

Grammatical influences of Kanuri on Chadic languages of Yobe State¹

Russell G. Schuh
University of California, Los Angeles

1. Kanuri and Chadic languages of north-eastern Nigeria

In Schuh (2003) I documented the pervasive linguistic influence of Kanuri on Bade and Ngizim. These are languages of the Chadic family spoken in what is now Yobe State, Nigeria, immediately west of Borno State, where Kanuri is the dominant language. In that paper, I provided evidence showing that intensive contact between Kanuri and the Chadic languages of northeastern Nigeria dates from at least the 16th century, and probably considerably earlier. Since writing the 2003 paper, continued work on the Chadic languages has substantially expanded the sizes of the lexicons of those languages and has resulted in more extensive documentation of Kanuri influences.

Table 1 shows the approximate proportions of Kanuri loanwords in currently available data from Ngizim, the Gashua and Western dialects of Bade (arguably different languages), and Bole. Bole, a Yobe State language that was not discussed in Schuh (2003), belongs to the A-Branch of West Chadic whereas the other languages belong to the B-Branch (Newman 1977).

Table 1: Proportions of Kanuri loanwords in overall lexicons

	Total entries	Kanuri loans	% Kanuri loans
Ngizim	3971	561	14.1%
G. Bade	2597	412	15.9%
W. Bade	3085	387	12.5%
Bole	4511	339	7.5%

These updated counts show a considerably higher proportion of Kanuri loanwords than the counts in the earlier paper (12.7% for Ngizim, 8.5% for Gashua Bade, and 7.92% for Western Bade).

¹ Work on the Chadic Languages of Yobe State has been supported by grants from the US National Science Foundation (BCS-0111289 from 2001-2004 and BCS-05553222 from 2006-2009, Russell G. Schuh, Principal Investigator). My thanks go to my collaborators on the languages of this project, most especially to my former student and now colleague, Dr. Alhaji Maina Gimba. Georg Ziegelmeyer provided useful comments on the first draft. It almost goes without saying that Norbert Cyffer's publications on Kanuri have been an indispensable resource for research in this area.

It is interesting to compare these figures with those for current counts of loanwords from Hausa, which pepper the speech of modern speakers of the languages: Ngizim 184 (4.6%), G. Bade 101 (3.9%), W. Bade 150 (4.9%), Bole 339 (7.5% – identical to that for Kanuri). Today, all speakers of these Chadic languages are also fluent speakers of Hausa. Younger speakers have little, if any competence in Kanuri. The comparative figures for loanwords, however, suggest that there must have been a long period of bilingualism in Kanuri in the Chadic language communities. This in turn suggests that linguistic influences of Kanuri may extend beyond simply adding new words to the lexicon. The purpose of this paper is to look at some ways that Kanuri has worked its way into the structural fiber of the Chadic languages. Clearly the Kanuri influence on the B-Branch languages (Ngizim, G. Bade, W. Bade) is greater than that of the A-Branch language, Bole. Bole is included in this study as a Chadic language from the same general zone of Kanuri influence in order to highlight the features of B-Branch languages that result from contact with Kanuri.

2. Remarks on typology

The focus of Schuh (2003) was on the phonological and morphological adaptation of Kanuri words as they have been borrowed into the Chadic languages rather than how loanwords have been integrated into language structure. The very large majority of loanwords are “substantive” items – nouns and verbs. For example, of the 561 Kanuri loanwords in Ngizim, 390 are nouns and 118 are verbs, the remaining 53 being a mix of adjectives, adverbs, ideophones, interjections, particles, and conjunctions. It is not surprising that substantive items dominate. Such items are useful in expanding the lexicon to allow naming of concepts that may not have been directly available from native expressions, and they require no structural linguistic adaptations.²

On the other hand, markers of syntactic function are, by definition, tied to syntax, and the syntactic typologies of Kanuri and the Chadic languages are radically different. Kanuri has SOV sentence structure, whereas all the Chadic languages here have SVO; Kanuri marks gram-

