentioned area) ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[cataphoric], e.g. kuma à nan mukèè sàukàa gidàn Àl-hàjì Ròòò 'and it's there at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. ganii nan barli nan 'as it's seen there, so shall it be left there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. nan dà nan sai ya yàrđà 'he agreed there and then'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *ahi* 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. : *ahi, en ese lugar, donde tu estás* 'there in that place where you are' (cf. à nan wurìn nan då 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 biirönkà shii née nan kakèe rike dà shii
‘your biro, that’s it there, you’re holding it’

(4) [speaker responds to the addressee’s question: īnaa 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]:
ząunaa 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]:

-----------
nāa yi nān kaa yi nān, yàayàà kèè nān?
‘I’m headed there, and you’re headed there, what’s happening?’

In all the above contexts, H nān 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]:
   tôo kuu nān kù matsoo nān
   ‘well, you there [where you are now], move over here [where I am as I speak now]’

(9) [speaker corrects the addressee]:
   à nān ka tarar dà nii bàà nān 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 nān would be pragmatically anomalous in the following motion-oriented (spatial) contexts, e.g.:

(10) # jèè ka nān  ‘# off you go there [where you are]’

(11) # zoo nān  ‘# come there [where you are]’

(12) # tàfì nān  ‘# get there [where you are]’
(13) # mātsaa nan ‘# move there [where you are]’

(14) # tūuraa 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) bār shi nan! ‘leave it there! [where you are]’

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

(17) fitoo dāgā 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. # tāfī nan ‘go there’, nor with centripetal verbs, e.g. # zoo nan ‘come there’ when used with a second person addressee.

The deictic pro-form haka ‘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]:

shīn yāyāa maa zān zānā hōōtōn?
‘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 in 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 yìi, 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 kàr kà shaafãa mìn 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]:

hattaràa! gàa kûnaamàa nan hakà (#hakà nan) dà kài

‘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 nee ‘*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 akwaatunaa hakà-hakà a āaakìn Audù can kàrkashin gadoo kùlle fam dà kwaadunaa ...

‘some suitcases of this sort of size in Audu’s room right under the bed, securely padlocked …’

(23) [same context as above]:

wadansu nùunnunnu hakà-hakà a ràafin Bàlaa can cikin rùmbu ...

‘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 a 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 nan* would normally refer to, e.g.:

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

```
talakaawaa dai sunâa shân wâhalâa ainûn à Nâajeeriyyâa ... tòó *nan* maa dai dâhîlân à fiîlii sukê
‘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]:

```
tòó, gàa shi, âmmaa fa baayan kwaanaa ukû, ... kà tahoó minî dà kufiinaa; tun dà saafe kà zoo minî dà suu. Kaa dai san gidân à *nan* areewacin masallâacin jumma’âa (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’
```
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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 gidan ‘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.4

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 tàfì zuwàa ‘ Montreal’ à gabashin Kyanadân [tòdò] ... dàgà nan née zaa à aikàa dà sàaàkòn ... (AHR:32)

‘then5 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 Àlhàjì 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 Bạ̀kayā̀?
‘do you know Bạ̀kaya (village)?

b) B: Bạ̀kayā̀, bạ̀ na nan mukee zuwàa kòkawàa ba?
‘Bạ̀kaya, isn’t it there that we used to go for wrestling matches?’

c) A: tò, ai nạ 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 na in 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 na 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 na 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 na 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 na is thus used to capture the addressee perspective regarding the story.6
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 short while, e.g.:

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

yāu dā dare kī koomāa, āmmaa in kin jee kādā kī kiraa Zāiraḵānī don baa shi nan (MJC:37)

‘you should go back tonight, but when you go, don’t call Zāiraḵānī, because he’s not there’

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

bā kā sanū ba, ākwai fa wata takārdāa nāa nan āljihih Sarkii, ya sāa na rubūtūaa zāi sāa ā kashē 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]:

tōo, gāa ni nan tāfē (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 yārda dā kāi 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.7

H nân 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]:
   lalle haka nân nêe Audû (ZRN:2)
   ‘certainly that is so Audu’

(35) [A then explains how smallpox can blind and uses the propositional haka nân]:
   kanâa sôo kà zama haka nân? (ZRN:8)
   ‘do you want to become (like) that?’

(36) [A indicates enthusiastic support for B’s idea]:
   haka nân nêe kûwa
   ‘that’s quite right indeed

(37) [speaker acknowledges the soundness of B’s advice]:
   nii maa dai inàa jîn haka nân zâi yi âmfânii ainûn ...  
   ‘I too think that would be very useful’

See also the following anaphoric connective usages of deictic hakà nân:
(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 dìn wani lauyà na Ma’aikatar Harkookin Cikin Gidan Birtaaniyà yaa gayàa wà Üumarù 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 Tafkin 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 bàa shi dà às måfàanii ‘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 Allah ya bàa màatarsà cikli (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]:
munâa nan hakà, rân nan inàa yaawòo cikìn kàasuwàa inàa tälla, bàà saï gàà su
Àzlamù bà, ... (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 Màiisàngoo ya ga wàni bàakòon bookàa
(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 fità dà tsakà daree rân-nan, ya shigèè dòokàd daajìii shìi kaďài
(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 Wàzìirinsà ya isoo, ya yi gaisuwàa, ya ga lâlcìi Sarkìi yanàà jìn nishaadîi
rân-nan
‘then his Vizier arrived, bowed, and realised that the king was definitely in a
good mood that day’ (MJC:194)

(45) yanàà nan kàn aikînsà, sai aâà zoo masà dà làabaarìn ràsuwàr mahàîfînsà
‘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 tañà dinkìn wani àbu, àlàhaalii kùwa båa koomee hannuntà. Dattijôn
naakà nàa nan dai dükushe 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 ràn-nan ‘one day’ in (42) and
specific ràn-nan ‘that day’ in (43)-(44). (Jaggar (1985a:127) confuses the two
variants, wrongly glossing ràn-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 Faada ya biyaa kuñin buulaalàa, akà båa Dooloo ràbonsà ya yi gidaa
Dàgà nan darajàr Sarkin Faada 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 sàa bààkkii yà buudèe, sai gàà wata muujìyyaa à zàune, ... dàgà nan Wàziìri 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]:

\textit{nan tâake} ya bii shi, sukà gayàa và sauraa àbin då akèe ciki ...(MJC:72)

'he followed him \textbf{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]:

\textit{sabòodà haka} koo då akà làalàbee shi då bàtun sàràutàà, \textit{nan då nan} sai ya ýàrda

(MJC:74)

'thus, when he was approached about succeeding to the throne, he \textbf{immediately} accepted'

A possible addressee orientation in all these pro-temporal \textit{nan}-marked deictic adverbials is easier to see if we think of the choice of \textit{H nan} as a strategy by the speaker to maximise the possibility of the addressee making the right temporal inference. \textit{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 \textit{H nan} is in the compound deictic expression \textit{(shii) kée nan} 'that's \textbf{it}, \textbf{that}'s all, \textbf{OK}' (again observe the use in English of speaker-distal 'that'). Cowan and Schuh (1976:167), for example, claim that \textit{kée nan} is synonymous with the copula \textit{nee/cee}, e.g.:

(51) haalin ýàaraa nèe \hspace{1cm} 'it's childish behaviour'

= 

(52) haalin ýàaraa \textit{kée nan} \hspace{1cm} '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 H 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 maagàninkù kèe nan (#nee). An cèe kù yì matà auree sòn saataa yaa hànàa 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 (MJC: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 àkwàatùn sai akà rubùutaa zuwàa gà Ma’aikatar Harkookin Wàje, gwammatìn tàarayyar Nàajeriyyà, Îkkò, wàatòò 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 kēe 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 kēe nan sai na koomàa gidàa

‘that was that, then I left for home’

(57) [speaker assures addressee]:

shii kēe 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]:
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àmmaa gàa fusookinsù dà Kiràajansù nan dük à sàale (AHR:69)¶
‘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 tuuklí ... (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 isa Siiriyàn Kwàà à Birnin Kanò (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]:

muka shiryàa, muka gudù, gàa mu nan har wani gàríi dà akèè kiràà 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]:

\[ jii \text{ nan, barii } \text{ nan } \quad \text{‘listen there, leave it there’} \]

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]:

\[ t\ddot{o}, \text{ ai gàa irîntà nan } \ldots[TG] \]

‘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]:

\[ t\ddot{o}, \text{ gàa ta } \text{ nan, bà kù san àbu ba kù tsayàa dà gardamàr rainin wàayoo} \]

(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 shì nàn gàa ka, tun dà yàkè baa kàa jìn màgànàr mútaànne
‘there, you go with him, since you don’t listen to people’s plea’

(68) [in answer to inquiry about A’s daughter]:

gàa tà nàn sài yàddà takè sòó takè yìì
‘she’s just there, doing what she feels like’

(69) [speaker feels that s/he’s been vindicated]:

bàa gàa irìn tà nà ba, wàn dà bâì jì bàrì bâ, ai yàa jì hoo hà
‘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 jì yà yi. Ai dùuniyàa cee, gàa shì nàn gàa tà, koowaà tà àuraa yàu, gòòbe
kàa jì àa ràbu dà shìi (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 nàn psycholinguistically reinforces the validity of the speakers’ utterance, and distances him from addressees’ position/behaviour in (66)-(70) above. H nàn 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 nàn 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]:

bāa wani nan, ai dāa man kun san inàa dà wandà nakèe sòo [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]:

dāa abinci nèe Sarkii ya kaawoo mukù dàa yànzu kunàa nan kunàa hannuu baka 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:
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(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]:

àmməa də ya tuñəa də cëewaa tsoohon Sarkin nán gàa shi nən garau kəmar koowâcè raanəa kaa{name}a màsà kərﬁi akèe yiî ... (MJC:65)
‘but when he remembered that this old king is there and (looking) healthy as though he’s being powered anew everyday...’

H nən 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 nən is used with its more opaque speaker-distal value as a formulaic response to standard Hausa greetings, e.g.:

(74) A: yàayàà iyaa’lii? B: sunàa nən laaﬁyàa lau
‘how are the family?’ ‘they’re there, just fine’

(75) A: ìnaa Uwaani? Na cëe koo tanàa laaﬁyàa? B: tanàa nən laaﬁyàa
(MJC:129)
‘how’s Uwani? Is she alright?’ ‘she’s there, just fine’

The reason behind the symbolic use of existential H nən in (74)-(75) are naturally explicable in terms of our model. F nàn (chapter 2) would be situationally inappropriate, since it would force its default speaker-proximal reading, and use of F càn or H càn [chapter 4] would similarly induce an inappropriate spatial-physical meaning. Respondent B therefore uses H nən 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
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nan in a comparable social act in the following standard student exchange in (76a-b):

(76) a) A: yàayàà kàrààatuu? b) B: munàà nan munàà ta tabàawaa

‘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.) wàdànnan, FH wànnan, HLH (pl.) wàdànnan (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan demonstratives

Analogous to the addressee-based deictic adverbial H nan are the pre-head demonstratives LH wànnan/ FH wànnan 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 wannan etc. (+NP), FH wannan etc. (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan

Bargery (1934:1081) identified LH wannan ['that'] as coding a distal space relative to the speaker’s position, e.g. təfi də wannan dookii ‘take that horse’, wannan bàa nàawa ba nèe ‘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 wannan and speaker/addressee-remote/distal LH wàncan is completely unaccounted for. Nor was he able distinguish LH wannan ‘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 wannan, 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) wannan shaafoo = shaafo-n-nan ‘the hawk in question’

Abraham (1962:924) also implies that LH wannan shaafoo ‘the hawk in question’ and LH wàncan shaafoo are semantically equivalent (cf. also dooki-n-nan = dooki-n-can ‘that horse in question’ (Abraham, 1959:135). Abraham in fact analysed a whole range of (tonally distinct) pre-head WANAN and WANCAN demonstratives as synonymous alternatives.
There are also long forms e.g. wannan shaafoo = wannan shaafoo ‘the hawk in question’. Alternatives are: wancan shaafoo = wancan shaafoo; wannan garii = wannan garii = wancan garii = wancan garii ‘the town in question’;
waɗanann dawaakii = waɗanann dawaakii = waɗancan dawaakii = waɗancan dawaakii; ‘the horses in question’ (Abraham, 1959:136).

However, we can straightway refute the claim that LH wannan and LH wancan 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 wannan counterpart in wannan shaafò ‘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 wannan and FH wannan 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/wàncàn = [+visible]); and (2) demonstratives referring to something mentioned or understood in a conversation or narrative (i.e. wannàn/wàncàn = [-visible]).’ Thus, spatial demonstratives have a high-low (HL) tone pattern (= HL wannàn/wàncàn), whereas anaphoric demonstratives, according to Cowan and Schuh, have a low-high [LH] tone pattern (= LH wannàn/wàncàn), e.g. :
(78) wannan bàraawdo 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 ingar[m]à-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 wannan ‘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 wannan 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 -nàn/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 wannan, FH wànnan. But they differ on an important point, because for Galadanci, pre-head LH wannan 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 wannan, but also its post-head demonstrative -nan variant, i.e. wannan dookii = dooki-n-nan ‘that horse we know about’. Galadanci went on to claim that pre-head demonstrative FH wànnan 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 wànnan 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 wànnan 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. riigā-r-nan #‘this gown (previously referred to)’, aikī-n-nan #‘this work (previously referred to), kujeerār-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 wàdànnan, 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.9

The problem with this description, however, is that it seems to preclude the possibility of including pre-head HL wannan, and its post-head -nân/nân counterpart in anaphoric contexts (chapter 2). There is an implicit (and often explicit) assumption that only (FH wannan) LH wannan 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 wannan anaphorically, 'in direct speech contexts', and symbolically, ... và kai wannan gàrii ... và kai wannan..., he seemed to imply that the LH wannan 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 wannan in contexts similar to those where Jaggar coded LH wannan. Quite apart from Schuh's personal comment concerning speaker/dialectal variation (reported in Jaggar (p. 175), and the relatively few occurrences of LH wannan, FH wannan 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 wannan 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 wannan, (LH wannan 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 wannan 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 wannan with LH wancan, e.g. wannan/wancan Ø [nêellya gudù ‘that particular/very (boy) was the one who ran away’ (Mohmed, 1977:145). Both of these claims are wrong: LH wannan has a basic *spatial* orientation, locating referent objects near the addressee, and is not to be confused with speaker/addressee-distal LH wancan (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). One of the central arguments I will be making in this section is that post-head -n/r-nan (≠ pre-head LH wannan 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, lamiiran nuunin jibintakāa and the referential ones lamiiran tsukācii. This is however incorrect, but Bagari even goes on to make a further erroneous claim that: bambancin lamiiran nuunin jibintakāa då takwaroorinsù màasu nuunin tsukācii shii nèe kawai karin sawûnsù (tones
the difference between spatial demonstratives and their referential counterparts is in their tonal variation only (italics mine) (p. 114) i.e. HL wannan = wancàn [= spatial]; LH wannan = wàncan [= anaphoric]. Notice that LH wannan 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 wannan. Bagari also mentions the post-head -n/r-nan counterpart, but with an anaphoric only meaning, e.g. A: kaa tunàa dà mutàanè-n-nan dà mukà ganii jiyà? B: li, wàddànnan màasu jaajàayan 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 wannan [pl. LLH wàddànnan] is glossed as: 1. that, that one (nearby). 2. That, that one (the one referred to) (p. 132), e.g. wannan itàacee = itàace-n-nan ‘that (specific) tree’, kaa tunàa dà gidà-n nan dà mukà yì màganàà à kài? ‘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 wannan 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 wannan, FH wannan 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 wannan, FH wannan, NP-n/r
-nan demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LH wannan (+NP)</th>
<th>Burgery</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Cowan and Schuh</th>
<th>Howeidy</th>
<th>Galadanci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wannan [+distal], e.g. tafi da wannan dookli 'take that horse'</td>
<td>[+visible] e.g. wannan shaafo = shaafo-n-nan 'the hawk in question'</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan baraaawdo 'that thief'</td>
<td>[±visible], addressee-proximal e.g. wannan 'that'</td>
<td>[±visible], addressee-proximal e.g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wannan = wancan shaafo 'that hawk'</td>
<td>yaya saabon ingarma-n-nan 'how's that new stallion?'</td>
<td>post-head -nan (no examples)</td>
<td>wannan dookli 'that horse'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wannan = wancan nee va gudu 'that was the one who ran away'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wannan 'that horse'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 wannan, FH wannan and the post-head demonstrative -nan, within the following pragmatic paradigm:
### Table 11: summary of the semantic-pragmatic functions of addressee-proximal LH wannan, FH wannan, NP-n/r-nan (also speaker-distal) demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative (pre-head)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH wannan, FH wannan +NP</td>
<td>addressee-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar], [+gesture]</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; address-proximal) wànnan 'yar fiistàa kadai sulée tàthàtìn sukà sàyèe tà ‘... that small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them’</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; address-proximal) FH wànnan (only) ... in na cée wànnan yà cée baa wànnan ba. In kuma na cée wànnan yà cée baa wànnan ba ‘if I say this (one), he’ll say not that (one), he’ll again say that (one)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bāa ni wànnan takàrdao ‘give me that paper’</td>
<td>[in focus] [short distance anaphor]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In a contrastive context, FH wànnan encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. bāa wànnan ba, wànnan ‘not that (one), that (closer one)’</td>
<td>[activated] LH wannan encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. aí dölë nee å sookà wànnan zaabée ‘it was inevitable that that election was cancelled’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative (post-head)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-nan</td>
<td>addressee-proximal [+familiar] [+identifiable] [-gesture]</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; address-proximal) [+identifiable] [+familiar] bāa ni bìrò-n-nan ‘give me that pen’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bāa ni bìrò-n-nan ‘give me that pen’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2. Spatial LH wànnan etc. (+NP), FH wànnan etc (+NP), NP-n/r-nan

