

THE FUNCTIONAL UNITY OF THE HAUSA AND WEST CHADIC SUBJUNCTIVE

RUSSELL G. SCHUH
UCLA
schuh@humnet.ucla.edu

The past decade has seen the publication of three important descriptive works on Hausa: Wolff (1993), Newman (2000), and Jaggar (2001). These three grammars make Hausa one of the most comprehensively and authoritatively documented languages in Africa. The grammars likewise present a healthy range of analytical views, but in one respect they are unified and they are wrong. This is in the analysis of the Subjunctive. All three grammars argue that the TAM (Tense/Aspect/Mood) traditionally called “Subjunctive” represents two distinct but homophonous TAM’s: a “Subjunctive”, with various modal functions, and a “Neutral”, which is an essentially TAM-less form that inherits its meaning from context. This paper argues for the traditional view of a single TAM, which, moreover, has a single function, characterizable as “dependent subsequent inception”. The paper first shows that this characterization unifies essentially all functions of the Hausa Subjunctive. The diagnostics that the three authors propose for the Subjunctive ~ Neutral distinction are shown to fail. Comparative evidence from other West Chadic languages shows that there is no support for a putative dual historical source for the Hausa Subjunctive. More important, the distributional range of the Subjunctive in other West Chadic languages is the same as that for the Hausa Subjunctive, with a couple of differences unrelated to the putative Subjunctive ~ Neutral distinction. The paper closes with the caution that when faced with apparent functional heterogeneity but formal identity, it may be worthwhile to look for unifying features in function rather than invent invisible differences in form.

1. Introduction

Since the 1930’s, Hausa has had some of the most accurate and most thorough lexical documentation of any African language, with the publication of Bargery’s great *Hausa-English Dictionary* in 1934, followed by Abraham’s *Dictionary of the Hausa Language* in 1946 with a second edition in 1962. Roxana Newman’s 1990 *English-Hausa Dictionary* stands among the best dictionaries going from a European language to an African language. Until recently, however, grammatical documentation of Hausa has not paralleled lexical documentation in terms of quality or comprehensiveness. Early grammars, such as Robinson (1897) or Taylor (1923), worthy efforts for their time, do not meet modern standards for language description. Abraham (1941) and Abraham (1959), while containing interesting and generally accurate information, are idiosyncratically organized and leave large areas of

grammar unexplored. Article length works, esp. those of F.W. Parsons, Claude Gouffé, Paul Newman, and Philip Jaggard, provided the most comprehensive grammatical documentation of Hausa in the latter half of the 20th century, but these papers cover only selected topics. In the last decade, this situation has changed dramatically. Beginning in 1993, three comprehensive reference grammars of Hausa have appeared: Ekkehard Wolff's *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa* in 1993, Paul Newman's *Hausa Language, An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar* in 2000, and Philip Jaggard's *Hausa* in 2001. These grammars, alongside the dictionaries mentioned above, make Hausa one of the best, if not the best documented language on the African continent.

These works will, without question, become the standard sources for information on Hausa for specialists and non-specialists alike, and well they should. The authors have all spent most of their professional lives involved in one way or the other with the Hausa language, and all three are well-trained and responsible linguists. Nonetheless, in works as large and detailed as these, there are sure to be areas where one will find analyses to disagree with, one of which is the subject of this paper. All three grammars argue that the verbal form traditionally called "Subjunctive" is actually the homophonous realization of two underlying forms, the "Subjunctive" and the "Neutral". I will argue that this analysis is wrong, having neither synchronic nor historical support.

One of the striking features of Hausa for someone newly approaching the language is the fact that the Tense/Aspect/Mood (henceforth, TAM) system marks distinctions not by changes in the verb, but by different sets of subject pronouns, some of which incorporate a segmentable auxiliary element. The one exception to the general principle that the verb does not change as a function of TAM is the Continuous TAM set, which uses a nominalized form rather than a finite verb (see examples in (1), where the verb in the Continuous TAM's ends in a long vowel rather than the short vowel seen in the rest of the TAM's). "Standard Hausa" (essentially the dialect of Kano, Nigeria), has eleven morphologically distinct verbal TAM's. The TAM's not shown with a negative counterpart either do not occur in the negative, or they use an exbraced structure **bà...ba** around the affirmative TAM form. Illustrate with third person plural subjects and the verb **gudù** 'run'. Examples preceded by three dots illustrate TAM's that cannot appear in "neutral" declarative sentences, i.e. they appear only in clauses with some element displaced for interrogation or focus, or in other special clause types:¹

¹ The term "TAM" has become standard for the literature on Hausa, and, increasingly, on Chadic languages in general. In Hausa and most other Chadic

(1) <u>Completive</u> :	sun gudù	‘they ran’
<u>Preterite (Rel. Comp.)</u> :	...sukà gudù	‘...they ran’
<u>Negative Completive</u> :	bà sù gudù ba	‘they didn’t run’
<u>Continuous</u> :	sunà gudù	‘they are running’
<u>Relative Continuous</u> :	...sukè gudù	‘...they are running’
<u>Negative Continuous</u> :	bā sà gudù	‘they aren’t running’
<u>Future</u> :	zā sù gudù	‘they will run’
<u>Potential</u> :	sầgudù	‘they will surely run’
<u>Rhetorical</u> :	...sukà gudù	‘...they could run’
<u>Habitual</u> :	sukàn gudù	‘they run’
<u>Subjunctive</u> :	sù gudù	‘they should run’

With the exception of the Rhetorical,² these are the categories that nearly all pedagogical grammars and earlier reference materials mention. In addition to these TAM’s, all three of the reference grammars cited above add an additional TAM or TAM-like category, called the “Neutral” by Newman (2000) and Jaggar (2001) and the “Aorist” by Wolff (1993). Newman (2000:593–594) provides the most explicit analytical statement:

“The analytical contrast here is between (1) a P[erson] A[spect] C[omplex] that happens to be phonologically zero, e.g., {3f[Sub]} = **tà** + /Ø/ → **tà** ‘she (sub[unctive])’ and (2) a PAC that lacks a TAM, e.g., {3f[III]} = **tà** → **tà** ‘she (neut[ral])’.”

and in an “Analytical Note” directly following the quotation above,

“This contrast may at first sight seem like a sleight of hand, but it is very real, both synchronically and historically, and it is essential to a proper understanding of the Hausa TAM system. Wolff (1991:16ff) deserves credit for the important observation that the so-called subjunctive paradigm synchronically incorporates two grammatically distinct, although phonologically identical categories.³ My treatment

languages, Tense, Aspect, and Mood are not independent morphological variables. The Hausa Completive, for example, can encompass both past tense and perfective aspect depending on context and specific verb. For specific TAM’s, I use the terminology of Newman (2000), aside from not including a “Neutral” TAM separate from the Subjunctive. This (non-)distinction is the topic of the remainder of this paper. A macron over a vowel indicates length, a grave accent indicates low tone, a circumflex indicates falling tone. Syllables not marked for tone are high.

² Newman (2000) presents the first serious documentation of this little known TAM. This is one of many previously undocumented or poorly documented features of Hausa grammar that Newman describes in his impressive book.