² Both Kanuri and the Chadic languages have extensive verbal inflectional morphology. As shown in Schuh (2003: 84-85), the Chadic languages handle this by borrowing the Kanuri verbal nouns, to which Chadic inflectional morphology is then added. Kanuri uses case-marking postpositions with nouns to show syntactic function, but nouns themselves are cited without postpositions and nominative and accusative case marking is, to some extent, optional. Kanuri case-marking is not imported with loan-nouns.

matical relations using postpositions, whereas all the Chadic languages use prepositions and mark subject and object functions only by word order. The following illustrative sentences from Kanuri and Ngizim both mean ‘the king has given something to this man’.³

Kanuri

- (1) **Mâi-yè kâṃ átə-ro agó lága cínà.**
 king-NOM man this-DAT thing some give.3SG.PERF
 (Lukas 1937: 149)

Ngizim

- (2) **Mâi bàrə bàyà ī nən tku.**
 king give-PERF thing to man this

Table 2 lists the grammatical function markers that I will discuss, grouped by function. This list is not exhaustive, but it includes some pervasive function words of (presumably) Kanuri origin used in the respective Chadic languages. Insofar as my data from these languages is representative, not all the languages use all the words, as indicated by the check boxes.

Table 2: Kanuri function words used in Yobe Chadic languages

	<i>Kanuri</i>	<i>W. Bade</i>	<i>G. Bade</i>	<i>Ngizim</i>	<i>Bole</i>
Clausal and discourse conjoiners					
dàji	√	√	√	√	√
gə̀le	√	√	√	√	√
kùru	√	√	√	√	
Topicalizing and focus particles					
dìye	√	√	√	√	
ye	√	√	√	√	(see fn. 6)
Clause final subordinators					
dùwo	√	√	√	√	
yàye	√	√	√	√	
Clause intial operators					
ngalwo	√	√	√	√	√
ngàlte	√	√	√	√	

³ I have relied on the following sources for information on Kanuri: Cyffer (1973), Cyffer (1994), Cyffer and Hutchison (1990), Hutchison (1981), Jarrett (n.d.), Lukas (1937), my own field notes on Manga, and a filemaker lexical database of Kanuri kindly provided by Georg Ziegelmeyer. I will not cite sources for specific comments about Kanuri except where I have drawn examples from one of these sources.

Spelling and sound correspondences: The written representations are, for the most part the “standard” spellings for the respective languages, supplemented by diacritics marking tone and vowel length. Following are spelling equivalents to IPA in brackets: **c** [tʃ], **j** [dʒ], **y** [j], **ə** [ɨ]. G. Bade and Ngizim **ř** is a trilled/tapped “r”, which contrasts with retroflex flap [ɾ], written as **r** (other languages have only tap/trill “r”). Grave accent (**â**) = low tone, circumflex accent (**â**) = falling tone, no accent = high tone except in examples from Lukas (1937) where acute accent (**á**) marks high, macron (**ā**) = long vowel (Kanuri does not have distinctive vowel length). Some Chadic examples are drawn from texts not marked for tone and vowel length. Diacritics have not been added in these examples.

As shown in Schuh (2003) and more systematically documented in Schuh (2005), most Kanuri loanwords came into the Chadic languages before Kanuri underwent a number of major sound changes. The Chadic languages preserve the earlier Kanuri pronunciations. The most obvious cases are the medial labials **p** and **b** and the medial velars **k** and **g**, which have been retained in the Chadic languages, whereas in Kanuri, the labials have all become **w** and the velars have disappeared completely or have become glides **w** or **y** depending on environment.

3. Clausal and discourse conjoiners

From the point of view of the Chadic languages, these items serve a linking function between a clause and preceding discourse. In modern Kanuri, the same seems to be true, but **dàji**, the first listed in table 2 has a grammatically different origin from the others.

dàji (< **dàngîn** ‘stand; be finished’) *conj.* ‘then, and then (*usu. as a connective in a narrative context*)’:

Kanuri

- (3) **Ngoðàà, dàji kàrààrò lèyadaniyà dàji lèjâi lèjâi ngai dùwôn, dàji faðò buldùyèrò lèyadà.**

‘[The dog and the jackal] gathered, then when they had gone to the bush, well they were going and going like that, then they went to the hyena’s house.’ (Yusufu Lawan)⁴

⁴ Examples notated “Yusufu Lawan” are from Manga texts narrated by Malam Yusufu, which I recorded in Gashua during July 1974.