Addressee-proximal demonstratives can occur pre-head, in which case they have the form LH wannan (pl. LLH wàdànnan), FH wannan (pl. HLH wàdànnan)+NP ‘that/those’, or post-head NP-n (m./pl.)/-r (f.)-nan ‘that, those’.\(^{11}\)

Pre-head demonstrative LH wànnan etc and its post-head demonstrative -n/r-nan counterpart, like the adverbial H nan, are essentially address-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 address-proximal relative to the speaker’s position at the moment of utterance, as in (79)-83):\(^{12}\)
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 wannan 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 wannan (FH wannan), 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-ŋ-r-nàn/nàn ‘this NP’ in chapter 2.

Table 12: Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski’s (1993: 275) The Givenness Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in focus</th>
<th>activated</th>
<th>familiar</th>
<th>uniquely identifiable</th>
<th>referential</th>
<th>type identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{it}</td>
<td>{that}</td>
<td>{that N}</td>
<td>{the N}</td>
<td>referential</td>
<td>indefinite this N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{this}</td>
<td>{this N}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{a N}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 wàdfànnan (= wàdfànnan) kùjjèruu dà kèe nan kusa dà kàai

‘bring those chairs (near you) that are right there close to you’

(85) kàawo kùjjèerû-n-nan à nān

‘bring those chairs (near you) here’

(86) bāa shì wànnan (= wànnan) wàsìikàa dà kèe gàbànki yà kàai mà Ùsmān

‘give him that letter that is in front of you to take to Usman’

(87) bāa shì wàsìikà-n-nan yà kàai mà Ùsmān

‘give him that (only) letter to take to Usman’

(88) don Allàh jàawò mìn hankàlin wànnan (= wànnan) maaÌàmìn mài farin kaayaa

‘please, call the attention of that gentleman in white towards me’

(89) don Allàh jàawò mìn hankàlin maaÌàmû-n-nan

‘please, call the attention of that gentleman in white towards me’

(90) biyòò mìn dà wànnan (= wànnan) kwaàlin àshaanàa

‘bring me that packet of matches along’

(91) biyòò mìn dà kwaàlin àshaanû-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) wàdànǹ kùjèeruu/wáccè wàsiìkkàa/wànnè maalàmmì?

‘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 daukâa '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 ganîi, 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]:

dùubî wànnan dài sôosai kî ganîi koo yanàa yi mìkî

'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 wànnan, and it usually contrasts with LH wànnan to distinguish between two conflicting addressee-centred
referents. In such a contrastive spatial context, FH wannan is the form used to indicate the referent which is closest to the addressee, while LH wannan encodes the referent furthest from the location of the addressee, e.g.:

(97) [carpenter orders his apprentice]:

a) bāa ni wannan sùkùddireebà?
   ‘give me that screwdriver’

b) [apprentice picks up the wrong one, and carpenter redirects him]
   bāa wannan nakèe bùkàatàa ba, wannan na kusa da 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 wannan as in (98)-(99):

(98) [speaker advises addressee]:
   wannan bà tà daacèe dà kee ba
   ‘that one (e.g. colour) does not suit you’

(99) [same context as above]:
   kadà maa kì gwàddà wannan, don bàa zài yi mìkì 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 wàddànnan (= pl. of FH wannan), LLH wàddànnan (= pl. of LH wannan), 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 wànnan is neutralised in the post-head -nan:

(100) [child protests at mother’s choice]:

màama, nii baa nàa sòn wàfànnan (wàfànnan) tufaaffi
‘mum, I don’t like those clothes (that you’re about to hand over to me)’

(101) [A orders B]:

dàuki wàfànnan (wàfànnan) kùjéerrún là kài cân
‘take those chairs over there’

(102) [A tells B]:

fàdàa wà mütàanè-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 wànnan etc. (+NP), LH wànnan etc. (+NP), NP+-n/r-nan
Of the two explicit pre-head demonstrative determiners, I will show that FH wànnan (pl. HLH wàdànnan) 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 -nän/-nän strategy (chapter 2) turned out (statistically) to be the more frequently employed anaphoric option than its pre-head wannän 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative form</th>
<th>Demonstrative from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-head NP+-n/e-nan</td>
<td>Pre-head FH wannän (LH wannän) + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The post-head demonstrative -nän 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 -nän and pre-head demonstrative FH wannän (LH wannän) 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 -nän in a written narrative context. He showed that ‘the N + demonstrative (= post head -nän) 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

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 Wâziiri ya sâa akâ säami âlbasàa ... Wâziiri ya cêe, ‘Murâ! Ai làabaarin
    murâ sai in gayàa wà wani. Kù kaawoo masà âlbasà-n-nan (#wânnan / #wànnan
    âlbasàa)’ (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’yâan sarkii, har màasu tàaàkamaa dà sulèe sun tàarù ... tòo cìkin
    ’yaa’yâan saraakunà-n-nan (#wàddànnan / #wàdànnàn’yaa’yâan saraakunâa) dà
    Màama ta kunyàtàa, kaa tunàa dà wani ... gàjëere ... ? (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 sallaààa, đan sarkii ya koomâà gàrìnsù ... lookàcì-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan
    lookàciì) dà sukà ràbu kòo dà àsàlàtàtà 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 sāami laayār yīn kurciyaa ... sai ya dāuki laayā-r-nan (#wānnan / #wānnan laayān) ya dāurāa matā (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 wannan (also LH wannan), 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 gamā kai dā wata makulliyar sarkii ... ‘tōo mēe ya yi wā makulllyā-r -nan (#wānnan / #wānnan 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 zuwāa tsakad daree, Jākaadiyaa ta zoo ta gayāa wā baayii ... cikin darē-ŋ -nan (#wānnan / #wānnan daree) màasu dawaakii sukā hau sukā 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 shìgàrsù sai Baawà ya ga àsheè ciki sai kà cèè gidan wani sarkii nèe ... Can yaa farkàa, sai ya gan shì kuyaa cikin raanaa. Gidà-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan gidaa) mài kyàu duk yaa bacèë (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 mà baaya ya sakoo tàاكamaa ya zoo gidin tsamiyà-r-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan tsamiyaa) ... ya säuka yà yi sallàa. Dà na zoo na gan shì nan, duk ràinaa ya baaci (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 koomàà shàn laamìi bàà roomoo dà tàushee, ya lùura kuma ya ga tsoohuwàr bàà tà dà fàra’àà kàmar dàà, sai ya cèè, ‘Innà hàlàamìàà kudîn-n-nan (#wàdànnan / #wàdànnan kudî) sun kaàrèë? ... (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 haka sai ya yi tsàmmaanii maakirçin dà ya kullàa wà Abdùn Ugù kwaanan nànan yaa ci turàa, tun dà gàaa shì màimakon à kóoree shì har zaa à yi masà kjàautaa, don yà jee yà kwaaso ìyyaàñinsà. Sai ya fàara túnànanin yaddà zài yi masà wàâyoo yà karbè takàrdâr, shìi yà kai, in am baayar shìi yà saacè rabìi, yà bàa Abdùn Ugù rabìi. Sabòòdà haka ya cèe wà Abdùn Ugù, ‘Ai kòò hanyak-n-nànan (#wànnan / #wànnan hanyakàa) bàa ta dà kyàu, àkwai ‘yam fashìi cìkin dàn daaji-n-nànan (#wànnan / #wànnan daajìi) na tsàkaanìn Yàna dà Bùgààbìri’ (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 tsàamiyà-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 kudì-n-nànan ‘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 hanyâ-n-nan ‘that road’, daaji-n-nan ‘that forest’ (all are along Abdu’s road). My claim that FH wannan (also LH wannan) is an immediate (short-distance) anaphoric marker holds for these contexts as well. For a pre-demonstrative FH wannan 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 wannan 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]:

\[\text{gà mafii yawan 'yan Nàajeeriyyà, 6ullôowar jirgin ruwâ-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan jirgin ruwa) mài suunaa 'Britannia' à gaabàr têekun ìkko kwànnan baaya, ita cèe àlàamàa ta farkoo dà ta nuunà cèewaa 'yan gidan sàràutàr Birtaaniyyà suunà ziyaaràr Nàajeeriyyà (AHR:8)}\]

‘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]:

\[\text{‘yan sàndaa ... sun kuma wargàzà fùngiyar bàwànnan bààraawó-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan bàwànnan bààraawóó) mài suunaa ‘Lawrence Anini’... (AHR:15)}\]

‘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 Musulmii ... yaa yi kiràa gà jàma’àrsà dà sù yi bìris dà wasu tàkàrduu dà akèe ràrràbàawàa) ... gàme dà rìkici-n-nan (#wànnan / #wànnan rìkicii) na Teekun Paasha (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 deductible 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. #wàdànnan), LH wànnan (pl. #wàdànnan):

(116) [a report about a snake that remains uncookable]:

yanàa dàya dàgà cìkin irìn màçìizà-n-nan (#wàdànnan / #wàdànnan màçìizai)
nèe màasu dafìn 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]:

154
zaa à bugà littaafi-n-nan (#wânnan / #wânnan littaafii) na Salman Rushdie, ...
wâatòo marùɓùucin littaafi-n-nan na Aayooyn Shàidàn (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 ammaa irin mabuusa-r-nan (#wânnan / #wânnan mabuusaa) mai kàmàa dà àlgaitàà dà akèè kiràa ‘saxophone’, ita cèè koowaa ya fi dangàntà kàɗe-kàɗen 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 èkwaà matùƙar bùƙaatar ragà irin hadnùrà-n-nan (#wàɗànnan / #wàɗànnan hadnùràa) dà bàà gairà bàà dàliiili dà maataa kèe fûskantàà wajen haïhiwaa (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’,13 as indicated in (115)-(119), include wàatòo ‘that is’, irin ‘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]:

cuuta-r-nan (#wannan / #wanan cuutâr) mài karyâ gârkuwar jikii — wàatatîo
AIDS—cuuttaa cèe dà akèe bazàawaa ta jinii 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 cêe yaa hadîyyee hoodâr ... wàddâ takè à cìkin roobàa — wàatatîo
ábfî-n-nan (#wannan / #wanan àbîn) dà akèe àmfàaanii dà shii don hanà
haifûwaa (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 dâurè wasu jáami’an tsàron fàsar Nàajeeriyyàa biyu wadàndà akà zàrgaa
dà laifûn kashè Dele Giwa, wàatatîo dan jàriidâ-r-nan dà ya rasà rànsà à dâliiîfin
wani bâm dà akà aikoo masà ta cìkin wàsiikuun tun shèekarår alif dà dàrii târà dà
tâmàaanin 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
wanàn. Consider the following:
Màama ta cèe, ‘Zàń tèmbàyyèe sù inaa nèe raanii kèe shèèkaràà, kuma inaa dààminoraa kèe shèèkaràà’... Tòo cikin ’yaa’yan saraakùnà-n-nan (#wàdànnan / #wàdànnan) ’yaa’yan saraakùnàa) dà Màama ta kunyàtaa, kaa tunà wàni dàn gàjèsirëc dà ta cèe masà kàmar an kifèe dà kwàndùù? Àshee duk yaa fi surànn zuúcìyàa. Koo dà ya tàfi gidàa, dàa maa duk tùnàänin àbin dà zàì yi wà yàarrìnyà-n-nan yakèe doò yà raamìàa, bàì saamùù ba) ... [tòo] yaànàa nan sai ya ji bàtun wànnàà tèmbàyyàà ... (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, wànnàà tèmbàyyàà ‘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 saraakùnà-n-nan. (Note too that tèmbàyyà-r-nān ‘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 -nān 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 wànnàà 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 wànnàà the first natural choice.
But in the following extracts, repeated from chapter 2, we see how the speaker-based post-head -nàñ/-nàn pragmatically differs from its addressee-based -nàñ counterpart:

(124) [Bamaguje pays a visit to Anunu, the dishonest butcher]:

Bàmaagujèe ya nùfi wajen Ànuunu, ya tarar dà shiì dà kàñ àkuyàà gàbansà yanàà sayârwaa ... Tòò yàù Jumma’àà, duk mutànanè kàuyèè sun waawàashee, sauraa d’àyà-n-nàn (d’àyà-n-nàn, #wànnàñ / #wànnàñ d’àya)... (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]:

hudù-n-nàn (hudû-n-nàn, #wàdànnàn / #wàdànnàn hudû) kadài sukà ragèè dàgà cìkin mààlàmàn dà kà yi zaamànìì dà suù à nàn

‘these four are the only ones left from the teachers that you know here’

(126) [speaker warns addressee]:

suù ukù ðì-n-nàn (suù ukù ðì-n-nàn, #suù wàdànnàn / wàdànnàn ukù) dà kà bàà aìkin kwààsàr shààraa bà zaa sù ìyàà 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 wannan to be felicitous, it must have an antecedent in the immediately intervening context, which leaves us with post-head -nàn. The crucial distinction between the post-heads -nàn/nàn and -nàn 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 -nān/nān and -nan strategy (only) as slot-fillers in: yàayàà suunan âbì-n-nān (âbì-n-nan, #wannàn/#wannan âbù) dà maatta sukke shaaфаawaa a lleбыனsù? ‘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 wānnan 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 wānnan.

Exploitation of the in focus function of FH wānnan 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 wannàn baawàn Alläh, gàa shì yaarbo sàrdiiidii, àmmaa gàjartàà kàmar an kifèe dà kwàndoo. ‘Dan dàgígèe! Dàa wānnan tsòoloolôn (#tsòoloolô-n-nan) na kusa dà kai yaa sam màkà tsawonsà kàfàn 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 kà kàshèe mini nàawa, nàa dàuki faatâr nàa kà kàntinsù. Wānnan ’yar faatâa (#’yar faatâ-r-nan) kàdài sulèe tâlantin sukà sàyyee 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 tùrâwaa ba ... wànnan mutàannee (#mutàanè-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: kài zaafì nàn kìlìlà àlàììmun yawan ruwàa nèe

‘hey, it seem that this heat is a sign of a big downpour’

B then responds to A’s monologue:

b) B: in Maalan ya zoo kìlìlà yà baa mú bàyaanìi gàme dà wànnan lamàrii (#lamàri-n-nan) [ZMA]

‘perhaps, if Malam arrives he’ll explain that issue to us’

(131) a) A: dàgà nàn har ìretàrà yeke tàfiyàà yànnà neeman tsoohuar leedàà

‘from here, he goes right up to the other end looking for used bags’

b) B: nàa ga mazàjeè sunàà wànnan himmàà (#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 Maalâm ya zoo kiilâ yà baa mû bâyaânii âame dà lamàrî-*n-nan*

‘perhaps, if Malam arrives he’ll explain **that** issue to us’

(133) Na ga mazâajèè 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) Fasaïïî: ashee maa misàalan sun fi gàrgàdfii daadîi. Â kaaràa mini …

Fasih: ‘so, examples are more enjoyable than advice. I want more …’

Wàziiri: kai dai riîke *wànnan* … (MJC: 17)

Waziri: ‘you memorise **that** (one) first …’
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 kèe dà wùyaa ... (MJC: 39)
Tsohuwa: ‘that (one) is going to be difficult …’

Maisàngoo: 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 …’

Nwàanko: wannàn èl’àmàrii wai bàa inkè, shàìdùunaa bakwàì nàa nàa, duk kòò màlàlàmài. Dàà àlkaalin Randagi har yàa cèe in yankàà, Bàlàa ya cèe bàì yàrda dà shàrì’àr 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’

Àlkaali: tsàyaa, nìi bànn tàmmàyèe kà duk wàfànnàn ba (MJC: 100)
Alkali: ‘stop it, I didn’t ask you about all those’

Ubàa: bàà wani gàrgàdii dà zànn kàaràa makà dà ya fi abùubuwà-n-nàa
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: wàfànnàn ai koo inàa bàrcù akà taà dà nìi, nàà fàdèe 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 wannan (= in focus) and the variant LH wannan (= 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 wannan 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 gudaa ya ragée mú ðaukàa ìdan munàa sòn mú yi nasarà;
      wannàn shii nèe mú yì bòoren nuunà kìn jinin saabuwar gwamnatin
      ‘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: wannan (#wannan) màganàr hákà 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: shin kaa jì làabaarìn wai gwamnàin sooji zaa tà sàki mulkì?
      ‘did you hear the news that the military government is apparently going to step down?’

   b) B: wannan (#wannan) làabaariì fa bàà jiitta-jiita ba née [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 wannan to indicate this. Moreover, there can be no ambiguity regarding the antecedent reference point given the use of FH wannan; 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 infelicity of LH wannan in (139)-(140) is to do with its more remote, *activated* status. Pre-head demonstrative LH wannan may even be ambiguous in certain contexts, e.g.:

(141) [In a radio interview discussing the problem of cancellation of elections]:

\[
\text{ai doolē nee à sooke wannan zaaBee.}
\]

‘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]:

\[
\text{wannan rigimàa ta cèewaa bà à yárda da suu ba ita cèe ta haifar då wannan}
\]

‘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 wannan 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 wannan — 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 wannan is not tied to the interviewer’s (addressee) statement in the same way as pre-head.
FH wannan would infer. Notice also that in this particular interview, reference has been made to numerous other (potentially ambiguous) zàaabee ‘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 wannan:

(143) [interviewer asks a farmer about his impression concerning the nature of the village farmlands, since his arrival there]:

wàatòo cikin lookàcin dà ka zoo Baari, shììn dà wannan lookàcin dà yànzù, kaa lùura dà wani canjin yanàyìn yàddà kasar goona 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 wannan lookàciì mutàânèe tålàatin 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 wannan in an anaphoric context, but largely in this intermediate activated role between in focus FH wannan and familiar post-head demonstrative -nan (see Jaggar 1985b:133).
In pro-nominal co-referencing, the overwhelming choice between FH wannan and LH wannan is the former. Anaphoric FH wannan picks up on only the most recent antecedent, as in:

(145) [speaker responds disagreeably to a proposition]:

tôo, wannan (#wannan) bâa nân ba kuma

‘well as for that, not here (you can’t get away with that here)’

(146) [speaker corrects an impression]:

wannan (#wannan) ai bâa aikîn jâm’iyyår 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]:

wannan (#wannan) kuma koowaa nàà dà râ’ayinsà

‘as for that, everyone has his/her own opinion [about it]’

The underlying assumption informing the speaker’s choice of FH wannan 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 wannan, 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 wadànnan (s. = wannan) and LLH wàdànnan (s. = LH wannan). 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 wadànnan (= pl. of FH wannan) 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]:

\[\text{wadannan/wàdànnan likitoocii} \text{ (}\#\text{likitoocí-n-nan}) \text{ dà ka àmbàtaa suù sukà bincikoo aìbin dà cùutâr kèe janyôowaa} \]

‘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]:

\[\text{wadannan/wàdànnan likitoocii} \text{ (}\#\text{likitoocí-n-nan}) \text{ dà akà àmbàtaa suù sukà bincikoo aìbin dà cùutâr kèe janyôowaa} \]

‘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, wadànnan/wàdànnan nèe na tûntubàa lookàcìn dà na kàarnu dà cùutâr

‘well, those [that you have just mentioned] are the very ones that I consulted when I caught the disease’

(150) dà sanìì wadànnan/wàdànnan likitoocii nèe akà yi ta ðûràà wà maràsaal

laafiyàa jiniii ...

‘it was with the knowledge of those doctors that patients were continually being injected’

(151) tòo, ai wadànnan/wàdànnan màgàngànnùn maa suù su kèe dàda zugà jàmà’aa
but, in fact, those statements are the type that further infuriate the people.

An interesting fact that pre-head FH wannan shares with its pre-head HL wannan counterpart is the relatively high proportion of FH wannan 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 wannan is anaphorically possible, it too has a far less frequency of occurrence than it is for FH wannan. In one transcription of an extended interview conducted between Graham Furniss and the Hausa novelist/broadcaster, Suleiman Katsina, the Hausa interviewee used LH wannan only on two occasions to code what appears to be a new referent, e.g. too shii née ya kée mën wannan báyaanii yanàa cëewaa .... 'well, that’s why he was explaining to me that ...'. In this interview alone, I counted 69 tokens of FH wannan, 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 wannan (only)

As I have shown in (chapter 2, §2.2.) dealing with symbolic HL wannan, 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 wannan 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 wànnan:

(152) [speaker describes an incident to the addressee]:

hakà dai mukà yi ta yìi; in na cée wannàn yà cée bàà wànnan ba; in kuma na cée wannàn yà cée bàà wànnan kuma ba; kâi har dai na gâji na yi tâfiyâataa)

‘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 wànnan 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 wàdànnan / HLH wàdànnan) and the post-head demonstrative -nan are not attested in symbolic usage, mirroring the unacceptability of the speaker-proximal HLF wàdànnàn and post-head demonstrative -nàñ/nàñ 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 wànnan +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 wannan 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 wannan and LH wannan may be used only where there is an explicit reference in the discourse context, with FH wannan 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 wannan (pl. wadannan) which is used by the speaker to indicate the object closest to the addressee. Activated LH wannan (pl. wàdànnan) encodes the more remote object in such contrastive context. However, in the absence of an implied contrast, of the two explicit forms LH wannan is the default spatial deixic, as is FH wannan the default anaphoric form.

Table 14 summarises the distinctive referential-pragmatic properties of the deixtic elements we have examined:
| Table 14: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based deictics |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Spatial**                     | **Anaphoric**                   | **Symbolic**                    |
| Adverbial                       | Adresssee-proximal, e.g.        | (speaker-distal << addresssee-proximal) |
| H nan                           | gāa shi nan kusā dā kāi 'there it is there close to you' | e.g. ganii nan bāri nan 'as it's seen there, so shall it be left there' |
|                                 | (speaker-distal << addresssee-proximal) | e.g. wàatōo dāi kū nan ... 'in short, for you there (in that pre-mentioned area) ...' |
|                                 | [cataphoric], e.g. kuma à nan mukēe sàukaa gidan Alhaji Rooró 'and it's there precisely at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay' | |
|                                 | [temporal], e.g. nan dā nan sai ya yārda 'he agreed there and then' | |
| **Demonstrative**               | addresssee-proximal [-identifiable] | (speaker-distal << addresssee-proximal) |
| (pre-head)                      | [-familiar]                      | e.g. wānnan 'yar fańtā kā' dāi sulē tālātīn sukā sāyee tā '... that small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them' |
| LH wānnan,                      | bāa ni wānnan takārdaa 'give me that paper' | |
| FH wānnan +NP                   | [+ gesture]                      | [in focus]                      |
|                                 | [non-presupposed]                | [short distance anaphor]        |
|                                 | In a contrastive context, FH wānnan encodes the closest addresssee-based referent, e.g. bāa wānnan ba wānnan 'not that (one), that (closer one)' [= in focus] | |
| | In a contrastive context, [activated] LH wānnan encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. ai doolē nee a sookē wānnan zā a bēe 'it was inevitable that that election was cancelled' | |
| **Demonstrative**               | addresssee-proximal [+identifiable], [+familiar] | (speaker-distal << addresssee-proximal) |
| (post-head)                     | [+gesture]                       | e.g. wānnan (only) |
| NP+ -n/r-nan                    | bāa ni biirō-n-nan 'give me that pen' | ... in na cēe wānnan yā cēe bāa wānnan ba; in kuma na cēe wānnan yā cēe bāa wānnan ba 'if I say this (one) he'll say not that (one); and if I say this (one), he'll again say not that (one)' |
|                                 | [presupposed]                    | |
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3. 3. Deictic ‘DIN’

The deictic particle ‘DIN’ (= H di-n or F di-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 di-n may occur as a demonstrative to mean ‘that, those’ following a numeral, e.g. (morphological segmentation added) littàttàfankà suu ukù ?dî-n ‘those three books of yours’. It may also follow an ‘emphatic or personal pronoun’, e.g. tàfi dà wannàn ?dî-n ‘take this away’, as well as the pro-sentential deictic hàkà in hàkà di-n zaa à yi ‘this/that is the way to do it’.

Bargery also has a H di-n variant with the possessive pronoun suffixes, e.g. inàa sòn goomà ?di-n-sà ‘I want ten like it’. As I will demonstrate later, the configuration di-n+possessive pronoun is normally only permissible following unassimilated foreign words, e.g. zàn zoo dà ‘friend’ dii-n-aa in bà kà dåamu 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 #di-n nàn [= ?dî-n nàn] ‘these three books of yours’. This clearly shows that Bargery is confusing the H di-n possessive morpheme with the referential deictic F di-n (see below).

Abraham (1962:214) writes: ‘(A) (‘DIN’) = F di-n (1) a) the one in question, baki ?dî-n ‘the black one’; shii di-n ‘yes, he is the one’; wannàn (= ?wannan) di-n bān san shì ba ‘I don’t know that one’; Audù di-n ‘yes, that Audu’; b) mùtûm #dî-n-nàn Kt. ‘this very person’; c) (with suffixed pronoun) dookii #dî-m-mû [= #dî-m-mû] ‘this horse of ours’; d) any numeral may add di-n, but those ending in a consonant preferably add it, in order to indicate ‘the one in question’, e.g. ukù-n = ?ukù di-n ‘the three in question’; biyar ?dî-n ‘the five in question’; hàkà di-n ‘exactly thus’. (B) (‘DIN’) = H di-n 1. particle suffixed to form genitive of numerals, e.g., a) ?biyar di-n-sù ‘five of them’; biyar-i-n-sù ‘five of them’; ?ukù di-m-mû = ukù-m-mû ‘thrice (the size) of us’.’ Elsewhere, Abraham equates the definite determiner -n/r with F di-n (Abraham 1959:55).
Parsons (1981:36-38) points out that 'the alternative linker dï (\(= F \text{dî-n}\))', is used in Hausa to '… further specify a noun that has already got another genitive after it' (p. 38), e.g. maginin tukwàanne ‘a potter (lit. builder of pots)'; maginin tukwàanne-\(n\) (-\(nan\)) ‘the maker of the(se) aforementioned pots'; ?maginin tukwàannee dî\(-n\) (-\(nan\)) ‘the/this aforementioned potter’. However, Parsons acknowledges that this proposal is based on a hunch rather than hard evidence of the use of F dî\(-n\) 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) mûtumin dà ya zoo jiyà\(-n\) (-\(nan\)) /jiyà ?dî\(-n\) (-\(nan\))
    ‘the man who came yesterday (you know him)’

(154) wàndà ya batà\(-n\) (-\(nan\))/ batàa ?dî\(-n\) (-\(nan\))
    ‘the missing one’

(155) dà suka zo\(-n\)/ zoo ?dî\(-n\) (-\(nan\))
    ‘when they came (as we have just told you they did)’

Cowan and Schuh (1976:99) cite ‘a special marker dî\(-n\) (dii before first person singular possessive pronouns) … often used instead of the normal linker after foreign borrowings ending in a consonant’, e.g. nawa nee karàs #dî\(-n\)-ki? ‘how much are your carrots?’, inaa teebûr #dii\(-n\)-aa ‘where is my table?’. However, informants’ judgements on this frequently cited use of possessive H dî\(-n\) indicate that it is mainly used in conjunction with unassimilated foreign words (or assimilated consonant-final words which do not have a final -\(ji\) variant), rather than those that have been Hausaised, e.g., 'brother' dii\(-n\)-aa 'my brother', bàabûr / màashùn [#bàaabùri / #mààashìii] dii\(-n\)-aa 'my motorbike', cf. teebûr-ji\(-n\)-aa [#
Bagari’s descriptive grammar (1986:118) contains examples of F dî-n contextual usage without any analysis or tones, e.g. (tones supplied):

(156) wadannan dà ka jeefar (?dî-n) sun fi kyåu
   ‘those that you’ve thrown away are better’

The context indicates that he is using F dî-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 dî-n, e.g. tsïidau #dî-n ‘the tsïidau plant’; b) items ending in a consonant require a following H dî-n form, e.g. fensûr ?dî-n (= fensûrin) Audû ‘Audû’s pencil’, teebûr #dî-n-kà (= teebûrinkà) ‘your table’, also #baabur dî-n ‘the motorcycle; c) following a proper noun, e.g. Lawàn #dî-n ( = dî-n) ‘the Lawan’; and (d) where F dî-n may be used, e.g. wändå ya zoo ?dî-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) dàn nii dî-n-nàn naa ìsa rràñàa ka?
   ‘can a little creature (like) me here despise you?’

(158) dâya saaboo fil dî-n  ‘the other brand new one’

He then concludes his discussion with the claim that there is no semantic difference between teebûrî-n and teebûr #dî-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 sōn fensīr # dī-n  ‘I want the pencil’

(160) yaaroo #dī-n nan, bāl 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 kèekee #dī-n-kà [= #dī-n-kà] (= kèeke-n-kà)
    ‘I brought your bicycle (the one we were discussing)’

(162) inaas fensīr #dīi-n-aa? (= fensīr-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. kwās dī-n-sù ‘their course’; b) F dī-n (= demonstrative) meaning ‘the very one
referred to: #wànnan dì-n ‘that very one’, ?ukù dì-n ‘the three in question’,
#mùtùmùn nànn di-n ‘this very man, hàkà di-n ‘exactly so’.

3.3.1. The Two DÍN 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 dì- to form an alternative possessive construction, e.g. ‘girlfriend’ di-n-sà (= bùdurwa-r-sà) ‘his girlfriend’, ‘brother’ dìi-n-aa (= d’àn’uwaa-n-aa) ‘my brother’. In such constructions, it is invariably H dì-n. Secondly, when the masculine definite determiner -n is suffixed to it, F dì-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 dì-n

H dì-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’ dì-n-mù ..., ‘there’s one close friend of ours (we are family friends)’

(164) mun daawoo dàgà ‘teaching practice’, koowaa yanàa sòo yà ji ‘result’

dì-n-sà ‘we were back from teaching practice and each of us was eager to know his result’
(165) kuma kaa san inàa zàton mútûm d'aya nèe zài ‘determining degree’

dî-n-kà
‘besides, you know I think only one person determines the award of your
degree’

(166) yàayàa zài cée wai kà jee kà yi ‘supporting’ dî-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 dî-n-nan, nii bàn san îndà sukà
hàd’u ba, kurùm D sai ya zama wani ‘hero’. Wai har dà shii fa akài
‘nominating’ dî-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
dî-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 dî-n, for example, # teebùr dîi-n-aa ‘my table’ in Madaki’s corpus.14
Compare the following fully integrated English loans which readily suffix the linker
+ pronoun (but do not naturally accept the possessive dî-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/-ii (mas.) final variant, e.g. laasin = laasíi ‘licence’ maalàm
= maalàmii ‘teacher’, àlhàmîs = àlhàmiíshii ‘Thursday’, ìàdàn = ìàdàanìi
'muezzin', mûtûm = mûtûmi ‘man, person’—and the postthetic vowel appears before the -n linker and possessive pronoun (Newman and Jaggar, 1989:245-246). With such nouns, the di-n possessive is unacceptable, e.g.:

(168) [speaker inquires]:

\[
\text{inaa ooishi-n-ka } [\# \text{oofis di-n-ka}] / \text{fensiri-n-ka } [\# \text{fensir di-n-ka}] / \text{kaamûshi-n-ka} \\
[\# \text{kaamûs di-n-ka}] \text{ yakè?}
\]

‘where’s your office/pencil/dictionary?’

(169) [speaker introduces a third person to the addressee]:

\[
\text{gàa làadaani-n-mù } [\# \text{làadàn di-n-mù}] / \text{maalàm-i-n-mù } [\# \text{maalàm di-n-mù}] \text{ can tàfe}
\]

‘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) kaamûs-u-n-ka ‘your dictionary’). However, consonant-final (loan) nouns without a final -ii alternant in isolation, e.g. bàabûr/màashîn ‘motorcycle’, kwâs ‘course’, only allow di-n + pronoun in possessive phrases, e.g. bàabûr di-n-ki ‘your motorcycle’, kwâs di-n-tà ‘her course’. Note, however, that the majority of (especially Arabic) foreign words enters the language with a final -ii, e.g. coocii ‘church’, cekii ‘cheque’, aadàlii ‘honest man’, jaahîlii ‘ignorant man’, jaaarûmii ‘brave man’, kaafîrii ‘unbelieving man, etc., in which case only the linker -n is acceptable.

Possessive di-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 ɗi-n [= biyu-n] ɓiɛn da mukɛɛ bɔkɛɛtɛa
‘they were twice as many as we needed’

(171) [speaker agrees to buy the addressee’s goods]:

ɓaα ni goomà ɗi-n-sù [= goomà-n-sù] / biyar ɗi-n-sù [= biyar-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 ɗi-n idiomatically links an independent pronoun to the following noun banzaa ‘uselessness’:

(172) [speaker dismisses addressee]:

kai (kuu/shii/suu) ɗi-n banzaa!
‘you (you [pl.]/he/they) are nothing!’

3.3.1.2. Deictic F ɗi-n

Deictic F ɗi-n ‘the /that one in focus/question’ is composed of the semantically empty morpheme ɗi- (the same morpheme ɗi- which suffixes the possessive linker -n, §3.4.1.1) plus the masculine definite determiner -n (with a floating L tone). Deictic ɗi-n is typically encountered in the following contexts (as an alternative to the -ɲ/ɬ determiner):

a) Following independent pronouns, e.g.:
[a news report on an anti-publication demonstration]:

àshee suu (maa) ëfì-n samsam baa sànn à bugà shì ... (AHR:50)

‘but they too (under discussion) do not want it to be published at all ...’

[speaker confirms]:

shii/ita/suu ëfì-n ‘him/her/them (under discussion)’

[speaker assures addressee]:

dàn nii ëfì-n-nànn naa ìshee kà

‘a little creature like me is match for you’

(where ëfì- has H tone following cliticisation of the -nànn demonstrative).

b) F ëfì-n is especially common following deictic time- and modal-adverbials, e.g.:

(176) haka nan à bàara ëfì-n [bàarà-ì], wani lauyà na Ma’àiikata Harkookin Cikin Gidaa yaa gayà wà Ìumarù Dìkkò cèewaa ... (AHR:3)

‘also in the same last year, a certain Home Office lawyer told Umaru Dikko that ...’

(177) à gòobe kuma zaa à bugà littaafìn à cikin Japanancii. Àmmàa sàbòodà

rikicììn dà akà yi à birnin ‘Tokyo’ à kàn wannàn littaafìn dà akà fassàraa dà harshèn Japanancii, dà àlaamàà bàà zaa à sààmì daamàr à bugà shì gòobe ëfì-n [gòòbe-ì] 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] ...’
... à yàu di-n [yà-n] kuma ñaya dàgà cikin shùugàbànnin wannàn
kungiyaa ta Mùsùlìnn yàa cèe lalle suù bàa zàa sù ñyaalè Giànnì 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 Giànnì Palma’

(179) tòò à raanar Àlhàmišs di-n [Àlhàmiìishì-n] nakèe faatat in taàshì dàgà
Kànììô
‘well, it’s on [the] Thursday [in question] that I hope to fly out from Kàno’

(180) hâkà di-n [hàkà-n] ya kàmaatå à yì
‘that’s what should be done’

c) F di-n may also follow proper names (persons, places, languages, etc.), e.g.:

(181) Audù di-n [Audù-n] dà ya màaree kà, shìi nèe ya màaree nì
‘the Audù who slapped you is the one who slapped me too’

(182) inàa Lawàn di-n [Lawàn-ì-n] dà ka cèe yàa zoo?
‘where’s the Lawal that you said has come?’

(183) mèe kùkèe gànnì dàngànèe dà hukùncìn kìsàn dà akà yànkèe wà Salìmì
Rùshdi di-n [Rùshdi-n]? (AHR:52)
‘what do you think of the death sentence passed on (the) Salìmì Rushdi’

(184) ... yàa yi kìràa gà dàkkàn mùsùlìnn dìì dà sù taàshì tsàyìè sù bàyyàìnnà rà’àyìnsù à
gàmè dà rìkícìì Tèèkùn Paàshà di-n [Paàshà-n] (AHR:76)
‘... he called on all Muslims to come out and express their feelings about
the Gulf crisis’
(185) Sarkin Gumel/Kano/Zaria da-n [Gumel-i-n/Kano-i-n/Zaria-i-r] yanaa
dagà cikin manyan saraankan kasar Hausa
‘the Gumel/Kano/Zaria king [in question] is one of the important kings of
Hausaland’

(186) mun hau Dàala da-n [Dàalà-r] bana
‘we climbed Dala Hill [in question] this year’

(187) à BUK da-i-n [Biiyukè-r] na hàfu dà ita
‘it was at BUK (Bayero University Kano) that I met her’

(188) à kòogin Kwaara da-i-r [Kwaara-r] anaa saamun manyan kiifâayee
‘and large fish are found in the river Niger’

(189) ai Gaskiyaa Taaì Fi Kwabò da-n [Kwabd-i-n] taa shâharà
‘well, Gaskiya Ta Fi Kwabo is famous’

(190) sun fitoo kàn tiitunàa sunàa zàngà-zàngà ta kìn jinin wannàn littaaffi dà
akè sôn bugàwàa à harshèn Japanancii da-n [Japananci-i-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 da-n is regularly used (by bilingual
Hausa-English speakers) to post-determine unassimilated loanwords:

(191) kuma akà cèe yaa hadiyee hoodàr ‘cocaïne’ da-n [# kòokeni-i-n], wàddà
takè à nànnàde 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’ di-n [# -n]? Shii ya sâa yàammùte-yàammùtsenkù 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) tâna sairùn sauyà tsâarin mulkùn jùmmùriyar ‘Niger’ di-n [# Nijär-j-n]
don à sàamu daamar kafà tsâarli màì jàmm’ìyyuu dà daamàa (AHR:99)
‘… it’s planning to change the constitution of Niger Republic (under
discussion) so that a multi-party system could be established’

(194) … yâa kiraawoo manèemma laâbaarai à ‘club’ di-n (nan) [# ‘club’i-n-nan]
nà yàn jà âriiduu na kàsàashen wâje (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 di-n
