

THE TOTALITY EXTENSION AND FOCUS IN WEST CHADIC¹

Russell G. Schuh
UCLA

Verb morphology in West Chadic languages is determined by several cross-cutting parameters: verb class, tense/aspect/mood (TAM), verbal extensions, pluractionality, and subject agreement. This paper focuses on the extension system in several West Chadic languages spoken primarily in Yobe State, Nigeria (Bade, Bole, Karekare, Ngamo, Ngizim), and in particular, on one extension usually called the *totality extension* in descriptions of these languages. In West Chadic languages such as Kanakuru and Hausa, the apparent counterpart of this extension indicates “action done to the totality of its objects”, and the Yobe State languages typically use their totality extension in translating Hausa verbs bearing this extension. However, distributional properties of the extension in the Yobe State languages indicate that it shares little else with unequivocal totality markers. In Yobe State languages, a verb with this extension is commonly used—even preferred—as the citation form, and use of this extension is excluded from negative clauses and from clauses with a questioned or focused constituent other than the verb. These distributional facts indicate that the so-called totality extension in these languages is actually a marker of *auxiliary focus* in the sense of Hyman and Watters (1984). An additional distributional point of interest is use of the extension with intransitive verbs, where the extension always cooccurs with Intransitive Copy Pronouns (ICP), which, in turn, do not occur in the absence of the extension. In other West Chadic languages, ICPs are not restricted in this way, and indeed, unequivocal totality extensions are almost entirely restricted to use with transitive verbs.

1. Introduction

Hyman and Watters (1984) provide an extensive typology of focus constructions, with particular reference to African languages. As the title of their paper suggests, their primary purpose is to document the nature of *auxiliary focus*, that is, explicit marking of focus on the verb in conjunction with its auxiliary features (tense, aspect, mood) as opposed to *constituent focus*, that is, explicit marking of focus on some constituent other than the verb, typically a nominal or adverbial phrase. The only Chadic language that they refer to in their paper is Hausa, which, in my opinion, does not provide a convincing example of a language with auxiliary focus, and despite a rather extensive literature on focus constructions in Chadic languages, no one else to my knowledge has argued that any Chadic language has constructions that specifically mark verbal auxiliary focus.²

¹ The research that serves as the basis for this paper was supported by a grant from the US National Science Foundation, award #BCS-0111289, Russell G. Schuh, Principal Investigator. I am grateful to all those with whom I have worked on their languages, not only during the most recent project, but for the past 35 years. I owe a special debt to Dr. Alhaji Maina Gimba, with whom I have collaborated in field work in Nigeria since 2000. I would also like to thank Katharina Hartmann, Malte Zimmermann, and the SFB 632 “Information Structure” research group for inviting me to the Berlin Focus Conference, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for funding to attend the conference, and Paul Newman for comments on a draft of the paper.

² Schuh (1998:173-174) rather timidly suggests that Miya, a West Chadic-B language of northern Nigeria, does have morphology that marks “(a) perfectivity combined with (b) what Hyman and Watters (1984) call ‘Auxiliary Focus’,” but none of the growing number of Chadic reference grammars nor the numerous papers on focus in Chadic, e.g. Hartmann and Zimmermann (2005), Kenstowicz (1985), Schuh (1982), Tuller (1992), Wolff (2001) among others, seem to document explicit marking of auxiliary focus except, perhaps, as being the form used when something else is NOT focused.

In this paper, I will present evidence that a group of Chadic languages spoken in Yobe State, Nigeria has developed a morphological pattern with this function. More specifically, I will argue that the function and distribution of verbal morphology traditionally called the *totality extension*, usually defined as emphasizing “intensity or finality of the action” (Newman 2000:648), is better understood if it is viewed as auxiliary focus. Unlike most of the cases that Hyman and Watters (1984) discuss in detail, where morphological and syntactic evidence as well as native-speaker judgments as to meaning make it clear that the verb and/or its auxiliary features are in focus, the evidence I will present for auxiliary focus in these Chadic languages will be largely circumstantial. That is, although no speaker of these languages has ever said to me anything like, “Oh, that shows that he DID do the action,” the distribution of the morphology in question and a comparison of uses with unequivocal totality extensions in other languages leads one to the conclusion that this morphology fits the main criteria that Hyman and Watters used in characterizing auxiliary focus.

This paper will discuss only languages of the West Chadic branch of Chadic. Some, but not all the morphological and syntactic characteristics may apply to languages of other branches. Within West Chadic, Newman (1977a) proposes two branches, “A” and “B”. While the overall structure of Newman’s West Chadic tree deserves revisiting, it is clear that Newman is right in recognizing a major split between the two groups of languages that will be the main concern of this paper, viz. the Bole-Tangale languages (Bole, Karekare, Ngamo, Tangale, Kanakuru, and others), which are in the “A” branch, and the Bade-Ngizim languages, which are in the “B” branch. All the languages to be discussed in this paper are spoken almost exclusively in Yobe and Gombe States, with Bade-Ngizim languages spoken roughly to the north of Potiskum in Yobe State and Bole-Tangale languages to the south of Potiskum in Yobe State and into Gombe State and eastern Bauchi State.

2. Parameters of Chadic Verb Morphology

Verbal morphology in West Chadic languages is determined by several cross-cutting parameters: (1) verb class, (2) verb tense/aspect/mood (TAM), (3) verbal extensions, (4) pluractionality, and (5) agreement. In most West Chadic languages, verbs fall into lexical *verb classes* related to number of root consonants, syllable weight, and final vowel, e.g. Bole Class A1 (light root syllable, final –u in completive) **zuru-** ‘laugh’, Class A2 (heavy root syllable, final –u in completive) **zūru-** ‘pour from a higher container into a lower one’, Class B (light root syllable, final –a in completive) **zūrā-** ‘slice’.³ Although verb class may affect the form verbs take across the other parameters in the same way that, say, Latin conjugation classes affect tense morphology, class is usually a lexically and/or phonologically determined feature without relevance to the topic of this paper and hence will not be further discussed.

For similar reasons, this paper will not discuss the parameters of *verb pluractionality* and *agreement*. Pluractionality typically involves reduplication to indicate some type of plural action (repeated action, many subjects acting iteratively, etc.).

³ The class numbering system here is that of Lukas (1970-72). Schuh (1977) reconstructs a verb class system that very closely matches the classes that Lukas proposed for Bole. Subsequent research supports the basic validity of this reconstruction and the usefulness of Lukas’s classificatory framework.

Pluractionality is, in a sense, a type of extension. Lukas (1971), for example, includes Bole pluractionals together with other extensions as the *Intensive Erweiterungen*. But pluractionality operates independently of class, TAM, and extension parameters and also independently of the syntactic focus system. There would seem to be a semantic connection between pluractionality and aspectual functions such as habituality, and although Ekkehard Wolff in Wolff (1979) and elsewhere has discussed this connection, I know of few, if any clearly documented cases where erstwhile pluractionals have worked their way into the TAM system.

Most Chadic languages use pronominal affixes/clitics as their only *agreement* marking. Some languages have grammaticalized presence or absence of pluractional marking as a type agreement (see Frajnyngier (1989:84-86) for such a system in Pero). Some languages of the Bole-Tangale group require a plural agreement affix **-an** on verbs in the completive (cf. Bole **'yor-wò** 'he stopped' vs. **'yòr-an-gò** 'they stopped'). Agreement is linked to the person, number, and gender features of grammatical subjects (or, in some cases, objects), aspects of syntax unrelated to the topic of this paper.

We turn now to the *TAM* and *extension* parameters. I know of no West Chadic language that has categories of tense (past, present), aspect (perfective/completive, imperfective/continuative), mood (indicative, subjunctive) that operate as independent variables.⁴ I thus follow what has become a standard Chadic descriptive practice of using the term "TAM" as a cover term for all manifestations of this parameter. The TAM system is functionally embedded in syntax. I illustrate with two TAMs from Bole, but parallels can be found in other Chadic languages. Among other functions, the Bole *completive* indicates completed action (usually translatable as English past tense) in a declarative statement with an active verb (1a), it indicates existing state (usually translatable as English simple present tense) in a declarative statement with a stative verb (1b), it indicates necessity or inevitability following the complementizer **kapa** "even, only" (= Hausa **sai**) (1c), and it indicates anteriority in a clause in narrative (1d, both clauses). Among other functions, the Bole *subjunctive* indicates hortativity or intention in an unmarked statement (2a, first clause), it indicates purpose after the complementizer **bōdō** 'in order that' (2a, second clause), it indicates fittingness after the complementizer **kapa** 'even, only' (= Hausa **sai**) (2c), and it indicates next event in a sequence in narrative (2c).⁵

- (1) a. **Bamoi ndī-wò.** 'Bamoi went/has gone.'
 b. **Bamoi mon-tù-wo.** 'Bamoi knows.'
 c. **Kapa ìn ndī-wò.** 'I have to go.'
 d. **Ndin-gò, èssē bòdī ì-jìni.** 'When she came, you see, the night had fallen.'

⁴ A fairly common development has been to extend the number of TAM distinctions by using preverbal auxiliaries in conjunction with one of the basic TAMs. For example, in Ngizim the basic imperfective TAM, which has the form **ā** + VERBAL NOUN (**n-ā wanà** 'I work, I will work, I am working'), can restrict meaning to progressive by using **təkà** 'body' as an auxiliary (**n-ā təkà wanà** 'I am working'), and it can restrict the meaning to future by adding **ya ī** [yē] 'going to' (**n-ā yē wanà** 'I will work, I'm gonna work'). However, use of auxiliaries like these never seem to crosscut the basic TAM system to create, say, a set of progressive TAMs such as "past progressive", "subjunctive progressive", and the like.

⁵ Macron marks a long vowel (**ā**), grave accent marks low tone (**à**), no accent over a vowel indicates high tone except in examples where tone and vowel length are not marked. I have not marked tone or vowel length in examples drawn from texts where these features were not marked in the source.

