To appear in: *Chadic Linguistics/Linguistique Tchadique/Tschadistik,* vol. 3, ed. by Dymitr Ibriszimow, Henry Tourneux & Ekkehard H. Wolff. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe

MORE ON IN SITU *WH-* AND FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS IN HAUSA˙

PHILIP J. JAGGAR
SOAS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

1. INTRODUCTION. Hausa is a discourse-configurational language where constituent WH- and focus constructions typically entail departures from the canonical SVO word order and pattern together in their morphosyntactic properties (WH-terms are inherently focus constituents). For both constructions Hausa is conventionally analyzed as having only one strategy—FRONTING to a designated structural position—with special inflectional morphology on the obligatory preverbal (perfective/imperfective) TAM, and an optional copula/focus marker (see §2). (Special INFL marking is attested throughout the Chadic family.) Recently, however, as a result of looking more closely at actual utterances produced by Hausa-speakers, some important new facts have emerged which demonstrate that WH-expressions and information focus (both new information and contrastive/corrective) can also occur IN SITU in the default declarative base position, without any morphological reflex on the independent TAM (INFL), special focus-marking on the TAM being a function (and diagnostic) of movement. Although, for many speakers, the syntactic distribution of in situ WH-elements (in particular) and focus elements appears to be limited compared with the canonical displacement option—more specifically there are constraints on the accessibility of core arguments especially to in situ questioning (§3.1)—they are out there and so cannot be ignored (and further research could reveal that they are in fact more widespread than I am assuming). The possibility of in situ WH-elements in Hausa—attested throughout the West Chadic branch—had in fact already been recognized and documented in both Newman (2000:496) and Jaggar (2001:522-23), but the parallel in situ focus facts had not, to my knowledge, been exposed before the observations in Jaggar (2001:496-98) and Green & Jaggar (2003) (see §3.2). In these accounts, we claimed that in situ focus and interrogative elements were "especially common with verbal/nonverbal predicates containing locative and prepositional phrases" (Jaggar 2001:496). However, subsequent research has revealed that core arguments, i.e., direct and indirect objects, can also function as in situ WH-elements, e.g., as pronouns (for some speakers), and focus, e.g., as NPs. This paper therefore provides a larger and more comprehensive body of evidential support for the existence and exploitation of in situ constituent interrogative and focus elements as discourse-pragmatic strategies.

The discovery that questions and focus can occur both ex situ *and* in situ on a range of constituents highlights the need to extend our narrow construction-bound definition of the

notions "WH-questions" and "focus" in Hausa beyond simple morphosyntactic reflexes, and to rethink traditional assumptions about the different information-packaging operations they subsume.

2. EX SITU WH-QUESTION AND FOCUS (= MOVEMENT). Hausa permits a wide range of constituents to undergo syntactic WH-/focus movement, including NPs, pronouns, VPs, and adjuncts ("movement to Spec-FP" in contemporary formulations).[1] Ex situ focus can be either new, non-presupposed information (where the salient material directly answers a WH-question), or contrastive/corrective depending on the discourse context (the latter type is a subcase of the category known as "exhaustive" focus in the modern linguistic literature, see Kiss 1998). Examples (1-2) illustrate typical ex situ WH-questions and new information focus responses, entailing: (1) fronting of the discourse-new WH-/focus elements (underlined) to left periphery; (2) special inflectional focus marking on the preverbal TAMs (this applies to the perfective and imperfective TAMs only); (3) an optional post-focus copula/focus marker (which reinforces the impact of the focus). (On these well-documented displacement phenomena, see McConvell 1973; Tuller 1986; Wolff 1993; Green 1997; Newman 2000:187-95, 488ff.; Jaggar 2001:493ff., 513ff.; for a survey of approaches to focus in African languages, see Bearth 1999; see also Morimoto (2000) for cross-linguistic (including Bantu) data on the sentence-initial focus position.)[2]

(1) a.   [**wàa**$_i$]$_{WH}$ **kukà** [**ganii** ____$_i$] **à kàasuwaa?** (question with ex situ WH-element)
         who 2PL.FOC-PFV see at market
         'whom did you see at the market?'

   b. [**yaarònkà**$_i$]$_{FOC}$ **nee mukà** [**ganii** ____$_i$] (answer with ex situ new info. focus)
         boy.of.2MS FM(MS) 1PL.FOC-PFV see
         'it was your boy we saw'   (= English *it*-cleft construction)

In (1a-b) the extraction and fronting of the direct object WH-question and focus-answer elements **wàa** 'who(m)?' and addressee-new **yaarònkà** 'your boy' (both coindexed with a gap ____$_i$) trigger selection of the special "focus" form of the perfective TAM (= 2PL.FOC-PFV **kukà** and 1PL.FOC-PFV **mukà**)[3] Notice that the focus-fronted construction with the non-

---

[1] Greenberg (1966) notes a strong correlation between WH-movement and both SVO (= Hausa) and VSO word order, and Dik (1997:283) reports that approximately 70% of the world's languages utilize the ex situ pattern with WH-terms.

[2] Transcription: **à(a)** = Low tone, **â(a)** = Falling tone, High tone is unmarked; **aa**, **ii**, etc. = long, **a**, **i**, etc. = short; **ɓ**, **ɗ** = laryngeal implosives, **ƙ (K')** = ejective, **ř** = apical tap/roll, **c** and **j** = palato-alveolar affricates. Abbreviations: ALLAT = allative (TAM); F = feminine; FM = focus marker (nonverbal copula); FOC-IMPFV = focus (relative) imperfective; FOC-PFV = focus (relative) perfective; FUT = future; IMPER = imperative; IMPFV = imperfective; M = masculine; NEG = negative; PFV = perfective; PL = plural; REL = relative marker; S = singular; SJN = subjunctive; 1/2/3/4 = first/second/third/fourth person.

[3] In Jaggar (2001) I introduced the cover-term "focus" for the special inflectional categories of the perfective and imperfective TAMs used in WH-/focus environments, in preference to

verbal copular focus marker **nee** in (1b) corresponds to and so is glossed with a syntactic *it-*cleft in the English equivalent (although the Hausa construction is in fact monoclausal).[4] Typical examples of moved WH- and focus constituents, taken from *Hausar Baka* [HB] by Randell, Bature & Schuh (1998), with other syntactic functions and perfective/imperfective TAMs, are:

[HB:segment 3.13]
(2)   a.   **tòo mèe akèe yîi dà shii?**   (opening question with ex situ WH-pronoun)
               OK what 4PL.FOC-IMPFV doing with 3MS
                  'OK what is done with it?'
       b.   **ɗauràa musù akèe yîi à ɗuwàawunsù** (answer = ex situ new info. VP focus)
               tie to.3PL 4pl.FOC-IMPFV doing on buttocks.of.3PL
               'it's tied on their buttocks' (lit. 'tying on them one is doing...')
(with focus-fronting of the VP in 2b)

Example (3) illustrates exhaustive focus (with string vacuous movement) on an independent (2FS) pronoun subject in the lower clause:

(3)   **kì tabbàtaa kee kikà kai masà àbincîn nan**   [HB:2.17]
            2FS.SJN be sure 2FS 2FS.FOC-PFV take to.3MS food that
            'make sure you have taken that food to him' (i.e., and no one else)

(4a, b) illustrate WH-fronting and focus-fronting of stationary locative prepositional phrases in nonverbal tensed clauses with focus imperfective TAMs:

(4)   a.   **tôo à ìnaa kukè?**   [HB:2.13] (question with ex situ locative WH-PP)
               OK at where 2PL.FOC-IMPFV
               'OK, where are you?' (i.e., where do you live?)
       b.   **muu à K'oofàr̃ Maataa mukè**   (= ex situ new info. locative PP focus)