W. Bade

- (4) **Aci əkfə i kunu gəru, daci gərau da kuɓi kərəp!**
 ‘When he went into the hollow, well the hollow closed up *kurup!*’
 (T1W_WuA_033)

G. Bade

- (5) **Dàci, aksi taun à kīfak māmatkəli.**
 ‘Well, they spent the night eating his mother.’ (GBI_MDW_040)

Ngizim

- (6) **... a bədlau ngum, daci a lawan kayak məstena gənawa.**
 ‘... [the hyena] was digging, and then he saw that the squirrel had changed in appearance.’ (AHS_BNK_133-134)

Bole

- (7) **Pətaj jito ye nà, “Ciwo,” dāshi bə bònò pài jini.**
 ‘When she went out she said, “Ciwo,” then the door closed up.’
 (Y_ANAK_007)

add underline

Kanuri **dàji** (< ***dàci**) is the third person singular Predicative (Lukas 1937) ~ Emphaticus (Cyffer 1973) ~ Verb Emphasis Completive (Hutchison 1981) form from the root **dà-** (morphologically **dà-c-i** root-3sg-aspect). Lukas (1937: 144) states that it “indicates that the action of the previous sentence is finished and that now another action starts”. This is a good characterization of its function in the Chadic languages as well. Originally in Kanuri, however, it would have been an integral part of a sequence of verbs, a meaning that it could have never had in Chadic. In modern Kanuri likewise it is bleached to the point of having no literal verbal meaning, as seen in the Manga example above, where the actors in the discourse are plural, but **dàji** is singular in form.

Kanuri **gəle** ‘but, well (pleonastic)’; (Jarrett n.d.) ‘indeed’:

W. Bade

- (8) **kələ àngwi dācīn!**
 ‘well take some hair then!’ (TA_03_010)

G. Bade

- (9) **kəle aci dā kadūwau?**
 ‘did he really come yesterday?’ (lexicon, *kəle*)

Ngizim

- (10) **ka zègà bīn, kàlē à bàrà dā**
 ‘if you don’t know, then give me the town (admit defeat)’ (Riddles #10 1970)

Bole

- (11) **Ita sorun sa, dashit mate na, “Kile shi sorako de?”**
 ‘When she didn’t fall, then they said to her, “Are you gonna fall then?”’ (DBP_LgaM_052)

The definitions of **gèle** from the Kanuri dictionaries are not very informative, and none of the Kanuri sources available to me provide any examples. This word is, however, well-integrated into the Chadic languages and has a fairly clear function. Most, if not all the examples that I have found use this word to initiate a command or a question and indicate an event contrary to expectation or resistance of the addressee to do an action. The Chadic languages all have initial **k-** rather than the **g-** given in the Kanuri sources, suggesting that this word passed into the Chadic languages at an early date, after which Kanuri voiced the initial sound.

(Kanuri) **kùru**, (Manga) **kòro** ‘again, and also; (in negative) not yet’:

Kanuri

- (12) **kùru dagəl dālami falrò fàrtəgìn**
 ‘again the monkey jumped onto a branch’ (Cyffer 1973: 182)

Manga

- (13) **kənnarì ngəbəl cùwàndiyà, buldù kàanjù cənè cəmoì, kòro gède cùwàndiyà, kàanjù cənè cəmoì**
 ‘when the squirrel found an egg, the hyena said he would take it as his, again when he found another, he said he would take it as his’ (Yusufu Lawan)

W. Bade

- (14) **pəfku koro aci da pi garwon da ni dawau**
 ‘in the morning again he let out the goats and went herding’
 (T1W_NBP_125)