- (2) a. **In sore bođo ma ngat-ti ina?** ‘(You say) I should fall in order that you eat me?!’
 b. **Kapa ka ndai bom-mu.** ‘You should go to our house.’
 c. **Sùn-ak-kò, dàshi sàtò gòlle.** ‘When she had spent the night [completive—cf. 1d], then the dawn came.’

Extensions are derivational affixes that create verb stems that have added meaning over and above the core meanings of the basic verb roots. West Chadic languages exhibit from one to five distinct extensions (Biu-Mandara languages tend to have more extensive extension systems). Three extensions that are found in at least some languages in both the A and B branches of West Chadic are *ventive*, *totality*, and *causative*. The ventive indicates that the action had its inception at a distance, with effect at a point of reference, usually the location of the speaker, e.g. ‘enter’ + ventive = “come in”, ‘forget’ + ventive = “forget something and leave it at a place distant from the place of speaking”. The totality indicates that the action has been done to the full extent available, e.g. ‘eat’ + totality = “eat up”, ‘cut’ + totality = “cut off”. The table in (3) illustrates the Bole verb **ngor-** ‘tie’ in the form it takes with a 3rd masculine singular subject and no objects in the completive, subjunctive, and future TAMs with no extensions, the ventive extension and totality extension. The ventive examples could read ‘tie and bring’, the totality examples ‘tie up’.

	Unextended	Ventive	Totality
(3) Completive	ngor-wò-yi	ngòru-n-gò-yi	ngor-tù-wo
Subjunctive	ngòri-yì	ngòru-ttù-yì	ngòr-tì
Future	à ngòrà-yi	à ngòr-àkò-yi	à ngòrà-ti

The *causative* adds an agentive subject that acts on an argument that would be the subject of the non-causative counterpart, e.g. *fell* would be the causative of *fall* (‘the tree will *fall*’ vs. ‘he will *fell* the tree’). In West Chadic, as in many other languages, the causative extension canonically creates a transitive verb from an intransitive, e.g. ‘go back’ + causative = ‘take back’, ‘get well’ + causative = ‘heal’. Hausa is exceptional among West Chadic languages in making fairly productive use of its causative extension, called *grade 5* in standard Hausa descriptions (Parsons 1960), not only to transitivize intransitive verbs but also to add an agent to transitive verbs who acts on the subject of the non-causative, if expressed, as a dative object, e.g. ‘buy’ + grade 5 = ‘sell (to someone)’, ‘learn’ + grade 5 = ‘teach (to someone)’.⁶ The causative is somewhat different from other extensions because it creates a verb stem with a new argument structure rather than simply extending the base meaning of the root. The Bole causative extension is **-t-**, e.g. **mā-jìni** ‘he went back’ (see section 4.2 for an explanation of **-jìni**) vs. **mā-tu-tù karài** ‘he took back the load’ (causative—underlined—combined with the totality extension **-tù**).

⁶ Newman (1983) refers to Hausa grade 5 as *effential* (based on Latin ‘do (away) from’), objecting to the term “causative” because the literal meaning is not “cause to do”, and perhaps more important, because this term better captures the range of meaning of the grade 5, including its use with intransitives (‘go out’ → ‘remove’), with transitives (‘pour’ → ‘pour/throw away’), and even with verbs having an intransitive meaning (**ƙayataɗ** ‘be beautiful, be pleasing’).

A considerable amount of syncretism seems to have taken place in West Chadic extension systems whereby extensions that probably had distinct meanings have been grammaticalized as allomorphs of a single extension or have otherwise shifted function.⁷ Thus, Bole has three non-cognate suffixes (**-n**, **-(t)tu**, **-àko**) marking ventive depending on the TAM. Bole consistently marks totality with a suffix **-tV**, but other closely related languages have an **-n** allomorph in addition to **-t**. The Bole causative appears to be cognate with a **-t** suffix used in other languages to derive verbs from nouns (cf. Hausa **kyâu** ‘good’, **kyâutâ** ‘do good’). It is not the purpose of this paper to reconstruct the extension system of West Chadic. I will therefore refer to a set of allomorphs that have a unitary function and are in complementary distribution as “THE X EXTENSION”. I will do likewise across languages for functionally related morphemes, even where they are non-cognate.

Unlike TAMs, which are embedded in syntax, which are subject to restrictions of syntactic distribution, and whose interpretation depends on syntactic environment, the expectation for extensions is that they will be unrestricted syntactically and will contribute an invariable meaning component regardless of syntactic environment or TAM. In (4) are Bole sentences drawn from folktales with the word ‘come’, which is the *ventive* form of **ndî-** ‘go’, in a variety of TAMs and syntactic environments, showing that there are no restrictions on its occurrence or variations in its meaning.

(4) a. **Dàshi bòlo mòngù ndettu gà bòdî-bòdî.** (subjunctive, event in narrative)

‘Well then the woman came in the late night.’

b. **Ndingo, dàshi gòwi bòbìn.** (completive, anterior event in narrative)

‘When she came, well she knocked on the door.’

c. **Sòbàno, ndètti mu ài bàsa.** (singular imperative)

‘My friend, come let’s make friends.’

d. **Mate ndettu mate ngori kaibono.** (subjunctive, horative)

‘They should come and perform the marriage ceremony.’

e. **Ita mù’yato yè ìnnaki ita ndin sa...** (completive, negative clause)

‘(When) she, the co-wife, saw that she hadn’t come...

f. **Ndin ga bommu lo?** (completive, questioned subject)

‘Who came to our house?’ (Came to house-our who?)

g. **Àdà ìndab bò ndàko...** (verbal noun in purpose phrase)

‘(When) the dog arose in order to come...’

The remainder of this paper will show that, unlike the ventive and causative extensions, which are unrestricted in syntactic distribution and which create stems with consistent meaning components, the totality, though considered to be part of the extension system in descriptions of these languages, does not have these properties.

⁷ Newman (1977b) suggests such syncretism as a way to explain how two affixes, which he reconstructs as ***(a)wa** and ***in**, have distinct functions in Hausa but have cognates in other languages that are allomorphs of a single ventive extension.

3. The Totality Extension

3.1. Linguistic distribution and limitations on the totality extension. The earliest use of the term “totality” applied to a verbal extension that I have been able to find is in Lukas (1971), where he called the Bole form illustrated in (3) the *Totalitätserweiterung*. Newman (1973) seems to have been the first person to use the term *totality extension* with respect to the Hausa grade 4.⁸ Since that time, the term has come into general use in Chadic linguistics with reference to functionally similar constructions. When one surveys West Chadic languages, however, it turns out to be more difficult to find functional equivalents for the totality extension than for the ventive or causative. Hausa, which tends to be the point of reference for Chadic studies, does have an extended verb form, the grade 4, that is productive and retains a constant totality meaning in all contexts,⁹ as illustrated in (5), with examples from Newman (2000:649).

(5) Unextended		Totality (grade 4)	
yā sàyi audùgā	‘he bought cotton’	yā sayè audùgā	‘he bought up the cotton’
nā bùgè shì	‘I hit him’	nā bugè shi	‘I knocked him down’
kà shā madarā	‘drink some milk’	kà shānyè madarā	‘drink up the milk’

Kwami has a suffix **-idd-**, which Leger (1994:220) calls the *Finale Erweiterung*, and which has totality semantics, e.g. **yìn pānd-idd-í lóo** ‘sie rösteten das Fleisch ganz und gar’. Kanakuru has a construction that Newman (1974:77-79) explicitly equates to Hausa grade 4, and which “occurs in a full range of syntactic environments ... in all tenses ... and in negative as well as affirmative sentences.” Unlike other languages that have a construction identified as “totality”, however, the Kanakuru marker is not a verbal suffix, but rather a particle whose “normal position ... is after objects” (78), e.g. **shiru ayim man ane!** ‘steal all his money!’ Newman (1972) relates Kanakuru **ane** to the **-anye** allomorph of Hausa grade 4—see ‘drink’ in (5), and suggests in personal communication that, like the Kanakuru form, the Hausa form may have originally been an adverb-like particle rather than a verbal suffix.

Aside from these few languages and the four languages of Yobe State, to be discussed in section 3.2, a totality extension is notable for its absence. In the Bole-Tangale group, descriptions of Tangale (Jungraithmayr 1991) and Pero (Frajzyngier 1989) do not mention such a form, and Schuh (1978) explicitly checked for it but did not find it in Kirfi, Galambu, and Gera. In the South Bauchi group, Haruna (2003) does not mention a totality form for Guruntum, and Caron (2001, 2002) does not mention one for Guus or Dott. In the North Bauchi group, Skinner (1979) does not mention any extensions for Pa’a. Schuh (1998:170-175) refers to a construction using markers **suw...ay** as “totality” in Miya, but for a number of reasons this is a mischaracterization, not the least of which is the fact that this construction is not restricted to verbal clauses! (See also the comment

⁸ Newman, in personal communication, has said that he is not sure where he got the term, but that he probably took it from Lukas.

⁹ Newman (2000:648) notes that Hausa grade 4 is “semantically heterogeneous”. The statements here about the function of grade 4 refer only to its use as derivational form that adds a totality component to a root whose neutral form is in some other Hausa verb grade.

on Miya in footnote 2.) Finally, in the Bade-Ngizim group, Bade and Duwai lack a totality construction for transitive verbs.