---

the traditional term "relative". I chose the terms "focus-perfective" and "focus-imperfective" in order to provide a unified semantic characterization of (most of) the syntactic environments which require these special TAMs. Although these reductionist labels are not ideal, I still think that on balance they are preferable to the narrow and potentially misleading terms "relative-perfective" and "relative-imperfective" (see in particular the discussion on pp. 162-4). The focus INFL is also used in relative clauses (hence the conventional term), and these overlap considerably with subordinate interrogative constructions, cf. (subordinate interrogative) **naa san àbîn dà yakèe neemaa** 'I know what he's looking for' (... thing.the REL 3MS.FOC-IMPFV looking for), and (relative construction) **gàa àbîn dà yakèe neemaa** 'here is what he's looking for'.
[4] The focus-marker/copula (also used in equational and identificational constructions) is also present, in segmentally repeated form, in the fully expanded variants of the personal **wàa** 'who?' and non-personal **mèe** 'what?' WH-pronouns, i.e., (MS) **wàa-nee-nèe** 'who (is it)?', **mèe-nee-nèe** 'what (is it)?' (see exx. 24a, 25a).

1PL at Gate.of Women 1PL.FOC-IMPFV
'we, we're <u>at the Women's Gate</u>' (lit. 'we <u>at Women's Gate</u> we are')

(5) exemplifies a fronted NP (a) followed by a response (b) in which the predicative complement adjective (head) is also moved:

(5)　　a.　**<u>shuuɗ̀in �feⁿt̀ii</u> kak̀ee ẁa moot̀ar̃k̀a?** (*yes/no* question with ex situ focus NP)
　　　　　blue.of paint 2MS.FOC-IMPFV to car.of.2MS
　　　　　'are you painting your car <u>blue</u>?'
　　　b.　**aa'̀aa, <u>ba'̀k̀ii</u> nak̀ee mat̀a**　　　　　(answer = ex situ corrective focus)
　　　　　no black 1S.FOC-IMPFV to.3FS
　　　　　'no, I'm painting it <u>black</u>' (lit. 'no, <u>black</u> I am (doing) to it')

3. IN SITU WH-QUESTION AND FOCUS ELEMENTS. Although the ex situ WH- and focus constructions exemplified above represent the norm in Hausa, there is much more to the story. Both WH-elements (§3.1) and focus elements (§3.2) also pattern together in terms of an alternative, pragmatically equivalent, information-packaging strategy—they can (and often do) occur in situ, with a general (non-focus) TAM in the perfective and imperfective, and are appropriate with both new information and exhaustive/exclusive focus (contra Kiss 1998).[5] However, because overt syntactic movement with a morphological reflex on the TAM is much more visible than the in situ strategy, this is the only one documented in standard descriptions (with the marginal exception of WH-constructions, §3.1). The result is that, prior to the in situ focus facts reported in Jaggar (2001:496-98) and Green & Jaggar (2003), the non-canonical in situ versions were hidden "below our radar"—we didn't see, but only because we weren't actually looking. This neglect/omission is perhaps even more surprising given that in situ interrogatives are relatively common in other West Chadic languages, and pragmatic in situ focus is also attested (see Schuh 1978, 1982, 1998, and §4). Another problem stems from the fact that Hausaists have tended to rely upon (and sometimes simply copy) the same or similar ex situ examples which are often decontextualized data derived from formal elicitation. Once we move away from made-up introspective data and look at real speaker usage in natural communicative contexts, however, we encounter a surprising number of spontaneous "accidental" utterances containing in situ interrogative and focus expressions which cannot be ignored. Much of the interactive data cited as evidence below is taken (or adapted) from *Hausar Baka* 'Spoken Hausa' (Randell, Bature & Schuh 1998), a 5-hour set of transcribed videos comprising spontaneous everyday discourse with a range of different speakers.[6] Where

---

[5] Kiss (1998) proposes a computational system which is sensitive to focus-type: ex situ correlates with exhaustive focus, in situ with new information focus. The Hausa facts clearly pose serious problems for any such hypothesis (see also Green & Jaggar 2003).
[6] Russell Schuh has, like myself, been using these *Hausar Baka* materials in his language classes at UCLA for a number of years, and we have exchanged data and ideas on the various in situ WH- and focus constructions we have encountered in this extensive spoken corpus.

necessary, i.e., to fill a gap in the coverage, this data is supplemented by discourse-linked examples provided and cross-checked by speakers.

3.1.   IN SITU WH-ELEMENTS. In situ WH-expressions are relatively restricted in their distribution compared with the more dominant ex situ variants (accessibility to focus in situ is less constrained, §3.2).[7] The first observation to make is that with regard to (non-subject) core arguments functioning as in situ WH-elements, i.e., direct objects and indirect objects in verbal clauses, speakers vary considerably in their grammaticality judgments (see below for WH-subjects). The generalization seems to be that the in situ WH- strategy is sensitive to the syntactic role of the constituent, and I have marked all such elicited examples with % to indicate this inter- and intra-speaker variation.[8] Examples (5-7) are taken from my cross-checked fieldnotes and they include a natural discourse context (a) for the subsequent (b) in situ WH-question on a core argument:

(5) a. **duk mun ga mutàanee can**
    all 1PL.PFV see people there
    'we saw all the people there'
   b. **%kun ga <u>wàa dà wàa</u>?**   (<u>in situ</u> conjoined direct object WH-pronoun)
    2PL.PFV see who and who
    'who did you see?'   (lit. 'you saw <u>who and who</u>?')
(6) a. **mun aikà kaayân kàasuwaa**
    1PL.PFV send goods.the market
    'we've sent the goods to the market'
   b. **%tôo, kun aikàa <u>mà/wà wàa</u>?**   (<u>in situ</u> conjoined indirect object WH-pronoun)
    fine 2PL.PFV send to who
    'fine, who did you send (them) to?' (lit. 'you sent <u>to who</u>?')

---

[7] Keenan & Bimson (1975) claim that languages with *in situ* WH allow a greater range of positions to be questioned than languages using *ex situ* WH (see also Dik 1997:281). This generalization breaks down for Hausa, where the accessibility constraints are stronger for in situ WH-expressions.

[8] The boundaries to what is admissable are difficult to specify given our present knowledge. In Jaggar (2001:496n) I noted that some speakers of eastern Hausa dialects appeared to allow (non-subject) core arguments to function as in situ WH-elements (perhaps due to substrate influence from languages permitting or requiring in situ WH-expressions in general?). It now seems that this strategy is not as dialect-specific as I had earlier thought. The distribution and frequency of in situ WH-elements (and focus) remains to be determined, however, and it could be that we are simply looking at more general categorial patterning, and not regional variation. Alternatively, it is possible be that I have in fact underestimated the prevalence of in situ questions (and focus) in spontaneous discourse. If only we Hausaists had access to machine-readable corpora of natural texts comparable to the Brown corpus of a million words of American English or the London/Oslo/Bergen corpus of British English!

Example (7b) illustrates an oblique (comitative) argument operating as an in situ WH-element:

(7) a. **Hàdiizà taa daawoo taa kòo zoo dà abuubuwàa irìi-irìi**
    Hadiza 3FS.PFV return 3FS.PFV and come with things kind-kind
    'Hadiza has returned and brought different kinds of things'
   b. **%tôo, taa zoo <u>dà mèe dà mèe</u>?** (<u>in situ</u> conjoined comitative WH-pronoun)
    OK 3FS.PFV come with what and what
    'OK, what has she brought?'   (lit. 'she has brought <u>what and what</u>?')