G. Bade

- (15) **Aksi a suwali a suwali, kwañi aduwau ni, aksi ta tli tannaksi.**
 ‘They were dancing and dancing, then in the afternoon they arose and left.’ (T1G_DDT_018)

Ngizim

- (16) **Kòřu dà ràmd ì m̄bədgarà, “Tìye ā zātan, dà ma bai.”**
 (After warning a headstrong girl not to remove a mortar) ‘In addition she said to her neighbors, “Whoever pounds, don’t remove it.”’ (AHS_BNJ_125)

Bole has not borrowed this word, rather using the native word **bòlo** in equivalent function. The other languages may have borrowed it independently at different times. Western Bade uses **kòro**, which is the form seen in Manga, whereas Ngizim **kùřu** (= **kòřu**) looks like the Kanuri form. Gashua Bade **kwāři** differs phonologically from the forms in Kanuri dialects for which I have information, but the tapped **ř** indicates non-native origin and the **k-ř-** template seems non-accidental. A rather cursory survey of the texts available to me suggests other differences as well. The use of **kòro** and **kwāři** in the respective Bade dialects is much more frequent than the use of **kùřu** in Ngizim. Also, **kwāři** in Gashua Bade seems to be used in a way similar to **dàji**, indicating a simple hiatus in activity as opposed to “addition, repetition”. Finally, none of the Chadic languages seem to use the word in the sense of ‘not yet’ in negative sentences, as indicated in Cyffer and Hutchison’s (1990) definition.

4. Topicalizing and focus particles

The basic function of the particles discussed in this section is to set off some element in a discourse, such as a noun phrase or even a full clause. This function generally comes under the heading *topicalization*, but sometimes it is difficult to pin down an exact function. In English, the function of such particles would typically be conveyed by phonological cues such as intonation or pause, or sometimes by a bleached phrase such as “ya know” or “I tell you”. Only two such particles are examined here, though there are other similar particles of likely Kanuri origin used in the Chadic languages, such as **kùwa** ‘now, by now’ and **bìya** ‘only, just, without reason, in vain’, which, in Kanuri, seem to have a conjunctive function similar to the words discussed in §3 (Cyffer 1973: 180ff).⁵

⁵ Ngizim uses a topicalizing particle **řò**, as in **amzharu řò atu ā nī** ‘tomorrow certainly she will come’. The tapped “r” is an almost certain indicator that this is a loanword. Kanuri has no such topicalizing particle, but it does use the postposition **-rò** in a variety of functions, including adverbial function that Hutchison (1981: 261) likens to the English *-ly* adverbial suffix. It looks as if Ngizim has reinterpreted this postposition as a separate particle.

diye 'surely, entirely, only':

Kanuri

- (17) **kurgûn diyé nyírò mataro legóskò**
'I went only to fetch you some medicine'
- (18) **wú cídànyi dískànà diyé**
'my work is completely finished'
(examples and translations from Lukas 1937: 152)

W. Bade

- (19) **ekàm òtkwatkàra mco no, nà satitəŋ ayu dəge**
'look at that body of hers, it's me who tattooed it, you know'
(GSS_51_9)
- (20) **A tadiyu diyé bena na hadam!**
'Let go of me I tell you or else I will bite you!' (TA_6_21)

Ngizim

- (21) **ka kkəmagəri gadagə mo? gədənci dəge**
'why are you beating him? he's your little brother, you know'
(lexicon, *dəge*)

In both Kanuri and the Chadic languages, **diye** (< **dəge**, still heard as such in Chadic) is almost always clause final and insists on or affirms the truth value of the clause. The scope seems to be the entire clause in the Chadic languages, and probably in Kanuri as well, though this is not entirely clear from Lukas's translations.

ye 'and, also, too':

Kanuri

- (21) **shi ye isənà** 'he also came, he came too'
- (22) **kàràjîn ye rùwòjîn ye** 'he reads and writes'
(both examples from Cyffer and Hutchison 1990: 189)