Mention of transitivity raises another issue involving the totality extension, viz. it does not combine easily with intransitive verbs. In Hausa, many intransitive verbs are lexicalized as grade 4 as the only form for the root, as the semantically unmarked form of a root, or as an intransitive counterpart of a verb having transitive meaning in another grade: **rāmè** ‘become thin’ with no counterpart having similar meaning in another grade; **rubè** ‘putrify’—cf. less commonly used equivalent **rùba**; **karyè** ‘snap in two (intr)’—cf. **karyà** ‘snap in two (tr)’. However, intransitives, particularly unaccusatives, generally cannot operate grade 4 or, if they do, they have become lexicalized with meanings whose semantics are not straightforwardly equivalent to root meaning + totality, e.g. **zaunà**/**?*zaunè**¹⁰ ‘sit down’, **tsayà**/**?*tsayè** ‘come to a stop’, **shiga/shigè** ‘enter/pass beyond’. Newman (1974) gives no examples of intransitive verbs in Kanakuru, and his discussion implies that the Kanakuru totality construction applies only to transitive verbs. Leger (1994:220) does give one example with an intransitive (**ndìb-ìdǎ-àn** ‘in nichts zerfallen’) but provides no information on syntactic distribution of verbs bearing this extension. As we will see in section 4, the languages of Yobe State show no limitations on the use of totality with intransitive verbs.

3.2. The totality extension in the languages of Yobe State. Of the Chadic languages indigenous to what is now Yobe State, Nigeria, six are still spoken. They are Duwai, Bade, and Ngizim of the Bade-Ngizim group (West Chadic B) and Karekare, Ngamo, and Bole of the Bole-Tangale group (West Chadic A). Ngizim, Karekare, Ngamo, and Bole are spoken in the area around Potiskum, the largest city in Yobe State, and to its south. The peoples speaking these languages have had intense cultural contact for a long time—certainly several hundred years. Duwai and Bade are spoken farther north, Bade fanning out to the south and West from Gashua, now the largest city in northern Yobe State, and Duwai fanning out to the south and east of Gashua. The Duwai-Bade area is separated from the Potiskum area by a Hausa/Kanuri/Fulfulde speaking zone, and although Bade and Ngizim are genetically very close, culturally, the Ngizim speaking people are closer to the Bole-Tangale speaking groups around Potiskum.

The four Potiskum area languages—Ngizim, Karekare, Ngamo, Bole—all have a productive verbal extension that has been called the “totality extension” (Schuh (1972) for Ngizim, Lukas (1971) for Bole), whereas the survey in section 3.1 shows a totality extension is absent among closely related languages outside this area, with the exception of Kanakuru, where the totality construction does not involve a verbal suffix, and Kwami, a western neighbor of Bole in Gombe state for which Leger (1994) does not provide information that would indicate whether or not the Kwami and Bole extensions have similar distributions. Moreover, this extension in the Potiskum area languages shares a cluster of distributional properties which, given the fact that languages from two rather

¹⁰I have not checked the grade 4 forms with a preceding “?” with a native speaker to see whether or not they have an interpretation, but they seem strange to me as a reasonably fluent, though not native speaker of Hausa, and they are not in Bargery (1934), who listed all derived forms that he attested. A few intransitives take a grade 4 form when used with an indirect object (**gujè** ‘run away from’ < **gudù** ‘run’, **kōmè** ‘go back (to someone)’ < **kōmà** ‘return, go back’), a function not obviously linked to totality semantics.

remotely related branches of Chadic are represented, must be the result of areal contact rather than inheritance from a shared ancestor. These properties suggest that the term “totality” as it is generally defined in the discussion of verbal extensions is not the most appropriate functional characterization of this extension in these languages. I will argue in the following sections that distributional evidence indicates that this extension in these languages has the function that Hyman and Watters (1984) call *auxiliary focus*. Nonetheless, I will continue to use the term “totality” as a convenient label for the extension morpheme(s).

3.2.1. Totality form in the Potsikum area languages. In this section, I consider only transitive verbs. See section 4 for intransitives. The combinations of verb roots with TAM marking, extensions, and pronominal clitics comprise the area of greatest morphological complexity in these languages. To keep things simple, I will present just four tables: the completive TAM in unextended and totality forms and the subjunctive TAM in unextended and totality forms, and for each of these TAM/extension combinations, the forms verbs take when no overt object is expressed and when a pronominal direct object ‘her’ is expressed. The morpheme marking totality is in small caps.¹¹

Table 1. Completive¹² unextended

	Karekare	Ngamo	Bole	Ngizim
‘he shot	bàsā-kàù	bàsâ	bàsā-wò-yi	və̀ɾkɯ
‘he shot her’	bàsā-tà-kàù	bàsà-tê	bàsā-tā-wo	və̀ɾk atú

Table 2. Completive + totality

	Karekare	Ngamo	Bole	Ngizim
‘he shot’	bàsā-s(I)-kàù	bàsa-T-kò	bàsā-TÙ-wo	və̀ɾkə-DÙ
‘he shot her’	bàsā-N-ta-kàù	bàsa-N-tô	bàsā-TÙ ità	və̀ɾkə-NĀ (a)tú

Table 3. Subjunctive unextended

	Karekare	Ngamo	Bole	Ngizim
‘that he shoot’	bàsì	à bèsê	bèsē-yì	dà vərki
‘that he shoot her’	bàsī-tè	à bèsè-tê	bèsē-tò	dà vərki(i) atú

¹¹ Karekare and Ngizim are dialectally fairly uniform. Ngamo has two major dialects, Gudi and Yaya. Though they differ significantly at all levels, they are alike in the way they use the totality extension. Data here are from the Gudi dialect. Bole likewise has two major dialects, Fika and Gombe. Data here are from the Fika dialect.

¹² The most frequently used terms for this TAM are *perfective* and *completive*. Personally, I prefer “perfective”, but Newman (2000) uses “completive”. Newman’s Hausa grammar, because of its quality and its comprehensiveness, will probably become the standard “Chadic” reference grammar. As a move toward standardizing Chadic terminology, I therefore use his term. *Completive* also has the advantage of perhaps being more transparent to non-linguists as a semantic label.

Table 4. Subjunctive + totality

	Karekare	Ngamo	Bole	Ngizim
‘that he shoot’	bàsē-sì ¹³	à bàsà-TÍ	bèsè-TI	dà vərki-DÙ
‘that he shoot her’	bàsa-N-tè	à bàsà-N-tò	bèsè-TI ità	dà vərki-NĀ (a)tû

Tables 1-4 show that these languages all overtly mark a parallel function on verbs, but they have not inherited the morphological marking of this function directly from a single reconstructable affix in a common ancestral languages. In the three Bole-Tangale languages, “**tV**” is shared by all the languages in both TAMs illustrated here, assuming that the “**si**” in Karekare (Table 2, Ø object and footnote 13) is from ***ti**. Bole has **tV** in all manifestations of the totality, but in Ngamo and Karekare, when a pronoun clitic follows the extended verb, totality has the form **-n-**. It seems likely that Bole is the innovator here, since it represents a simplification from the heterogeneous situation seen in Karekare and Ngamo, where there are suppletive allomorphs. The **-nā** pre-object suffix in Ngizim may be cognate with the **-n-** of Karekare and Ngamo, though it is functionally different since it is used before any direct object, noun or pronoun. The Ngizim **-dù** suffix, used when no direct object is present, appears to have its origin outside the totality system. The Ngizim totality allomorphs are, in fact, identical in both form and distribution with objects to the allomorphs of the *causative* extension—cf. **deu** ‘he came’ vs. causativized **dē-NĀ karē** ‘he brought the load’, **dē-DÙ** ‘he brought (it)’. In Bade, only the **-dù** suffix is used as a causative extension, and although Bade does not use a totality extension with transitive verbs, it uses an **-n-** with intransitive copy pronouns, which, I will argue in section 4.1, are the intransitive counterpart of the totality extension in Yobe languages. Ngizim has apparently undergone double syncretism, “borrowing” the *causative* extension **-dù** as totality when no direct object is present and “borrowing” the *totality* **-nā** as causative when a direct object is expressed.

Although these four languages have remodeled their extension systems in various ways to present a rather heterogeneous formal picture both language internally and cross-linguistically, the next sections will show that functionally, they are essentially identical, a situation that must result from areal contact.

3.2.2. Totality as citation form. By definition extended verb forms are marked. The normal expectation would thus be that the most neutral/unmarked citation forms would be unextended. This is certainly the case for Hausa verbs without and with grade 4 marking. For example, if one were to ask a Hausa speaker to translate the English sentence, “He bought it,” the response would be **yā sàyā**, not **yā sayè** (with the grade 4 final vowel and tone pattern). In doing linguistic field work in northern Nigeria, it is common practice to use Hausa as the main elicitation language, and for eliciting verbs, the typical frame is a completive with a 3rd masculine singular subject (**yā sàyā** ‘he

¹³I have supplied this form based on information from elsewhere in the Karekare paradigm. I seem not to have elicited the subjunctive totality with Ø object in Karekare for this class of verb (class B) and can find no clear examples in texts. Class A1 subjunctive + totality is **às-sì** ‘that he pick up’, and a class B verb with an indirect object, where the pronoun is affixed directly to the verb root, also has the **-sì** totality suffix, viz. **bàsē-tà-sì** ‘that he shoot for her’.

bought’, **yā tàfi** ‘he went’, etc.). When translating Hausa verbs in this frame into Ngizim, Karekare, and Ngamo, speakers tend to use the totality extended forms rather than unextended forms. Indeed, because I would usually want the simplest form of the verb for entry into our lexical database, I had to devise ways to assure that speakers did NOT use the extended form, usually by using a negative frame (‘he didn’t buy it’)—see section 3.2.3. From my own field notes, it is thus hard to provide objective evidence of the tendency to use the totality extended form as the citation form, but the data in Kraft (1981) does provide such evidence. Kraft’s wordlists were collected by field workers who had no prior knowledge of the languages, and the speakers providing the data had no training in the structures of their languages or of working as linguistic consultants. Here are figures from the verbs in Kraft’s lists. I include figures for intransitive verbs, which I discuss further in section 4.1.