Speakers differed in their reactions to the above (b) examples of in situ WH-questions on core (and oblique) arguments. Some accepted them, usually as a secondary option to the fronted version which was in fact the Hausa equivalent first produced. Other speakers considered them only marginally acceptable, at times bordering on ungrammatical. Perhaps this constraint on accessibility relates to the pragmatic fact that questions, unlike reactive focus responses (§3.2), are opening speech acts formulated without any presuppositional background and so need to be overtly encoded as questions.

    Although the cut-off point for the in situ strategy was variable, *all* speakers predictably allowed the canonical ex situ WH- versions with fronting and focus TAMs, i.e., (5b') **dà wàa dà wàa kukà ganii**? (and who and who 2PL.FOC-PFV see), (6b') **tôo, wàa kukà aikàa wà**? (OK who 2PL.FOC-PFV send to), (7') **tôo, dà mèe dà mèe ta zoo**? (OK with what and what 3FS.FOC-PFV come). Compare also (8b), the in situ version of (37a), where the interrogative NP (WH-determiner + noun) is less readily left in situ:

(8) a. **jiyà nee dà na ci àbinci sai na mâncee kaayaanaa**
    yesterday FM(MS) when 1S.FOC-PFV eat food then 1S.FOC-PFV forget things.my
    'it was yesterday when I'd eaten I forgot my things'
   b. **%kin mântà <u>wànè kaayaa</u>?** (<u>in situ</u> direct object WH-NP)
    2FS.PFV forget which things
    'which things did you forget?' (lit. 'you forgot <u>which things</u>?')

with speakers initially volunteering the occurring (37a) **<u>wànè kaayaa</u> kikà mântaa**? (which things 2FS.FOC-PFV forget).

    Subjects, it is important to note, are not licensed to operate as in situ WH-elements (nor as in situ foci, §3.2, exx. 49b, 50b), and only (string vacuous) movement to the sentence-initial focus site is possible, e.g.,

(9)   **<u>su-wàa</u> sukà zoo?**   (ex situ subject WH-pronoun)
    3PL-who 3PL.FOC-PFV come
    'who came?'
cf.,
(10) **<u>*su-wàa</u> sun zoo?**   (<u>in situ</u> subject WH-pronoun)
    3PL-who 3PL.PFV come
    'who came?'

(10) is ungrammatical (for all speakers) because the INFL **sun** is not marked for focus Subjects must move, therefore, if focussed.

When we turn to clausal *adjuncts* functioning as in situ WH-elements, judgements become uniformly more secure. There are functional constraints on accessibility to the in situ WH- operation, therefore, and many speakers have in situ WH- on core arguments (unacceptable) and adjuncts (acceptable) in complementary distribution. Locative **ìnaa** 'where?', for example, regularly occurs in situ in verbal clauses with goal complements (**ìnaa** is also extremely common in situ in nonverbal contexts, see below), e.g.,

(11) **hannun rìigař Fàřiidà zâi kai ìnaa?**   (HB:3.08b, <u>in-situ</u> WH-adjunct)
sleeve.of dress.of Farida FUT.3MS reach where
'where will the sleeve of Farida's dress reach to?' (lit. '...will reach <u>where</u>?')

(12) a.   **yaaròonaa yaa bař gidaa**
boy.of.1S 3MS.PFV leave home
'my boy has left home'

  b.   **yaa tàfi ìnaa (nèe)?**   (<u>in-situ</u> WH-adjunct)
3MS.PFV go where (FM(MS))
'where has he gone?' (lit. 'he has gone <u>where</u> (it is)?')

Cf. the synonymous ex situ alternatives with a focus INFL: **ìnaa hannun rìigař Fàřiidà zâi kai?** (where sleeve.of dress.of Farida FUT.3MS reach), **ìnaa (nèe) ya tàfi?** (where (FM(MS)) 3MS.FOC-PFV go). The above in situ adjuncts, like their ex situ counterparts, still carry the same intrinsic focus function and semantics of WH-elements, even if they do not trigger INFL focus marking. (Kraft & Kirk-Greene (1973:113-14) also cite the same in situ WH-adjunct example as 12b, in addition to an in situ WH-direct object in **yaa yi mèe?** 'what did he do?' (3MS.PFV do what).)

The temporal interrogative adjunct **yàushee** 'when?' is similar to locative **ìnaa** 'where?' in its syntactic distribution (perhaps because temporal location is the analogue of spatial location), often operating in situ as the adverbial complement of the durational preposition **hař** 'until', e.g.,

(13) **zaa kà kai <u>hař yàushee</u> à gàrii?** (<u>in-situ</u> WH-adjunct)
FUT 2MS reach until when in town
'until when will you stay in town?' (lit. 'you will stay in town <u>until when</u>?')

Examples (14-16) illustrate more adjuncts functioning as in situ WH-elements in verbal clauses (with some variation (%) in acceptability):

(14) %**kin sàamee shì <u>à wànè haalii</u>?**   (<u>in situ</u> manner WH-PP)
2FS.PFV find 3MS in which condition
'what condition did you find him in? (lit. 'you found him <u>in which condition</u>?')

(15) %**kin gayàa matà hakà <u>sabòodà mèe</u>?** (<u>in situ</u> causal WH-PP)
2FS.PFV tell to.3FS this why

'why did you tell her this?'   (lit. 'you told her this <u>why</u>?')

(16) a. **sai ta kaawoo masà kuɗîn ta aĵìyee ta tàfi**
           then 3FS.FOC-PFV bring to.3MS money.the 3FS.FOC-PFV put down 3FS.FOC-PFV leave
           'then she brought the money to him and put (it) down and left'

      b. **%sai ya yi <u>yàayàa</u> dà suu**?   (<u>in situ</u> manner WH-adjunct)
           then 3MS.FOC-PFV do how with 3PL
           'then what did he do with it (them)?' (lit. 'then he did <u>how</u> with them?')

(the INFL **ya** in (16b) is in the focus (perfective) form because it is part of a historical narrative sequence which contains specific, discrete events in sequence).

When we turn to nonverbal contexts, base position WH-elements are regularly attested and are especially common in *nonverbal stationary locative* (**ìnaa** 'where?') predicates, and this particular construction was one of the first to occur to me when I started to research the problem. (Recall too that in situ focus is also common in verbal clauses containing locative predicates, §3.1.) The felicitous dialogues in (17, 18) illustrate naturally-produced in situ locative **ìnaa** WH-elements occupying the linear position which the corresponding stationary locative expressions would occupy in the declarative construction, and occurring with a general imperfective TAM in verbless tensed clauses.[9] Notice that the corresponding declarative addressee-new information answers can, and often do (17b), contain in situ locative focus (so anticipating and supplementing the data in §3.2).

(17) a. **sunàa <u>ìnaa</u> yànzu?**[10]   (question with <u>in situ</u> locative WH-adjunct)
           3PL.IMPFV where now
           'where are they now?' (lit. 'they are <u>where</u> now?')

      b. **sunàa <u>makaṙantaa</u>**   (answer with <u>in situ</u> new info. locative focus)
           3PL.IMPFV school
           'they are <u>at school</u>'

(18) a. **ɗaatàanaa ya ƙwaacèe mîn** [HB:2.11]   (ex-situ new info. focus)
           eggplant.of.1S 3MS.FOC-PFV grab from.1S
           '(it's) my eggplant he grabbed from me'

      b. **yanàa <u>ìnaa</u>, ɗaatàn?**   (follow-up with <u>in-situ</u> locative WH-adjunct)
           3MS.IMPFV where eggplant.the

---

[9] When we move to embedded subordinate clauses, however, my impression is that it is *not* possible for the interrogative locative phrase to remain in situ in such nonverbal tensed constructions, i.e., *****sai ta tàmbàyi sanìn [sunàa ìnaa]** 'then she asked where they were' (then 3FS.PFV ask knowing.of <u>3PL.IMPFV where</u>) is ruled out, and only **sai ta tàmbàyi sanìn [indà sukè]** (... knowing.of where <u>3PL.FOC-IMPFV</u>) is admissable, where initial position **indà** 'where' is the complex relative form corresponding to interrogative **ìnaa**.