W. Bade

- (23) **Gangan paltu kwaya, əskwaran ye a paltu.**
'If the drumming changes, the dancing too will change.' (GSS_99, #33)
- (24) **Ja ji re kukon ye, nama, 'Mco kukou kulim.'**
'When she yet again went to a baobab, she said, "This is not a good baobab."' (T1W_WuA_061)

- (25) **Suwarau dukwu aci uktətu yauman, atu ye kəfak da rawinara.**
 ‘When the mother-in-law heard that he [the ogre] had taken her [his own mother], she for her part stealthily ran away.’
 (T1W_MKM_033)

G. Bade

- (26) **Atu sədfwə nə, aci ye ta sədfwì.**
 ‘When she moved a bit, he too moved a bit.’ (GBI_BDu_053)

Ngizim

- (27) **Dləgəmau marəm nən, kakəragəri ye gawa.**
 ‘If a camel is big, his load too will be great.’ (prov_as_089)
- (28) **Mayim dambasu da jəb kawagəri atu ye a təkə bi kəmagara.**
 ‘The child was sitting and began playing and she for her part went ahead with her work. (ZMN_NDnaW_050)

The sense of ‘too, also’ is retained from Kanuri into the Chadic languages, but in the Chadic languages, the function has broadened to general topic marking, as shown by the last examples for W. Bade and Ngizim, where the translation ‘also’ would not be appropriate. In the Chadic languages, by far the most common function of **ye** is to set off a clause initial noun or pronoun as a topic, though the second W. Bade example shows that it can be a clause level marker as well. Here, there is a clear difference between Kanuri syntax and the way the Chadic languages have adapted this marker. In Kanuri, **ye** is a correlative conjunction that typically is suffixed to each of the conjuncts and would be translatable as ‘both ... and ...’ as in the second Kanuri example (see also Cyffer 1973: 183, Lukas 1937: 146). Even when suffixed to a single constituent, as in the first Kanuri example, it has the meaning ‘also’, indicating the presence of a “silent” conjunct. Conjunction by postposition is foreign to the SVO typology of the Chadic languages, and, not surprisingly, they always use **ye** as a stand-alone topicalizer, never as a correlative. This probably has facilitated the bleaching of **ye** to become a simple topic marker without the specific ‘also’ meaning.⁶

boldface

⁶ I have not included Bole among the languages that have borrowed **ye** from Kanuri, even though Bole does have a homophonous particle whose uses overlap those seen in the other Chadic languages, as in **Gāzà ye in an bōni àmmā kokkirōtōni in gòru.** ‘As for a/the rooster he belongs to his owner, but his crowing belongs to the town.’ This particle is a definite determiner with cognates in other Chadic languages. It is not used in the meaning ‘too, also’, where Bole uses **ke** or **ma**, the latter perhaps a loan from Hausa, as in **d’inkiyān bonni ye mā kungurum ko memu** ‘the drinking cup of his house too was a human skull’, where **ye** cooccurs with **ma**.

5. Clause final subordinators

Both the items in Table 2 have complex syntactic distributions and complex semantics. I will here illustrate only their functions as conjunctions placed at the end of subordinate clauses, i.e. those discussed in Cyffer (1973: §3.4.3).

dùwo *part (used as conj.)* ‘before, though, although’:

Kanuri

- (29) **kàràngîn dùwô kòlwokò**
 ‘I was studying though and then I quit’
 (example and translation, Hutchison 1981: 307)

W. Bade

- (30) **nə ’yawum, nə ji i pata duwon kunau da sazvi**
 ‘I didn’t give birth, when I went to the bush, the pregnancy aborted’ (T1W_NBP_013)

Ngizim

- (31) **ka ni ka dəbshinakəm dəgo kaki be waña a wakata**
 ‘come and hide first and see what is happening’ (ZMN_WCG_233)

It is difficult to circumscribe the meaning/function of **dùwo**. Cyffer (1973) calls it “temporal”; Hutchison (1981: 303-308) devotes five dense pages to it and points out that Lukas (1937) discusses it in six separate sections. As a clausal conjunction, its base meaning is the completion/termination of an event before the beginning of another event, often calling for a translation “first”.