³ Wolff (1993:416) attributes the distinction to Schubert (1971-72): “Schubert (1972) hingegen trennt klar zwischen ‘Optative’ (= Subjunktiv) und ‘Sekutiv’ (= Aorist); diese Scheidung ist bislang in der Literatur nicht aufgenommen worden.”

differs from his in that he treats the non-subjunctive category as a full-fledged TAM, the ‘aorist’, on a par with the other TAMs, whereas I see it as an unmarked neutral pronoun form lacking a TAM.”

The primary basis for the Subjunctive/Neutral/Aorist distinction is functional: the Subjunctive appears in a variety of primarily modal contexts whereas the Neutral⁴ functions to mark events in a sequence in non-Completive contexts. I discuss functions in detail in section 2. A second basis for the distinction is in the marking of negation: the Subjunctive may be negated by a special negative or “prohibitive” marker, *kadà*, whereas, for Newman and Jaggar, the Neutral has no negative counterpart and for Wolff (1993:419–420), the negative counterpart of the Aorist is formally identical to the Negative Completive. Newman further offers a historical source for the distinction, viz. an original distinction in proto-Chadic between a Subjunctive and a “Grundaspekt”, which have formally fallen together in Hausa but whose functional distinction persists. I discuss the historical issue in section 3.

In this paper I will argue that the Subjunctive/Neutral distinction is a fiction, with neither synchronic functional justification nor historical support. Nearly all the contexts where the Subjunctive (aka “Neutral”) appears flow from a unitary function which may be stated as follows:

- (2) The Subjunctive signals an event which will have its inception subsequent to the moment of speaking and/or to an event in a superordinate clause.⁵ The temporal, aspectual, and modal (= TAM) interpretation of the event represented by the Subjunctive is dependent on that of the superordinate clause or operator. This statement has the caveat that the Subjunctive can never function to show simple sequentiality in a string initiated by the Completive or Preterite.

Section 2 will provide a number of illustrations, but to give a flavor of the application of this definition, consider the sentences in (3). The Subjunctive clause and the portion of the English that translates it are underlined:

⁴ I will henceforth use just the term “Neutral”, with the understanding that comments are equally applicable to Wolff’s “Aorist” unless otherwise stated.

⁵ Additionally, the Subjunctive is always interpreted either as punctual or inchoative, never as progressive/continuous.

- (3) a. **inà sô sù gudù** ‘I want them to run’
 b. **dòlè sù gudù** ‘it-is-necessary-that they run’
 c. **zā sù tāshì sù gudù** ‘they will arise (and) run’

In (3a), the superordinate verb *sô* ‘want’ requires a Subjunctive clause. The action in the Subjunctive clause is necessarily interpreted as being subsequent to the inception of the wanting. In (b), *dòlè* is a complement-taking operator signaling necessity. The event in the Subjunctive clause takes place subsequent to the circumstance necessitating that event. In (3c), which would be an example of the “Neutral” in the analyses of Wolff, Newman, and Jaggar, a Future TAM initiates a sequence of events, with the remaining events in the sequence expressed by the Subjunctive. By definition, each of those events is subsequent to the preceding. In all the cases in (3), the second part of the definition in (2) also holds, i.e. it is the superordinate (or prior) event or operator that determines the temporal, aspectual, or modal nature of the utterance. I would argue that the Subjunctive event carries no inherent meaning other than subsequent inception—any modal or temporal connotations it has are inherited from the superordinate clause or the global interpretation of the utterance. Although the Subjunctive commonly occurs in modal contexts, the Subjunctive itself does not express mood. The function of the *Subjunctive* is thus quite appropriate to the Latin etymology of the term: it is “joined to” but is “under” (dependent on) a superordinate or prior event or operator. The one common function of the Hausa Subjunctive that does NOT seem to fit here is its use as an imperative or exhortation, e.g. *sù gudù* ‘they should run, may they run’. Here the Subjunctive has a specific function not dependent on any other event, operator, or the like for its interpretation. I return to this issue in sections 2 and 3.

This paper has three goals. First is the narrow goal of addressing what I consider to be a seriously misleading analysis of Hausa proposed in all three recent comprehensive grammars. These grammars will be viewed as authoritative by their users, and well they should for the most part, but I fear a situation where a non-specialist accepts the Subjunctive-Neutral analysis as gospel and derives erroneous implications from it that could have repercussions beyond the narrow field of Hausa linguistics. Second, I will use this paper as an opportunity to demonstrate that the cluster of functions associated with a single Hausa Subjunctive TAM is widely shared and must thus constitute a functional natural class. Finally, I underline the fact that the Hausa Subjunctive exemplifies a general linguistic principle that formal unity generally goes hand in hand with functional unity—the “one meaning, one form” principle that drives both analogical and semantic change. When we see cases of apparent functional heterogeneity with a single formal expression, we should consider the

idea that the functions may not be so heterogeneous as they might appear.

2. The Subjunctive and the Neutral

Wolff's, Newman's, and Jaggar's grammars first discuss the Subjunctive, then present the "Neutral", arguing for its distinct status by contrasting it with the Subjunctive. It is, however, easier to present the functional division in the opposite order because the base function of the "Neutral" on which these grammars all focus is simpler to state than that of the Subjunctive: *In a sequence of events where the first is not completive/perfective in sense,⁶ all but the first event receive formal expression in the "Neutral"*. Newman (2000:594) states the basis of the term "Neutral" in saying, "The neutral form is found in a number of different constructions in which grammatical specification of tense/aspect is not essential since it is deducible from the sentential or pragmatic context." This description of the "Neutral" function covers several kinds of cases, most of which are presented in (4):⁷

(4) CONTEXTS FOR THE "NEUTRAL"

a. Events in sequence initiated by TAM's other than Completive

<u>Continuous</u> :	⁸ kullum sunà tāshì sù gudù 'they always arise (and) <u>run</u> '
<u>Future</u> :	zā sù tāshì sù gudù 'they will arise (and) <u>run</u> '
<u>Potential</u> :	śā tāshì sù gudù 'they will surely arise (and) <u>run</u> '
<u>Habitual</u> :	sukàn tāshì sù gudù 'they arise (and) <u>run</u> '
<u>Subjunctive</u> :	inà sô sù tāshì sù gudù 'I want them to arise (and) <u>run</u> '
<u>Imperative</u> :	tāshì kà gudù 'get up (and) <u>run</u> ' (singular Imperative)

⁶ If the first event is in a subordinate clause, such as a conditional, the TAM may be Completive, but the overall sentence will have a generic or future interpretation rather than one of completed past tense.

⁷ The grammars all present rich sets of interesting examples, which I recommend that the reader look at.

⁸ Jaggar (2001:191) notes that "Neutral" shows sequence after Continuous only "with a habitual interpretation". The Continuous can also have a progressive interpretation, but the meaning 'they are arising and running' would be expressed by the Continuous TAM with both verbs. See footnote 5.