[10] In Standard Hausa, clauses containing a WH-element usually attach a Low tone interrogative morpheme with vowel length /ˋ:/ to the final constituent (the so-called "*q*-morpheme), and I am assuming this applies whether the WH-element is ex situ or in situ. If the word has a final High tone, as in (17a), the output is a Falling tone on a long vowel, i.e., **sunàa ìnaa yànzu** + /ˋ:/ → **[sunàa ìnaa yànzûu]**. See Newman & Newman (1981) for details.

'where is it, the eggplant?' (lit. 'it is <u>where</u>, the eggplant?')

If the locative WH-element occurs as the complement of a preposition, however, then the entire PP must be fronted, e.g., (source head preposition) **dàgà ìnaa kikè?** 'where are you from?' (lit. 'from where you are?'), but not ***kinàa dàgà ìnaa?** (lit. 'you are from where?'), (verbal, ex. 26c) **dàgà wànè gàrii ka zoo?** 'from which town do you come?', but not ***kaa zoo dàgà wànè gàrii?** (lit. 'you come from which town?'). On the other hand, the temporal WH-adjunct **yàushee** 'when?' regularly occurs in situ in nonverbal (and verbal) clauses as the complement of the durational preposition **haɼ** 'until', e.g.,

(19) **kanàa nan haɼ yàushee?—zân zaunàa haɼ ƙarfèe bakwài** (<u>in situ</u> WH-adjunct)
       2MS.IMPFV there until when—FUT.1S stay until o'clock seven
       'until when are you around?—I'll stay until seven o'clock'
       (lit. 'you are around <u>until when</u>?'...)

Sentence (20) contains an in situ causal WH-adjunct (acceptable for some speakers):

(20) %**kinàa dàariyaa don mèe?**   (<u>in situ</u> causal WH-adjunct)
       2FS.IMPFV laughing why
       'why are you laughing?' (lit. 'you are laughing <u>why</u>?')

All the above in situ locative WH- and focus elements could (and often would) be fronted to left periphery, of course, producing the following (near) synonymous ex situ variants with focus-imperfective TAMs (some, but not all speakers, consider the preposed alternatives to be slightly more emphatic): (17a') **ìnaa sukè yànzu?** 'where are they now?' (<u>where</u> 3PL.FOC-IMPFV now), (17b') **à makaɼantaa sukè** 'they are at school' (<u>at school</u> 3PL.FOC-IMPFV), (18b') **ìnaa yakè, ɗaatàn?** 'where is it, the eggplant?' (<u>where</u> 3MS.FOC-IMPFV eggplant.the), etc. (cf. also example 4a). Note too that the truth conditions, illocutionary meaning and propositional content of the in situ and ex situ versions remain the same. What we encounter in actual usage, however, are perfectly natural examples of base-position adverbial WH-elements (and focus) with no INFL focus marking, i.e., with parallel syntax and TAM morphology, the choice of which is probably also influenced by personal and interactional style. Although they do not trigger INFL focus marking, they still express the focus function and semantics and their distribution overlaps with that of the displaced versions. Indeed, my impression is that the in situ interrogative strategies (and focus answers) exemplified in (17a, 18b, 19), i.e., with locative and temporal adjuncts and imperfective TAMs in verbless clauses, are at least as frequent and natural as their ex situ syntactic counterparts in such question/answer environments (see also §3.2).

The adverbial WH-quantifier **nawà**? 'how many/much?' is positionally versatile and can occur in situ in both verbal (21a, 22a) and nonverbal (23a) clauses, e.g.,

[HB:3.16]
(21) a. **anàa sayaɼ dà ita kàmaɼ nawà?** (question with <u>in-situ</u> quantifying WH-PP)
           4PL.IMPFV sell 3FS about how much

'about how much is it sold for?' (lit. 'one sells it <u>about how much</u>?')
b. **anàa sayař dà ita ɗàrii biyu dà hàmsin** (<u>in situ</u> new info. focus answer)
4PL.IMPFV sell 3FS 250
'it's sold for 250 (naira)' (lit. 'one sells it <u>250</u>')

[A lemon-seller asks a customer how many pieces he should slice the orange into]:

(22) a. **à rabàa gidaa nawà?** [HB:3.12] (question with <u>in-situ</u> quantifying WH-NP)
4PL.SJN divide house how many
'how many pieces should one divide (it into)?'
(lit. 'one should divide <u>piece how many</u>?')
b. **ràbaa gidaa huɗu** (answer with <u>in situ</u> new information focus)
divide.IMPER house four
'divide (it into) <u>four pieces</u>'

(23) a. **wannàn <u>nawà</u> nee?** (question with <u>in situ</u> WH-quantifier)
this one how much FM(MS)
'how much is this one?' (lit. 'this one <u>how much</u> it is?')
b. **yanàa <u>tsàkaanin naiřàa hàmsin dà naiřàa sìttin</u>** (<u>in situ</u> new info. focus)
3MS.IMPFV between naira 50 and naira 60
'it's <u>between 50 and 60 naira</u>'

Nonverbal equational constructions in which in situ WH-words and their in situ focus responses function as complements are also common, e.g.,

(24) a. **shii <u>wàanee</u> nèe?** (question with <u>in-situ</u> WH-pronoun)
3MS who FM(MS)
'who is he?' (lit. 'he <u>who</u> it is?')
b. **shii <u>Audù</u> nee** (answer with <u>in situ</u> new information focus)
3MS Audu FM(MS)
'he is Audu' (lit. 'he <u>Audu</u> it is')

(25) a. **shii kuma wannàn <u>mèenee</u> nèe?** (question with <u>in-situ</u> WH-pronoun)
3MS and this what FM(MS)
'and what is this?' (lit. 'and this <u>what</u> it is?')
b. **wannàn <u>jàkaa</u> cèe** (answer with <u>in situ</u> new information focus)
this bag FM(F)
'this is a bag' (lit. 'this <u>bag</u> it is')

Having established and exemplified the existence of in situ WH-elements in verbal and nonverbal clauses, and elucidated the syntactic constraints on accessibility to the operation, we now move on to consider the corresponding focus facts.

3.2. IN SITU FOCUS. Focus can also occur in situ in verbal clauses with a general TAM (see the many examples in §3.1), in addition to nonverbal clauses, and the in situ strategy is appropriate with both focus types according to discourse context, i.e., new information and contrastive/corrective focus (see Jaggar 2001:496-98; Green & Jaggar 2003; Hartmann [in press]).

Without an extensive and systematic text count it is difficult to state with any certainty to what extent in situ focus is less frequent than the movement focus strategy (if at all) in natural contexts, but it is certainly subject to fewer distributional constraints than the corresponding in situ WH-constructions. It freely occurs, for example, with core arguments in verbal predicates, e.g., exx. 37-48, and there are also scattered tokens to be found in pedagogical texts, e.g., Cowan & Schuh (1976:85). This in situ distribution could derive from the pragmatic fact that focus-answers, unlike questions, simply provide information within a pre-established, addressee-old discourse framework, and as such do not require overt marking to the same extent as questions. Parallel to in situ interrogatives, in situ focus is especially common with locative adverbial predicates (source, goal, location), but it is also possible with temporal and instrumental complements, and in some cases, e.g., with nonverbal locatives and possessive ("be with") adverbial complements and imperfective TAMs, in situ focus actually represents the norm. They also express the same truth conditions, propositional content, and illocutionary force as the ex situ versions would.