yàye ‘even if, although’:

Kanuri

- (32) **bìsketərò lèji yàye, àgo wuzannà bagò**
 ‘though he went to the celebration, there wasn’t anything worth seeing’ (Cyffer 1973: 154)

W. Bade

- (33) **əktlan duwon gagara yaye, atu auktaŋ fuwara**
 ‘a cow, even if she is old, she must carry her horns’ (GSS_101, #81)

G. Bade

- (34) **aci ta jlami ta jlami yaye, aci ba ad’atkəla bai**
though he tried and tried, he did ^{not} convince her (“get her head”)’ insert 'not'
 (T1G_WdM_030)

Ngizim

- (35) **jagadlau jid ici tləri yāye, ā kalū bai**
 ‘even if a lion attacked him, he wouldn’t be afraid’ (lexicon, *yaye*)

As a clause-final conjunction, **yāye** is quite consistent in marking concessive conditionals (‘although, even if, no matter that’).⁷

From a typological point of view, it is unexpected that the Chadic languages would adopt and fully integrate these clause final conjunctions. While such conjunctions are consistent with the SOV (‘‘head final’’) typology of Kanuri, they seem inconsistent with the SVO (‘‘head initial’’) typology of the Chadic languages. In Bole, for example, the concessive conditional conjunction is clause initial (**le innashi ko garaṅ, a konati konni** ‘even if he sees you from afar, he will not bring himself’ LK_MBA_KZ_141). The integration of clause-final conditional and temporal conjunctions may have been facilitated in the Yobe State Chadic languages by the fact that in all these languages (including those, like Bole, which have not borrowed the clause final Kanuri conjunctions discussed here), clauses that stand in a temporal relation to each other generally mark the first clause, not by a clause initial conjunction, but by a clausal final marker that has its historical origin in the determiner system. Because the Yobe Chadic languages are all consistently head initial, determiners are always postnominal within noun phrases and, as a consequence, they are clause final when extended to temporal clausal functions:

Ngizim

- (36) **ja ika aci tǎnu, ja ndəm aci**
 ‘when we saw him, we greeted him’ (lexicon, *tǎnu*)

Bole

- (37) **bati nonshi ye ndin ye, shi attam mammē dō?!**
 ‘when your sister came, is that how you behaved toward her?!’
 (Y_IDZ_106)

(Note that the first **ye** in the Bole example is functioning as a definite determiner within the subject noun phrase.)

Cross-linguistically, extension of determiners to phrasal syntax is not unusual, and in fact Kanuri has done the same thing (Hutchison 1981:

⁷ A related use of **yāye** in Kanuri is as a clitic to question words to form universally quantified constructions, e.g. **ndu yāye** ‘anyone, whoever, no matter who’. The Chadic languages have imported **yāye** in this use as well, e.g. W. Bade **tē yāye** ‘everyone, whoever’ alongside native **tēka**.

242).⁸ In this connection, it is worth mentioning some postpositional conjunctions in Kanuri that Yobe State Chadic languages have *not* borrowed, but rather use clause initial conjunctions: relative clauses (Kanuri **-tə**), reason and purpose clauses (Kanuri **-ro**), direct and indirect quotations (Kanuri uses forms of the irregular verb ‘say’ at the end of the clause). Moreover, Kanuri has conditional (**-ga**) and concessive (**-so**) postpositional conjunctions that Chadic languages have not adopted.

6. Clause-Initial operators

In all the constructions examined so far, the Chadic languages have adopted both the words and the word orders of the source Kanuri constructions. In the case of clausal postpositions, I have suggested a path by which the Chadic languages have borrowed the Kanuri constructions even though there seems to be a typological clash. In the cases in sections 3-4, the word orders seem compatible with both head final and head initial typologies, though perhaps for different reasons: **dàji** is, historically, a verb in Kanuri and hence a clause on its own, whereas in Chadic, it comes in as an unanalyzable conjunction heading a clause; **gàle** is probably treated like a sentence-level adverb in both languages, and such adverbs would be clause initial in both typologies because they scope over an entire clause; **dīye** may be a postposed clausal conjunction in Kanuri, but an enclitic in Chadic, morphosyntactically like the determiners discussed in §5.