- b. Event in a consequent clause following a conditional clause⁹

ìdan an tsōràtā su, sai sù gudù

‘if one frightens them, then they run’

kō an kyālè su, sai sù gudù

‘even if one ignores them, then they run’

- c. “An action temporally dependent on and closely connected to the time indicated in another clause” (Newman 2000:594)

kàfin yà zō nān, sai ìn gamà (Newman, 594)

‘before he comes here, I’ll finish’

bāyan kā kāsà gamà aikìn, kà cè ìn biyā kà? (Jaggar, 193)

‘after you have failed to complete the work, you say I should pay you?’

dà sun dāwō sun fādā, sai mù yi ta shirìn... (Wolff, 419)

‘as soon as they came back and spoke, then we would set to preparing...’

sā’àn nan kōwā yà kùnshi gārī cikin wàrkìnsà kō yà sá cikin gōrā (Wolff, page 419)

‘(at) that time everyone would wrap flour in his loincloth or he would put (it) in a gourd’

- d. “The Neutral TAM-less form regularly functions to express habitual-generic activity in coordinate clauses...” (Jaggar (2001:193))

dalà tà hau tà sàuka (Newman, 596)

‘the dollar goes up, (and) it goes down’

The function in (d) seems to contradict the idea of the “Neutral” receiving its interpretation from sentential context. Both Newman (2000:596) and Jaggar (2001:193) suggest that this usage is an alternative to a construction with an expressed Habitual. I have no better analysis.

In contrast to this fairly unified distribution for the “Neutral”, the Subjunctive is the “elsewhere” case, i.e. anywhere one finds a TAM

⁹ In the contexts of (b-d), the operator **sai** typically precedes the Subjunctive (=□Neutral”). This operator in most of its functions expresses “exclusion”, e.g. **sai Hausa** ‘just Hausa, only Hausa, all but Hausa’, **sai nā dāwō** ‘(not) until I return, only when I return’. Use of **sai** as a sequential marker may be an attenuation of the base meaning of **sai** akin to the English use of unstressed *just*, also an exclusivity operator when stressed, as in, “When I think I’m losing, I just give up.” As we will see below, **sai** can also precede the Subjunctive when used as an Imperative or Hortative, perhaps with a similar parallel in English, “Just drink your beer and shut up.”

homophonous to the “Neutral” outside the contexts in (4), it is the Subjunctive. Although the three grammars are largely in agreement on Subjunctive function(s), they use different schemas for presenting those functions. It is impossible to cleanly separate Subjunctive-taking contexts into mutually exclusive categories or even to enumerate them all. The schema below tries to give a flavor for the major clusters of contexts. It covers the main contexts mentioned in the three grammars.

(5) CONTEXTS FOR THE SUBJUNCTIVE

a. Plural imperative and alternative to singular imperative

kù jē kù sàyi àlēwà ‘go and buy candy’ (plural)

kì fàdā dà kārfi = fādī dà kārfi

‘say (it) loud’ (singular, feminine addressee)

b. First and third person exhortation (1st person often preceded by **bàri** ‘let (imperative)’)

bàri ìn bā kà Nairà biyu ‘let me give you two Naira’

kōwā ya rēnà tsàyuwār watà, yà hau yà gyārà

‘whoever belittles the position of the moon, let him go up (and) fix (it)’

c. Expressions of wish, request, beseeching

Allàh yà kiyàyè hanyà ‘may Allah watch over (your) trip’

d. Reported commands, exhortations, and requests

nā ùmàrcē shì yà zaunà ‘I ordered him to sit down’

e. Complements to expressions of desire and admonition

inà sô sù fādī gaskiyā ‘I want them to speak the truth’

nā gār̀gàd̀ē sù dà sù yi àjìyà̀r̀ hatsì

‘I admonished them that they should store grain’

f. Complements to expressions of causation, permission

mè zài sà yà fādī hakà ‘what would make him say that?’

bà kù barì à zō gàban magàbàtā ba

‘you didn’t allow (that) one come before the superiors’

g. Complements to expressions of (im)possibility

yā yìwu à sàmē shì 'it's possible one will find him'
 yā gàgarà à gānè 'it defies (that) one understand'

h. Complements to expressions of propriety or necessity

yā kāmātà sù tūba 'it is fitting (that) they repent'
 dōlè kà biyā hàrāji 'you have to pay taxes'

i. Clauses expressing purpose, intent, effort (purpose clauses may be introduced by **dōmin** = **don** 'in order that, so that')

tā tàfi kàsuwā (dōmin) tà yi cèfānē
 'she went to the market (in order that) she do shopping'
 sai kà yi ròkarì kà biyā shì 'make an effort to pay him'

j. After certain conjunctions: kàfin 'before', **bàllē** '(how) much less', **màimakon** 'instead of'¹⁰

kàfin kà dāwō, yàrankà duk sun girmā
 'before you return, your children all will have grown up'
 bā yà gārdamà dà kōwā **bàllē** wata 'yā tankiyā tà tāshì
 gāme dà shì
 'he didn't argue with anyone much less did a little dispute
arise having to do with him'

k. With the prohibitive operator kadà, translatable as 'don't...'
with imperatives and hortatives and as 'lest' in other contexts

kadà kù tāshì 'don't get up'
 nā jē dà saurì (don) kadà wani yà sàyā
 'I went quickly lest someone else buy (it)'
 nā ji tsòrò kadà à kashè ni
 'I was afraid lest one kill me'
 sai kì yi hankàlì kadà yà bā kì wùyā
 'be careful lest he give you problems'

About the only thing that can be said about the meaning of the Subjunctive in contexts (5a-k) is that it has NO unified temporal,

¹⁰ Subjunctive is appropriate with 'before' since subsequent inception is inherent in the meaning of the conjunction. I do not understand use of the Subjunctive with 'much less' and 'instead of'. Both inherently NEGATE the Subjunctive event they contain ("much less[!]" contain a clause showing a subsequent event. The function of the Subjunctive might emerge if one were to work out the logical semantics of these words.

aspectual, or modal meaning! However, with the exception of (5a-c), where the Subjunctive is the contextless main clause TAM, the interpretation of the Subjunctive conforms to the characterization in (2): the event expressed by the Subjunctive has its inception subsequent to a time implied by context, and the clausal interpretation follows from what precedes the Subjunctive, not from the Subjunctive itself. This characterization applies equally to the Subjunctive in the contexts in (4a-d). The only thing differentiating the examples in (4) from those in (5) is that the meaning supplied by the superordinate or preceding context in (4) is primarily temporal or aspectual while that supplied by the superordinate or preceding context in (5) is primarily modal. In short, the distinction that the Wolff, Newman, and Jaggar grammars draw between “Neutral” and Subjunctive has nothing to do with the TAM itself but rather with the types of context that the TAM finds itself in. There is a single TAM—the Subjunctive.

Let us examine certain facts more closely. First, as I noted at the beginning of the preceding paragraph, the functional distinction that seems to call for separate treatment is not the distinction between (4)—the “Neutral”—and (5)—the “Subjunctive”, but rather the function of the bare Subjunctive as an Imperative or Hortative, a function that all three grammars group with the Subjunctive without comment.¹¹ As we will see in section 3, Hausa’s closest Chadic cousins DO express the functions in (5a-b) differently from all the other functions in (4) and (5), which have a single formal expression. There are a couple of ways to view the function of the Subjunctive as a command or exhortation within Hausa. One would be to unify all uses of the Subjunctive by proposing a “silent” superordinate clause such as {IOrderThat}. A second approach would be to include real world context among the contexts that the Subjunctive relies on for its interpretation. A bare Subjunctive cannot be interpreted as Completive, Future, Continuous, etc. since those functions all have formal expression distinct from the Subjunctive, leaving command or exhortation essentially the only possible interpretation available for a Subjunctive utterance when addressing individuals. What I would NOT care to argue is that there is a special “Hortative” TAM, formally identical to the Subjunctive, used

¹¹ Newman (2000:591) makes the oft-repeated claim that “in the second person, [the Subjunctive] serves as a somewhat softer alternative to the imperative for expressing commands,” suggesting a functional difference between the Imperative and the Subjunctive used to issue commands. No one drawing this distinction ever presents evidence for the difference, and in my experience, there is none. Texts and audio and video recordings involving dialog reveal many examples of Imperatives in contexts where one would expect deference and Subjunctives where there would be reason to expect abruptness. Moreover, there is no alternative to the Subjunctive in the PLURAL Imperative, regardless of addressee or pragmatics.

for direct commands and exhortations, despite the existence of formally distinct TAM's that serve this purpose in other Chadic languages.

