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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KKK</td>
<td>Ka Ḫara karatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS-1</td>
<td>Kogin soyayya 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYTK</td>
<td>Ka yi ta karatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Muhammed Abdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJC</td>
<td>Magana Jari Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Maikūdi Karaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>Negative particle/morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegP.</td>
<td>Negative phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pseudo-cleft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pc.</td>
<td>Personal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>Perfective TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Phonological form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prt.</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Question morpheme/marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>(Previous) Reference marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel.-cont.</td>
<td>Relative continuative TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel.-perf.</td>
<td>Relative perfective TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAK</td>
<td>Safiya Ali Kwate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGJ-1</td>
<td>Soyayya Gamon Jini 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGJ-2</td>
<td>Soyayya Gamon Jini 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec.</td>
<td>Specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>Subjunctive TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Tense, Aspect, and Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tns.</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>Topic NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TopP.</td>
<td>Topic phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKB</td>
<td>Tura ta Kai Bango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintr.</td>
<td>Intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>Verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtr.</td>
<td>Transitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X⁰</td>
<td>Lexical category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_max</td>
<td>Maximal projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This study is a description of some aspects of Hausa complementation phenomenon. The forms and positions of subjunctive propositional complements and nominalized subject complements of certain groups of complement taking expressions/predicates (CTEs) are described within the framework of Government and Binding Theory. I argue that these two types of complements differ in two respects. The first difference between the two is that while subjunctive propositional complements may occur in post-CTE position as extraposed logical subjects, the nominalized complements cannot occur in such position (as logical subjects). The second difference is that while the former cannot occur in pre-CTE position as logical subjects (i.e. in the Spec of IP of the root clause), the latter can. However, both types of complements may occur in
other peripheral positions of a sentence as afterthoughts, topics (in topic phrase position), or as WH-Moved constituents (occurring in the Spec of CP position).

It is also shown that any constituent in the propositional complement (such as subjects, objects [direct, indirect, or oblique]) can be WH-Moved to CP or be topicalized. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that while the constituents in the CP are there as a result of WH-Movement operation, those in the projection of a topic phrase are argued to be base generated thee as topics. These claims are tested in chapters 2 through 7. It is hoped that the results of this study would provide some means for testing some of the claims made in some of theories of syntax.
CHAPTER 1. Introduction

1.1 Object of the Study.

The Hausa Language is a member of the Chadic group of the Afroasiatic family of languages which is primarily spoken in Northern Nigeria and Niger Republic. It is the most widely studied language in this group, in aspects of both language and culture. In spite of the scholarly attention it has enjoyed, there are many syntactic issues involving complex structures that are still poorly understood. One such complex construction is complementation. The main purpose of the study then is to provide an in-depth study of the syntax of one aspect of complementation. I will pay particular attention to the syntax of subjunctive propositional complement and nominalized complement. An attempt will also be made to investigate the relationships between these types of sentences with certain NPs occurring as complements of verbs, prepositions, copula and nouns. This will however be very brief.

There is very little rigorous study of Hausa complementation. Some of the works which have addressed this are Eulenberg 1972, Bagari 1971, 1972, 1976, Galadanci 1969, 1976, McHugh 1984, Tuller 1986, Dimmendaal 1989 and Abdoulaye 1992. In each of these works, only some general aspects of complementation are described. The interest shown in the Hausa complementation constructions have clearly indicated that there is a need for a complete description of the complement types found in Hausa. This study will be based on the data from spoken Hausa of the Kano dialect, the dialect of the writer himself. In addition, I will also consult earlier works on Hausa syntax, story books, texts and newspapers. The goals of the dissertation are both descriptive and to a certain extent theoretical. It is hoped that the results of the dissertation would provide some means for testing some of the claims made in some of theories of syntax, especially
that of GB whose central concern is to relate aspects of language specific systems with that of the Universal Grammar.