determination, as an alternative to the definite determiner -n:

(195) kaa san mutàânên dà sukkà shigò di-n [shigò-n]?
‘do you know the people who have come in?’

(196) naa san dàaliban dà sukkà zoo di-n [zò-n]
‘I know the students who have come’

Now, although both F di-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 di-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 di-n is anaphorically used. Moreover, only F di-n can be used to spatially locate an object (not the definite determiner -n), e.g.:

(197) [pointing15 to something that the addressee missed the first time]:

shii di-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 di-n , as in:

(198) [A arrives in B’s place, and he first asks B]:

yàayàa gârî-n [# gârii di-n]?
‘how’s the town?’

Extract (198) is in fact ‘phatic’ in the sense of Malinowski (1969[1923]:315), since by using gârîn ‘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 di-n is perfectly permissible, e.g.:

(199) [speaker asks addressee about his journey]

yàayàa gârî di-n [# gârî-n]?
‘how’s the town [that you’ve visited]?’

However, in all cases where F di-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 di-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 kamfée ‘campaign’ in the text:

(200) zubar då cikii dai wani àbù nee då dòokaa ta harâmtaa à Nàajeeriyyàa, kuma à haalin då akèe ciki yànzu an waatsar då kamfèn #dï-n [= dì-n possessive] neeman dòokaa tà amîncee då zubar då 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 dì-n compatible. I assume, therefore, that they are mutually exclusive with respect to their acceptable usages, e.g.:

(201) #suu ukù-n dì-n då sukà zoo malaålalàataa 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 dì-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 dì-n + possessive pronoun, although there are cases where it alternates with the linker -n/r. F dì-n does not always have the same functional use as the definite determiner -n/r, e.g.: yàayaà gàrî-n [#gàrî dì-n]? ‘how’s the town?’, although both forms are possible in many deictic referential contexts.
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3.4. Summary

In this chapter, my aim has been to analyse the categorial function of adverbial H
nan, LH wannan, FH wannan +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 wannan, FH wannan 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. wannan /
wan nan+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 wannan (= pl. wàddan n) is largely a spatial
deictic, whereas FH wannan (= pl. wàddan n) 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 dì-n or
F dì-n).
Notes

1 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 wannan / FH wannan 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 nän 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: nän baaa nan ba, cân baaa can ba ‘here not there (near you), over there not way over there’, F nän/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.

5 See Greenbaum (1969:50f) for examples of the use of English ‘then’ as an additive conjunct (= Hausa sànnan).

6 Citing examples from Spanish, Hottenroth (1982:148) has argued that ‘... the motivation for choosing ... ahi [‘there’] instead of ... aqui [‘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).

7 There are other interpretative constraints informing the choice of H nan instead of F nàn 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 nàn (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).

8 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).

9 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 wannan.

10 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.

11 As with speaker-proximal HL wannàn and F nān (Chapter 2), both pre-head LH wannan, FH wannan 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 wannan 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).

12 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 vaarò-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 di-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 [d] sound.

15 Note that a gesture of pointing is in fact required for the felicitous use of F di-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.) wancan/waccan (pl. HLF wad Bancan, HLH wadancan), LH (m./f.) wancan/waccan, LLH (pl.) wadancan, FH (m./f.) wancan/waccan, HLH (pl.) wadancan), post-head NP+-n/r-can/can, NP+-n/r-can ‘that, those’, adverbial F can ‘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 nan [chapter 2], or addressee-proximal H nan (chapter 3). F can 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 nan. 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 can 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 can , 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 can is defined as ‘there’ and ‘visible’, while H can gets the interpretation ‘there’, but ‘invisible’ e.g. : gaa shi can ‘he’s over there’; naa gan shi 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 can, he would have come up with gaa 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 dāa 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 can 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 can 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
can. And this suggests that they are thinking of the distance only in terms of
physical objects in sight, e.g. gàà Audù can ‘there’s Audu over there’, but gàà
Audù can ‘there’s Audu in the distance’.¹

Cowan and Schuh (1976:70, 299) argue that only F can can possibly be used with
an accompanying gesture in the CAN-adverbials, e.g. sunàa can ‘they’re there’,
and that ‘this will generally be the case when (nàm or) can 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 can and H can, although the latter recognises the
possibility of using H can ‘in pointing’ at something or somebody, e.g. inàa tiitùn
‘Dantàata? gàà ta can kusa dà vàncan gini ‘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 gàààn akà gan shi ‘it was in that town that he was seen’ (Newman and Newman 1979:18).

For the most part, adverbial F can and H can have been defined in terms of a [±visible] dichotomy. F can ‘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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Kraft/Kirk-Greene</th>
<th>Cowan/Schuh</th>
<th>Newman and Newman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F can</strong></td>
<td>can (no tones) = ‘there’</td>
<td>[+visible, -proximal], e.g. yanàa can ‘it is over there (=# nan)’</td>
<td>[+visible, -proximal] ‘yonder, over there (fairly distant but visible)’ e.g. yanàa can ‘it’s there’</td>
<td>[+visible] ‘there’, e.g. gàà Audù can ‘there’s Audu over there’</td>
<td>[+visible, -proximal] ‘there’, e.g. sunàa can ‘they’re there’</td>
<td>[+visible, -proximal] ‘over there’ no examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **H can** | can (no tones) = ‘there’ | [-visible, -proximal] ‘there’, e.g. nàa bi ta can (=# nan) ‘I passed through there’ | [-visible, -proximal] ‘yonder, over there (distant and invisible)’ e.g. yanàa can ‘he’s there’ | [+visible, -proximal] ‘there’, e.g. gàà Audù can ‘there’s Audu in the distance’ | (-visible], e.g. tanàa can à gidàa ‘it’s there at home’ | [+visible] ‘there’, e.g. gàà ta can kusa dà wàccan bìshiyà “there it is over there by that tree”

à can gàààn akà gan shi ‘it was in that 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F can</strong></td>
<td>speaker/addressee-distal, e.g. gaan shi can à Inda ka bar shi ‘there it is over there where you left it’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>e.g. (indicating) zân jee cân nee in daawoo ‘I’m going over there (not far away), and will be back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in na yi nân yâ yi cân ‘if I move here, he’ll move there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H can</strong></td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote/distal, e.g. mâtsaa zuwâ can gâba tükûna ‘move over there for now’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-remote-distal) anaphoric: ... à cân na sâami wata yaarînyà ‘it’s there that I met a girl’</td>
<td>can dai, muugûn bàakinkà yà bii kà ‘well, there may your evil mouth follow you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cataphoric: can à gärin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajeeriyà... ‘way over there in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi ...’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2. Spatial F can and H can

F can 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 can, 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 shi
      ‘there it is there (over there), where you left it’
   b) gàa shi can, à ìndà ka bar shi
      ‘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 dâazu
      ‘it’s over there that I saw him pass through just now’
   b) ta can fa^ na ga ya bi dâazu
      ‘it’s way over there that I saw him pass through just now’

(3) [speaker directs addressee to move further]
   a) màtsaa zuwàa cân tükûna
      ‘move over there for now’
   b) màtsaa zuwàa can tükûna
      ‘move way over there for now’
(4) [speaker responds to the question ‘where’s Audu?’]:
   a) shii née cân à kishingide gindin bishiyàa
      ‘he’s the one over there lying by the tree

   b) shii née cân à kishingide gindin bishiyàa
      ‘he’s the one way over there lying by the tree’

In addition to these distal cân, cân adverbials, Sokoto and Niger Hausa has the more proximal L cân ‘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 cân?
    ‘who’re those that I’m seeing there?’

(6) [speaker directs addressee to the referent]:
    gàa ya cân zamne
    ‘there he is seated there’

The L cân pragmatic coding mirrors the use of L nân (chapter 2), which is the more intimate speaker-proximal form than its F nân counterpart.

F cân and H cân are often used in contrastive contexts, e.g.:

(7) [speaker is re-routing the crowd]:
    wafandà kée cân, 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 cân ai yaa kaai taaktìi goomà shàa 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 cân:

(9) [speaker points to his own location]:

a) à nàn ka tarar dà nii cân  ba

‘it’s here that you met me not over there’

b) à nàn ka tarar dà nii cân  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) båa cân ba, cân

‘not there (where you are), over there’

b) båa cân ba, cân

‘not there (where you are), way over there’

This is a clear indication that F cân and H cân have distinctive roles to play within the deictic-adverbial paradigm. F cân and H cân 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 cân 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) #màtsoo cân
   # ‘move over there (closer to me)’

b) #màtsoo 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 tààkàlìmkà cân
   ‘put your shoes over there’

(15) [speaker orders someone to disperse a crowd of children]:
   wàatsè yààràn 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) đa 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 baava ‘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 baava, e.g. gàa su Audù cân/can baava ‘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 koofâa
    ‘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.:
Similarly, both F can and H can can combine with deictic haka ‘thus’ (before or following) to further specify a directional orientation. The modal haka ‘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: dōn Allāh inaa nēe hanyār zuwāa kwaleejīn SOAS?
      ‘please, where is the road to SOAS?’
   
      [speaker B redirects A to the appropriate way]:
   b) B: i) ai ta can haka zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejīn SOAS =
      ai ta haka can zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejīn SOAS
      ‘you should follow [way] over there, up to SOAS’
   ii) ai ta cân haka zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejīn SOAS =
      ai ta haka cân zaa kà bi har kà kai kwaleejīn SOAS
      ‘you should follow over there, up to SOAS’

It is clear, then, that a spatial context can accommodate both F cân (L cân) and H can in order to specify the distinctive location of a referent which is distal from both participants’ position.

4.1.3. Anaphoric H can (only)

In this function, only H can 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 taashi, 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 kàasuwa. Can uwàsà kàn rìkà kai masà dàn 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]:
Maisànggo fa tun dà ya ga yaa sàami fúskaarı Saanii, sai ya máfàlee 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’àa dai à wàhàlce sukè à Nàajeeryàa. 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]:

203
... sai na sâa yâ ëauki gaawan nân, mukà tàfi wàjen gàrii mukà ajìyee shi can (RBJ:23)
‘... then I made him pick the corpse up, went outskirt of town, and placed it there’

(27) ya ruugàa buzu-buzu wajen Sarkii. Ya faafâ gâbansâ, ya kwàashi
miyàagun màgàngànnuu ya cèe Dolo kèe can wài kèe faafii (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 zaâ mù soomà shirînmû dà lâaabarin rîkîn dà akëe yîi can
Nàajeeriyyàâ (AHR:38)
‘and today we will begin our programme with news of a problem way over there in Nigeria

(29) [another broadcast from London]:

\textit{can à gârin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajéeriyyàa ...} (AHR:124)

‘way over there in the northern Nigerian town of Bauchi ...’

Note, however, that in the case of (28)-(29), \textit{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 \textit{H nan}'s natural coding as an addressee-specific deictic to speak to them.

Adverbial \textit{H can} also has remote-distal temporal uses, e.g.:

(30) ... \textit{can sai na ga yaa dùubi saafòn 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 barcìi...\textit{can} ... sai wata dàbaaràà ta faafoo mini (RBJ:16)

‘when I heard this I went back to my room; I couldn’t sleep... \textit{then} ... I thought of a solution’

Another important cataphoric function performed by \textit{H can} (but not \textit{F cân} or \textit{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]:
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]:
Fasih ya koomaa zauree. Can zuwaa azahar Waziiri ya farkaa (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 miikêe don in yi daariyaa. 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 kwaasoo kudii yanàa ta baayárwaa, yanàa ta shân waaḳàa dà kidàa. Ya mânčaa dà kàráatuui 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]:
da na ji hakà na koomàa daakùi, na kaasà barcii don zullùmii. Can an yi kwaanaa bîyar sai wata dàbaaràa ta faaɗoo mini (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 kasar Irami nèe, kasar Irami kùwa kasaa cèe ta âljànnuu. Ruwan Bagaja kùwa maa bàa nan kasâr yakè ba, yanàa can bisà wani doogon duutsèe dà akèe kirânsà Duutsën Kaf. Baabù màhâluukin dà yakèe iyà zuwàa can sai âljànnuu (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 can, F nān and H nān) cannot occur in this (temporal) frame:

(39) [speaker promises addressee]:
   zân kaawoo makâ 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]:
   kàr 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 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 nàa sàami sùkuunni zân zoo in shaa Àllàahù
   ‘I’ll come sometimes later, when I get the chance, God willing’
(43) [a futuristic look at a developing country]:

anàa sàa rànn cèewaa can gàba, koowaa zài såami 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 ikìràarin zamaa hàlààràtacciyyar mataimakiyyar shùugàban kasaa, tòò àmmaa sai gàa shì à yànzù ita cèe ’yar kazagìn gwànnàtì màì cìì

‘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 gàba zaa gà cìì gàban dà bà kà tabà ganìi can baaya ba

‘(later) in the future, you’ll see developments that you’ve never seen in the past’

The use of can gàba with an accompanying preposition à adds greater definiteness to its remote coding, e.g.:

(46) [writer talks about his writing priorities]:

koodàyàushè àbin dà zàn rubùutaa, tòò zài shàafi haalin dà mutàànnee sukke cìkkì nèe à lookàcììn; kàmar yà zama taariihì- taariihì nee, à can gàba, na haalin dà akèe cìkkì à wannànn lookàciì

‘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’
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4.1.4. Symbolic F can 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 can 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 tafi? ‘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): 4
   zân jee cân née in 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]:

nàa yì nàan kàa cèè bàa nàan bà, nàa yì càn kàa cèè bàa càn bà. Tòò yàayàà kèè nàan?

‘I moved here, you said not there; I moved (over) there, you said not way over there. Well, what then?’

Interestingly, both H nàan and H càn are anaphoric in (49), i.e. referring back to the symbolically proximate location indicated by the frame F nàan … càn.

The maximal (spatial) remote-distal interpretation of H càn 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]:

càn dài, mùugùn bààkin kàà yà bii kà!

‘well there, may your evil mouth follow you!’

H càn 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]:

iì, nàa ji dài, àmmàa à yi càn dà mùugùn hàllì

‘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]:

täfi can⁵ 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) 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.) wancan/waccan, LHL (pl.) ?wâďâncan as ‘that, those (one(s))’, observing that the post-head CAN strategy (i.e. liittaafin 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.) wâncan/wâccan, LLH (pl.) wâďâncan, nor FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLH (pl.) wâďâncan were documented by Howeidy.

Bargery (1934:149, 1078) correctly describes the spatial distinction between the pre-head demonstrative HL wâncân and LH wâncan in terms of increasing (visible) distance from the position of the participants at the moment of utterance. Thus, pre-head HL (m./f.) wâncân/wâccân, LLF (pl.) ?wâďâncân in wâncân dookii ‘that horse’, wâccân goodiyaa ‘that mare’, are defined as ‘that one; that one yonder’. As for the pre-head LH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLH (pl.) ?wâďâncan, Bargery assigned the same meaning ‘but at a greater distance than implied by HL wâncân’ (no examples provided (p. 1078)). Elsewhere, he documented post-head -cân/cân and -can, with identical meaning ‘that’, e.g.
dooki-n-cân ‘that horse’, gârî-n-can ‘that town’ (tones and glosses supplied) (p. 149). However, no examples of FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan and LLH (pl.) wàďâncan were found.