All the grammars point out that the Subjunctive has a special negative, marked by a “prohibitive” morpheme, **kadà**, rather than the canonical Hausa exbricated negative **bà...ba** (or, in the Continuous and certain non-verbal utterances, a single clause initial **bā**)—see (5k). Newman (2000:593) states, and Jaggar (2001:191) implies that the “Neutral” has no negative counterpart.¹² I would argue that the Subjunctive has no negative counterpart either. In its canonical functions as a “sub-joined” TAM, it would make no sense in the negative. It gets its interpretation from the superordinate context. What would a negated Subjunctive mean? Significantly, in negative contexts, it is virtually always the superordinate clause that is negated, e.g. **bā nà sò kù yi hakà** (Jaggar, 187) ‘I don’t want you to do this’, not ?***inà sò kadà kù yi hakà** ‘I want you to not do this’.¹³ To express the meaning of the English translation here, either a negating auxiliary verb would be inserted in the Subjunctive clause (**inà sò kù dainà yin hakà** ‘I want you to cease doing this’), or the sentence would be recast to avoid an embedded **kadà** Subjunctive clause (**àbin dà nakè sò, shì nè kadà kù yi hakà** ‘what I want, it is, don’t do this’).

Newman (2000:592) proposes the correct analysis for the so-called Negative Subjunctive: “Structurally, [**kadà**] behaves more like an adverb such as **dòlè** ‘perforce’ than a true negative marker.” One piece of evidence for this analysis is the fact that **kadà** precedes an entire clause, including a nominal subject, e.g. **kadà Bintà tà amsà** ‘Binta should not answer’ (Newman, 592). The scope of **kadà** is the whole clause, not just the TAM and associated verb phrase as in negative counterparts of other TAM's. **Kadà**, though it fills the semantic spot of a Negative Subjunctive, is a complement-taking modal operator.

As noted above, Newman (2000) claims that one diagnostic for distinguishing the Subjunctive from the “Neutral” is that the former,

¹² Wolff (1993:419-420) argues for a Negative Aorist (= “Neutral”). This is not, however, a special negative form for the Aorist, but is rather the form referred to in (1) as the Negative Completeive, which is identical to the Aorist with the negative **bà...ba** added. This is purely a formal identification. Wolff presents no evidence for a functional link between the Aorist and “Negative Aorist”, nor would one expect any. The formal identity between Aorist and Negative Completeive is a historical accident, occasioned by the loss of distinctive TAM marking suffixes on the verb in Hausa—see section 3.

¹³ Abraham (1962:440) does give a couple of examples with embedded **kadà** + Subjunctive clauses, e.g. **yā fi kyāu kadà à yi** ‘it would be better (that) one not do it’. I have some question as to whether the syntactic embedding here has the same status as an affirmative Subjunctive would, but I know of no tests for this.

but not the latter, can be negated. Consider the following sentences (Newman 2000:594):

- (6) a. **in sun zō, sai mù gayà musù** (“Neutral”)
 ‘when they come, then we will tell them’
 b. **in sun zō, bà zā mù gayà musù ba** (Negative Future)
 ‘when they come, we will not tell them’
 c. †**in sun zō, kadà mù gayà musù** (“Negative Neutral”)
 ‘when they come, we will not tell them’
 d. **in sun zō, kadà mù gayà musù** (Negative Subjunctive)
 ‘if they come, let’s not tell them’

Example (6a) illustrates the “Neutral” in a (4b)-type context. Its negative counterpart, (6b), requires the Negative Future. Were the “Neutral” and the Subjunctive one and the same TAM (the position taken in this paper), it should be possible to use **kadà** + Subjunctive, (6c), as the negative counterpart of (6a), but in fact, the sentence cannot have this interpretation, as indicated by the †. The string of words in (6c), repeated with a different translation in (6d), however, is “grammatical ... when the second clause is understood to be in the subjunctive, which, unlike the [Neutral], *may* be negated” (Newman 2000:594). But what can be the meaning of the phrase “understood to be in the subjunctive”?! As we have seen in (5), it is impossible to assign a meaning to the Subjunctive divorced from its context. All we can say with certainty is that (6d) is not the negative counterpart of (6a), a fact that says nothing about whether the TAM in (6a) is the same as or different from the TAM in (6d). In this case, the explanation for why (6d) is not the negative counterpart of (6a) is that **kadà** is not a simple mark of negation, but rather is a clause level modal operator indicating prohibition. It imposes this modal connotation on the Subjunctive clause embedded under it, a modal connotation that would not be present in the simple negation of (6a). My interpretation for why the negation of (6a), with the Subjunctive, is (6b), with the Negative Future, follows from the characterization of the Subjunctive in (2). The only semantic content inherent in the Subjunctive itself is “subsequent inception”. If the event is negated, there is no inception, hence the Subjunctive is inappropriate. The most natural way to express this notion is to cast the event in the future and negate it.

Newman (2000:595) presents another argument for a division Between Subjunctive and “Neutral”. Consider the following sentences drawn from Bature et al (1996–98):

- (7) a. **ìn rakà ku mù tàfi**
 ‘let me accompany you (and) let’s go ~ ?(so that) we might go’
- b. **zā mù je lābārāri nē mù yi kàràtū**
 ‘we’re gonna go to the library and study ~ to study’
- c. **kàwō na azùrfā mù ganī**
 ‘bring out the silver one ?(and) we’ll see (it) ~ (so that) we might see (it)’

The underlined clauses each have two potential interpretations: an event in sequence to a preceding event (4a) or an expression of purpose (5i), but the strength of one reading as opposed to another varies from sentence to sentence. In (7a) the sequential interpretation seems more suitable, in (7b) either interpretation seems equally suitable, and in (7c) the purpose interpretation seems more suitable. Newman (2000:595), after discussing an example with the sequential reading as representing the “Neutral”, says, “Note that one *can* have a true subjunctive after a matrix clause. Such a sentence, however, would have a different meaning—reflecting the semantic attributes of the subjunctive—from one with a sequence of underlying [non-Completive TAM’s].” As in the discussion of (6), one wonders what the “semantic attributes of the subjunctive” are that the purpose meaning might embody but that the sequential meaning does not embody. What semantic property, for example, does the underlined clause in **zān sà yà tàfi** ‘I will cause him to go’ (cf. 5g) share with purpose that it does not share with sequence? In fact, virtually every sentence of the type illustrated in (7) would potentially have either a sequential or purpose reading, both of which embody the base meaning “dependent subsequent inception” of the Subjunctive.¹⁴ The pragmatics of the utterance are what determines the preferred reading, if any, not a distinction in underlying TAM.