1.2 Theoretical Background.

In this study, I will assume the version of the Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) which has developed over the years, through the works in the Extended Standard Theory (EST). More specifically, I are referring to the Government and Binding Theory (GBT). This theory particularly assumes that there are four distinct levels of representations that are assigned to sentences. These levels are indicated in (1) which are in essence related by mapping procedures illustrated in the diagram:

(1)

```
Base
  D-Structure
    S-Structure
      Phonetic Form (PF)
        Logical Form (LF)
        Syntactic Move Alpha
```

These levels of representations must obey the constraints through the operation of several independent subsystem theories of grammar listed in (2):

(2)

- a. X-bar Theory
- b. Theta Theory
- c. Case Theory
- d. Government Theory
- e. Binding Theory
- f. Bounding Theory
- g. Control Theory
It is assumed that D-structure is the initial level of syntax which represents a stage where there is always an interface between the syntactic component and the lexicon. This level must specify or observe the lexical properties of each of the individual lexical item in the string of sentence. The representations at this level are projected directly from the lexicon which are only constrained by the principles of the X-bar theory and the theta theory. X-bar theory as developed in Chomsky 1970 and other subsequent works assumes that phrases are projections of lexical categories. That is the head of a phrase X, projects to a maximal projection XP. In other words, each lexical category (N,V, A, P) is an X-max - head of its phrase. That is if X is a lexical category, it must be dominated by a phrasal node XP of the same category. The linear order or rather the position of the head and its complements is however not universal. The essential schema of this relation between the head and its complement can be represented as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(3) & \quad \text{a. } X'' & \rightarrow \text{SPEC } X' \text{ ] } X' \ast \\
& \quad \text{b. } X' & \rightarrow \text{X-zero [Complement ]*}
\end{align*}
\]

where the * indicates any order. It is plausible to assume that the order of each of the levels of the phrase is parameterized, and by appealing to the interaction of X-bar theory with other sub-theories like Case and Theta theories, it is possible to formulate a simple optimal X-bar schema represented in (3a-b) above (cf. Chomsky 1981, Stowell 1981, Travis 1984, Koopman 1984, Tuller 1986 and the references cited there for theoretical discussions on X-bar theory). Furthermore, Chomsky 1986b extends the X-bar schema to the non-lexical categories INFL and COMP. In that work, Chomsky following Stowell 1981, assumes that INFL is the head of S = IP and COMP is the head of S' = C". The structures of S and S' of (3a-b) above will then be represented as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \text{a. } S = I'' & = \text{[ I NP [ I' I VP ]]}. \\
& \quad \text{b. } S' = C'' & = \text{[ C" [ SPEC ] [ C' I'' ]]}. 
\end{align*}
\]
Theta theory is concerned with the semantic properties of specific lexical items. It plays an important role in the projection of D-structure directly from the lexicon. In other words, each lexical head (like a verb) will specify the semantic theta roles which it assigns, such as agent, patient, experiencer, etc. (see Koopman 1984 chapter 1). Thus a Hausa verb like mârâ ‘slap’ specifies that it assigns an external theta role of agent and an internal theta role of patient. Verbs like hanâ and tàmbayâ ‘prevent/disallow’ and ‘ask/question’ respectively, assign external theta roles of agent and internal theta roles of patient and theme. These theta roles are projected from the lexical properties of the verbs by the projection principle. Furthermore, the theta roles may be assigned only to a subject or complement of a predicate depending on the subcategorization properties of the head. The positions assigned theta roles by the head are called argument positions (henceforth A-positions), while those that are not assigned theta roles are the non-argument positions (henceforth A-bar/A’-positions). Similarly, those A-positions are assumed to be theta positions, while the A-bar positions are non-theta positions. In principle, theta roles are assigned to A-positions under government (to be discussed briefly soon), and this assignment is regulated or governed by the Theta Criterion as stated in the following:

(A) **Theta Criterion:**

Each argument receives one and only one theta role, and each theta role is assigned to one argument.

The theta criterion which is assumed to hold at LF is a minimal condition of adequacy. The Projection Principle stated below, extends it into all levels of representations such as the S-structure, the D-structure, and the PF.
(B) Projection Principle:

The theta marking properties of any lexical item must be represented categorically at each syntactic level (i.e. LF, D- and S-structures).

In other words, if a verb assigns a theta role to its complement, the complement is assumed to be present at every syntactic level of the derivation. By virtue of the theta criterion, the complement position must contain an argument. A verb may also theta mark its subject indirectly (cf. Koopman 1984). However, Pesetsky 1982 argues that selection of a complement with a certain semantic role is S-selected. Thus in a sentence like (5) below, the verb bọyẹ ‘hide/conceal’ S-selects a complement with the semantic role of patient:

(5) [Ip Audùi yă bọye(è) kudî-n-sàj [pp à bankî]].