Table 5. Numbers of verbs cited with or without the totality extension in Kraft (1981)

	Transitive unextended	Transitive totality	Intransitive unextended	Intransitive totality
Ngizim	53	20	11	4
Karekare	38	44	7	12
Ngamo	3	62	0	16
Bole (Gombe)	79	0	24	0

(6) Examples of verbal citations with the totality extension from Kraft (1981)¹⁴

Elicitation*	Karekare	Ngamo ¹⁵	Bole	Ngizim
H: ya samu ‘he obtained’	wa(sò)kèw (wā-sì-kàù)	’watkò (wa-t-kò)	wawo’i (wā-wò-’i)	nə bədu (na ba-dù ⁷)
H: ya safa ‘he wove’	ca(sò)kèw ¹⁶ (càku-sì-kàù)	sà’itkò (sà’y-it-kò)	sàkowo’i (sàku-wò-’i)	nə cakədù nə cakəu (na cāka-dù)
H: ya wanke ‘he washed’	bùdusòkèw (bìđu-sì-kàù)	bù’ukò (bu’u-kò /bud’-kò/)	bìďawo’i (bìďā-wò-’i)	nə vīyu(dù) (na vīyə-dù)
H: ya kashe ‘he killed’	dùkwasòkèw (dùkwu-sì-kàù)	du kò (dukò /duk-kò/)	dùwo’i (duw-wò-’i)	nə tku (na tkú /na təkú/)

¹⁴ The citations in the table are from Kraft’s original notes rather than those in Kraft (1981). Unfortunately, in preparing the data entries in Kraft (1981) for publication, the editor(s) attempted to extract roots from the elicited data. The result is that, on the one hand, important information, such as that being discussed in this paper, was omitted in editing, and on the other, because the editor(s) did not know the languages, material that is not part of the roots is often included in the published entries. For example, the Ngamo entry for ‘obtain’ is **wat**, but the **t** is the totality extension, not part of the root—cf. the entry **bat** ‘break (a rope)’, where the **t** IS a root consonant. See Newman (1984) for a critical review of the methodology used in compiling Kraft (1981).

¹⁵ The Ngamo data in Kraft’s (1981) list is from the Gudi dialect. In this dialect for A1 verbs, i.e. CVC roots with a short vowel, the difference between the unextended verb and the totality extension is in tone only. Thus, ‘he washed’ in the unextended form is /bùď-kò/ → [bù’ùkò], with low-falling tones, whereas the totality extended form is /bud’-kò/ → [bu’ukò], with high-low tones. The Kraft list consistently shows high-low tone for A1 verbs.

¹⁶ It looks like the field worker omitted a syllable in Karekare or there was some confusion.. The root for weave in Karekare is **càku-**. The root **cā-** means ‘begin’.

H: ya bushe 'it dried up'	səwro tinki (similar word unknown)	fò'in nî (hò'y-in-nî /hò'y-it-nî/)	pò'ywi (pò'u'ò)	wòḏḏongərə wòḏu (wəḏḏə-n-gaḗ)
H: ya mutu 'he died'	mè tinki (mèt-ti-n-ki)	màtin nî (màt-in-nî /màt-it-nî/)	mutu'ò (motu-wò)	mòtu (mətu)

*The Ngizim transitive verbs have first singular subjects, i.e. 'I obtained', etc.

The most striking figures in Table 5 are those for Ngamo and Bole. In Ngamo, virtually 100% of the verbal entries have the totality extension, whereas none of the Bole entries do (I return to the Bole situation below). In Ngizim, around 30% of the entries have the totality extension, in Karekare, around 60% have the totality extension. For both Ngizim and Karekare, many of the entries in Kraft's original data tables give alternatives with and without the totality extension. I have counted these as being entries with the totality extension. In (6), entries that had alternatives in Kraft's data are shown either with the totality extension in parentheses, e.g. (sò), or as two separate entries, depending on how they appeared in the original. The parenthesized forms below Kraft's entries are the counterparts as they would be transcribed in my own data.

The figures in Table 5 and the Hausa elicitation forms in (6) make it clear that whatever the meaning expressed by the totality extension (or by its absence) in these languages might be, it has no relation to totality semantics or to the form of the Hausa elicitation verb. The Ngamo speaker equated the Ngamo totality extension with the Hausa neutral citation form essentially 100% of the time. The Karekare and Ngizim speakers likewise used totality forms to translate Hausa citation forms, and for many entries, they volunteered both unextended and totality as apparent equivalent translations of the Hausa. Many Hausa verbs have been lexicalized with grade 4 form, such as 'wash; 'kill', and 'dry up' in (6), but the fact that the speakers gave totality forms not only for these verbs, but also for 'obtain' and 'weave', which do not have grade 4 morphology in Hausa, shows that there is not a purely formal matching of Hausa grade 4 verbs with totality. There is not even a correlation between inherent totality semantics and totality form. The Ngizim speaker gave only UNextended forms as translations of 'kill' and 'die'.

Using totality as a preferred or at least an alternative citation form is consistent with the concept that it is functioning as auxiliary focus. Clearly, the focus of the citation form is the action referenced by the verb, though it would be a rather weak focus, i.e. citing a verb in isolation calls neither for *assertive* focus (filling in a value in a presupposed context) nor *contrastive* focus (filling in a value that conflicts with a value in an asserted context).¹⁷ The fact that the force of focus is rather weak in citation forms without context would explain the rough equivalence that the Karekare and Ngizim speakers in Kraft's data seem to give the unextended and totality forms. Though this particular Ngamo speaker consistently chose the totality form, this is not a requirement for grammaticality or felicity in Ngamo. Once Ngamo speakers that I worked with learned that I was looking for the simplest form for verbal citations, they readily cited verbs without the totality extension.

The data discussed here involves forms that speakers provide in essentially neutral contexts. One reason that those of us who have worked on these languages have used the

¹⁷ See Hyman and Watters (1984:239-240) for *assertive* vs. *contrastive* focus.

term “totality” to refer to the extension in question is that one can fairly reliably elicit verbs with this extension by using Hausa grade 4, e.g. a Bole speaker, if asked to translate Hausa **ya cinye tuwo** ‘he ate up the *tuwo*’ (**cinye** = grade 4 of **ci** ‘eat’), will respond **tī-tù ottò** (**tī** ‘eat’ + totality **-tù**), and if asked to translate **tī ottò** vs. **tī-tù ottò** into Hausa, Bole speakers would probably respond **ya ci tuwo** ‘he ate (some) *tuwo*’ vs. **ya cinye tuwo** ‘he ate up the *tuwo*’ respectively. These translation equivalences do not, however, constitute *prima facie* evidence that Yobe “totality” should be functionally equated with Hausa grade 4. It is difficult if not impossible to know exactly what feature is the focus of these apparent translation equivalents. For example, in the examples here *totality* semantics would presumably focus on the fact that the *tuwo* was consumed in its entirety, but another plausible interpretation is that focus is on the *telicity* of the event, the event reached a logical point of termination, an interpretation that does not generally call for a grade 4 verb in Hausa, e.g. **ya gina gida**, with grade 1, would have the telic interpretation ‘he built a house’, not an atelic interpretation such as ‘he built on a house’. Moreover, when speakers of Yobe languages are asked to differentiate a pair of sentences differing only by an unextended vs. totality extended verb, a typical translation for the totality extended version will use Hausa **riga** ‘have already done’ rather than a Hausa grade 4.¹⁸

Returning to the figures in Table (5), one wonders why the Bole speaker for the Kraft (1981) list never used the totality extension. There are several possible answers: (1) he had a choice between either the unextended form or the totality extension and happened to make the opposite choice from the Ngamo speaker; (2) the function of the totality extension in Bole differs from its function in the other Potiskum languages, i.e. its addition creates a “non-neutral” verb form that is inappropriate for citation; (3) Bole should not be typologically grouped with the other Potiskum languages, at least in the use of the totality extension. The answer may be a combination of these. The Kraft (1981) Bole list is from the Gombe dialect, whose speakers have no direct contact with speakers of the languages around Potiskum. All my own information is from the Fika dialect, which IS in contact with those languages. The two dialects do seem to differ with respect to use of the totality extension. The Fika dialect of Bole does not use totality extended forms as citation forms with the frequency of the other languages, but certain verbs in Fika always use the totality extension except where it is grammatically precluded (see sections 3.2.3-4). Verbs requiring the totality extension include ‘know’ and other verbs of mental state (‘forget’, ‘remember’) and the verb ‘surpass’, used in comparison. Even these verbs lack the totality extension in the Gombe Bole of Kraft’s list, e.g. Fika **mòntu-tù-wo** ‘he has forgotten’ (Kraft **muntu-’o-’i**),¹⁹ Fika **’yā-tù-wo** ‘it is better’ (Kraft **yawò**). Further evidence for this dialect difference is found in Benton (1912). Benton’s materials contain a mix of dialect material that is not always easy to disentangle, but he makes an explicit statement (page 13), “The transitive is shown by the termination **-woyi**

¹⁸ One often looks back at linguistic field work and wishes that verbatim recordings of every interchange had been made. Rather off-hand translation equivalents like this are the type of information that I rarely, if ever, recorded, either in writing or electronically. I can therefore not provide specific examples.

¹⁹ Cf. Fika **mon-tù-wo** ‘he knows’, Kraft **munko’i**. The **-k-** in Kraft’s citation does not correspond to any Fika form. Paul Newman, who worked on the Gombe dialect some years ago, recalls, in personal communication, that the Bole-Tangale completive suffix **-ko** may be pronounced [ko] after roots ending in **-n**. In the Fika dialect, this suffix always has the allomorph **-wo** when the verb has a singular subject, regardless of root shape.

in the Bara dialect [Bara is directly west of Gombe—RGS] and **-tuo** or **-o** in the Fika dialect,” citing Fika forms like **ni awátuo** ‘I open’.²⁰

In section 3.2, I suggested that the cluster of properties associated with the totality extension in the Potiskum languages is, at least in part, an areal phenomenon. Geographically, Bole is the southernmost of these languages and in some respects is more like its southern cousins than it is like Karekare and Ngamo. It would therefore not be surprising if Bole diverged to some extent from the shared areal properties of its northern neighbors, and moreover, that the further south one went the greater this divergence became. We will see in the next sections, however, that Bole’s use of the totality extension fits exactly with that of the other languages in important respects.