Characterizing environments where the Subjunctive CANNOT appear is also important to understanding its function. Some such environments are in (8). Choice of TAM is essentially free in these contexts except for exclusion of the Subjunctive and with the caveat that “non-relative” TAM’s (Completive, Continuous, Potential) are excluded from (8a-b) and ONLY “non-relative” TAM’s are allowed in (8c-e).

¹⁴ Newman points out that the purpose reading can always be forced by introducing the Subjunctive clause with **dōmin** or **don** ‘in order that’.

(8) SOME CONTEXTS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE SUBJUNCTIVE

a. Sentences with questioned or focused constituents

mè zân (*in) cé? ‘what might/will I say?’

b. Relative clauses

yârân dà zā sù (*sù) ci jaṙṙàbâwā
‘the children who will/might pass the examination’

c. Sentence level adverbial subordinate clauses

ìdan zā kà (*kà) hūṭā, ka hūṭā à bàbbaṙ inuwā
‘if you’re gonna rest/if your intention is to rest, rest in broad shade’, i.e. whatever you do, do it with conviction

d. Complements to verbs of perception, discovery, knowledge

nā san zā kà (*kà) yāṙḍa ‘I know you’ll agree’

e. Verbs of mental activity and emotion

inā fātā bà kī mântā mài gidā zāi (*yà) gàyvāci bākī ba
‘I hope you didn’t forget (that) our husband will invite/ plans to invite some guests’
nā yī muṙnā dà zā sù (*sù) zō
‘I am happy that they will come’

The basic shared factor in all these contexts that makes them incompatible with the Subjunctive is that the TAM in the clause of interest does not have the characteristic of “dependent subsequent inception”. The event in a sentence with a questioned or focused item (8a) is presupposed, and relative clauses (8b) assert a property of the antecedent in the form of a proposition. Presupposition and assertion are antithetical to the dependent nature of the Subjunctive. Sentence level adverbial clauses, such as conditional and temporal clauses (8c), establish the very context to which a Subjunctive will have subsequent inception and will depend for its temporal, aspectual, or modal interpretation. The time and/or aspectual nature of the events in the complement types in (8d-e) are independent of the superordinate constructions, i.e. they neither necessarily have subsequent inception to the superordinate event nor do they depend on that event for their interpretation.

Jaggar (2001:192), among his examples of the “Neutral”, includes the sentence **wàñē nè kè d’aukàn yârā yà kai sù gidā?** ‘who [kè Rel. Continuous] picks up the children (and) takes them home?’. Of this (and another similar example) he says, “Notice that unlike the modal Subjunctive, which cannot be used in focus constructions□., [this example] shows that there is no such restriction on the Neutral Ø–TAM, an important syntactic diagnostic for distinguishing the two paradigms.” But the governing factor for the TAM in the underlined clause is not the focus (or, in this case, question) construction (cf. 13a), but rather sequentiality to the preceding Continuous TAM. Use of the Subjunctive (alias “Neutral”) is no more noteworthy here than it would be in a sentence like **wàñē nè kè sô yà kai yârā gidā?** ‘who wants to take the children home?’, with the superordinate verb *sô* ‘want’ in the Relative Continuous TAM and its complement in the Subjunctive.¹⁵

I believe the discussion in this section shows the untenability of the proposal put forth in Wolff (1993), Newman (2000), and Jaggar (2001) that Hausa masks two distinct TAM’s, “Neutral” and Subjunctive, under homophonous phonetic forms. The single, rather simple characterization of the Subjunctive in (2) covers essentially all the functions of the “Neutral” and Subjunctive, with the possible exception of its use as an Imperative and Hortative in direct address, functions that the three grammars do NOT single out for special treatment. The various diagnostics that the three grammars propose for distinguishing “Neutral” from Subjunctive fail, not only because they ignore the COMMONALITY of function, but also because they provide no unified characterization of the Subjunctive. In effect, they isolate one function of the Subjunctive (its ability to inherent temporal/aspectual interpretation of a superordinate context), refer to it as “Neutral”, and call all other functions “Subjunctive”. The next section will show that not only is there no basis in modern Hausa for making a “Neutral” vs. Subjunctive distinction, there is also no support for claims in Wolff (1993) and Newman (2000) that the putative functional distinction is a reflex of an earlier morphological distinction. Indeed, comparative evidence confirms that we must reconstruct a single morphological form covering essentially all the functions of the modern Hausa Subjunctive.

¹⁵ The difference between Jaggar’s sentence and the sentence with ‘want’ + complement cannot be attributed to conjunction vs. subordination or the like. There are, in fact, complement clause types that “inherit” relative TAM’s from their superordinate verbs, e.g. *sâ* ‘cause’ as in **su wâ sukà sâ kukè yîn hakà?** ‘who all [sukà Rel. Completive] caused you (pl) [kukè Rel. Continuous] to be doing this?’

3. *The West Chadic Subjunctive*

Wolff (1993:416) and Newman (2000:594) make identical claims about the historical source of the TAM that is the focus of this paper. I quote Newman in full:

“In many West Chadic languages, the subjunctive—but not the neutral form (sometimes termed ‘Grundaspekt’)—is distinctively characterized by a change in the verb stem (Newman and Schuh 1974), and thus it is possible to keep the two apart, even though, on the surface, they both lack overt TAMs. In present-day Hausa, on the other hand, verb stems themselves are not inflected for tense/aspect/mood (with the exception of the imperative), and thus the true subjunctive and the neutral forms have fallen together. They can, nevertheless, still be distinguished synchronically by their different meanings and functions and the fact that only the subjunctive and not the neutral form can be negated using **kadà**.”

In the preceding section, I have argued that the claims in the last sentence do not hold up, i.e. there is no principled distinction that can be drawn in meaning or function and there is no true negative of the Subjunctive in any function—**kadà** is a clause level operator on a syntactic par with other such operators such as **dòlè** ‘perform’. These arguments do not prove, however, that the single Hausa Subjunctive does not represent the merger of two historically distinct forms, as claimed by Wolff and Newman.

Newman, in the quoted passage above, asserts that there is a formal distinction between a marked Subjunctive and an unmarked “Grundaspekt” in “many West Chadic languages”. The only support he provides for this assertion is to cite Newman and Schuh (1974). In our 1974 paper, Newman and I traced the historical origin of the TAM marking system of Hausa, using both internal reconstruction and comparative Chadic evidence as we had it at the time. For the most part, I believe our paper still holds up, but in some respects we were completely wrong. The most glaring mistakes are in §2.2 *Aspect Markers* (Newman and Schuh 1974:7-8), where we reconstruct a ***kà** Perfective¹⁶ and a * \emptyset , “which was used both for a semantically less specific aspect labelled by German scholars as ‘Grundaspekt’ and for the Subjunctive.” We go on to say, “The ‘Grundaspekt’ with a \emptyset aspect marker is extremely widespread in Chadic.”

¹⁶ Though a number of languages have a “kV” morpheme associated with Perfective (=Completive), the evidence is close to nil for reconstructing such a morpheme as a primary marker for perfectivity in West Chadic. I am now 100% certain that the source of all the kV morphemes in the Hausa TAM-marking system is a copula derived from a proto-Chadic ***kV** determiner.