In the two cases to be discussed in this section, it seems that the Chadic languages have borrowed the Kanuri words, but have adapted them to Chadic syntax in a way that is distinct from their use in Kanuri.

ngalwò *adj* ‘noble, superior’ (Cyffer and Hutchison 1990); ‘best, decent, exceptional, significant’ (FileMaker dictionary):

Kanuri

- (38) **shí kâm tútùro ngálwò go**
 ‘he is of nobler birth than that man’ (Lukas 1937: 148)

W. Bade

- (39) **ngalkò gà si bón**
 ‘it would be best that you drink *fura*’ (lexicon, *ngalkò*)

⁸ See Schlenker (2004) for the semantic basis for this extension of function.

G. Bade

- (40) **ngalko ɓa nɛn katanānai**
 ‘it would be better that I return’ (lexicon, *ngalkò*)

Ngizim

- (41) **ngalko na dlabi gō ama**
 ‘it would be best that I remain without a wife’ (AHS_Day_041)

Bole

- (42) **kobò ka ndaì tanā ngalkò ka ɗowi**
 ‘rather than that you go there, it would be better that you stay’
 (lexicon, *ngalkò*)

ngàlte *adv* ‘ever (occurring usu. in a negative past context)’:

Kanuri

- (43) **ngàlte-ma isənyi**
 ‘he never arrived’ (Cyffer and Hutchison 1990: 134)

W. Bade

- (44) **ngàlte gə jí Kanò ɓi? - ngàlte nə jàgjà Kanò pəm**
 ‘have you ever gone to Kano?’ – ‘I have never gone to Kano’ (lexi-
 con, *ngàlte*)

G. Bade

- (45) **ngàlte ɓa jə ngamadāli bai**
 ‘he and I have never met’ (lexicon, *ngàlte*)

Ngizim

- (46) **Ngàlte tɔmaku ’yawu aku bai.**
 ‘A sheep has never given birth to a goat.’ (prov_2004_007)

underline

In Kanuri, **ngalwò** (< **ngalkò**, still seen in all the Chadic languages), with high-low tones, is an adjective, used as a predicate in the example here; **ngàlte** is a temporal adverb, which presumably could be preceded in a clause by noun phrase arguments.

The Chadic languages have reanalyzed these words in a way that fits head initial typology: both are now clause initial conjunctions, or perhaps better, clause initial *operators* that scope over the entire clause. In the case of **ngalwò**, this loanword may have replaced a native word in the same function (cf. Hausa **gāra**, with the same meaning and syntax) or perhaps a more complex clausal circumlocution. In the case of **ngàlte**, however, the original native way of expressing “have done before, have

never done” seems to have been with a verb, as seen in Hausa, Bole, Miya, and probably many others, e.g. Bole **onta dodo godon ya ita dandak inne sa** ‘he gave her money in an amount that she had never seen [... had not touched seeing]’ (LK_MBA_KZ_136). The Chadic languages that use **ngàlte** may have innovated this construction on analogy with the more widespread construction with **ngalwò** as a way to simplify the syntactically complex construction using a verb.

7. Conclusions

Work on this short paper has highlighted two general points. The first has been the differing levels of influence that Kanuri has had on Yobe State languages. This influence is pervasive in speech in all these languages, for example, in exclamations such as **dàmbèràm(bè)**! ‘I’ll be damned!’ used in all the languages mentioned here and others as well, leading to a rather indiscriminate concept of Kanuri influence throughout the area. Relative numbers of borrowed items, however, indicate that Kanuri influence has been much greater on the Bade-Ngizim languages than on the Bole-Tangale languages, and although Ngizim is now geographically separate from Bade, and all its neighbors are Bole-Tangale languages, the Kanuri influence on Bade-Ngizim must date to a time when this group occupied a geographically contiguous area and the languages were less differentiated from each other than they are now. This conclusion, drawn from simply counting loanwords, is reinforced by looking at specific items. Most of the abstract syntactic and discourse markers of Kanuri origin examined in this paper are shared by all the languages of the Bade-Ngizim group, but not by Bole, indicating a more superficial influence of Kanuri on Bole than on the Bade-Ngizim languages.