3.2.3. Negative sentences. All the Potiskum languages share an inviolate grammatical restriction: a totality extended verb may not appear in a negative clause. For example, all the Potiskum languages invariably use a totality extended form for the verb ‘know’ in affirmative clauses, but in the negative the totality is excluded.

(7) The verb ‘know’ in affirmative and negative clauses

	Karekare	Ngamo	Bole	Ngizim
Affirmative	nà mènta-sì ‘I know’	mànō-Tì Audù ‘he knows Audu’	mon-TÛ-wo ‘he knows’	zèga-NĀ zhà ‘he knows war-making’
Negative	nà mènta bai ‘I don’t know’	mànì Audù bù ‘he doesn’t know Audu’	monū sa ‘he doesn’t know’	ka zgá kàwà bai ‘you don’t know the game’

In Schuh (1972:457-459), I noted the exclusion of a verb bearing the totality extension from a negative predicate in Ngizim and suggested that “if we take a rough translation of the Totality Extension to be ‘do completely’, we can understand [this exclusion], i.e. one cannot ‘completely not do’ something.” This explanation does not work for a number of reasons. First, this semantic explanation would not account for the Hausa/Ngizim equivalences in (8), noted in Schuh (1972:458), where Hausa **shanye** is the grade 4 form of **sha** ‘drink’.

(8) Hausa	Ngizim	
na shanye giya	na sa-NĀ sēmà	‘I drank up the beer’
ban shanye giya ba	na sa sēmà bai	‘I didn’t drink up the beer’
	*na sa-NĀ-sēmà bai	

Second, excluding the Ngizim totality form from negative clauses on the grounds of totality semantics would not provide an account that would also encompass the citation form facts discussed in section 3.2.2 nor the constituent focus facts discussed below in section 3.2.4.

²⁰ In modern transcription, this would be **in àwā-TÛ-wo** and would be more appropriately translated ‘I opened’. Benton claims to be comparing these forms with intransitive verbs, though he does not say how intransitive verbs would terminate, he does not cite any intransitive verbs, and he does not give any examples with the ending “-woyi”, which would also be the valid unextended form in Fika. What is significant here, however, is Benton’s correlation between choice of terminations and dialect.

Givón (1979:Chapter 3) discusses semantic and syntactic differences between affirmative and negative clauses at length. One of his conclusions (139) is that

“negatives are consistently more *marked* in terms of their discourse-pragmatic presuppositions [than corresponding affirmatives]. Specifically, they are uttered in contexts where the corresponding affirmative has been discussed, or else when the speaker assumes that the hearer’s bias toward or belief in—and thus familiarity with—the corresponding affirmative.”

In a normal negative clause, then, the base proposition is, in some sense, presupposed and the negation is the new information, i.e. the information that is in focus. Hyman and Watters (1984:261), referring to languages that have special negative verbal tenses, note that many African languages “have their grammars assign a redundant [+focus] specification to all negative forms.” A counterpart to this in Chadic languages is Hausa in contexts such as those in (9):

- (9) a. **yaranmu sun karkace** ‘our children have gone astray’
 b.i. **su wa suka karkace?** ‘who all have gone astray?’
 b.ii. ***su wa sun karkace?**
 c. **yaranmu ba su karkace ba** ‘our children have not gone astray’
 d.i. **su wa ba su karkace ba?** ‘who all haven’t gone astray?’
 d.ii. ***su wa ba sun/suka karkace ba?**

In (9a) the *general completive* (**sun**) is used in a declarative assertion. In (9b), where the event of ‘going astray’ is presupposed and the request for new information is in focus, the *relative completive* (9b.i, **suka**) is required and the general completive is excluded (9b.ii). The *negative completive* (9c-d.i), with its single form regardless of context, overrides the distinction between focus or non-focus of non-verbal constituents. Neither the general nor the relative forms are possible in a negative (9d.ii).

The sole mark of negation in Yobe State Chadic languages is a single clause final negative marker—see the examples in (7). None of these languages has any negative TAMs that are formally distinct from those used in the affirmative.²¹ Although negation does not neutralize or replace TAM marking in these languages, it does neutralize the distinction between unextended and totality extended verbs, a distinction that is available in affirmative clauses. If the function of the totality extension is auxiliary focus, then the assumption that the propositional information in a negative clause is presupposed and hence out of focus explains why the totality extension is excluded from negative clauses.

3.2.4. Constituent questions and focus. Another context where the totality extension is excluded in Yobe State Chadic languages is clauses with questioned or focused constituents. In the examples in (10-13), the morpheme marking totality is in small caps. The examples show that when a subject or object is questioned, use of the totality extension makes the sentence ungrammatical. Neither word order nor type of object play a role in this exclusion. These languages have *in situ* placement of question words except for subjects, i.e. questioned non-subjects all take their declarative order after the verb.

²¹ Bade has a distinct completive TAM used in negative clauses, but this form can also be used in counterfactual affirmative clauses. Duwai, Bade, and Ngizim all have a “Second Subjunctive”, which replaces the imperative in negative commands, but this form is also used in affirmative contexts, esp. 3rd person exhortations.

Questioned subjects are sentence final for most languages in the Bade-Ngizim and eastern Bole-Tangale languages. Karekare is the exception, where *in situ* sentence initial position for subjects seems to be preferred,²² although post-verbal positioning of question and focused subjects is also grammatical.

- (10) Karekare
- | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| a. Totality+N DO | wā-KÀ tàmci
cf. wā tàmci (no totality) | ‘he got a sheep’ |
| b. Totality+pro DO | wā-NÀ-ka-kàu | ‘he found you (m.s.)’ |
| c. Q subj, pro DO | mìyà wā-kà-kau?

*mìyà wā-NÀ-ka-kàu? | ‘what’s wrong with you?’
(“what got you?”) |
| d. Q DO | ka wā mìyà?
*ka wā-KÀ mìyà? | ‘what did you get?’ |
- (11) Ngamo²³
- | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------|
| a. Totality+N DO | moiko-K tèmshi
cf. mòiko tèmshi (no totality) | ‘he saw a sheep’ |
| b. Totality+pro DO | mòy-IN-kô | ‘he saw you (m.s.)’ |
| c. Q subj, pro DO | mòiko ko-i lô?
*moy-IN-ko lo? | ‘who saw you?’ |
| d. Q DO | kò moikò lò?
*ko moiko-K lo? | ‘who did you see?’ |
- (12) Bole
- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| a. Totality+N DO | wā-TÙ tèmshi
cf. wā tèmshi (no totality) | ‘he got a sheep’ |
| b. Totality+pro DO | wā-TÙ kai | ‘he found you (m.s.)’ |
| c. Q subj, pro DO | wā-kà lè?

*wā-TÙ kai lè? | ‘what’s wrong with you?’
(“what got you?”) |
| d. Q DO | ka wā lè?
*ka wā-TÙ lè? | ‘what did you get?’ |

²² My guess is that this is a calque from Hausa. When I first elicited sentences with questioned subjects, using Hausa as the elicitation language, I thought speakers were just giving me a word-for-word Hausa translation. However, most examples of questioned subjects in available texts are also initial. On the other hand, if this is a calque on Hausa, it applies only to subjects. Questioned non-subjects in Karekare are always *in situ*, whereas all questioned constituents in Hausa are initial.

²³ There are two morphemes with the segmental form **ko** in the Ngamo data: the 2nd masculine singular morpheme and the completive marker. The verb root is **moy-** (spelled **moi-** before a consonant), and the completive marker is written as part of the verb, with no hyphen. The completive marker is elided when a pronoun object is a clitic—cf. **mòy-IN-shî** ‘he saw you (f.s.)’.

(13) Ngizim

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| a. Totality+N DO | ba-NĀ tēmākú | ‘he got a sheep’ |
| | cf. ba tēmākú (no totality) | |
| b. Totality+pro DO | ba-NĀ kēm | ‘he found you (f.s.)’ |
| c. Q subj, pro DO | ba kēm nən tàm? ²⁴ | ‘what’s wrong with you?’
(“what got you?”) |
| | *ba-NĀ kēm nən tàm? | |
| d. Q DO | ka ba tām? | ‘what did you get?’ |
| | *ka ba-NĀ tām? | |

The obvious explanation for the exclusion of the totality extension in these contexts is that the questioned or focused word has preempted focus, thus disallowing focus on the verb auxiliary, which, in any case, is a rather weak focus, at least compared to overt focusing of a constituent. In languages that have an extension with unequivocal totality semantics, there are no syntactic restrictions on the distribution of totality. For example, in Kanakuru, which, like the Yobe languages, postposes subjects for questioning and focus, one can use the totality marker in conjunction with a focused subject: **at dēnoi shire ane** ‘SHE ate up the peanuts’, i.e. “ate peanuts SHE *totality*” (Newman 1974:78).

Since Yobe languages generally postpose questioned or focused subjects (though see the remark above on Karekare), focus on the subject will be clear from word order. Other questioned and focused constituents are *in situ*. Use of a question word obviously marks a question, but word order alone does not show that a non-subject is focused. ABSENCE of the totality extension is a partial indicator of focus, but since the totality extension is never required for a sentence to be grammatical (section 3.2.2), pragmatics alone is usually the only clue as to whether or not a non-subject is focused.²⁵ In Bole, however, some constructions do permit differentiation of focused vs. non-focused direct objects.

(14) Bole questioned and focused direct objects

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| a. mu bòla tēmshi Bamoi | ‘we will find Bamoi’s sheep’ (no focus) |
| we find(fut) sheep Bamoi | |
| b. Q: mǎ bòla tēmshi yàllà? | ‘which sheep will you find?’ (Q object) |
| = mǎ bòla tēmshi yàllà? | |
| A: mu bòla tēmshi Bamoi | ‘we will find BAMOI’S SHEEP’ (F object) |

Of interest here is the tone of the first syllable of **tēmshi** ‘sheep’. In a neutral statement, a direct object following a verb is subject to Low Tone Raising (LTR), which raises a low tone syllable to high following a high tone (Lukas 1969, Gimba 1998). Thus, in (14a) the first syllable of **tēmshi** is high. When the object is questioned, LTR is

²⁴ The formative **nən** is an obligatory marker of postverbal questioned or focused subjects.