There are two errors here. First, we took the analytical position that if some TAM's had preverbal markers, then all TAM's must have preverbal markers, even if they were phonologically \emptyset ! This is rather like saying that since English has a preverbal auxiliary in *I am thinking*, then there has to be a preverbal auxiliary in *I \emptyset think*. As an example from an Ngizim citation **na màsu** 'I bought (it)', which, indeed has no preverbal TAM marker, but it IS marked for the Completive TAM by the final **-u** on the verb (see below). A preverbal \emptyset TAM marker is an unnecessary fiction. Our second error is factual. A survey of Chadic grammars shows that a so-called "Grundaspekt", far from being "extremely widespread", is rare to non-existent. In fact, if by "Grundaspekt" we mean something like a bare verb stem with no inherent TAM meaning of its own, no grammar that I have examined has such a form.

Looking just at West Chadic languages, the languages most directly relevant to Hausa, the only descriptions I have found that even use the term "Grundaspekt" are those of Ron languages found in Jungraithmayr (1970). From Jungraithmayr's descriptions, it is not at all clear, however, that the forms he calls "Grundaspekt" are cognate even across the Ron languages nor that they have the properties of being morphologically unmarked and semantically neutral as Newman and Schuh (1974) would claim this putatively "widespread" TAM would be.

The Ron languages are among the southernmost West Chadic languages. They and their nearby West Chadic cousins of the Angas group (Angas, Sura, Mupun, inter alia) and the South Bauchi group (Zaar, Bogghom, Guruntum, inter alia) are intermingled with Benue-Congo languages and have undergone obvious major typological shifts that make them look quite different from their Chadic cousins to the north. The latter languages, including those of the Bole-Tangale group (Bole, Karekare, Ngamo, Tangale, Kanakuru, inter alia), the Bade-Ngizim group (Bade, Ngizim, Duwai), and the north Bauchi group (Warji, Miya, Pa'a, inter alia) share many typological similarities. Their main linguistic neighbors for centuries if not millenia have been other Chadic languages, including the immediate ancestors of Hausa and Hausa itself. I would therefore argue that they are the languages most likely to provide evidence for a reconstructed proto-West Chadic TAM system that would be the precursor to that of Hausa.

These languages share TAM marking systems that are very much alike. The primary marking of TAM distinctions is carried by the verb, consisting of final vowel differences and, in some languages, tonal distinctions. The only consistently present preverbal TAM auxiliary is

a(a) Imperfective (a single TAM usually allowing for progressive, future, or habitual interpretations). Historically speaking, the Imperfective comes from a non-verbal locative source, something like “I [am] on walking”, a source reflected in the fact that Imperfective verbs in many languages are still nominal in form and a preposition **a(a)** is still used for location. Some languages have variations in subject pronouns related to TAM distinctions, but true preverbal auxiliaries other than Imperfective **a(a)** are generally obvious innovations not shared by even closely related languages. For example, Ngizim has Imperfective **aci à wanà** ‘he is working ~ he will work’. The word **tàkà** ‘body’ can be used as an auxiliary to force a progressive reading, i.e. **aci à tàkà wanà** ‘he is working’, and a periphrastic construction with /**ya + ī**/ → [**yē**] ‘going to’ can be used to force a future reading, i.e. **aci à yē wanà** ‘he will work, he’s gonna work’. The closely related Bade language has neither of these forms, but has others of its own.

All the northern Bole-Tangale, Bade-Ngizim, and North Bauchi languages for which I have information have the following basic TAM’s: COMPLETIVE (= PERFECTIVE) marked by lexically determined final **-a** or **-u/-ə/-Ø**;¹⁷ SUBJUNCTIVE marked by final **-i**; SINGULAR IMPERATIVE marked by final **-i**; PLURAL IMPERATIVE marked by final **-a**; IMPERFECTIVE marked by preverbal **a(a)** and a nominal form of the verb. In addition Bade-Ngizim and North Bauchi have a distinct HORTATIVE TAM used for non-2nd person direct commands, but it is not obvious that Hortative TAM’s in the two groups are reflexes of a single reconstructable TAM nor that a special Hortative TAM is reconstructable for West Chadic. In Bade-Ngizim, the primary mark of the HORTATIVE is final **-a** on the verb, whereas in Miya the HORTATIVE has a preverbal **ta** and verbs have the lexical vowel seen also in the Completive. The table in (9) illustrates the basic TAM’s of Bole and Bade with the verb ‘steal’ < proto-Chadic ***kəru** in the form it would have with a third person singular subject (except for the Imperatives, which are specific to second person).

¹⁷ In Schuh (1977) I reconstructed the vowels of the Completive as **-a** or **-u**. Choice of Completive vowel class is a property idiosyncratic to each verb, though verbs taking **-a** are restricted to C- and CVC- roots. Verbs in the “non-**a**” class in some languages have final **-ə** or **Ø** rather than **-u**. While I find evidence for **-u** to be the most compelling, there are also reasonable arguments favoring **-ə** or **Ø**. *Pace* Frajzyngier (1982), the reconstructable vowel for the Completive was certainly NOT **-i**.

(9) BASIC TAM FORMS IN TWO WEST CHADIC LANGUAGES

	BOLE	BADE
COMPLETIVE	shir-wô-yi ¹⁸	kàru
SUBJUNCTIVE	shirî□	dà kàri ¹⁹
SING. IMPERATIVE	shirî□	à kàr-i/à kàr-əm ²⁰
PLURAL IMPERATIVE ²¹	shirâ	à kàra-wún
HORTATIVE	= SUBJUNCTIVE	dà kàra
IMPERFECTIVE	à shirâ-yi	à kàrà

Absent from these paradigms is anything like the putative unmarked “Grundaspekt”, i.e. every TAM has a minimum of one morphological feature that distinguishes that TAM from every other verbal form. What is important for this paper is the functional distribution of these TAM’s, especially the Subjunctive. The examples in (10) show that a single TAM, the Subjunctive, appears in all the functional contexts of the Hausa Subjunctive INCLUDING THOSE THAT WOLFF (1993), NEWMAN (2000), AND JAGGAR (2001) CLAIM TO BE THE DOMAIN OF A DISTINCT “NEUTRAL” TAM. In (10) I illustrate the Subjunctive in BADE spanning the functions of the Hausa Subjunctive as illustrated in both (4)—contexts of the “Neutral”—and (5)—contexts of the Subjunctive. Most of the BADE examples come from Schuh (n.d.). Similar example sets could be constructed from any of the languages of the Bole-Tangale group (for Bole, see Lukas (1970-72), esp. §§124-127) or the North Bauchi group (for Miya, see Schuh (1998:124-127) and references to other parts of the grammar to be found there).

¹⁸ The Bole-Tangale languages, in addition to having a special Completive form for the verb stem, have a Completive clitic *ko (> wo in Bole between vowels). How far back this can be reconstructed is uncertain. There are no reflexes of it in North Bauchi languages or Hausa, and evidence for it in BADE-Ngizim is equivocal at best. Bole also has a Ø-anaphora marker, -yi, required with transitive verbs if no object is expressed. It is realized as length and falling tone in Subjunctive and Imperatives.

¹⁹ BADE-Ngizim and Miya require a preverbal dV in Subjunctive and Hortative with third person subjects. Other persons would have the appropriate pronoun, e.g. nà kàri ‘that I steal’. I do not consider dV a pronoun because it does not distinguish gender and number as do all true personal pronouns, and it is present even when there is a noun subject.

²⁰ All BADE Imperatives, transitive or intransitive, require a suffix showing gender or number of the addressee. In closely related Ngizim, which does not require these suffixes, singular Imperative is à kàri. BADE-Ngizim languages are unusual—perhaps unique—in having a preverbal TAM marker, a, in the Imperative.