The data in (26a-j) are highly informative—they are all taken from segment 1.11b (p. 40) of *Hausar Baka*, a brief exchange which nevertheless includes one in situ WH-word (a), and *four* in situ focal responses (d, f, h, j): [11]

(26) a. **zuwàn yàushee?**   (question = <u>in situ</u> WH-adjunct)
          coming.of when
          'when did you come?'
      b. **ai zuwàn kèenan**
          well coming.the it is
          'well I've just come'
      c. **dàgà wànè gàrii ka zoo?**   (question = ex situ WH-PP)
          from which town 2MS.FOC-PFV come
          'from which town do you come?'
      d. **naa tahoo <u>dàgà Biřnin K'wànni</u>**   (= <u>in situ</u> new info. PP focus)
          1S.PFV come from Birnin Konni
          'I come <u>from Birnin Konni</u>'
      e. **tòo, mèe ka zoo yîi à gàrinmù?**   (question = ex situ WH-pronoun)
          OK what 2MS.FOC-PFV come doing in town.1PL
          'OK, what have you come to do in our town?'

----

[11] Given that English marks in situ (and often ex situ) focus by means of prosodic prominence (nuclear stress) on the focal constituent, this gives rise to some open and interesting empirical questions: (a) can Hausa also identify the focus of an utterance through prosodic means, e.g., pitch, duration, stress? (b) is there a "trade-off", i.e., when focus is expressed syntactically, especially in a tone language, it is not also highlighted by any prosodic prominence as claimed, for example, for Aghem (Bantu) by Watters (1979)? Melanie Green (Sussex University) is planning to investigate the possible interaction between morphosyntactic and prosodic options for marking Hausa focus (both ex situ and in situ), in addition to WH-constructions. (On the syntax-focus-prosody interface, see Truckenbrodt 1999.)

     f.   **naa zoo gàrinkù <u>zìyaařàa</u> nee**
        1S.PFV come town.2PL visit FM(MS)
        'I've come to your town (to) <u>visit</u>'
        (where the <u>in situ</u> new information focus is realized as a purposive NP adjunct)

     g.   **mèe dà mèe kakèe sôn ganii?**   (question = ex situ WH-pronouns)
        what and what 2MS.FOC-IMPFV wanting.of seeing
        'what do you want to see?'

     h.   **inàa sôn ganin <u>kòokawàa dà dambe</u>** (= <u>in situ</u> new info. conjoined NP focus)
        1S.IMPFV wanting.of seeing.of wrestling and boxing
        'I want to see <u>wrestling and boxing</u>'

     i.   **à ìnaa ka sàuka?**   (question = ex situ locative WH-PP)
        at where 2MS.FOC-PFV stay
        'where are you staying?'

     j.   **naa sàuka <u>à gidan kàawuunaa</u>** (= <u>in situ</u> new info. locative PPfocus)
        1S.PFV stay at house.of uncle.my
        'I'm staying at <u>my uncle's house</u>'

In (26d) the (source) locative prepositional phrase (**dàgà) Biřnin K'wànni** '(from) Birnin Konni' represents the principal information which directly and explicitly answers the interrogative PP **dàgà wànè gàrii?** 'from which town?' in (26c), and it occurs in the base position with a general perfective TAM (= 1S **naa**). In terms of pragmatic function, it represents the salient discourse-new information focus (on the pragmatics of focus, see Dik 1989:264ff., 1997:291ff.). All the in situ foci in (26), moreover, still carry the same intrinsic focus function and semantics as their ex situ counterparts would, even though they do not trigger INFL focus marking. Interestingly in this regard, Newman (1974:68-69) reports that Kanakuru (West Chadic-A) requires focus locatives to remain in situ.

    Example (27), inter alia, shows that the WH- and focal response strategies do not have to match (27a = ex situ, 27b = in situ).

(27) a.   **ìnaa sukà tàfi?**   (question with <u>ex situ</u> WH-adjunct)
         where 3PL.FOC-PFV go
         'where have they gone?'

      b.   **sun tàfi <u>gidaa</u>**   (answer = <u>in situ</u> new information focus)
         3PL.PFV go home
         'they've gone <u>home</u>'

    Examples (28-34) illustrate various adverbial elements functioning as in situ informational foci, including locative complements (goal, location) and time adjuncts.

(28) a.   **ìnaa ka sàyee shì?**   (question = ex situ WH-adjunct)
         where 2MS.FOC-PFV buy 3MS
         ^where did you buy it?'

      b.   **naa sàyee shì <u>à Kàtsinà</u>** (= <u>in situ</u> new information locational focus)
         1S.PFV buy 3MS in Katsina

'I bought it <u>in Katsina</u>'

(29) a.   **ìnaa kòofii?**   (question = ex situ WH-adjunct)
           where coffee
           'where's the coffee?'

      b.   **yanàa <u>can cikin kwabàa</u>** (answer = <u>in situ</u> new information locative focus)
           3MS.IMPFV over there in cupboard
           'it's <u>over there in the cupboard</u>'

(30) a.   **ìnaa zâa ka?**   (question = ex situ WH-adjunct)
           where ALLAT 2MS
           'where are you off to?'

      b.   **zâa ni <u>tashàa</u>**   (answer = <u>in situ</u> new information locative goal focus)
           ALLAT 1S station
           'I'm off to <u>the station</u>'

Sentence (31b) contains a sentence-final copula/focus-marker with interesting scope implications:

(31) a.   **ìnaa zuwàa?** (question = ex situ WH-adjunct)
           where going
           'where (are you) going?'

      b.   **zân tàfi <u>gidaa</u> nèe**   (answer = <u>in situ</u> new information locative goal focus)
           FUT.1S go home FM(MS)
           'I'm going <u>home</u>'

From a formal syntactic point of view, the (optional) occurrence of the default masculine singular focus marker **nèe** as used in sentence-final position in (31b) correlates with sentence-focus, i.e., where the focus extends its (wide) scope over the entire proposition (sentential focus is common in Hausa). However, in discourse-pragmatic terms, the (in situ) focus is unambiguously assigned to the goal locative noun **gidaa** 'home', the subclausal syntactic constituent which, as addressee-new information, directly and explicitly answers the locative WH-question (see also exx. 47b, 51c).[12] Examples (32-34) illustrate in situ focus on various temporal adjuncts expressing duration and (clock) time points (realized by adverbs, NPs and PPs):

---

[12] Compare English (Quirk et al. 1985:1363ff.), where the constituent bearing the nuclear stress in a response can in fact encompass varying amounts of material, i.e., the scope of the focus is (potentially) ambiguous, ranging from broad to narrow. Thus, an utterance such as 'he's buying a can of PAINT' (with small capitals indicating that the stress is on PAINT) could be a plausible and coherent response to any of the following questions (with progressively narrower foci): (a) 'what's happening?' (focus scope = clause 'he's buying a can of paint'); (b) 'what is he doing?' (scope = VP 'buying a can of paint'); (c) 'what is he buying?' (scope = NP 'a can of paint'); (d) 'what's he buying a can of?' (scope = noun 'paint'). See also Green & Jaggar (2003:205).