²⁵ Another possibility for marking focus would be intonational cues. No one has studied intonation in the Yobe languages, but I have elicited hundreds of examples of question-answer pairs in most of these languages, and I hear nothing about the intonation that would differentiate them from declarative statements.

optional, as in the two “Q” examples in (14b).²⁶ When an object is focused, however, it does not undergo LTR, as in the “A” example of (14b). This is reminiscent of (and probably historically related to) the behavior of questioned and focused objects in Tangale, described in Kenstowicz (1985), whereby questioned and focused objects do not condition vowel elision and tonal processes that neutral objects do condition. However, in Bole, because LTR requires a specific tonal environment and because LTR can be blocked by other phenomena, the situation seen in (14) arises only occasionally, leaving absence of the totality extension and pragmatics as the only way to interpret a direct object as focused. No other constituent would ever fall into an environment where LTR could apply, and hence there is never any overt indication of focus of constituents other than direct objects.

In the context of questions and focus, it may be worthwhile to compare Yobe language structures with Hausa, which boasts a rather extensive descriptive and theoretical literature on questions and focus. Like the two-way totality vs. non-totally distinction in Yobe languages, Hausa has a two-way TAM distinction between so-called relative vs. general TAMs. The negative conclusion of the comparison here will be that syntactically, the respective Hausa and Yobe language distinctions have nothing to do with each other and that pragmatically, they share only the trivial connection that they interact with the focus system. In the Hausa examples in (15), the crucial TAM marking distinction is the underlined kā/nā ‘you/I (general completive)’ vs. ka/na ‘you/I (relative completive)’. Examples (15ai, bi) are a natural Q & A exchange from a videotaped segment in Bature et al. (1996-98). The examples in (16) are the parallel Bole sentences. Underlined j̄iko/j̄ino are the totality markers for intransitive verbs in Bole (see sections 4.1-2). A double asterisk means “ungrammatical in any context”, a single asterisk means “ungrammatical in the meaning given”.

(15) Hausa, illustrating contexts for relative and general completive

- ai. Q: **À inā ka sàuka?** ‘Where have you lodged?’
 aii. ****À inā kā sàuka?**
 bi. A: **Nā sàuka à gidan kàwūnā.** ‘I’ve lodged AT MY UNCLE’S HOUSE.’
 bii. ***Na sàuka à gidan kàwūnā.**
 ci. A: **À gidan kàwūnā na sàuka.** ‘I’ve lodged AT MY UNCLE’S HOUSE.’
 cii. ****À gidan kàwūnā nā sàuka.**
 di. **Nā sàuka à gidan kàwūnā.** ‘I’ve lodged at my uncle’s house.’
 dii. ***Na sàuka à gidan kàwūnā.**

(16) Bole, illustrating contexts for totality vs. non-totally

- ai. Q: **Ka yawwū gà àu?** ‘Where have you lodged?’
 aii. ****Ka yawwū-j̄iko gà àu?**

²⁶ The examples here use a full noun phrase with the question determiner **yàllà** ‘which..., which one?’ Simple question words, like **lè** ‘what?’, **lò** ‘who?’, **sòttò** ‘when?’ systematically resist LTR in all contexts (Gimba 1998).

- a.iii. ****Gà àu ka yawwuwò/yawwū-jìko?**
- bi. A: **Ìn yàwwū gà bàni rapàno.** ‘I’ve lodged AT MY UNCLE’S HOUSE.’
- bii. ***Ìn yàwwū-jìno gà bàni rapàno.**
- c. A. ****À bàni rapàno ìn yàwwuwò/yàwwū-jìno.**
- di. **Ìn yàwwū gà bàni rapàno.** ‘I’ve lodged at my uncle’s house.’
- dii. **Ìn yàwwū-jìno gà bàni rapàno.**

Comparing just the questions in (15a, 16a), one might jump to the conclusion that the Hausa *general* completive is comparable to the Bole *totality*, i.e. the forms are excluded in the respective questions, whereas only the Hausa *relative* completive and the Bole *unextended* verb are allowed. This idea immediately breaks down when we compare (15b, 16b). In Hausa, the answer to a constituent question can be *in situ*, but pragmatically, it is focused (see Jaggar (2004) for discussion of Hausa *in situ* questions and focus). With the Hausa *in situ* answers in (15b), the opposite situation holds compared to (15a), where the question word is obligatorily fronted. In (15b), only the *general* form is grammatical, whereas, in Bole (16b), the distributional facts are identical to those for the question in (16a). Probably more common than *in situ* focus in Hausa, is fronting of a word for focus, using the syntactic structure parallel to that for question words, as in (15c). Here, the distribution of general and relative forms is as in the question. Fronting results in ungrammaticality in Bole (16a.iii, 16c). Comparing Hausa and Bole, it is clear that choice of general vs. relative TAM in Hausa is *syntactically* conditioned—if the questioned or focused constituent precedes the verb, use the relative TAM, otherwise the general—whereas grammatical exclusion of the totality in Bole is *pragmatically* conditioned—if a constituent is questioned or focused, regardless of order, use only the unextended verb.

Putative equivalence of Hausa *general* = Bole *totality* also breaks down in simple declarative statements as in (15d, 16d). In Hausa, only the general form is grammatical, whereas in Bole, declarative statements with either unextended or totality extended verbs are acceptable. Actually, a Hausa sentence like that in (15dii) is not ungrammatical, given appropriate context. Most commonly, the interpretation would be that it is one of a sequence of punctual events in a narrative (probably best translated as English simple past, “[and then] I lodged at my uncle’s house”). Here, there is even less basis for associating Hausa TAM use with Bole verbal extensions. Bole would express a sequential event using the subjunctive—use or non-use of totality would be irrelevant.

In short, the exclusion of the totality extension from sentences with questioned and (pragmatically) focused constituents in Yobe languages, provides good evidence that the totality extension marks auxiliary focus, which is preempted by constituent focus. Hyman and Watters (1984:248-249) use a similar distribution for the Hausa general (“non-relative”) TAMs to arrive at the erroneous conclusion that these TAMs mark auxiliary focus, a conclusion resulting from the failure to realize that the Hausa general TAMs CAN appear in clauses with pragmatic focus as long as the focused constituent is post-verbal.

4. Intransitive Verbs, the Totality Extension, and Intransitive Copy Pronouns (ICP)

4.1. ICPs as markers of auxiliary focus in Yobe State language. As mentioned in section 3.1, the canonical use of an extension with totality semantics is with transitive verbs, though Hausa grade 4, for example, can have totality semantics with selected intransitive verbs (**ƙaƙe** ‘be completely lost’ < **ƙata** ‘get lost’), and a number of intransitive verbs, particularly resultatives, are lexicalized as grade 4, perhaps because the event, by its nature, must be “total”, e.g. **ƙaƙe** ‘shatter (intr.)’ (cf. transitive **ƙasa** ‘break (something shatterable)’). Yobe languages cannot freely use intransitive verbs with a simple totality-marking suffix. To do so results in ungrammatical structures, e.g. Ngamo **pàtâ** ‘he went out’ cannot be extended as ***pàtâ-T-kò** ‘he went right out’ in the way that **bàsâ** ‘he shot’ can be extended as **bàsâ-T-kò** ‘he shot (it) dead’ (see Tables 1-2). Rather, the totality extension with intransitive verbs must always be used in conjunction with an *Intransitive Copy Pronoun* (ICP), e.g. Ngamo **pàtannî** /**pàtâ-T-nî**/ ‘he went right out’, where **-nî** is a 3rd person masculine singular pronoun agreeing with the subject.

ICPs, first described and so-named by Newman (1971), are widespread in West Chadic languages. ICPs are pronominal suffixes attached to (a subset of) intransitive verbs that agree with the subject. In some languages, such as Kanakuru (Newman 1974:23-24), Tangale (Jungrathmayr 1991:59-61), or Miya (Schuh 1998:181-183), they are obligatory for (most) intransitive verbs in all contexts, e.g. Kanakuru **nà pìrò-no** ‘I woke up’, **shì pìrò-shì** ‘you (f) woke up’, etc., not ***nà/shì pìrè** (Newman 1971:188). Indeed, Newman (1971:190) notes that a verb in Kanakuru WITHOUT an ICP will be interpreted as transitive. Frajzyngier (1989:118) makes a similar observation for Pero, though he considers the ICP to function as an INtransitivizer of basic transitive verbs, e.g. **nì tà-mè-tù-ē-nò** ‘I will return/come back’ (I fut.-return-ventive-e-ICP) from **ma-** ‘return’, which he takes to be lexically transitive.²⁷ In Hausa, remnants of the ICP can be seen in some forms of the verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’, e.g. **nā zō-nī** ‘I have come’, **mù jē-mu** ‘let’s go’, **yā-kà!** ‘come here!’ (masculine singular imperative).

In these cases (also in Miya), the ICP is a pronoun suffixed directly to the verb stem and is obligatorily present in all contexts. With intransitive verbs in the Yobe Chadic languages other than Bole, the totality extension and the ICP obligatorily cooccur (see section 4.2 for the form of the ICP in Bole). The examples in (17) show the verb meaning ‘go out’ in each language with a 1st singular subject followed by examples in each language with 1st singular and 2nd masculine singular subjects with ICPs. The totality extension is in small caps and the ICPs are underlined. Although Bade does not have a totality extension with transitive verbs, it does have ICPs that combine with **n(ā)**, which is cognate with the Ngizim totality extension. Bade (Western dialect) is thus included in (17).