Audù 3ms.-perf. hid money-of-him at/in bank

‘Audu hid his money at the bank’

It is also claimed that in the optional case C-selection follows S-selection (see Pesetsky 1982). That is, when a head like the verb bọyẹ above, S-selects a semantic category C =kudî, then it C-selects a syntactic category which is the canonical structural realization (CSR) of C. This issue is also raised in Stowell 1981 where he argues that there is a separate theta role of "proposition" which actually forms part of the lexical entry of some categories of verbs that subcategorize for S’. Chomsky 1986b proposes that the CSR (proposition) is either a clause or an NP, where the NP will receive a propositional interpretation. Furthermore, in addition to the theta criterion and the projection principle, Chomsky 1981 also proposes that all clauses must have subjects. That is the Extended Projection Principle (EPP). He also proposes that every element at PF and LF must have an appropriate interpretation — hence the principle of full interpretation (PFI).
(C) **Case Theory:**

Case theory deals with the distribution of phonetically realized NPs through the assignment of abstract Case. For instance, the verb assigns abstract case to its NP complement, and INFL assigns abstract case to the NP subject, when the clause is tensed. In Hausa for instance, case is assigned in the following contexts:

(6) a. The subject of an S/IP is assigned nominative Case by Agreement (AGR) contained in the INFL of the sentence.

b. The object of a verb or preposition is assigned objective case by its head.

c. The object of a dative morpheme (a clitic of a special type) assigns a dative Case to an NP.

d. Genitive Case is also assigned by the genitive marker *na/-n* for a masculine singular or plural head, and *ta/-r* for feminine singular head.

Note that in Hausa, unlike in English, there are instances where Case is not assigned under strict adjacency between the assigner and the assignee NP (see Tuller 1984 and Munkaila 1991 for the discussion on this issue). There is also a well-formedness principle which regulates the occurrence of an NP in a particular position. This is the role of the Case filter stated as follows:

(D) **Case Filter:**

*NP, where NP has a phonetic matrix and is not Case-marked.

The Case filter requires that overt NPs must appear in a position where Case is assigned. The filter is assumed to apply at S-structure. Furthermore, it is assumed that at D-structure, arguments must appear in positions that are theta marked, while at S-structure these arguments, if phonetically realized, must appear in Case-marked positions. Furthermore, it is move-alpha that assures that these conditions are satisfied. In cases
where there is raising with the verbs like ‘seem’ or in structures like the passive, the verb only assigns an internal theta role to its clausal complement but not with Case. Similarly, it does not assign external theta role to the subject (cf. Chomsky 1981, Koopman 1984, Stowell 1981 and the references cited there).

(E) **Government Theory:**

The notion of government is actually the basic structural concept in most of the subtheories of grammar mentioned above. In particular, it deals with the relation between a head and its complement(s). One definition of government in Chomsky 1982:19 is given as follows:

(7) a. \( \alpha \) governs \( \beta \) if \( \alpha = X \) max, \( \alpha \) C-Commands \( \beta \), and \( \beta \) is not protected by a maximal projection.
    b. \( \beta \) is protected by a maximal projection if the latter includes \( \beta \) but not \( \alpha \).

Aoun and Sportiche 1983 on the other hand offer the following definition of government as a modification of the one given above:

(8) \( \alpha \) governs \( \beta \) iff they share all the same maximal projections. \( \alpha \) is a governor iff \( \alpha \) is an \( X \) in the X-bar system (i.e. lexical category, [+Tense], and [+AGR ]).

The head of the maximal projection XP may be governed from outside if XP is governed (cf. Belleti and Rizzi 1981, and Koopman 1984). Government theory also plays a crucial role in the Empty Category Principle (ECP), which requires that traces be properly governed. Proper government is explained as follows:

(9) \( \alpha \) properly governs \( \beta \) iff \( \alpha \) governs \( \beta \) and \( \alpha = AGR \) (Chomsky 1981:250).
Binding Theory:

The theory of Binding in the framework of GBT, is primarily concerned with the relations between anaphors, pronouns and R-Expressions (including WH-traces, NP-traces and PRO) to their antecedents. In earlier GB works, these elements were accounted for by three central notions: namely, (a) coindexation (b) C-Command and (c) governing category. In the version of the BT proposed in Chomsky (1981), it is assumed that it has three principles which are sensitive to the issue of government. These principles or conditions are stated as follows:

\[ (10) \]
\[ a. \quad \text{An anaphor must be A-bound in its governing category (GC).} \]
\[ b. \quad \text{A pronominal must be A-free in its GC.} \]
\[ c. \quad \text{An R-Expression must be A-free (in all domains).} \]

The “governing category” and the notion of bound/free as defined in Chomsky 1981, 1982 are as follows:

\[ (11) \]
\[ a. \quad \alpha \text{ is a governing category for } \beta \text{ if and only if } \alpha \text{ is the maximal projection containing } \beta, \text{ a governor of } \beta, \text{ and a subject accessible to } \beta. \text{ Subject } = \text{AGR or [NP, S].} \]
\[ b. \quad \text{An element } \alpha \text{ is bound by an element } \beta, \text{ if and only if it is coindexed with } \beta \text{ and } \beta \text{ C-Commands } \alpha. \text{ If } \alpha \text{ is not bound, it is then free.} \]

Note that accessibility is defined as follows, “\( \alpha \) is accessible to \( \beta \) iff \( \beta \) is in the C-Commanding domain of \( \alpha \) and coindexing of \( (\alpha, \beta) \) would not violate Principle C of the BT.” Here, the notions “bound” and “free” do not cover only the A-binding, but are extended to include A-bar binding in the sense that bound is replaced by X-bound while free by X-free. Furthermore X-binding is aimed to unify the binding of elements at both
A- and A-bar positions. Thus the revised version of the binding principles given in Chomsky 1986b) are stated as follows:

(12) a. An anaphor is bound in a local domain.
    b. A pronominal is free in a local domain.
    c. An R-Expression is A-free (in all domains of the heads of its chain).

(G) **Bounding Theory:**

Bounding theory is concerned with the subjacency conditions which states how far a category can move in one step under Move α. It is this theory that has been extended and modified in "Barriers" model of Chomsky 1986b.

(H) **Control Theory:**

There are two ways in which controlled structures are usually viewed. The first one is where a relationship is established between the matrix argument NP (subject or object) and the embedded argument NP. The second way is by determining the the relationship between the controller and the embedded predicate. The former way has been the main concern for many syntacticians on this issue of control. The issue is mainly how to predict which NP (subject or object) of the matrix clause is the controller of the embedded subject argument in a control structure. As for the latter concern, the main issue is to determine why only the subject position is controlled and what restrictions are there on the embedded predicate. But the main discussion in control is on the function of the controller NP and the controllee null subject NP of the embedded clause. The theory of control then mainly deals with the choice of antecedent for the embedded null argument \( PRO \). In Hausa, the canonical \( PRO \) is found in nominalized complements as illustrated below:
(13) Pro an hanà [NP PRO shà-n bárásà à nán].
Imp.-perf. prohibit drinking-of alcohol at/in here

'Drinking of alcohol is prohibited/forbidden/not permitted here'

and perhaps in equational sentences where there is no overt pronominal subject as in the
(a) example below:

(14) a. PRO málämí nē teacher cop. (ms.)
   Versus b. shī málämí nē he teacher cop.
   'He is a teacher' 'He is a teacher'

where in (14a) we find PRO in subject position if one assumes that copula word is not a
Case assigner (see Tuller 1986 for discussion on this issue) and in (14b) we find an overt
pronominal subject in the Spec of IP. Note that this is the only instance where we find an
independent pronoun occupying the Specifier position of a sentence (see Yalwa 1992 for
arguments on this claim). I therefore assume that in sentences with morphological INFL’s
only the small Pro occurs in the Specifier of the IP as in the clause Pro an hanà X
'one/they do not allow/permit X’. Big PRO cannot occur in the specifier position of this
clause since subject NPs whether overt or null are governed by the AGR component of
the INFL. That only small Pro is found there is due to the fact that PRO theorem
requires that PRO should not be governed or Case marked, and in this case the null
subject is governed by the AGR "an" 'someone/they did'. I will not however touch
upon control theory in this dissertation (see Tuller 1986 and Yalwa 1989 for arguments
on where it is found in Hausa). Note that in my 1989 paper I claimed that there are two
main types of null subject arguments. The un goverened big PRO in contexts mentioned
above and the so called small Pro that is found in all cases where there is a morphological
INFL or where it is governed by a lexical head like a verb or preposition. This small Pro
can either be arbitrary or non-arbitrary null subject argument or as a null object argument Pro. Let me now give a brief discussion on the small Pro (for a full discussion on the distribution of this empty category in Hausa see Tuller 1986 and Yalwa 1989 and the references cited there).