(32) a. **ƙarfèe nawà zaa kà daawoo?** (question = ex situ temporal WH-NP)
o'clock how many FUT 2MS return
'what time will you return?'

b. **zân daawoo dà ƙarfèe biyu**   (= <u>in situ</u> new info. temporal PP focus)
FUT.1S return at o'clock two
'I'll return <u>at 2 o'clock</u>'

(33) **kin gayàa minì zaa kì zoo <u>jiyà</u>**   (<u>in situ</u> corrective temporal adverb focus)
2FS.PFV say to.1S FUT 2FS come yesterday
'you told me you would come <u>yesterday</u>'

(34) a. **yànzu kanàa yîn <u>kwaanaa nawà</u> kàn kà gamà**   [HB:3.16]
now 2MS.IMPFV doing.of day how many before 2MS.SJN finish
ɗinkìn hùulaa ɗaya?   (<u>in situ</u> durational WH-NP)
sewing.of cap one
'how many days do you now spend before you finish sewing one cap?'

b. **inàa yîn <u>kwaanaa huɗu</u>**   (<u>in situ</u> durational NP focus)
1S.IMPFV doing.of day four
'I spend <u>four days</u>'

Examples (35b, 36b) illustrate base-position adverbial complements of the instrumental-comitative preposition **dà** 'with' (indicating "be with" possession with the imperfective TAM in 36b):

(35) a. **dà mèe dà mèe akèe yînsà?**   (question = ex situ conjoined WH-pronouns)
with what and what 4PL.FOC-IMPFV making.of.3MS
'with what is it made?'

b. **anàa yînsà <u>dà fìlaawàa dà yîs dà ƙwai</u>** (answer = <u>in situ</u> new info. focus)
4PL.IMPFV making.of.3MS with flour and yeast and eggs
'it is made with flour and yeast and eggs'

(36) a. **mèe kakè dà shii?**   (question = ex-situ WH-pronoun)
what 2MS.FOC-IMPFV with 3MS
'what do you have?'

b. **inàa <u>dà fensìr̃ dà kuma biir̃òo</u>** (answer = <u>in situ</u> new info. focus)
1S.IMPFV with pencil and pen
'I have <u>a pencil and a pen</u>'

Pragmatically highlighted in situ focus is also freely attested with (non-subject) core arguments in verbal predicates, in contrast to the corresponding WH-constructions where there is variable loss of acceptability regarding in situ core arguments (§3.1). Examples (direct and indirect object focus):

(37) a. **wànè kaayaa kikà mântaa**? [HB:3.07] (question = ex situ WH-NP)
which things 2FS.FOC-PFV forget
'which things did you forget?'

    b. **naa mâncee <u>jàkaataa dà hùulaataa</u>** (= <u>in situ</u> new info. conjoined direct object focus)
        1S.PFV forget bag.of.1S and hat.of.1S
        'I forgot <u>my bag and my hat</u>'

(38) a. **kòofii zaa kà shaa?**   (*yes/no* question)
        coffee FUT 2MS drink
        'will you drink coffee?'

    b. **aa'àa, zân shaa <u>shaayìi</u>**   (= <u>in situ</u> corrective direct object focus)
        no FUT.1S drink tea
        'no I'll drink <u>tea</u>'

(39) a. **tôo, bâs zaa kà hau koo kùwa Fìijôo?** [HB:3.02-04] (ex situ alternative question)
        OK bus FUT 2MS ride or else Peugeot
        'OK, will you ride a bus or a Peugeot (taxi)?'

    b.   **nii naa fi sôn hawaa <u>Fìijôo</u>**
        1S 1S.PFV exceed wanting.of riding Peugeot (<u>in situ</u> selective focus)
      'me, I prefer to ride (in) <u>a Peugeot (taxi)</u>'

(40) a. **aikìn mèe akèe à nân?**   (question = ex situ WH-phrase)
        work.of what 4PL.FOC-IMPFV at here
        'what work is done here?'

    b. **munàa <u>aikìn rinìi</u>**   (answer = <u>in situ</u> new info. predicate focus)
        1PL.IMPFV work.of dyeing
        'we do <u>dyeing work</u>'

(41)   **dàa naa sanìi dàa naa zàaɓi <u>Tankò</u>, bàa Muusaa ba**
        if 1S.PFV know then 1S.PFV vote for Tanko NEG Musa NEG
        'if I'd known I would have voted for <u>Tanko</u>, not Musa'
        (contrastive <u>in situ</u> direct object focus)

(42) a. **mèe sukà kaawoo?** (question = ex situ WH-pronoun)
        what 3PL.FOC-PFV bring
        'what did they bring?'

    b. **sun kaawoo <u>rìigaa</u>**   (answer = <u>in situ</u> new info. direct object focus)
        3PL.PFV bring gown
        'they brought <u>a gown</u>'

(43) a. **wàcè mootàa zaa sù baa shì?** (question = ex situ WH-NP)
        which car FUT 3PL give 3MS
        'which car will they give him?'

    b. **zaa sù baa shì <u>Mar̃sandì</u>**   (answer = <u>in situ</u> new info. direct object focus)
        FUT 3PL give 3MS Mercedes
        'they'll give him <u>a Mercedes</u>'

(44)   **koomee wàhalàr̃ aikìn, zaa sù bâa <u>Audù</u>**
        whatever difficulty.of work.the FUT 3PL give Audu
        'however difficult the work, they would give (it to) <u>Audu</u>'
        (= contrastive <u>in situ</u> indirect object focus)

    In order to reinforce the truth value of a response, speakers sometimes insert a preverbal restrictive-corrective "modal particle" **dai** 'actually, just' (45b, 46b) and/or an adverbial

focusing modifier such as **kawài** 'just, only, simply' (45c), or a sentence-final focus marker (47b), e.g.,

(45)   a.   **kaa gayàa wà Audù làabaar̃ìn?**   (*yes/no* question)
             2MS.PFV tell to Audu news.the
             'did you tell (to) Audu the news?'

       b.   **aa'àa, naa <u>dai</u> gayàa wà <u>Kànde</u>**   (= <u>in situ</u> corrective indirect object focus)
             no 1S.PFV actually tell to Kande
             'no, I actually told <u>Kande</u>'

or:

       c.   **aa'àa, naa gayàa wà <u>Kànde</u> kawài**
             no 1S.PFV tell to Kande just
             'no, I just told <u>Kande</u>'

(46)   a.   **wàa kukà yi wà àlkawàr̃ii?**   (question = ex situ WH-pronoun)
             who 2PL.FOC-PFV do to promise
             'who did you promise (to)?'

       b.   **mun <u>dai</u> yi wà <u>Audù</u> àlkawàr̃ii** (= <u>in situ</u> corrective indirect object focus)
             1PL.PFV actually do to Audu promise
             'we actually promised <u>Audu</u>'

Example (47b) has in situ focus on a modifying adjective functioning as a head element:

(47)   a.   **kaa sàyi jar̃ mootàa?**   (*yes/no* question)
             2MS.PFV buy red.of car
             'did you buy a red car?'

       b.   **aa'àa, naa sàyi <u>faraa</u> nèe**   (= <u>in situ</u> corrective adjective head focus)
             no 1S.PFV buy white(F) FM(M)
             'no, I bought a white (one)'

(47b) is also another example of the masculine singular focus marker **nèe,** often used in end position to signal sentential focus, but in this case pragmatically scoping the most informative element in the clause—the left-adjacent adjectival head **faraa** 'a white (one)' (see also ex. 31b). Notice that even though the semantic focus is unambiguously on the in situ feminine singular constituent **faraa** 'a white (one)', the final focus marker **nèe** takes the default masculine gender—(feminine) gender agreement on the focus marker would only be triggered if **faraa** was fronted, i.e., **aa'àa, <u>faraa</u> cèe na sàyaa** '<u>it's a white (one)</u> I bought' (no <u>white(F) FM(F)</u> 1S.FOC-PFV buy). Example (48) illustrates in situ focus followed by the same end-position focus marker, where the pragmatic scope is on the contrastive VP '(I'm going to) buy (it)':

(48)   **naa faasà hayàr̃ gidân, zân <u>sàyaa</u> nèe**
        1SG.PFV postpone renting.of house.the FUT.1SG buy FM(MS)