For Abraham (1962:919), however, the distinguishing feature between pre-head HL wâncan and LH wâncan relates to the [±visible] dichotomy. He claimed that HL (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLF (pl.) wàďâncan mean ‘in the near or far distance, but visible’, e.g.: wâncan dookin (= dooki-n-cân) ‘that horse’, with LH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan. LLH (pl.) wàďâncan used to individuate (non-visible) object(s) ‘... referred to ... the one in question’, e.g. à cikin wâccan shèekaràa ‘during the year in question’. He also documented FH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, HLH (pl.) wàďâncan as equivalent to LH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan, LLH (pl.) wàďâncan (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 wâncan ‘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 wâncan is further away from the interlocutors’ position than those that are indexed by HL wâncan at the moment of utterance.

Galadanci (1969:283) provides an interesting tabulation in which he specifies not only the tonal features of WâNCAN, but also its varying semantic interpretation. Thus, while wâccan riigaa (= riiga-r-cân) ‘that gown’ is described as ‘that (gown) not near you or me, deictic’, wâcan riigaa (= riigâ-r-can) is shown to be both ‘deictic’ (i.e. spatial) or anaphoric. But according to Galadanci, LH (m./f.) wâncan/wâccan is only felicitous in a (contrastive) spatial context, with the
meaning ‘that not the near one [sic]’. As I shall show below, although LH wâncañ/wâcçan 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.) wâncan/waccan, HLF (pl.) wadâncân as ‘that, those’. They also documented the post-head -cán/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. mútumí-n-cân ‘that man’, âbînci-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 -càn is said to be ‘employed to indicate previous reference’, e.g. kujêcê-r-càn ‘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.) wâncañ/wâcçan, LLH (pl.) wadâncân 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.) wâncañ/wâcçan, HLH wadâncân demonstratives.

Cowan and Schuh (1976:57, 114, 165, 298) return to Abraham’s division between visible and non-visible referents. Thus, HL (m./f.) wâncan/wâncän, HLF (pl.) wadâncân are said to be ‘largely restricted to great physical distance from the speaker’, e.g. waccan bàta taâgâ ba cêe ‘that is not a window’. For them, an object can only attract a LH wâncañ/wâcçan (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 cêe makarantaa wâccan makarkataa cêe ‘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 wannan ‘that’ ( [= anaphoric] which you have just mentioned’). If the reference is to some remote (temporal) event, then speaker-distal FH wàccan would be felicitous). The spatial usages of speaker/addressee-remote-distal LH wàncan/wàccan 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)’, duutse-n-càn ‘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-càn (# = -nan) an yi ruwaa dá 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. #ki yankà kubèeewàa waccàn ‘cut up that okra’. This is only possible with a few specialised time-words (and only with LH wàccan), e.g. bàara wàccan the year before last’, dåamanàa wàccan ‘the wet-season before last’ (see §4.2.3.2.). No examples or description of FH (m/f) wàncan/wàccan, HLH (pl.) wadàncan were found.

Newman and Newman (1979:131) continued the tradition of distinguishing HL wàncàn from its remote-distal LH wàncan variant on the basis of the factor of visibility (HL wàncàn ‘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 wàncàn 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-càn/càn description: daakunà-n-càn ‘those rooms over there [distant but visible]’, and NP+ -n/r-càn ‘that, those [not visible]’ (no examples) (p. 18).
In her most recent dictionary, Newman (1990:275) erroneously equated HL (m./f.) wancan/waccan, HLF (pl.) wàdàncän with post-head -càn/cän (= ‘there’), and LH (m./f.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH (pl.) wàdàncan with post-head -can (= ‘way over there’), e.g. wàncan dàbiinò = dàbiinò-n-cän ‘that date-palm-tree’, wàccan tsaamiyaa = tsaamiyaa-r-cän ‘that tamarind tree’, wàdàncan gìgniyyu = gìgniyyu-n-cän ‘those deleb-palms’; wàncan gìnii = gìnii-n-cän ‘that building’, wàccan makaranta = makarantà-r-cän ‘that school’, wàdàncan rumbunàa nee ‘those are granaries’.

Table 17: summary of previous descriptions of WANCAN (+NP) NP-CAN demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Howeidy</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Galadanci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL wàncan (+NP)</td>
<td>wàchàn (wàccàn) hànyàa</td>
<td>wàncàn ‘that’ (!visible) wàncàn dòookì</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-càn/càn</td>
<td>hànyà-r-chan (càn) ‘that way’ (no tones)</td>
<td>líttaññ-n-càn ‘that book’ (no tones)</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH wàncan (+NP)</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-càn</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH wàncan (+NP)</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Demonstrative)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(pre-head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL wàncan (+NP)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. kùjèèràr tanàa baìyan wàncàn dààkkì ‘the chair is behind that hut’</td>
<td>[contrastive] töò dàngànèè dà wàncàn màgààna kùmà... ‘as for that (other) issue...’</td>
<td>anàà fàddàa tsàkkànnì wàncàn (zùrì’å) dà wàncàn (zùrì’å) ‘there’s conflict between this clan and that (clan)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pre-head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH wàncan ,</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. à wàncàn wurìn múkà tarà dà shìì ‘it’s at that place over there that we met him’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à wàncàn /wàncàn loòkkàà ciì yì yà yàmìì láçììn ‘at that (other) time, he pleaded not guilty’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH wàncan (+ NP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(non-presupposed)</td>
<td>[long distance]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP+ -n/r-càn/càn</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal [+identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture], e.g. anyàà kùó bìì yi wà yàaà-r-n-càn (yàaà-r-n-càn) nauùì bìì? ‘is it not too heavy for that boy/ those boys?’</td>
<td>[presupposed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP+ -n/r-can</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal [+identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture], e.g. mutàânà-r-n-can nèè dà kèè gùðìì nà gànnì jììì ‘it’s those people running that I saw yesterday’</td>
<td>(speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [non-contrastive]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2.2. Spatial WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives.

At the most basic spatial level, pre-head HL (m./f.) wancàn/waccàn, HLF (pl.) wadàncàn and LH (m./f.) wànçan/wàccàn, LLH (pl.) wàdfànçan 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-càñ/càn and NP-n/r-cân 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 wànçan designates remote-distal (less visible) referents, as I shall show below.

4.2.2.1. Spatial HL wancàn etc. (+NP), NP-n/r-càn/càn = speaker/addressee-distal

Both pre-head wancàn/waccàn/wàdfàncàn (wàdfàncàn)+NP and NP-n/càn/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]:

daûkoo waccàn buutàa

‘bring that kettle’

(54) [speaker gives additional directional information to addressee]:

kujèèrîr tanàa baayan wancàn daakli

‘the chair is behind that hut’
(55) [A points to a book that is away from him and B]:
   a) A: bâa wancân littaafii nee kakêe neemaa ba?
      ‘is that not the book you’re looking for’

(56) [A asks B]:

   su wàa nee nèe wadâncân mutânée?
   ‘who’re those people over there?’

Notice the tonal symmetry between the demonstratives HL wancân and adverbial F cân, a correlation that has been observed between speaker-proximal HL wannàn and F nân and between addressee-based LH wannan and H nan (see chapters 2 and 3 for details). See also LH wànca and H can in § 4.3.2.2.

Like its pre-head HL wannàn (chapter 2) counterpart, HL wancân 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 jii wadâncân/wadâncân maataa dâgâ gidankù sukà fitoo
   ‘I think those women are from your home’

(58) [speaker sends addressee]:

   jèe-ka kà gayàa wà wadâncân/wadâncân daalibai cèewaa bâa laccâ yàu
   ‘go and tell those students that there’s no lecture today’

Although HLF wadâncân is the preferred choice for many speakers, I myself prefer the HHL wadâncân 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-cán/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 -cán/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.) wafâncàn, 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 yaaarò-n-càn wannàn sadakàa

‘give this alm to that boy (over there)’
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Pre-head demonstratives HL wancàn, HLF wadâncàn 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, yaarô ‘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 sòn ganinkà
‘(here’s) that man (who) wants to see you’

[Bala responds]:
wànè maalàmii, à kàn mèè?
‘which man, what about?’

(66) [Audu reminds Bala]:

yaarinyà-r-càn kai fa takèè sòn ganii
‘that girl (really) wants to see you, you know’

[Bala responds]:
iì, tòó, 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 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 -càn/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 -càn/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: bàà wancàn yaarroj cèefàñèn yà kai cikin gidaa
   ‘give that boy the shopping to take inside the house’

   b) B: anyàa kòò bàì yi wà yaarro-n-càñì nauyii ba?
   ‘is it not too heavy for that youth?’

(68) a) A: inàà mutuwàr sòn sauràyi-n-càñì
   ‘I’m dying for that boy’

   b) B: Laadi, bàà kee cèe na ganii kinàà wancàn saurâyij 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 -càñ, 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 -càñ 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: wâcè 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-nàn/nàn and addressee-based -nàu) post-head strategies, non-count (mass) nouns normally attract post-head -càn/càn irrespective of the identifiability of the referent, e.g.:

(70) gâa shinkaafa-r-càn/waake-n-càn/roogò-n-càn kì kai mareedaa
   ‘there’s that rice/beans/cassava for you to take to the grinding mill’

(71) kai ruwa-n-càn/fura-r-càn/àbinci-n-càn wurin bàakon dà kée 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 *wadâncàn*) can function as a *spatial* pronominal. As such its referent can be [± identifiable, ± familiar] depending on the context, e.g.:

(72) [speaker A is satisfied with the labourer he has just hired]:
   a) A: *yàuwaa, tốo kaa gá dán aikii kām*
      ‘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 bâa Raabi ba cèe màatar mákwâbciinâa?*
   ‘is *that* not Rabi, my neighbour’s wife?’

(74) [speaker A to B]:
   *su wàa nee nèe wadâncân/wadâncàn, kâmar Bintâ dà Làamii*
   ‘who’re *those* over there, looks like Binta and Lami’

(75) [speaker A to B]:
   *mèe wadâncân/wadâncàn sukèe neemaa cikin juujìi?*
   ‘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 *wadâncàn* variant more frequently.
4. 2. 2. 2. Spatial LH wâncan 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]:
    jëe-ka wajen wâncan bishiyàa kà jiraa mà
    ‘go to that tree and wait for us’
    or

(77) [same context as above]:
    jëe-ka wajen bishiyà-r-can kà jiraa mà
    ‘go to that tree and wait for us’

(78) A: inaa ka ajiyee mootàr taàkà?
    ‘where did you park your car?’

    B: a) gàà ta can gàban wâncan giniì à daama dà kai
    ‘there it is there in front of that building to the right of you’
    or

    B: b) gàà ta can gàban gini-n-can
    ‘there it is there in front of that building ’
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(79) [additional instructions to the addressee]:

a) kà kuma biyoo dà wàccan tàabar mà
   ‘and bring that mat with you as well’

   or

b) kà kuma biyoo dà tàabar mà-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. tàabar mà —> tàabar mà-r-can.)

(80) [same context as above]:

a) tôo àmmaa sai kaa jee baayan wàncan d’akii na gàba ìdan kanàà sôn zamaa kàn màì kyàu
   ‘but you’ll have to go to that hut further away if you want to sit on a good one’

b) tôo àmmaa sai kaa jee baayan d’akìì-n-can ìdan kanàà sôn zamaa kàn màì kyàu
   ‘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 bàà wàncàì litaałìn nee kakèe neemaa ba?
   ‘is that not the book you’re looking for?’

   [ and B replies]:

b) (i) aa’àa, wàncan kundìn nee dà kèe baayankà na nèemaa
   ‘no, it’s that volume behind you that I looked for’

b) (ii) aa’àa, kundì-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 wàdàn cân mutàanee?
    'who’re those people over there?'

  [B replies]:
  b) B: bàn san sù ba, àmmaa naa san wàdàn cân
    'I don’t know them, but I know those (ones) further away'

Whilst the LH wàncàn etc. demonstratives may be said to denote less visible referent objects, their basic function is to pick out more remote objects, leaving distal HL wàncàn 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 wàccàn mootàa zaa tà shigèe
    'look at that car about to disappear’
(84) [speaker asks]:

a) wàa këe dà riigà-r-can dà iskàa këe jàa?

‘who owns that gown that is being dragged by the wind?’

b) [speaker alerts the addressee(s)]:

wàa këe dà wàccan riigaa dà iskàa këe jàa?

‘who owns that gown that is being dragged by the wind?’

(85) [speaker wonders]:

a) yàayààa kikà barii wàdàncan sàmàarii sukà sulàalee manà?

‘how come you let those guys slip away from us?’

b) yàayààa kikà barii sàmàarin-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] kàl! yàaran yàu sai hàkurii

‘oh, one need patience in dealing with boys nowadays’

b) B: wài yàarà-n-can dà këe 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.) wàncan/wàccan, LLH wàdàncan 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 wâncan 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 [± identifiable], e.g.:

(87) [speaker points out the referent to addressee]:
shîn wâncan àlfalâmii dà kêè fàrshên teebûr bâa nàawa bà neè?
‘is that (way over there) pen at the far end of the table not mine?’

(88) [speaker responds]:
aa’àà, wâncan nàawa neè ‘no, that (one) is mine’

(89) [speaker is asked to make his choice]:
wâncan na fi soo ‘I prefer that (one)’

(90) [mother warns her child]:
kâr in saakè ganînkà tàare dà wàdfâncan
‘don’t let me ever see you together with those (ones)’

(91) [speaker reminds addressee]:
wâncan fa shii nèe mûtumin dà ya zoo jiya
‘that (one) is indeed the guy who came yesterday’

(92) [speaker points to a man walking]:
a) A: wâncàn bàa Bàlaa ba nèè kûwa?
‘is that (one, over there) not Bala?’
b) B: aa’àa, wànćan nèe Bàlaa, wànćàn ai Saabo nèe
‘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 cèe wàccàn dà kèè kòokàriń tsàllàkà tìtti idòò-rùfe?
‘who’s that (far away) trying to cross the road blindly?’

(94) [speaker threatens addressee, as he points to a group of policemen]:
a contrastive strategy to maximise the possibility of the addressee identifying the intended reference object..

Remote-distal demonstratives, LH wâncan etc. and FH wâncan etc., share many of the characteristic distinction between addressee-based LH wânnan and FH wânnan (chapter 3). Informants judgements on the use of LH wâncan is that, like LH wânnan, 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) daukoo mîn  wâncan fârantî 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, wâncan 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 wâncan 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 wâncan and FH wâncan to LH wânnan and FH wânnan (chapter 3) also extends to the plural forms of these speaker/addressee-distal deictics. LLH wàdâncan is the (default spatial) plural form of LH wâncan, while HLH wàdàncan functions as the plural form of FH wâncan used spatially to
contrast remote-distal referents (cf. the addressee-based LLH wàdànnan, HLH wàdànnan (chapter 3):

(98) [speaker inquires]

wàdànkan kùjèrûn hàllàa bè zaa à yi àmfaa ni àdà suu ba?
‘aren’t those (way over there) chairs going to be used?’

(99) [A redirects B]:

bàa fa wàdànkan kùjèrûn ba, wàdànkan dài na geefènsù
‘look, not those (way over there) chairs, but those (ones) next to them’

(100) [speaker requests addressee]:

don Allàh, kiràa wàdànkan mutàaanè màasu tàllÀr lèemoo
‘please, call those (way over there) people who are hawking oranges’

(101) wàdànkan gidàajee dà kakè hàngaa à dàama dà muu suu nèe na

‘Dantàata, bàa wàdànkan 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 -nàn/nàn/nàn, e.g.:

(102) [speaker observed]:

kaa ga mutàaanè-n-can sunàa duuðàn àlmaajirìi!
‘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-càn/càn) has been attested in an anaphoric context. Curiously, even the pre-head plural HLF wadancàn, HHL wadāncàn forms are only marginally acceptable. But the fact that both pre-heads and post-head -càn/càn 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 -càn/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— 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]:

naasu kàràatu nàdìbam née, nii iirì dàbam nàkèe sòo in kooyàà makà... wancàn kàràatu dà ka ji sunàà yìì... (MJC:3)

‘their own reading style is different from the one I want to teach you...that (other) reading that you heard them...’
Waziri’s advice to Sarki:

Wæziiri ya cće, ‘Bàà àbin dà ya fi, sai kà cée aurree dai yaa yi, àmmaa bà kà yàrда ba dà wàncàn sàddáakii dà sukà yankàà’ (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 wàncàn 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) tòò, danganée dà wàncàn màgànanà kuma, inàà jìn sai dai kà yi hàkùrìi

har nán gàba

‘as for that (other) issue, I think you’ll have to be patient until sometime in the future’

In (105), HL wàncàn serves to shift the conversation to a different issue which has been introduced by the speaker. Since the referent of HL wàncàn is not the focus of (105), FH wàccàn is not acceptable in this context. Nor is FH wànnan 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 wàncàn etc. (+NP), NP-n/r-can