One of the main condition on Pro as stated in Chomsky 1982 is that for this empty category to act as the subject NP of a sentence with case etc., as mentioned earlier, it must also be governed by some pronominal features such as person, number, gender, etc. In this regard I follow Jaeggli 1986 and Tuller 1986 for assuming the following condition on "Pro identification":

(15) An e.c is a Pro iff it is governed and coindexed with the features of [Person, Number, Gender, and Case].

This is illustrated in the following examples:

(16) a. [IP Audùj yanā só [IP Ālij yā shā madarā]].
Audù 3ms.-cnt. like/want Āli 3ms.-subj. drink milk
‘Audu wants Ali to drink some milk’

b. [IP Proj yanā só [IP Proj/ j yā shā madarā]].
3ms.-cnt. like/want 3ms.-subj. drink milk
‘Audu wants to drink some milk’
‘Auduj wants him to drink some milk’

As we can see from the (b) example, small Pro occurs in the subject position of both the matrix and embedded clauses. In both cases it is governed by the AGR in the INFL of each clause. Therefore, since the AGR component of the INFL contains the features mentioned above, it is appropriate to consider Hausa as a Pro-drop language. It shares most of the properties of Pro-drop found in other well known Pro-drop languages discussed in the literature. Some of these properties are:
(17) a. Empty pronouns in both subject and object position.
b. Apparent violation of the that-trace filter.

Hausa however does not have free-inversion. What appears to be an inverted subject is actually an NP that has been uttered as either an afterthought or for the sake of emphasis. In subjunctive clauses as well as impersonal constructions we do not find the big PRO in subject position due to the presence of AGR in INFL. This AGR prohibits the occurrence of PRO in all Hausa sentences having morphological INFL component in them. Note that with some TAMs, this AGR component can be dropped in certain limited contexts (cf. Tuller 1986, 1987 and the references cited there). Apart from the regular Pro which is identified by "full/rich phi-features" in INFL, there are also other types of Pro’s. I give a brief discussion on two of these Pros below.

(i) Pro as a Quasi-Argument:

This is an expletive Pro subject found in (a) constructions with an extraposed sentential subject (the kind of construction that we will be dealing with in this study) and (b) constructions with atmospheric (or temporal) predicates (see Tuller 1986 and Yalwa 1989 for detailed discussion on these constructions). The following are examples of such constructions:

(18) a. \([\text{IP Proexp. yā kurē [\text{IP Proarb à tafari can}]}]\).  
   3ms.-perf. be too late Imp.-subj. go there
   ‘It is too late to go there’

b. \([\text{IP Proexp. an yi ruwā na kwānā dā kwānakī bā --- Imp.-perf. do rain of day and days neg. tāre dā [NP PRO tsayāwā bā]}]\).
   together with stopping neg.
   ‘It rained for days without stopping’
Chomsky (1981) points out that expletives that function as quasi-arguments have a special role. They are arguments that receive temporal or weather/atmospheric theta-roles and are in the domain of theta-criterion which do not behave very much like referential arguments. Rizzi (1986) also argues that the expletive in a sentence like that in (18b), controls the PRO in the nominalized construction. In addition, a pronominal whose context cannot be recovered can only be a non-argument. He then concludes that quasi-arguments are simply labels for arguments that are non-referential. Note that it is not possible for the ‘a’ + (TNS) to co-occur with any lexical NP or overt pronominal. For instance we could not have the following if the subject of the embedded clause is assumed to have been moved to the Spec of IP in the matrix clause rather than to the CP:

(19) *[IP Audùi aìn yi tsàm mānì [CP (cëwā) [IP tì wāwā nè]].

Audù Imp.-perf. do think that foolish cop.

‘Audu was believed to be a fool’

The only instance where we find a/an/anâ is in a kind of rhetorical expression. And such expressions always exhibit violation of constituent structure of an NP in terms of the agreement between the head and its complements. Such an expression is Su Audu an yi fushi, ‘they Audu (singular) = he was angry’.