'I've changed my mind about renting the house, I'm going to <u>buy</u> (it)'

Subjects represent a special category and cannot receive in situ focus, with speakers routinely rejecting examples such as (49b, 50b) (with *****sun** INFL) in response to the *yes/no* question (49a) and WH-question (50a):

(49) a. **'yan-sàndaa sun gaanoo gaawaȓ mamàcîn?**
        police 3PL.PFV discover body.of dead man.the
        'did the police discover the dead man's body?'
    b. **aa'àa, 'yaa'yan mamàcîn sukà (*sun) gaanoo shì**
        no children.of dead man.the 3PL.FOC-PFV (*3PL.PFV) discover 3MS
        'no, <u>the dead man's children</u> discovered him'
(50) a. **su-wàa sukà tàfi Amìȓkà?**
        3PL-who 3PL.FOC-PFV go America
        'who went to America?'
    b. **su Audù dà Muusaa (nèe) sukà (*sun) tàfi**
        3PL Audu and Musa (FM.PL) 3PL.FOC-PFV (*3PL.PFV) go
        '<u>Audu and Musa</u> went'

As with WH-questions (§3.1, ex. 10), the subject focus responses with **(*sun)** are inadmissable because the INFL is not marked for focus, and only the displaced versions with the focus INFL **sukà** are possible, with string vacuous movement to the designated pre-INFL focus target. (For cross-linguistic discussion of this asymmetry between subjects and non-subjects under focus, see Green & Jaggar 2003:211, and Hartmann & Zimmermann 2004 for similar phenomena in other Chadic languages.)[13]

Example (51) illustrates negative focus with in situ locative adjuncts, alongside the preposed counterparts:

(51) a. **yaarònkà yanàa Amìȓkà koo?**   (*yes/no* question with tag)
        boy.of.2MS 3MS.IMPFV America or
        'your son's in America isn't he?'
    b. **aa'àa, baa yàa <u>Amìȓkà</u>, yanàa <u>Ingìlà</u>**   (corrective <u>in situ</u> locative focus)
        no NEG 3MS.IMPFV America 3MS.IMPFV England

or:

    c. **aa'àa, bàa <u>à Amìȓkà</u> yakè ba, <u>à Ingìlà</u> yakè** (corrective <u>ex situ</u> locative focus)
        no NEG in America 3MS.FOC-IMPFV NEG in England 3MS.FOC-IMPFV
        'no, he's not <u>in America</u>, he's <u>in England</u>'

Notice that even though the "wrap-around" negative markers **bàa...ba** bracket the whole clause in the fronted (51c) version (the only possible syntactic positioning for the speakers I

---

[13] Noonan (1981), writing on Lango (West Nilotic), suggests that (movement and) special marking of WH- and focus subjects is a mechanism for avoiding positioning them in the sentence-initial position normally reserved for *topics* (see also Dik 1997:321ff.).

consulted), the discourse domain means that the scope of the exhaustive negative focus is narrow (not wide), i.e., it would be pragmatically and unambiguously interpreted as falling on the fronted adjunct **Amìr̃kà** 'America' (s). (The interface between (contrastive) negation, preposing, focus and scope is yet another area of this complex and poorly-understood system just waiting to be investigated!)

In (52) the speaker mixes strategies, using in situ focus in (52b) to negate the discourse-old information—the goal locative 'Kano' in (52a)—followed by the correct replacement new information 'Kaduna' occurring ex situ (52c):

(52)   a.   **sun tàfi Kanòo koo?**   (*yes/no* question with tag)
             3PL.PFV go to Kano or
             'they went to Kano didn't they?'
         b.   **aa'àa, bà sù tàfi <u>Kanòo</u> ba**,   (<u>in situ</u> negative goal focus)
             no NEG-PFV 3PL go to Kano NEG
         c.   **<u>Kàduuna</u> sukà tàfi**   (corrective <u>ex situ</u> goal focus)
             Kaduna 3PL.FOC-PFV go to
             'no, they didn't go to <u>Kano</u>, (it's) <u>Kaduna</u> they went to'

Fronted focus constructions could of course be substituted for all the above in situ examples, with essentially the same truth conditions, e.g., (26d') **dàgà <u>Bir̃nin K'wànni</u> (nèe) na tahoo** '(it's) <u>Birnin Konni</u> I come from' (from Birnin Konni (FM.MS) 1S.FOC-PFV come), (30b') **tashàa zâa ni** '(it's) <u>the station</u> I'm off to' (station ALLAT 1S), (37b') **jàkaataa dà hùulaataa (nèe) na mâncee** '(it's) <u>my bag and my hat</u> I forgot' (bag.of.1S and hat.of.1S (FM.PL) 1S.FOC-PFV forget), (38b') **aa'àa, shaayìi (nee) zân shaa** 'no, (it's) <u>tea</u> I'll drink' (no tea (FM.MS) FUT.1S drink), (41') **dàa naa sanìi dàa <u>Tankò</u> na zàaɓaa, bàa Muusaa ba** 'if I'd known (it's) <u>Tanko</u> I would have voted for, not Musa' (if 1S.PFV know then Tanko 1S.FOC-PFV vote for NEG Musa NEG), (48') **naa faasà hayàr̃ gidân, sàyensà zân yi** 'I've changed my mind about renting the house, I'm going to <u>buy it</u>' (lit. '...<u>buying of it</u> I will do', 1SG.PFV postpone renting.of house.the buying.of.3MS FUT.1S do), etc., etc.

Instead, whatever the conventional wisdom regarding the formal reflexes of focus in Hausa, what we have here are naturally-produced examples from spontaneous discourse which must be recognized for what they represent—in situ focus constructions which place the communicatively more important elements (often discourse-new information) at or towards the end of the clause. (Quirk et al. (1985:1356ff.) refer to this linear ordering as the principle of "end-focus", similar to the "communicative dynamism" concept introduced by the "Prague School"; see also Hetzron 1975 on African languages.) In the same way, therefore, that general linguists describe and analyze English, Hungarian, Standard Arabic, and many other languages, as displaying in situ (as well as ex situ) focus (Quirk et al. 1985; Kiss 1998; Huddleston & Pullum 2002:1365ff.), so the descriptive facts require us to analyze Hausa too as licensing pragmatic in situ focus.

4. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS. As so often happens in (Hausa) linguistic research, once we are alerted to the existence of some previously undocumented phenonemon, our "antennae" all of a sudden start to pick up more and more examples. This paper has provided

further empirical confirmation of the fact that in situ WH- and focus constructions are an integral part of Hausa grammatical architecture, and has made some progress in elucidating the syntactic contexts which license them. The in situ versions are syntactically more basic than their ex situ counterparts, but do not differ in their truth conditions, propositional content, or illocutionary force, only in the way they organize and present the information, and the information-packaging itself can shift throughout the discourse. In other words, they are simply a different *type* of focus construction. The account extends our knowledge beyond the narrow confines of standard approaches and permits a more complete and coherent overview of WH- and focus constructions. Much work remains to be done, however, e.g., on the relative frequency of the two strategies across different genres, the accessibility of core arguments especially to in situ questioning, the scope and interaction of WH/focus, focus markers and negation, embedded subordinate interrogatives, the use of restrictive focus modifiers such as 'only', 'just', etc. Table 1 summarizes the syntactic organization of WH- and focus expressions.

	in situ WH-constituent in question	in situ focus constituent in response
verbal predicate	% (= judgements vary) **%kin mântà wànè kaayaa?** 'which things did you forget?' (lit. 'you forgot which things?') √ Ex situ universally acceptable: **wànè kaayaa kikà mântaa?** 'which things did you forget?'	√ **naa mântà jàkaataa dà hùulaataa** 'I forgot my bag and hat' + ex situ: **jàkaataa dà hùulaataa (nèe) na mântaa** '(it's) my bag and my hat I forgot'
nonverbal predicate	√ (e.g., locative predicate) **sunàa ìnaa yànzu?** 'where are they now?' (lit. 'they are where now?') + ex situ: **ìnaa sukè yànzu?** 'where are they now?'	√ **sunàa makařantaa** 'they are at school' + ex situ: **à makařantaa sukè** 'they are at school' (lit. 'at school they are')

Table 1. Syntactic distribution of in situ WH- and focus constructions in Hausa.