Like adverbial H can, pre-head FH wàncàn etc. and post-head -n/r-can are both possible in an anaphoric role. However, neither form has the frequency of speaker-based HL wànnàn etc., NP-n/r-nàn/nàn or addressee-based LH wànnàn etc., FH wànnàn etc., NP-n/r-nàn. 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 wâncan etc. and post-head -can on the basis of the factor of presuppositionality (i.e. ± identifiable, ± 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]:

Wâziiri ya fusaata dà wannân màgànaa ta Faasih. Ya taashi ya màngàree shì, yàddà ya ga mutàanè-n-can nàa yi wà 'yaa'yaayensù (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]:

SâKimu sai na ji àshee dai wân nan nàawa née SâKimù, agôolan ùbannù, wàndà ya kashèe shì, ya sàa kuma à kashè iyàayemmù maataa don mafarkî-n-can dà na gayàa mukù yaa yi na ðàn dàbiinò (RBJ:36)

‘then I heard that it was in fact that brother of mine, SâKimu, 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 wadàncan
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 lookàciai yaa ki yà amsà lâifin yìn zàmba
‘at that (other) time, he denied the charge of fraud’

(109) [speaker tries to convince addressee]:
bambancìn shii nèe cèewaa à wàncan / wàncan karòn, bàn fàhìmci 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 wâncan 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 wâncan 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 düubee shi tun gàrgà kàsà har bisà, sai na ga yaa yi kàmàa dà Maalàm
    Zurkèe dàm Mûhammadà, wâncan / wâncan dà na sàa akà yi wà àtùrèe à
    Sàaabùrì ... (RBJ:12)
    ‘I looked at him top to bottom, and seem to look like Malam Zurkèe dàn
    Muhammad, that one that I set people to drive away at Saburi …’

Clearly, the narrator realises that he needs to use FH wâncan (LH wâncan) 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]:
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na tambàyee shì gàrinsù, yà cêe à Nasaraawaa akà hàiffe shì, (wàatàwâ wàn wàncàn/wàncàn dà kànènsà yà baa ni 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]:

shìn koo kaa ba wàni wàrii yà kwaàcèe màkà à aikìn dààmanaa 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 táfà ruwaa mài tsanànìn gàské, àmmàa bàna kàm

sai dai à cêe an gòoddè 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 wàncàn etc. (+NP) (only )

Only pronominal HL wàncàn etc. is available to the speaker for use as a symbolic distal demonstrative (cf. symbolic F çàn 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’àr ìkàsàr, àmmaa sun kàrkàsà su dàgà wannàn yankii zuwàa wannàn wàccàn
‘there are other indigenous language groups, but they differ from this region to that region’

(115) [narrator describes the clan conflict in Somalia]

Àmmaa ànnà saàmmùn amàn wùtar bindigoogii à fàddàn dà àkèè yiì tsàkaànnìn wannàn zuùría dà wàccàn
‘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 wannàn gidàn yà gànnà dà wàddà kèè can, àmmaa bài tàllàmmà bà, yanàà iyà zuwàà òjà gidàn yà tàllàmmì wàccàn yà daawòo. Duk kùwà dà cèewàa màattsà ìkù (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 làmmàùn yà ruudèe, wannàn yà cèè wannàn nee, wàccàn yà cèè 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 wannàn 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/nân 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 wannàn (also FH wannàn) 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 \(\text{spatial}\) pre-head \(\text{WANNAN} \ (\text{+NP})\) coding non-presupposed \([-\text{identifiable}, \ -\text{familiar}]\) referents, and \(\text{NP-NAN}\) with presupposed \([+\text{identifiable}, +\text{familiar}]\) referents. In the \textit{anaphoric} domain, both pre-head \(\text{HL} \ \text{wancàn etc.}\) and \(\text{FH} \ \text{wâncan etc.}\) are essentially contrastive anaphors, operating over long (text) distances. As for the post-head \(\text{NP-CAN}\) strategies, we noted that there are no attested tokens of enclitic post-head \(-n/r-cân/càn\) in an \textit{anaphoric} context (see also \(\text{F càn}\) which does not occur as a pro-locative anaphor). However, remote-distal post-head \(-n/r-cân\) does have an \textit{anaphoric} role, where it maintains its basic \textit{spatial} \([+\text{identifiable}, +\text{familiar}, \ \text{presupposed}]\) features. Similarly, post-head \(\text{NP-CAN}\) has no \textit{symbolic} application, a context where pre-head \(\text{LH} \ \text{wâncan etc.}\), \(\text{FH} \ \text{wâncan etc.}\) are also not attested. Thus, only pre-head \(\text{HL} \ \text{wancàn}\) has any \textit{symbolic} role, although it is more commonly used by bilingual Hausa-English speakers to complement the normative \(\textit{symbolic}\) role of speaker-proximal \(\text{HL} \ \text{wannàn etc.}\) (see chapter 2). Indeed, the marginality of speaker/addressee-(remote) distal \(\text{WANCAN} \ (\text{+NP})\), \(\text{NP-CAN}\) 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 \(\text{WANNAN} \ (\text{+NP})\), \(\text{NP-NAN}\) 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F can</td>
<td>speaker/addressee distal, e.g. gàà shi cân à îndà ka bari shi ‘there it is over there where you left it’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>e.g. (indicating) cân jee cân nee in daawoo ‘I’m going over there (not far away), and will be back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H can</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal, e.g. mààsaa zuwàà cân gàà tükîna ‘move way over there for now’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-remote-distal) anaphoric: ... à cân na sàami wàta yàarinyàà ‘it’s there that I met a girl’</td>
<td>can dài, muugàn bàakinkà yà bii kà ‘well, there may your evil mouth follow you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[cutaphoric] cân à gàrìn Bauchi na areewacin Nàajérìyàà ... ‘way over there in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi ...’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative (pre-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. kujèèràn tànnà bàyan wàncààn dàkkì ‘the chair is behind that hut’</td>
<td>[contrastive] bòò dànnàà wàncààn màànàà kuma ... ‘as for that (other) issue ...’</td>
<td>anàà fàddàà tsàkàànàà à wànnàà zu’ùà à wàncààn (zu’ùà) ‘there’s conflict between this clan and that (clan)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL wàncààn + NP</td>
<td>[non-presupposed]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative (pre-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture], e.g. à wàncààn wùrnà mukà tàrÀ tà sìi ‘it’s at that place over there that we met him’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à wàncààn/wàncààn lookàà jïi yà amsà láàfìì ‘at that (other) time, he pleaded not guilty’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH wàncààn + NP</td>
<td>[=contrastive] bàà wàncààn mòòntàà ba, wàncààn tà gàà bà ‘not that car (you’re approaching), that (other one) way in front’</td>
<td>[long distance]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH wàncààn +NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 [±visible, ±distal] distinction, but more importantly with respect to the position of the speaker as well as that of the addressee.
Notes

1 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 năn 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. gâa Audù cân (# cân) ‘there’s Audu there’. This is also true of F dî-n, which is realised as L dî-n following a high tone in Sokoto Hausa, e.g. shii dî-n nakêe sôo, ‘he’s the (very) one I like’.

2 See Galadanci (1969: 265-272) on the additional pragmatic information coded in a speaker’s use of such focus-modal particles as fâ, maâ, kâm, kûwâ, dâi, etc. Note that the modal fâ is tonally different from interrogative L fâ. Thus, I can say cân fâ? ‘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 fâ? ‘and what about (over) there?’ is also felicitous, but only in a spatial context.

3 But see năn gâba (chapter 2, § 2.1.2) which codes a relatively closer time to the moment of utterance than H cân gâba. Notice, however, that neither H năn (chapter 3) nor F cân (this chapter) is possible in (39)-(42), because while the former cannot be used in this temporal (cataphoric) context (#năn gâba), the latter is constrained by the very fact that it encodes an equivalent distance to the one encoded by bare gâba ‘in front’ or baaya ‘behind’, making the temporal phrases #cân gâba, #cân baaya necessarily tautological.

4 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 kàr kà shaafaà mini 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 Wàziiri ya lùura dà shii, sai ya cèe wà mutàance, ‘wàanee nèe wancàn?’ (MJC:219)
when Waziri noticed him, he asked the people, ‘who is that?’

dà Hassan ya hangoo tà tàfe, sai ya cèe 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 shi sai ... ya cèe wà ’yan’uwansà, ‘shîn wancàn ... Bàhaushée nee, koo kûwa?’ (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 \textit{NAN} and \textit{CAN}, and I have extended the analysis to encompass the demonstratives \textit{WANNAN} (+NP), NP-\textit{NAN}, and \textit{WANCAN} (+NP), NP-\textit{CAN}. I have also addressed the function and interpretation of some important spatio-temporal and modal deictic particles, e.g. \textit{haka} 'thus, this, so', \textit{nān gaba} 'in future', and referential \textit{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 \textit{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) \textit{wannan vaaro} vs. \textit{vaaro-n-nan} '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 nān ‘here’, the pre-head Demonstratives HL wannan etc. (+ NP), NP+r/-n-nān/-nān ‘this, these’, and the pro-form hakā ‘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 nān 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 nān and HL wannan etc. are clearly weighted towards the metaphorical position of the speaker). Equally interesting is the discovery that F nān 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 wannan etc. (+NP) and FH wannan 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 WANNNAN/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 cân 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 wàncàn etc. This fact has never been mentioned before Jaggar and Buba (1994), and it was often erroneously assumed that H cân 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 can 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 nan-adverbial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F nan</th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Kraft &amp; Kirk Greene</th>
<th>Cowan &amp; Schuh</th>
<th>Newman &amp; Newman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(=nan) 'here' (no tones provided)</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here', e.g. kadà kà zoo nàn 'don't come here'</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here', e.g. ājyee shi nàn 'place it here'</td>
<td>[+proximal] 'here', e.g. gā Audu nàn 'here's Audu here' (nearby)</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here', (there), e.g. yanàa nân 'he is here'</td>
<td>[+visible, +proximal] 'here' (nearby), e.g. inàa zàune à nân 'I live here'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F nan</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaker-proximal, e.g. [+gesture], e.g. gàa shi nàn kusa dà nii 'here it is here close to me.'</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) [anaphoric], e.g. wàatoo daai muu nàn... 'in short, for us here (in this pre-mentioned area)...'</td>
<td>(&lt;&lt; speaker-proximal) [gesture], e.g. ...in na yi nàn yà yi nàn '...if I move here, he moves [t]here'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt; speaker-proximal] [anaphoric], e.g. shuaawaràr dà zàn baa kà à nàn ita cèe... 'my advice to you here is...'</td>
<td>[cataphoric], e.g. shuaawaràr dà zàn baa kà à nàn ita cèe... 'my advice to you here is...'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[temporal], e.g. nàn gàa kàdàn zaa kì ji shakàmàkon gaanàawàr 'soon, you'll hear the result of the interview'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3: summary of previous descriptions of HL wannàn, NP-n/r-nan/nan demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(pre-head)</td>
<td>speaker-proximal</td>
<td>[−identifiable]</td>
<td>[−gesture], e.g. gaa wannan maalami (da ka cece ...) ‘here’s this teacher (that you said...’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL wannàn + NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−familiar]</td>
<td>[−identifiable], e.g. yayaa zan yi dà wannan maalami? ‘what am I going to do with this teacher?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-head)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−identifiable]</td>
<td>[−familiar], e.g. yayaa zan yi dà maalami-n-nan ‘what am I going to do with this teacher’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-nan/nan</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−identifiable]</td>
<td>[−familiar], e.g. gaa maalami-n-nan (da ka cece ...) ‘here’s this teacher (that you said...’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘he would go to this sorcerer, and shift to this [that] Islamic teacher...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-proximal HL wannàn, NP-n/r-nan/nan demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(pre-head)</td>
<td>speaker-proximal</td>
<td>[−identifiable]</td>
<td>[−gesture], e.g. faddaa wajen wannan bookaa, gangaraa wajen wannan maalami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL wannàn + NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−familiar]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(post-head)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−identifiable]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-nan/nan</td>
<td></td>
<td>[−familiar]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[−identifiable]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[−familiar]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in focus &gt;</th>
<th>activated &gt;</th>
<th>familiar &gt;</th>
<th>uniquely identifiable &gt;</th>
<th>referential &gt;</th>
<th>type identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{it}</td>
<td>{that}</td>
<td>{this}</td>
<td>{that N}</td>
<td>{the N}</td>
<td>{indefinite this N}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Frequency count of speaker-proximal (anaphoric, non-spatial) demonstratives in Imam’s Magana Jari Ce 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative form</th>
<th>Demonstrative form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-head NP+n/r-nan/nan</td>
<td>Pre-head HL wannan +NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F nan</td>
<td>speaker-proximal (+gesture), e.g. gaa shi nan kusa da nii ‘here it is here close to me’.</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) (anaphoric), e.g. waa-ndo daai muu nan... ‘in short, for us here (in this pre-mentioned area)...’.</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) (+gesture), e.g. shaawarar da zan baa ka a nan ita cee... ‘my advice to you here is...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[cataphoric], e.g. shawarar da zan baa ka a nan ita cee... ‘my advice to you here is...’</td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. nan gaba kadaan zaa ki ji saakamakon gaamawar ‘soon, you’ll hear the result of the interview’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) (+gesture), e.g. ya wucce wannan zaurree, ...ya wucce wannan zaurree ‘he would pass this room...and he would pass this room’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative (pre-head) wannan + NP</td>
<td>speaker-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar] (+gesture), e.g. gaa wannan takardaa (# da ka cee...) ‘here’s this paper (# that you said...)’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) [-identifiable] [-familiar], e.g. amusa wannan tambayaa ta kasas ‘answer this question below’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal) (+gesture), e.g. ya wucce wannan zaurree, ...ya wucce wannan zaurree ‘he would pass this room...and he would pass this room’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative (post-head) NP+n/r-nan/nan</td>
<td>speaker-proximal [+identifiable] [+familiar] (+gesture), e.g. gaa takarda-r-nan (da ka cee...) ‘here’s this paper (that you said...)’</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker-proximal), [+identifiable], [+familiar], e.g. baa da amshir tambayaar-r-nan da samas ‘answer this question (above)’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: summary of previous descriptions of H nan-adverbial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Kraft/Kirk Greene</th>
<th>Cowan/Schuh</th>
<th>Newman/Newman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H nan</strong></td>
<td>n a n (no tones)</td>
<td><strong>‘here, there’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[±visible]</td>
<td>[±visible]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+distal]</td>
<td>‘here’, e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(= # cã nº /</td>
<td>bãr shi n a n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># can)</td>
<td>‘leave it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>where it is’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k a a s a n wтри kãzaa,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tбо à n a n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g i d a n s й a kãè</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘you know such-and-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>such a place;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w ell <strong>that is</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>where his</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>home is</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[±visible,</td>
<td>[±visible,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[±proximal]</td>
<td>‘there’, (distant or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>previously mentioned’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. tanà n a n kusa dà</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wáccan bishiyàn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘she’s over <strong>there</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>by that tree</strong>, jii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nakè yànà n a n h a r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yànzu ‘I think he is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>still there</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(where we were talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>about before)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spatial</strong></th>