(ii) Pro as an Arbitrary Null Subject:

Hausa also allows arbitrary null subjects in sentences with morphological INFL. This empty category has the regular features of [+ pronominal, - anaphoric]. The sentence in (20a) illustrates a case with this Pro subject (note also the embedded clause in 18a where the subject is arbitrary):
If we look at the English translations, it is clear that the two constructions differ in that in (20a) the person(s) breaking the door are not known. There is no indication of the gender, person, or number of the people or person involved in doing the action. Whereas in (20b) all these features are specified in the AGR component of the INFL, which also indicates that the persons are definite. Note that Hausa does not have any formal [+plural] marking on the verb. Plurality or otherwise is always indicated in the INFL. Therefore there is no ambiguity in the interpretation of (20b) like the one found in Spanish for instance. I therefore, assume that sentence (20b) exemplifies an active impersonal sentence in which the 'a' appears to function as an identifier of a subject with arbitrary reference roughly equivalent in interpretation to arbitrary PRO or 'one' of English; 'on' of French, 'si' of Italian, and 'se' of Spanish. It is however, different from 'si' or 'se' in that it does not cliticize to the verb. It occupies the same position as its referential, definite counterparts discussed above.

To summarize this section, I have shown that (following Rizzi (1986), Jaeggli (1984), and Tuller (1986) with modification on Proarb status) the identification of Pro in subject position involves two related factors. These are licensing which requires government of the Pro by a head licenser and identification which requires/involves the interpretation of the referential possibilities of the licensed Pro. The parameter involved in Hausa is that AGR is always generated in INFL. The AGR acts as the licensor of the Subject Pro, and its features identify the referential properties of the Pro. Furthermore, if
the licenser contains the specification of all phi-features, then *Pro* is assigned a definite referential index. In the absence of all these features, then arbitrary reference is assigned to the *Pro*. That is, it is interpreted as an "unspecified indefinite" pronominal. I therefore assume that the feature [-specified] is what differentiate the definite clitic pronouns from the impersonal clitic ‘a’ (see Yalwa 1989 for a detailed discussion on this issue). This completes the review of the main concepts of subtheories in the GB theory.

1.3 Organization of the Dissertation.

This dissertation is aimed at providing an in-depth description of Hausa complement structures with the goal of making a significant contribution to the study of Hausa syntax. The complement structures we will be dealing with can be classified into two types according to their surface structure and other syntactic properties, which have close connection with the semantics of the predicate they depend on. These complement structures are: (1) nominalized clauses, (2) subjunctive subject complements of certain predicates that look like English raising predicates such as ‘seem’, ‘likely’, etc. Some of these predicates are *kàmåtå, yiwu, dàcè, tabbås nè, dölè nè* and *watakîlá nè* meaning "be better, possible, be better, undoubtedly, is necessary/is a must and probably/perhaps" respectively. These complement types will be illustrated in the overview section.

It is pertinent here to mention that even though the bulk of this study is basically descriptive in nature, I feel that it has some theoretical import as well. This is important because the study will have to deal with the relations between the syntactic and semantic properties of the sentences on the one hand and the relationship between the syntactic component and the morphological component on the other. This is mainly due to the complex nature of the Hausa predicates under study (as we will see in chapters 1 and 2).
Therefore, the theoretical framework to be employed as I mentioned earlier is the so-called EST and Government and Binding as defined in the works of Chomsky 1970, 1973, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1986a, 1986b, 1991, Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 and references cited there). I have chosen to use GB because it provides an explicit descriptive and theoretical analyses of complementation using some assumptions such as Binding, Bounding, Control, Case, Government and other subtheories as described above.

This dissertation is divided into eight chapters. Chapter 2 introduces the general overview of the complement types to be covered in the study. A brief classification of the complement taking expressions will be made based on syntactic properties rather than semantic. This is necessary due to the complex nature of the properties of these Hausa predicates as will be explained in the chapter.

Chapter 3 discusses the complementizer system of Hausa, the interaction of the complementizers and the predicate taking expressions as well as the function of the complementizers in introducing the subjunctive propositional complements of these complement taking expressions. This chapter will provide a full description of the types of complementation patterns introduced by predicate expressions taking subjunctive sentential sentences.