From a wider comparative-historical perspective, the Hausa facts need to be viewed in the context of the syntax of related West Chadic languages (subgroups A and B), where in situ constituent WH-elements are common, e.g., the Bole/Tangale languages (Schuh 1978), including Kwami (Leger 1994:171ff.), Tangale (Kidda 1993:30ff.), the Bade/Ngizim group (Schuh, 1982), Kanakuru (Newman 1974:63-71), Guruntum (Haruna 2003:126ff.), Zoɗi [Dass] (Caron 2002:179), Mupun (Frajzyngier 1993:366ff.), and Miya (Schuh 1998:chap. 12). Base-position WH-constituents are also found in some Central Chadic languages, e.g., Ga'anda (R. Newman, 1971), Daba and Mina (Frajzyngier 1996:221ff.), Kera (Ebert 1979:260ff.), and in East Chadic, e.g. East Dangaléat (Ebobissé 1979). In situ constituent focus is also an option in some languages, e.g., Kanakuru (pronouns) (Newman 1974:63-71), Mupun (Frajzyngier 1993:397ff.) (and the *only* strategy in languages such as Miya and

Goemai [Hellwig, p.c.]), though it appears to be less common than displacement (with question/focus subject-postposing attested in some cases, Schuh 1971, Newman 1974). This distribution raises the possibility at least that the Hausa in situ WH-constructions, and perhaps also in situ focus, are in fact syntactically-restricted retentions from Proto-West Chadic, and that the movement strategy in Hausa (and other languages where it is now found) is in fact a syntactic innovation.

References

Bearth, Thomas. 1999. The contribution of African linguistics towards a general theory of focus. Update and critical review. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 20(2):121-56.

Caron, Bernard. 2002. Dott, aka Zoɗi (Chadic, West-B, South-Bauchi): grammatical notes, vocabulary and text. *Afrika und Übersee* 85:161-248.

Cowan, J Ronayne, and Russell G. Schuh. 1976. *Spoken Hausa*. Ithaca: Spoken Language Services, Inc.

Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause.* Functional Grammar, Series 9. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 2: Complex and Derived Constructions*, ed. by Kees Hengeveld. Functional Grammar, Series 20-21. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ebert, Karen H. 1979. *Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad), Teil 3: Grammatik.* Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Afrika, 15. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Ebobissé, Carl. 1979. *Die Morphologie des Verbs im Ost-Dangaleat (Guera, Tschad).* Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Afrika, 21. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1993. *A Grammar of Mupun.* Sprache und Oralität in Afrika, 14. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1996. *Grammaticalization of the Complex Sentence: A Case Study in Chadic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Green, Melanie. 1997. *Focus and Copular Constructions in Hausa*. University of London Ph.D. dissertation. (To appear in: *Publications of the Philological Society Series*, Oxford: Blackwell.)

Green, Melanie, and Philip J. Jaggar. 2003. Ex-situ and in-situ focus in Hausa: syntax, semantics and discourse. *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar 2 (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory),* ed. by Jacqueline Lecarme, 187-213. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. *Language Universals*. The Hague: Mouton.

Hartmann, Katharina. In press. Focus constructions in Hausa. *The Architecture of Focus (Studies in Generative Grammar),* ed. by Susanne Winkler and Valéria Molnár. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hartmann, Katharina, and Malte Zimmermann. 2004. Focus strategies in Chadic—the case of Tangale revisited. *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 1*, ed. by Shinishiro Ishihara, Michaela Schmitz and Anne Schwarz. Working Papers of the SFB 632 "Informationsstruktur: Die sprachlichen Mittel der Gliederung von Äußerung, Satz und Text".

Haruna, Andrew. 2003. *A Grammatical Outline of Gùrdùŋ/Gùrùntùm (Southern Bauchi, Nigeria)*. Frankfurter Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte, 25. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Hetzron, Robert. 1975. The presentative movement or why the ideal word order is V. S. O. P. *Word Order and Word Order Change*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 346-88. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaggar, Philip J. 2001. *Hausa* (London Oriental and African Language Library, 7). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Keenan, Edward L., and K. Bimson. 1975. Perceptual complexity and the cross-language distribution of relative clause types. *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism*, ed. by Robin E. Grossman, L. James San, and Timothy J. Vance. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Kidda, Mairo E. 1993. *Tangale Phonology: A Descriptive Analysis*. Sprache und Oralität in Afrika, 8. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Kiss, Katalin É. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74(2):245-73.

Kraft, Charles H., and A. H. M. Kirk-Greene. 1973. *Hausa*. Teach Yourself Books. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Leger, Rudolf. 1994. *Eine Grammatik der Kwami-Sprache (Nordnigeria)*. Frankfurter Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte, 8. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

McConvell, Patrick. 1973. *Cleft Sentences in Hausa? A Syntactic Study of Focus*. University of London Ph.D. dissertation.

Morimoto, Yukiko. 2000. *Discourse Configurationality in Bantu Morphosyntax*. Stanford University Ph.D. dissertation.

Newman, Paul. 1974. *The Kanakuru Language*. West African Language Monographs, 9. Leeds: Institute of Modern English Language Studies, University of Leeds and West African Linguistic Society.

Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa Language: An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Newman, Paul, and Roxana Ma Newman. 1981. The question morpheme *q* in Hausa. *Afrika und Übersee* 64:35-46.

Newman, Roxana Ma. 1971. *A Case Grammar of Ga'anda*. UCLA Ph.D. dissertation.

Noonan, Michael P. 1981. *Lango Syntax*. UCLA Ph.D. dissertation.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Randell, Richard, Abdullahi Bature, and Russell G. Schuh. 1998. *Hausar Baka ('Gani Ya Kori Ji'): Elementary and Intermediate Lessons in Hausa Language and Culture*. Windsor, California: World of Languages.

(www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/aflang/hausarbaka)

Schuh, Russell G. 1971. Reconstruction of the syntax of subject emphasis in certain Chadic langugages. *Papers from the Second Conference on African Linguistics, UCLA, March 26-27, 1971*, ed. by Talmy Givón, 67-77. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, UCLA.

Schuh, Russell G. 1978. *Bole-Tangale Languages of the Bauchi Area (Northern Nigeria)*. Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde, Serie A, Afrika, 13. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Schuh, Russell G. 1982. Questioned and focussed subjects and objects in Bade/Ngizim. *The Chad Languages in the Hamitosemitic-Nigritic Border Area*, ed. by Herrmann Jungraithmayr, 160-74. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Schuh, Russell G. 1998. *A Grammar of Miya*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 130. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 1999. On the relation between syntactic phrases and phonological phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:219-55.

Tuller, Laurice A. 1986. *Bijective Relations in Universal Grammar and the Syntax of Hausa*. UCLA Ph.D. dissertation.

Watters, John R. 1979. Focus in Aghem: a study of its formal correlates and typology. *Aghem Grammatical Structure*, ed. by Larry Hyman, 137-197. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Wolff, Ekkehard. 1993. *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa*. Hamburger Beiträge zur Afrikanistik, 2. Münster & Hamburg: Lit.