²¹ “Imperative” in these and other northern West Chadic languages refers to any utterance where the addressee includes 2nd person. First plural exhortations, which may include the addressee, thus use the Plural Imperative plus a first plural clitic, e.g. Bole shirâ-mù-yi ‘let’s steal’, BADE à kàra-wà ‘let’s steal’. BADE has a first plural inclusive ~ exclusive distinction. The Imperative form is used only with inclusive. A 1st person exclusive exhortation uses the Hortative, e.g. jà kàra ‘let’s steal’ (excluding addressee).

(10) EXAMPLES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN BADE

a. Events in a sequence initiated by any TAM (cf. 4a)**Completive:** *āmən jàwo m̀dan da-zg̀m̀i*‘it rained (and) people planted’**Imperfective:** *ai ǹò, ǹa ǹayi ǹa^hl̀adi*‘as for me, I’ll come (and) lie down’**Subjunctive:** *m̀aimakon ə̀bjl̀am̀ dà pakpi ikci ǹa t̀eỳaye dà-kwti k̀ari ǹa ...*‘instead of the hyena distributing it to them (and) everybody taking his stuff...’**Hortative:** *m̀d̀ən b̀e r̀eǹat̀ə jl̀uwu-ŋ t̀əl̀aǹ, d̀ə g̀aya-c̀i dà d̀alm̀i*‘a person who belittles the position of the moon, let him go up (and) fix it’**Imperative:** *à jəm̀ ǹa g̀a d̀əf̀i*‘go (and) water [the cattle]’ (female addressee)b. Event in a consequent clause following a conditional (4b)**d̀aẁa-kci ỳaum̀aǹ, d̀aci, dà-tl̀i-kci ī m̀nya m̀agvu**‘when they bring them out, well, they place them at the edge of the hole’c. An action closely connected to the time in another clause (4c)**āko j̀ə k̀arm̀ə d̀əmaǹ, k̀òri j̀ə t̀l̀əb̀ər̀i**‘after we chopped down the tree, then we split [the wood]’**à f̀it̀a à f̀it̀a, ak̀a da-bd̀am̀i wuǹya bugzər̀i dà-m̀ti**‘she was fanning and fanning (but) the fire resisted [becoming lit] (and) the girl “flop (*bugzər̀i*)” died’d. Expressions of wish, request, beseeching (cf. 5a-c)**K̀ak̀a ta b̀ar̀iẁa jl̀awu k̀əl̀ap̀iyan**‘may God give us living in good health’**t̀ərzəǹa dunguruf̀, s̀ana ǹa b̀i kab̀ón**‘the story’s over, tomorrow may I get a penny (for it)’e. Reported commands, exhortations, requests (cf. 5d)**M̀ai Mamm̀an d̀ar̀aỳa ǹò ma M̀ai S̀al̀è dà ǹi ǹa akci dà salam̀ti ǹa**‘Mai Mamman said to me that Mai Sale should go and they should make peace’

f. Complements of desire and admonition (cf. 5e)

nè nci aci dà masì gàskamón ‘I want him to buy a rooster’
nè jlàm ìkci kwágwɗan akcì dà rèpti adán
 ‘I made them an admonition (that) they should work together’ (...they should join heads)

g. Complements to expressions of (im)possibility (cf. 5g)

à jlùwi aci da nè sàna
 ‘it’s possible (that) he will come tomorrow’

h. Complements to expressions of propriety or necessity (cf. 5h)

kèd’o wà-tkèrì wana mco ‘it’s best (that) we finish this work’
dòlè wà-kwtì ì Màyán aisán
 ‘we must honor the Chief’ (“it is necessary (that) we take to the Chief sand”)

i. Clauses expressing purpose, intent, effort (purpose clauses may be introduced by **gàd’á** ‘in order that, so that’) (cf. 5i)

nə-tlɛ̀ ɔ̀mɔ̀n ɪ̀ afà gáɗà da-rgwà̀mì
 ‘I put the water in the sun so that it would get warm’

j. After **kàbdèrò** ‘before’ (cf. 5j)

kàbdèrò ga jlàwì à kāsò, nâɓfē-gì
 ‘before you sit down in the room, I’ll sweep it for you’

There are two differences between the functional distribution of the Hausa Subjunctive and the Subjunctive in Bole and Bade: (i) direct commands in 2nd person require the appropriate Imperative—the Subjunctive is not used in this function; (ii) the distribution of the Hausa Subjunctive in (2) requires the caveat that “the Subjunctive can never function to show simple sequentiality in a string initiated by the Completive or Preterite.” Hausa’s linguistic cousins do not require this caveat—in a sequence of events, the Subjunctive in these languages inherits the temporal and aspectual features of any TAM (see 10a).

Bade and other languages that do not use the Subjunctive for direct commands and exhortations can make an overt contrast that is not possible in Hausa. The first example in (10d), with the Subjunctive, is a wish that God might grant something. This is in contrast to the Hortative example of (10a), where the Hortative **dè gàyá-cì** ‘let him go

up’ is a command directed at the subject of ‘go up’. The second example in (10d), which is a wish in the Subjunctive that the subject expresses with respect to herself, is in contrast to **nə kùzgùz(a) ēgĩ b̀à** ‘let me teach (it) to you’, which is a self-directed command in the Hortative. The same contrast should be possible for 2nd person, where the Imperative is the obligatory form for expressing 2nd person commands, but the Subjunctive should be possible in wishes such as ‘may you live long’. I have not been able to find examples of the latter context in currently available data.

In Bade, the Subjunctive cannot appear in negated clauses. In negative commands, exhortations, and “lest” clauses, the Hortative is obligatorily used in place of the Subjunctive. Compare the sentences in (11) with the Hausa sentences in (5k). The clause final **-m** is the marker of negation.

(11) HORTATIVE AS NEGATIVE COUNTERPART OF SUBJUNCTIVE

a. Negative Imperative and Hortative

gə g̀afa-m ‘don’t catch (it)’
m̀dan d̀ə j̀ina d̀ə-tka-yu nə d-ùkta-m
 ‘let one not come, kill me, and take (it)’

b. Negative purpose (“lest” clause) (cf. 10i)

nə d̀əpsə tagd̀ə-ŋ-ā g̀ad̀ə akcì d̀ə-gna-m
 ‘I hid my money so that they wouldn’t take (it)’

In the second example of (11b), with three verbs, ALL are in the Hortative. This is contrast to a string of affirmative Hortatives, where all but the first are in the Subjunctive (cf. 10a). However, in other types of sequential contexts parallel to those in (10a), a negated clause in a sequence bearing a Completive sense is Negative Completive, as in (12).²² In my write-up of Bade, I note that in a sequence having an Imperfective sense, a negated clause is in the Negative Imperfective, but I seem to have no easily accessible examples.

(12) **Mái Ājì d̀ə-tkə-cì da-n d̀ə ni da-n d̀ə tad̀ə-cì, ùgz̀àza ē g̀ak Shēhu-m**

‘Mai Aji killed [Sjn] him and he went [Sjn] and he deposited [Sjn] him (but) he did not return to the Shehu’

²² The example in (12) is taken from a narrative. All the clauses other than the negated one are in the Subjunctive, which has inherited Completive meaning from elsewhere in the text.