<th><strong>Anaphoric</strong></th>
<th><strong>Symbolic</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H nan</td>
<td>addressee-proximal, e.g. gãa shi n a n kusa dà kai ‘there it is there close to you’</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. wãatò bù dai kùu n a n ... ‘in short, for you there (in that pre-mentioned area) ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. gãa shi n a n kusa dà kai ‘there it is there close to you’</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt;&lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. gãa shi n a n kusa dà kai ‘there it is there close to you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[cataphoric], e.g. kuma à n a n mukè saukaa gidan Alhaji Roorô ‘and it’s there at Alhaji Roro’s house that we used to stay’</td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. n a n dà n a n sai ya yàrda ‘he agreed there and then’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. n a n dà n a n sai ya yàrda ‘he agreed there and then’</td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. n a n dà n a n sai ya yàrda ‘he agreed there and then’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10: summary of previous descriptions of LH wannan, FH wannan, NP-n/r
-nan demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LH wannan (+NP)</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Cowan and Schuh</th>
<th>Howeidy</th>
<th>Galadanci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[±visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td>[±visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td>[-visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td>[-visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan shaafoo-\textit{\textit{n-nan}} \textit{that hawk}</td>
<td>[-visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td>[-visible], address-proximal e.g. wannan \textit{that}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LH wannan (+NP)</th>
<th>Jaggar</th>
<th>Mohamed</th>
<th>Kraft and Kirk-Greene</th>
<th>Bagari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-visible], \textit{closer to the addressee}, e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[±visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[±visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td>[-visible] e.g. wannan = wannan \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{n-nan}}\textit{ that boy}}}}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-proximal LH wannan, FH wannan, NP-n/r-nan (also speaker-distal) demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative (pre-head)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH wannan, FH wannan</td>
<td>addressee-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture]</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt; addressee-proximal) e.g. ... wannan 'yar fatàa kàdài sulèe tllàatin sukkà sàyèe ò '... that small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them'</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+NP</td>
<td>e.g. baa ni wannan takàrdàa 'give me that paper'</td>
<td>In a contrastive context, FH wannan encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. baa wannan ba, wannan 'not that (one), that (closer one)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In a contrastive context, FH wannan encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. baa wannan ba, wannan 'not that (one), that (closer one)'</td>
<td>In a contrastive context, FH wannan encodes the closest addressee-based referent, e.g. baa wannan ba, wannan 'not that (one), that (closer one)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Gundel, Heideberg and Zacharski’s (1993:275) The Givenness Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in focus &gt;</th>
<th>activated &gt;</th>
<th>familiar &gt;</th>
<th>uniquely identifiable &gt;</th>
<th>referential &gt;</th>
<th>type identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{it}</td>
<td>{that}</td>
<td>{that}</td>
<td>{that N}</td>
<td>{the N}</td>
<td>{indefinite this N}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{this}</td>
<td>{this N}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{a N}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Frequency count of speaker-distal (< addressee-proximal) anaphoric demonstratives in Imam’s Magana Jari Ce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative form</th>
<th>Demonstrative from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-head NP+n/r-nan</td>
<td>Pre-head FH wannan (LH wannan) +NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of addressee-based deictics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverbial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H nan</strong></td>
<td>addresseé-proximal, e.g. gâa shi nan kusa dà kai 'there it is there close to you'</td>
<td>speaker-distal (&lt; addresseé-proximal) e.g. wàatòó dai kuu nan... 'in short, for you there (in that pre-mentioned area)...'</td>
<td>speaker-distal (&lt;&lt; addresseé-proximal) e.g. ganii nan barí nan 'as it's seen there, so shall it be left there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[cataphoric], e.g. kuma à nan mukè saukaa gidan Alhaji Rooro 'and it's there precisely at Alhaji Roro's house that we used to stay'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[temporal], e.g. nan da nan sai ya yàrdà 'he agreed there and then'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(pre-head)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LH wànnan.</strong></td>
<td>addresseé-proximal [-identifiable] [-familiar] [+gesture] bàa ni wànnan takàrdàa 'give me that paper'</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt; addresseé-proximal) e.g. ... wànnan 'yar faata kan' suhà tàllàtìn suhà sàyí tà '... that small skin alone was bought for 30 shillings by them'</td>
<td>(speaker-distal (&lt;&lt; addresseé-proximal) wànnan (only))... in na cèe wànnan yà cèe bàa wànnan ba. In kuma na cèe wànnan yà cèe bàa wànnan ba 'if I say this (one) he'll say not that (one); and if I say this (one), he'll again say not that (one)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FH wànnan +NP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>In a contrastive context, FH wànnan encodes the closest addresseé-based referent, e.g. bàa wànnan ba wànnan 'not that (one), that (closer one)' [= in focus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In a contrastive context, [activated] LH wànnan encodes the more remote speaker-distal anaphoric reference, e.g. ai doolè nee à sookè wànnan zà à bëe 'it was inevitable that that election was cancelled'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(pre-head)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NP+ -n/r-nan</strong></td>
<td>addresseé-proximal [+identifiable], [+familiar] [-gesture] bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me that pen'</td>
<td>(speaker-distal &lt; addresseé-proximal) [identifiable] [familiar] bàa ni biirò-n-nan 'give me that pen'</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: summary of previous descriptions of CAN-adverbials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Kraft/Kirk-Greene</th>
<th>Cowan/Schuh</th>
<th>Newman and Newman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| F can | cān (no tones) = 'there' | [+]visible, -proximal, e.g. yanaa cān 'it is over there (=#nan)'
|       |          |         |         | [+]visible, 'there', e.g. gān Audū cān 'there is Audū over there' |
|       |          |         |         | [+]visible, 'there', e.g. gān Audū cān 'they’re there' |
|       |          |         |         | [+]visible, -proximal] 'over there' |
| H can | cān (no tones) = 'there' | [-visible, -proximal] 'there', e.g. naa bita can (=#nan) 'I passed through there' |
|       |          |         |         | [-visible, -proximal] 'there', e.g. yanaa cān ‘it’s there' |
|       |          |         |         | [-visible], e.g. tanaa can à gidaa 'it’s there at home' |
|       |          |         |         | [±visible] 'there', e.g. gāa ta can kusa da wàancock bishiyà 'there it is over there by that tree' |
|       |          |         |         | à can gàrin akà gan shì 'it was in that town that he was seen' |
### Table 16: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of CAN-adverbials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F can</td>
<td>speaker/addresse-distal, e.g. gàa shi cân à índà ka bar shi 'there it is over there where you left it'</td>
<td>e.g. (indicating) cân jee cân nee in daawoo 'I'm going over there (not far away), and will be back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>in na yi năn yà yi cân 'if I move here, he'll move there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H can</td>
<td>speaker/addresse-remote-distal, e.g. màtsaazuwà cân gàba tükùna 'move over there for now'</td>
<td>(speaker/addresse-remote-distal) anaphoric, e.g. ... à cân na sàami wata yaarinyàa 'it's there that I met a girl'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cataphoric: cân à gàrin Bauchi na areewacin Nàajeeriyàa... 'way over there in the northern Nigeria town of Bauchi...'</td>
<td>cân dai, muugùn bàkinkà yà bì kà 'well, there may your evil mouth follow you'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17: summary of previous descriptions of WANCAN (+NP) NP-CAN demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robinson</th>
<th>Howeidy</th>
<th>Bargery</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Galadanci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL wàncàn (+NP)</td>
<td>wachan (waccàn) hanyàa</td>
<td>wàncàn 'that'</td>
<td>[+visible], wàncàn dookii</td>
<td>[+visible], wàccàn riigaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hanyà-r-chan</td>
<td>[+visible] wàncàn dookii</td>
<td>(can)'that way' (no tones)</td>
<td>riigà-r-càn 'that gown (not near you or me)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-can/càn</td>
<td>littnaff-r-chan</td>
<td>= dooki-n-càn 'that horse'</td>
<td>[-visible] wàccàn sheekaráà</td>
<td>wàccàn riigaa 'that gown'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(càn)'that book' (no tones)</td>
<td>= dooki-n-càn 'that horse'</td>
<td>= sheekàrà-r-càn #-nan 'that year in the past'</td>
<td>[±visible] riigà-r-càn 'that gown'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH wàncàn (+NP)</td>
<td>[±visible], wàncàn 'that'</td>
<td>[±visible], wàccàn 'that'</td>
<td>[-visible] wàccàn 'that'</td>
<td>[±visible] wàccàn riigaa 'that gown'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yonder'</td>
<td>wàccàn riigaa</td>
<td>sheekàràà</td>
<td>riigà-r-càn 'that gown'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-n/r-can</td>
<td>[±visible], gàff-r-càn 'that town'</td>
<td>= sheekàrà-r-càn #-nan 'that year in the past'</td>
<td>[±visible] wàccàn 'that year in question'</td>
<td>riigà-r-càn 'that gown'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH wàncàn (+NP)</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>[±visible] wàccàn riigaa</td>
<td>[±visible] wàccàn riigaa 'that gown'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kraft &amp; Kirk-Greene</td>
<td>Cowan &amp; Schuh</td>
<td>Newman &amp; Newman</td>
<td>Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HL \textit{wàncàn} (+NP)</strong></td>
<td>[+visible] \textit{waccàn goonaa}</td>
<td>[+visible] \textit{waccàn goonaa}</td>
<td>[+visible] (distant) \textit{wàncàn} \textit{that} (no examples)</td>
<td>[+visible] (distant) \textit{wàncàn} \textit{dàbìinò}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NP-n/r-càn/càn</strong></td>
<td>= goona-r-càn \textit{that farm}</td>
<td>= goona-r-càn \textit{that farm}</td>
<td>\textit{dikùnà-n-càn} \textit{those rooms over there}</td>
<td>\textit{dàbìinò-n-càn} \textit{that date-palm tree}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LH \textit{wàncàn} (+NP)</strong></td>
<td>[-visible] \textit{wàncàn} \textit{the one in question}</td>
<td>[-visible] \textit{wàccàn} makàkkàtÀa cè \textit{that is a place of deviation}</td>
<td>[-visible], \textit{wàncàn} \textit{that}, \textit{that one} (no examples)</td>
<td>[+visible], \textit{wàncàn} \textit{ginì}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NP-n/r-càn</strong></td>
<td>\textit{kùnà-r-càn} \textit{that chair}</td>
<td>\textit{cùkì-n \textit{shèekà-r-càn} / #-\textit{nan} \textit{in that year}}</td>
<td>\textit{NP-càn} \textit{that} (not visible, the one referred to)</td>
<td>\textit{ginì-n-càn} \textit{that building (way over there)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FH \textit{wàncàn} (+NP)</strong></td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18: summary of the semantic-pragmatic features of speaker-addressee (remote-) distal WANCAN (+NP), NP-CAN demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative (pre-head)</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL wancan (+NP)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-distal [-identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture], e.g. kujëerar tanãa baayan wancan d’aakli ‘the chair is behind that hut’ [non-presupposed]</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-distal) [contrastive] too danganëe da waccan màganàa kuma... ‘as for that (other) issue...’</td>
<td>anàa faadàa tsàkaanin wànnàa zùrì’aa dà waccan (zùrì’àa) ‘there’s conflict between this clan and that (clan)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate (pre-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal [-identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture], e.g. à wancan wurfin mukà tarar dà shii ‘it’s at that place over there that we met him’ [contrastive], e.g. bâà waccan moòtaa ba, wàccan tà gaba ‘not that car (you’re approaching), that (other one) way in front’ [non-presupposed]</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à wàncan/ wâncan lookàcii yaa fi yàa ansà lààfìn ‘at that (other) time, he pleaded not guilty’ [long distance]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH wancan,</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote [-identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture] wàncan loona da waccan ‘at this (other) time, he pleaded not guilty’</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH wàncan (+NP)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal [-identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture] anyàa koo bâi yi wà yàarà-n-càn [yàara-n-càn] nàuyìi ba? ‘is it not too heavy for that boy/those boys?’ [presupposed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate (post-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote [-identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture] mutàinë-n-càn nè è këe gudùu na gànii jiyà ‘it’s those people running that I saw yesterday’ [presupposed]</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [+identifiable] [+familiar], e.g. ya sàa kuma à kàshë iyàayënmù maataa don mafàrkî-n-càn da na gàyàà mukû ‘he ordered our mothers to be killed because of that dream I told you about’ [non-contrastive] [presupposed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP+-n/r-càn/càn</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate (post-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote [-identifiable] [+familiar] [+gesture] mutàinë-n-càn nèè da këe gudùu na gànii jiyà ‘it’s those people running that I saw yesterday’ [presupposed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverbial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F can</strong></td>
<td>speaker/adresssee-distal, e.g. gãa shi cân  à indã ka bar shi 'there it is over there where you left it'</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>e.g. (indicating) zân jee cân nee in daawoo 'I'm going over there (not far away), and will be back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H can</strong></td>
<td>speaker/adresssee-remote-distal, e.g. mëtsaa zuwà can gàba tükàna 'move way over there for now'</td>
<td>(&lt;speaker/adresssee-remote-distal) anaphoric: ... à can na sàami wata yaarinyàà 'it's there that I met a girl'</td>
<td>cân d'ai, muugàn bàakinkà yà bii kà 'well, there may your evil mouth follow you'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(pre-head)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HL wàncàn (+NP)</strong></td>
<td>speaker/adresssee-distal [-identifiable] [+gesture], e.g. kujëeràr tanàà baayan wàncàn d'aakìi 'the chair is behind that hut'</td>
<td>tôo danganèà dà wàncàn màgàanà kuma ... as for that (other) issue ...</td>
<td>anàa fàndàà tsàkaànin wànnàn zùrì'àà dà wàncàn (zùrì'àà) 'there's conflict between this clan and that (clan)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(pre-head)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LH wàncàn +NP</strong></td>
<td>speaker/adresssee-remote-distal [-identifiable] [-familiar], e.g. à wàncàn wurîn mukà tarà dà shii 'it's at that place over there that we met him'</td>
<td>(&lt; speaker/adresssee-remote-distal) [contrastive] à wàncàn / wàncàn lookàài yaa ki yà amsà làffìn 'at that (other) time, he pleaded not guilty'</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FH wàncàn +NP</strong></td>
<td>[contrastive] bàà wàncàn mootàà ba, wàncàn tà gàba 'not that car (you're approaching), that (other one) way in front'</td>
<td>[long distance]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
<td>Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative</strong> (post-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-distal [+identifiable] [+familiar] [-gesture], e.g. anyàa kọọ bái yi wà yaarò-n-càn [yàara-n-càn] nauyii ba? ‘is it not too heavy for that boy [those boys]?’ [presupposed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative</strong> (post-head)</td>
<td>speaker/addressee-remote-distal, [+identifiable] [+familiar] [-gesture], e.g. mutàànè-n-can nèe dà kèe gudùù na ganii jìyà ‘it’s those people running that I saw yesterday’ [presupposed]</td>
<td>(speaker/addressee-remote-distal) [+identifiable] [+familiar], e.g. ya sàa kùmà à kàshè iyààyenmù màataa don mafàrkò-n-can dà na gayàà mukà ‘he ordered our mothers to be killed because of that dream I told you about’ [non-contrastive] [presupposed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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