²⁷ The discussion of the distribution of ICPs in Pero in Frajzyngier (1977) and Frajzyngier (1989), which he says (113) supersedes the earlier analysis “to a certain degree”, is difficult to interpret. Frajzyngier (1989:116) says, “The most important function [of ICPs] is that of indicating the punctual aspect.” Such a function would be compatible with an auxiliary focus function, but Frajzyngier’s examples do not convincingly demonstrate that the ICP itself is showing punctuality, mainly because he presents no contrasting examples showing that ICPs are incompatible with non-punctual contexts. He also notes (115) that his data have no examples of ICPs in negative clauses, which would be a strong parallel with the distribution of totality and ICPs in the Yobe languages, but Frajzyngier himself notes that this gap in his data may be “pure coincidence” (115), and he presents no examples that contrast ICPs in affirmative contexts with their absence in parallel negatives.

(17)	Karekare ²⁸	Ngamo ²⁹	Bole	Ngizim	Bade (W)
No ICP	nà fātā-kàu	nè fātá	̀̀n pātā-wò	na vèɽu	nə vèru
1 sg.	nà fātā-HN-na-kàu	nèhàta-N-nô	̀̀n pātā-jì-no	na vèɽ-N-gâ	nə vèrə-N-āné
2 m.sg.	nà fātā-ɾI-na-kàu	kò hata-ɾ-kô	ka patā-jì-ko	ka vèɽə-NĀ-ci	gə vèrə-NĀ-i

Because ICPs in Yobe Chadic languages are used only together with the totality extension, it should come as no surprise that the distribution of intransitive verbs with the ICP (= totality+ICP) is similar to the distribution of transitive verbs with the totality extension. First, in citation form, the verb with or without the ICP is grammatical, with preferences or dispreferences for use parallel to that for transitive verbs—see Table 5 and data in (6). Second, use of the ICP is excluded in negative clauses (cf. section 3.2.3) in Karekare, Ngamo, Bole, and Ngizim. The data in (18) shows the expression for ‘he died’/‘he didn’t die’ in each language, without and with the ICP in affirmative negative clauses. The negative with ICP is the only ungrammatical expression.

(18)	Karekare	Ngamo	Bole	Ngizim
No ICP, aff.	mètu-kàu	màt-kô	motu-wò	mètu
ICP, aff.	mètu-ti-n-kì	màt-in-nî	motū-jìni	mètə-n-gəɽî
No ICP, neg.	mètu-kà bai	màt-ko bù	motū sa	mètə bai
ICP, neg.	*mètu-ti-n-kì	*màt-in-nî	*motū-jìni	*mètə-n-gəɽî

I have not fully investigated the distribution of verbs with ICPs in Bade, where they are not as frequently used as they are in the Potiskum area languages illustrated in (18). I have not found any examples of ICPs in negative sentences in texts, but in my notes from the 1970’s, I have found a couple of examples such as **n-ugzàzə-n-āné-m** ‘I didn’t return’ (‘I-return-tot-ICP-neg’). The fact that Bade no longer uses a totality extension in any context with transitive verbs suggests that this extension, if it was ever productive, may no longer have a connection to its original function with intransitive verbs either.

The third context discussed for transitive verbs (3.2.4) was sentences with questioned or focused constituents. I have not carefully investigated the (non)use of the ICP in this context in the Potsikum area languages other than Bole. In Bole, use of the ICP in sentences with questioned or focused constituents results in ungrammaticality exactly as use of transitive verbs with the totality extension. This is illustrated in (19a). In the other languages, I have not yet found any examples in texts with the ICP in questions or sentences with obvious constituent focus, but in recordings for a syntactic questionnaire, the exchanges in (19b) and (19c) showed up for Ngamo and Ngizim respectively.

- (19) a. Bole: **ka patā bō lè?** ‘why did you go out?’ (you exited for what?)
***ka patā-jìko bō lè?**

²⁸ In the configuration **tinV**, **ti** → a nasally released stop followed by a syllabic **n**, represented as “**hn**” in the data here. See Schuh (2003)

²⁹ The totality extension **t** in Ngamo completely assimilates to a following nasal, resulting in a geminate **n-n**.

- b. Ngamo: **Sauna gandi -n -ni baya miya?** ‘why did Sauna lie down?’
 Sauna lie down tot ICP because what
Sauna gandi-n-ni baya a kolshe monsom ‘Sauna lay down because
 he felt sleepy’
- c. Ngizim: **Sauna j(u) i rawan i ta are-gu.** ‘Where did Sauna go to eat
 Sauna go to where to eat cakes-the the bean cakes?’
Sauna ji-n-gəri i shi waka don da ci are-gu
 ‘Sauna went-tot-ICP to the base of a tree so-
 that he might eat the bean cakes’

In the Ngamo Q & A example in (19b), the totality+ICP shows up in both the question and the answer. In the Ngizim Q & A in (19c), the question does not have an ICP, but the answer, which presumably has pragmatic focus, does. The Ngamo question in (19b) is the only example of a verb with an ICP in a constituent question in currently available Ngamo data, and I have found no examples of constituent questions with ICPs in Ngizim data. It may be significant that the questions and answers in (19) involve *reason* phrases. There is evidence that reason clauses are outside the verb phrase. Further research will be necessary to understand the distribution of ICPs in constituent questions and clauses with pragmatic focus, but overall, ICPs appear less freely in such clauses than in declarative statements, and they seem not to appear at all in some clause types, such as those with postposed questioned or focused subjects.

In short, distribution of ICPs and their formal linkage with the totality extension indicate that they comprise the functional intransitive counterpart to transitive verbs with the totality extension and thus that their function is that of auxiliary focus. An unanswered question is why ICPs and the totality extension are linked in the Yobe State languages. This issue goes beyond the scope of this paper and, at our current state of knowledge, an answer would be no more than speculation in any case. Suffice it to say that this linkage must be an innovation in the languages in question. The fact that ICPs appear as obligatory pronominal suffixes in all environments and with no morphological cooccurrence restrictions in three distinct branches of West Chadic (in Hausa, in Kanakuru of the Bole-Tangale branch, and in Miya in the North Bauchi branch) suggests that this was the original situation. It thus seems likely that ICPs at one time appeared with all intransitive verbs, with or without other extensions.

4.2. ICPs in Bole. The syntactic distribution of intransitive verbs with ICPs in Bole is identical to the distribution of transitive verbs with the totality extension and likewise is essentially identical to the distribution of intransitive verbs with ICPs in the other Yobe State languages. It is obvious from the data in (17-18), however, that formally, Bole ICPs are different from those of the other languages. First, the Bole **-tV** totality extension used with transitive verbs is absent and adding it results in ungrammatical forms, e.g. **̀̀n pàtā-jìno** ‘I went out’, not *̀̀n pàtā-tù-(jì)no. Second, Bole ICPs incorporate a formative **jì-** that is absent in the other languages. We will see that the historical source of the Bole ICPs is clear. WHY Bole has replaced the more conservative forms of the other Yobe State languages is not. Bole ICPs are, historically, the word ‘body’ (**jìwò** in citation form, **jì-** as a bound form) plus a possessive pronoun

corresponding to the subject of the clause. Bole has thus replaced the original ICP suffix with an anaphoric expression similar to reflexives and reciprocals, and indeed, a number of West Chadic languages use the expression BODY+possessive pronoun to form reciprocals (though generally not reflexives, where HEAD is more common).

How this has come about is hard to say, but a cross-linguistic connection may be worth noting. ICPs themselves are a sort of anaphor if we define *anaphor* as “a pronominal form coreferentially bound to an expression elsewhere in the same clause”. Thought of this way, ICPs are strikingly like middle reflexive pronouns used in many languages to *detransitize* otherwise transitive verbs, as in French *je me lave* ‘I am bathing’ (“I wash myself”), *la foule se disperse* ‘the crowd is dispersing’ (“the crowd disperses itself”).³⁰ If we view ICP suffixes of the Kanakuru or Miya type this way, then the step to replacing them with a more complex anaphoric expression does not seem so radical.

Of particular interest to the topic of this paper is the fact that Bole treats its ICPs as the functional equivalent of the formally quite distinct ICPs of its linguistic cousins to the north. This is almost surely a result of contact with those languages. The Bole ICP innovation is shared with Bole-Tangale languages of Bauchi State, including Kirfi and Gera (Schuh 1978)—cf. Kirfi *nà rīwu ji-m-no* ‘I went in’, Gera *nì fidəm ji-m-ni* ‘I went out’.³¹ These Bauchi State languages lack a totality extension in any function. Moreover, they have no contact with the Yobe State languages of the Potiskum area. The similarity of Bole and Bauchi State language ICPs must be an innovation that took place in a common ancestral language. The functional similarities in the use of the totality extension and ICP between Bole and its northerly cousins must be a result of contact.

4.3. The totality extension with intransitive verbs in Bole. As noted in the previous section, the Bole totality extension *-tV* used with transitive verbs cannot cooccur with the Bole ICP. Bole can, however, use the totality extension on intransitive verbs without the ICP. Consider the Q & A pairs in (20), the first an exchange from a folktale (unpublished transcript of a tale narrated by Amina Kakkaba, known as “Yaka”), the second an elicited example:

(20) Hyena: **Yak ka ndī-tù bēi yā̀ n̄ èwenkandì 'ya ye?!**

‘Did you already GO to the place where I showed you that thing?’

Squirrel: **Ñ ndī-tù-wo.** ‘I WENT.’

³⁰ Frajzyngier (1989:119) notes this connection and gives almost morpheme-by-morpheme translations of some Pero sentences with ICPs into Spanish sentences with reflexives.

³¹ The *-m-* in these expressions is a genitive linker reconstructable for Bole-Tangale, though lost in Bole. In Schuh (1978) I mistakenly interpreted *ji-* as the word ‘thing’ in these languages. As in Bole, the ICP is not obligatory with these languages. In order to elicit verbs with the ICP, I used a Hausa construction with ‘thing’, which gives a sense of “do without a by your leave” (Schuh and Gimba 2001), e.g. *na shiga abi-n-a* ‘I went right in’ (“I entered my thing”). I assumed that the speakers were translating the Hausa expression literally, whereas it is now clear that they were giving verbs with an ICP based on ‘body’, as in Bole.