Chapter 4 discusses the role of negation in complementation structures and the constraints that it imposes on negating the subjunctive propositional complements. The scope issue that arises with respect to the position of the negative markers in both root clauses and the subjunctive propositional complements of the predicate expressions will also be briefly discussed.

Chapter 5 examines the role of topicalization in the complementation of subjunctive propositional complements. It will be shown that in addition for the extrapolation requirement for the complements of these complement taking expressions,
there is also another option for having their logical subject complements occur as topics or as afterthoughts.

Chapter 6 investigates the nature of WH-extractions of arguments such as subjects and objects of the complements and non-arguments such as VPs and adjuncts out of the complement clauses. In other words the process of WH-extraction of constituents in sentences like cleft/focus, question-word/constituent question, relativization, and pseudo-cleft constructions, as well as the relationship between the WH-extraction and topicalization will be discussed in detail.

Chapter 7 deals with the complementation of nominalized complements. It will be shown that there is a difference between subjunctive propositional complements and nominalized complements with respect to their occurrence in post-predicate and pre-predicate positions. They however have the same properties with regard to their occurrence in positions outside the root clauses. Furthermore, it will be shown that the complement taking expressions to be studied in this dissertation differ from the predicates taking object complements/ clauses in the sense that while the former may take nominalized complements as subjects, the latter cannot.

Finally, chapter 8 summarizes the issues discussed in the dissertation. A brief suggestions of topics for further research on other related issues will conclude this study.

1.4 A Brief Overview of Hausa Constituent Structure.

Hausa is a basic SVO language which displays the Pro-drop phenomenon (Tuller 1986). In other words, the subject position cannot contain an overt pronoun in sentences with morphological INFL (see Yalwa 1992 for this proposal). Similarly, Hausa lacks infinitival morphology (but see Newman forthcoming), instead it uses subjunctive clauses or nominalizations to express what would be expressed in English with an infinitive clause. So the subject position (in tensed clauses) cannot be occupied by a big PRO due to
the presence of a subject clitic/agreement pronoun which identifies and assigns nominative Case to the subject NP (cf. Tuller 1986). Furthermore, the agreement clitic/marker occurs in INFL (in both finite and subjunctive clauses), and the COMP may be empty in some complements.

With regard to the pronominal system, it is generally assumed that pronouns have certain distinctive properties apart from their lexical properties. These properties are what is now assumed in the GB works as “phi-features”. The function of these features on pronouns varies from one language to another. Some languages have rich phi-features, while some make very minimal use of them. Hausa is a language that represents the former type. In Hausa, there are several sets of pronouns, the choice of which is determined by syntactic position. There are roughly two main groups of pronouns. The first group consists of pronouns that are called the independent pronouns or the disjunctive pronouns which are traditionally termed as the subject pronouns. Such pronouns are nî ‘I’, kai ‘you (ms.)’, kê ‘you (fs.)’, shî ‘he’, ita ‘she’, mû ‘we’, kû ‘you (pl.)’, and sû ‘they’. In this study, I assume that these pronouns in the present state of the language actually occur primarily in either the topic position or in the CP in focus position. The independent pronouns are also found as objects of ‘true’ prepositions, objects of negative existential predicate bābù ‘there isn’t’ and as conjoined NPs. The independent pronouns usually ‘make reference to an entity present in the shared perceptual environment or rendered salient in some other way’ (Koopman 1984).

Note that these pronouns differ from the subject clitic pronouns which obligatorily follow the grammatical subject. They are those pronouns which contain the phi-features mentioned above. And they are mainly followed by the TAM of the clause. The pronoun and the TAM both occur in the same slot in INFL as mentioned earlier. The second group of pronouns are the subject (clitic) pronouns. These contain the phi-features of the subject
and usually combine with a tense/aspect/mood (TAM) of the clause. The pronoun and the
TAM both occur in a separate inflection (INFL) component.

The third group of pronouns is the indirect object pronouns, which are governed
by the dative morpheme/particle \textit{ma} as will be illustrated later. The forth set of pronouns
is the direct object pronouns which are governed and Case marked by the verb. The fifth
set of pronouns is the possessive pronouns which are linked to a noun with the genitive
marker -\textit{n}- for masculine singular and plural nouns, or -\textit{r}- for feminine singular.