The second general point has to do with documentation of the types of markers discussed here. There is a tendency among descriptive linguists to pay scant attention to abstract items that do not have straightforward grammatical function or translation: Kanuri **gàle** is described vaguely as “pleonastic”, and I could find no examples illustrating this item in any of the reference sources; I have listed both **dəge** and **dəgo** in the Gashua Bade lexicon, which means that I must have found them used somewhere in that language, but when I entered them, I included no examples and could find none in texts. Bilingual speakers of these languages, on the other hand, must have been paying very careful attention to such items as indicated by the fact that they have imported them from the discourse/syntactic fabric of a second language into their native languages. We, as linguists, should take a cue from the practices of speakers as to what counts as worth paying attention to!

References for Examples

References in this paper have the following form:

“lexicon” = elicited examples found under headwords in dictionaries of the respective languages.

Text examples have the format X_Y_###, where X = a text collection, Y = a text in that collection, ### = the line number in that text. The collections are as follows:

Western Bade:

<http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/aflang/Bade/bade.html>

T1W = *Tərzəna Gabade* (2003):

TA = *Tərzənaŋ Amsi* (1974)

GSS = *Tərzənaŋo, Mimiko, Təmtəmeko da Maka-ranta Gasiwa* (1975, 2004), cited by page number only; #33, etc. = proverb numbers

Gashua Bade:

<http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/aflang/Bade/bade.html>

T1G = *Tərzəna Gabade* (2003):

GB1 = unpublished texts available on website

Ngizim:

<http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/aflang/Ngizim/ngizim.html>

AHS = *Zənzən da Rik Adamu Helman Sale* (2003)

ZMN = *Zənzən i Miya Ngəzəm* (2007)

prov_2004 = *Gamzazəgai Gagaya Ngəzəm* (2004)

prov_as = unpublished proverbs compiled by Adamu Sale in 1970

Riddles = unpublished riddles collected in 1970

Bole:

<http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/aflang/Bole/bole.html>

DBP = *Dindi Bo Pikka* (2003)

LK = *Labar ga Komno Bo Bole* (2007)

Y = *Dindi Bo Pikka ko Gama Yaka* (2000)

References

Cyffer, Norbert. 1973. *Syntax des Kanuri*. Hamburger Philologische Studien 35. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

_____. 1994. *English Kanuri Dictionary*. Westafrikaischen Studien, Band 3. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Cyffer, Norbert & John Hutchison (eds.). 1990. *Dictionary of the Kanuri Language*. Publications in African Languages and Linguistics, 13. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Hutchison, John P. 1981. *A Reference Grammar of the Kanuri Language*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin African Studies Program.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1937. *A Study of the Kanuri Language*. London: Oxford University Press. [Repr. 1967 by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London for the International African Institute.]
- Jarrett, Kevin. n.d. A Dictionary of Manga, a Kanuri Language of Eastern Niger and NE Nigeria. Edited by Roger Blench. PDF manuscript.
- Newman, Paul. 1977. Chadic classification and reconstructions. *Afro-asiatic Linguistics* 5: 1-42.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2004. Conditionals as definite descriptions (a referential analysis). *Research on Language and Computation* 2: 417-462.
- Schuh, Russell G. 2003. The linguistic influence of Kanuri on Bade and Ngizim. *MAJOLLS V* (Maiduguri Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies). 55-89.
- _____. 2005. The History of Labial and Velar Obstruents in Kanuri. Manuscript, UCLA.
- Schuh (2003, 2005) can be downloaded from:
<http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/schuh/schuh.htm>