- Q: **Màte 'yòran gà makaranta d'ò?** 'Did they stop at the school?'
 A: **Ò'o, màte 'yòran-tù-n-go.** 'Yes, they DID stop.'

In these examples, the totality extension (underlined) is used with an intransitive verb without an ICP. In each case, context makes it clear that the focus is on the verb. In the first exchange, the hyena is expressing surprise that the squirrel could have gone so quickly to a distant place. In the second, the question is a request for information about whether a stopping took place, and in the answer, the focus is on the fact that it did, in fact, take place. In these and in other examples of the same usage found in texts and elicited data, the totality extension functions to affirm that a specific act took place, often translatable using the English auxiliary verb DO ("he DID do that"). This is a type of auxiliary focus, discussed in Hyman and Watters (1984), where context draws *assertive* focus to the verb, unlike the weaker auxiliary focus typical of verbs in contextless citation or the like. Such examples provide further evidence of the function of the totality extension as a marker of verb focus. As far as I can tell, use of intransitive verbs with the totality extension but no ICP is not available in the other Yobe State languages, but this needs investigation.

5. Conclusion

In using Hausa for data elicitation in the Chadic languages indigenous to Yobe State, Nigeria (Bole, Karekare, Ngamo, Ngizim, and perhaps Bade), the Hausa grade 4, which marks action done to completion ('eat up', 'buy up', etc.), will usually educe verbs with a particular set of extension suffixes. Mainly because of this apparent association with the meaning of Hausa grade 4, those of us who have worked on these languages have referred to this set of extension suffixes as the *totality extension*. However, study of the distribution of these affixes outside this limited elicitation context makes it evident that the overall function of these extension suffixes bears little relation to the function of derived grade 4 verbs in Hausa. This paper looked at three distributional contexts: citation forms, affirmative vs. negative clauses, and neutral declarative statements vs. constituent questions and statements involving pragmatic constituent focus. Citation forms show free use of verbs with or without the extension suffixes and perhaps even a preference for citing verbs with the suffixes, facts that demonstrate that the extension suffixes are not adding a derived meaning component beyond the core meaning of the verb. In negative clauses, use of the extension suffixes results in ungrammaticality. Use of the extension suffixes in constituent questions and in clauses with strong pragmatic focus on some constituent other than the verb likewise generally results in ungrammaticality.

I have suggested that the so-called "totality extension" in the Yobe State Chadic languages marks *auxiliary focus* in the sense of Hyman and Watters (1984). In citation form, pragmatic focus is at least weakly on the verb being cited, making auxiliary focus marking appropriate; in negative clauses, it is a common property cross-linguistically for negation to attract focus and hence preempt focus from other elements of the clause, particularly a rather weak focus such as auxiliary focus; in constituent questions and clauses with pragmatically focused constituents, focus, by definition, is attracted to the constituent that requests or provides new information, again preempting auxiliary focus.

In languages with true totality extensions, such as Kanakuru or Hausa, those extensions function primarily, if not exclusively with transitive verbs. In Yobe State languages, the so-called totality extension functions equally with both transitive and intransitive verbs, though a feature specific to intransitives is that this extension is always accompanied by Intransitive Copy Pronouns (with Bole presenting a special case in terms of ICP form). A question left unanswered is how/why these languages have developed the linkage of totality extension and ICP.

Hyman and Watters (1984) discuss a number of additional distributional properties found in languages with well-documented auxiliary focus marking, including exclusion of auxiliary focus on verbs in conditional clauses, relative clauses, and in certain tenses. A cursory examination of data from the Yobe State Chadic languages does not reveal obvious distributional factors of these types, but topics for future research include investigation of preferences/dispreferences/exclusions of the extension suffixes relating to particular TAMs, particular verb properties (stative, active, telic, resultative, etc.), and particular clause types (conditional, relative, complements of various types, etc.).

References

- Bargery, G.P. 1934. *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bature, Abdullahi, Richard Randell, and Russell G. Schuh. 1996-98. *Hausar Baka—Gani Ya Kori Ji* [Oral Hausa—A Picture is Worth 1000 Words]. Series of three videotapes for elementary and intermediate study of Hausa. Windsor, CA: World of Languages.
- Benton, P.A. 1912. *Notes on Some Languages of the Western Sudan*. London: Oxford University Press. [Reprint with an introduction by A.H.M. Kirk-Greene, London: Frank Cass, 1968.]
- Caron, Bernard. 2001. “Guus, aka Sigidi (Chadic, West-B, South-Bauchi): grammatical notes and vocabulary.” *Afrika und Übersee* 84:1-60.
- Caron, Bernard. 2002. “Dott, aka Zodi (Chadic, West-B, South-Bauchi): grammatical notes, vocabulary and text.” *Afrika und Übersee* 85:161-248.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1977. “On the Intransitive Copy Pronouns in Chadic.” In Martin Mould and Thomas J. Hinnebusch (eds.), *Papers from the Eighth Conference on African Linguistics*, pp.73-84. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 7. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1989. *A Grammar of Pero*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Gimba, Alhaji Maina. 1998. “Low Tone Raising in Bole.” MA thesis, UCLA.
- Givón, Talmy. 1970. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- Hartmann, Katharina and Malte Zimmermann. 2005. “Nominal and verbal focus in the Chadic languages.”
- Haruna, Andrew. 2003. *A Gramatical Outline of Gùrdù/Gùrùntùm (Southern Bauchi, Nigeria)*. Westafrikanische Studien, Band 25. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Hyman, Larry M. and John R. Watters. 1984. “Auxiliary focus.” *Studies in African Linguistics* 15:233-273.

- Jaggar, Philip J. .2004. "More on in situ wh- and focus constructions in Hausa." To appear in Dymitr Ibrizimow, Henry Tourneux and Ekkehard H. Wolff (eds.), *Chadic Linguistics* (vol 3). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Jungraithmayr, Herrmann. 1991. *A Dictionary of the Tangale Language (Kaltungo, Northern Nigeria)*. Franfurter Studien zur Afrikanistik, 12. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Kenstowicz, Michael. 1985. "The phonology and syntax of WH-expressions in Tangale." *Studies in LInguistic Sciences* 15:79-91.
- Kraft, Charles H. 1981. *Chadic Wordlists*. Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunded, Serie A, Band 23, 24, 25. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Leger, Rudolf. 1994. *Eine Grammatik der Kwami-Sprache (Nordostnigeria)*. Frankfurter Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte, Band 8. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1969. "Tonpermeable und Tonimpermeable Konsonanten im Bolanci (Nordnigerien)." In *Ethnological and Linguistic Studies in Honour of N.J. van Warmelo*, pp. 133-138. Ethnological Publications, 52. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1970-72. "Die Personalia und das primäre Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigerien)," *Africa und Übersee* 54:237-286, 55:114-139.
- Lukas, Johannes. 1971. "Über das erweiterte Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigerien)." *Journal of African Languages* 10(1):1-14.
- Newman, Paul. 1971. "Transitive and intransitive in Chadic languages." In Veronika Six et al. (eds.), *Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen—Eine Querschnitt*, pp. 188-200. Hamburger Beiträge zur Afrika-Kunde, 14. Hamburg: Deutsches Institut für Afrika-Forschung.
- Newman, Paul. 1972. "Study Kanakuru, understand Hausa." *Harsunan Nijeriya* 2:1-13.
- Newman, Paul. 1974. *The Kanakuru Language*. West African Monographs, 9. Leeds: Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds and West African Linguistic Society.
- Newman, Paul. 1973. "Grades, vowel-tone classes and extensions in the Hausa verbal system." *Studies in African Linguistics* 4:297-346.
- Newman, Paul. 1977a. "Chadic classification and reconstructions." *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 5(1):1-42.
- Newman, Paul. 1977b. "Chadic extensions and pre-dative verb forms in Hausa." *Studies in African Linguistics* 8:275-297.
- Newman, Paul. 1983. "The efferntial (alias 'causative') in Hausa." In Ekkehard Wolff and Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg (eds.), *Studies in Chadic and Afroasiatic Linguistics*, pp. 397-418. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Newman, Paul. 1984. Review of C.H. Kraft, *Chadic Wordlists*. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 6:195-198.
- Parsons, F.W. 1960. "The verbal system in Hausa." *Afrika und Übersee* 44:1-36.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1972. "Aspects of Ngizim syntax." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1977. "West Chadic verb classes." In P. Newman and R.M. Newman (eds.), *Papers in Chadic Linguistics*, pp 143-167. Leiden: Afrika-Studiecentrum.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1978. *Bole-Tangale Languages of the Bauchi Area (Northern Nigeria)*. Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunded, Serie A, Band 13. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

- Schuh, R.G. 1982. "Questioned and focussed subjects and objects in Bade/Ngizim." In H. Jungraithmayr (ed.), *The Chad Languages in the Hamito-Semitic Border Area*, pp. 160-174. Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Band 27. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.
- Schuh, Russell G. 1998. *A Grammar of Miya*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, Volume 130. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Schuh, Russell G. 2003. "Shooting through the nose in Karekare." Ms., UCLA, available at <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/Aflang/Yobe/>.
- Schuh, R.G. and A.M. Gimba. 2001. "Substantive and anaphoric 'thing' in Bole, with remarks on Hausa *abu/abin*." In Harold Torrence (ed.), *Papers in African Linguistics 1*, pp. 90-122. UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics, No. 6. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics.
- Skinner, Margaret G. 1979. "Aspects of Pa'anci grammar." Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Tuller, Laurice: 1992. "The syntax of postverbal focus constructions in Chadic." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:303-334.
- Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 1979. "Grammatical categories of verb stems and marking of mood, Aktionsart, and aspect in Chadic." *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 6.5.
- Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 2001. "Predication focus in Chadic languages." In H. Ekkehard Wolff (ed.), *Topics in Chadic Linguistics: Papers from the 1st Biennial International Colloquium on the Chadic Languages, Leipzig, July 5-8, 2001*, pp. 137-159. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.