In summary, Hausa's West Chadic cousins provide no support for the proposal that the Hausa Subjunctive represents the historical merger of two distinct TAM's. More important, these languages reinforce the premise of this paper, viz. the Hausa Subjunctive is a single morphological and functional entity, as earlier grammars and pedagogical works have always described it. Other West Chadic languages have a single, overtly marked TAM that covers nearly all the functions of the Hausa Subjunctive illustrated in (4) and (5).

The Hausa Subjunctive does differ functionally from its cousins in a couple of respects. First, all the other West Chadic languages examined require a special Imperative (singular or plural) for commands to 2nd person addressees, and Bade-Ngizim and North Bauchi languages require a special Hortative TAM for non-2nd person addressees. Hausa uses the Subjunctive as an option for commands to single 2nd person addressees and obligatorily for all other addressees, an apparent extension of function.

Second, all other West Chadic languages examined use the Subjunctive in sequential events following any TAM. Hausa uses the Subjunctive in this function after non-Completive/Preterite events only (cf. 4). In Completive and Preterite contexts, these TAM's themselves are used as their respective sequentials.²³ Given the fact that the other West Chadic languages examined here are not particularly closely related and are not, for the most part, in contact with each other, it seems most likely that Hausa is the innovator in excluding Subjunctive as a sequential TAM in Completive contexts, but there are other languages in the general geographical area, including Kanuri, Fulfulde, and some Chadic languages, that make the same distinction as Hausa in terms of TAM choice in sequence marking. I leave the issue of direction of innovation unresolved at this point.

As a final point, let us return to the distinction that Newman (2000) and Jagger (2001) draw between the Subjunctive, which does have a negative form, and the "Neutral", which does not. The comparative data invalidates this as a diagnostic. In Hausa, the Subjunctive appears to have a negative form marked by **kadà**, but in the discussion preceding (6), taking a cue from Newman, I suggested that clauses introduced by **kadà**, while functionally the negative of the Subjunctive, are syntactically affirmative propositions embedded under a clause-level

²³ The Preterite is sometimes characterized as the TAM that marks sequence. This is true in narrative discourse about the past. However, in timeless sequences initiated by a Completive, the Completive itself marks sequence, as for example, in the proverb **an fādō dàgà kán dabīnò an zarcè rījīyā** 'one fell from up in a date palm and went by into a well' ("from the frying pan into the fire").

prohibitive operator. The data from Bade confirm the proposal that the Subjunctive has no negative form in any of its functions. In modal and similar contexts where it makes sense to negate the “Subjunctive” event—negative commands, stating a purpose for not doing something—Bade uses the Hortative rather than negating the Subjunctive. Subjunctive used in sequential contexts inherits its temporal or aspectual value from the superordinate TAM. A negative in such a context is, by definition, an event that did not occur in the sequence. The only negative form that makes sense is the negation of the superordinate TAM, not the negative Hortative with its prohibitive sense.

4. Conclusion: *The Hausa Subjunctive and the “One Form, One Meaning” Principle*

Languages generally do not like a plethora of forms to express the same meaning nor do they like a single form to express apparently unrelated meanings. This is the “one form, one meaning” principle that drives much analogical, syntactic, and semantic change. For example, in Western European languages like French and German, the original simple past form is being replaced by a periphrastic past using *have* or *be* as an auxiliary. In French, *j’ai chanté* ‘I sang ~ I have sung’ is used to the exclusion of *je chantai*, the original past form. In English, both the periphrastic construction and the simple past are alive and well. The reason seems to be that in English, the two forms retain distinct meanings, whereas in the other languages the periphrastic form has encroached on the meaning domain of the simple past, rendering the latter redundant and hence expendable. It seems unlikely that anyone would argue that the underlying tense/aspect system of French remains identical to that of English, with two underlying forms that surface as distinct in English but as homophonous in French. We say that the French periphrastic past has a broader semantic domain than either of the English forms, yet it is a domain across which there is a semantic commonality. In other words, we interpret the change in French as an application of the “one form, one meaning” principle.

In French, two historically distinct past tense forms have merged²⁴ because of a merger of function. In the case of the Hausa Subjunctive, I have argued that there were not two distinct forms to start with, but the same principle of understanding functional unity in terms of formal unity applies. Why would the speakers of Hausa and many other Chadic languages be content to use a single form, the Subjunctive, to express a semantic range that, from the point of view of speakers of

²⁴ “Merged” in the sense that where there were originally two forms, there is now only one. They obviously have not undergone “merger” in the phonological sense.

other languages, may look like a hodge-podge of different meanings? The only explanation is that from the point of view of speakers of the Chadic languages, there is NOT a hodge-podge of different meanings. In (2), I tried to characterize what might be the semantic commonality unifying the functions of the Subjunctive. That characterization may or may not be close to the mark, but the principle is clear. Without very good evidence to the contrary, linguists would do well to take a WYSIWYG approach when looking at the ways speakers of a language distribute the morphological and syntactic species of their languages.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R.C. 1941. *A Modern Grammar of Spoken Hausa*. London: Crown Agents for the Colonies (published on behalf of the Nigerian Government).
- Abraham, R.C. 1946 [2nd ed. 1962]. *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*. London: University of London Press.
- Abraham, R.C. 1959. *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: University of London Press.
- Bargery, G.P. 1934. *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bature, A., R. Randell and R.G. Schuh. 1996-1998. *Hausar Baka—Gani Ya Kori Ji* [Oral Hausa—A Picture is Worth 1000 Words]. Series of three videotapes (ca. 5 hours) for elementary and intermediate study of Hausa. Available from East Bay Media Center, Berkeley, CA.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1982. "Another look at West Chadic verb classes." *Africana Marburgensia* 15(1):25-42.
- Jaggar, Philip J. 2001. *Hausa*. London Oriental and African Language Library, Volume 7. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jungraithmayr, Herrmann. 1970. *Die Ron-Sprachen, Tschadomhamitische Studien in Nordnigerien*. Afrikanistische Forschungen, Band 3. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1970-72. "Die Personalien und das primäre Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigerien), Mit Beiträgen über das Karekare." *Afrika und Übersee* 54:237-286, 55:114-139.
- Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa Language, An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Newman, Paul and Russell G. Schuh. 1974. "The Hausa aspect system." *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 1(1):1-39.
- Newman, Roxana Ma. 1990. *An English-Hausa Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Parsons, F.W. 1960. "The verbal system in Hausa." *Afrika und Übersee* 44:1-36.

- Robinson, Charles H. 1897. *Hausa Grammar (with Exercises, Readings and Vocabularies, and Specimens of Hausa Script)*. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner.
- Schubert, Klaus. 1971-72. *Zur Bedeutung und Anwendung der Verbalparadigmen im Hausa und Kanuri*. *Afrika und Übersee* 55:1-49, 208-227; 56:90-118. [Reprinted in 1972 as a single volume.]
- Schuh, Russell G. n.d. "Verbs." Unpublished description of the verbal system of Western Bade.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1977. "West Chadic verb classes." In Paul Newman and Roxana Ma Newman (eds.), *Papers in Chadic Linguistics*, 143-166. Leiden: Afrika-Studiecentrum.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1998. *A Grammar of Miya*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, Volume 130. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Taylor, F.W. 1923. *A Practical Hausa Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 1993. *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa*. Hamburger Beiträge zur Afrikanistik, Band 2. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.