The sixth set is the anaphoric pronouns i.e. the reflexives and the reciprocals. The
reflexives are composed of the word \textit{kāi} ‘head/self’ plus the possessive pronouns to
mean ‘\textit{X}- self’, literally ‘head of \textit{X}’. \textit{Kāi} ‘self’ can be used alone when no phi-features
are relevant. Apart from the above true reflexives, there are also emphatic ones. These are
composed of the true reflexives preceded either by the independent pronoun alone as in \textit{nī
kāina} ‘I myself’ or by the independent pronoun and the preposition \textit{dā} ‘with/by’ as in
\textit{nī dā kāina} ‘I myself’. And finally, reciprocal pronoun in Hausa is expressed by
using the word \textit{jūnā}, originally meaning ‘body’, plus the plural possessive pronouns
agreeing in phi-features with the NP which binds it, as in \textit{jūnanmù}, \textit{jūnankù}, \textit{jūnansù}, ‘each other (of us/you/them)’. However, reciprocals, unlike the reflexives,
do not need the possessive pronouns with the phi-features of their binder. Similarly, like
the reflexive \textit{kāi}, \textit{jūnā} can also be used alone when phi-features are irrelevant (see
Yalwa 1992 for the syntax of Hausa anaphors pronouns and also Newman forthcoming).

1.5 A Brief Survey of Previous Studies and Analyses on Hausa Complement Types
and Complementation.

It used to be assumed in the framework of the transformational generative
grammar and the EST that sentential complements are generated through the expansion of
a NP which occurs in the pre-verbal position. The sentential complement is then moved to
the post-verbal position by the well known obligatory transformational rule of extraposition. This is what made it possible to account for the structure in which the post verbal NP could function as either a subject or object, usually characterized as [NP, S] and [NP, VP] respectively. It was later realized that there is a problem with this analysis, in the sense that not all verbs (predicates) taking NP complements can also take different types of sentential complements and vice versa (cf. Grimshaw 1979). It was then assumed that complementizers behave differently with respect to the type of complement that will follow the verb (this issue with complementizers will be taken up in chapter 3).

In this dissertation, I will assume that there are three main complement types in Hausa. Two with inflectional features (INFL) such as agreement and tense/aspect/mood (TAM) (cf. Schuh 1985a, 1985b and Newman and Schuh 1974 for the discussion on this term), and one with null INFL. The former two are full sentences (tensed and subjunctive complements). The tensed complements can be headed by a overt or null ‘that-COMP’ or a ‘Wh-COMP’. Similarly, the subjunctive can be headed by either overt or null COMP. But unlike in the tensed complement, the tense specification in the subjunctive complement clause is null (Tuller 1986, and McHugh 1984). The nominalized clause is a full S/IP that has been reduced by deleting the INFL components of the clause. The verb is then changed to a nominalized form. The nominalized clause can be either of VP type or an NP type even though this distinction does not matter much with respect to our concern in this thesis. This distinction will be explained in the dissertation wherever needed.

The subject (argument) position of the tensed and subjunctive complements can be occupied by a lexical NP, a null NP, a nominalized NP (or a sentential subject clause in d-structure though). Similarly, the sentential subject can also be moved to the end of the sentence by extraposition. The subject of the nominalized clause however need not be deleted. It may contain an overt lexical NP or a null pronominal (i.e. the big PRO) which may be coreferential with a matrix NP as illustrated in the following sentences:
(21) a. [İp [NP shâ-n kwâya-r Audù] yâ dâmê ni].
   drinking-of drugs-of Audù 3ms.-perf. disturb/worry me
   ‘Audù’s taking drugs disturbs/bothers/annoys me’

   b. [İp Pro inâ sô-n [NP PRO hîra dâ àbôkai-n-â]].
      1s.-cnt. liking-of chat with friends-of-me
   ‘I like having a chat with my friends’

The various types of complements mentioned above can be summarized as follows:

(22) a. Full Sentences are:
   Tensed Clauses: (i) [+ AGR, + Tense] or
                   (ii) [- AGR, + Tense]
                   (ii) Possible only when AGR is dropped.¹

   b. Subjunctive Clauses: [+ AGR, - Tense].

   c. Nominalized Clauses: [- AGR, - Tense].
      (i) VP Type
      (ii) NP Type.

Complements can be governed by verbs and copulas, they can be governed by adverbs, nouns and prepositions. They occur in positions where NPs are found and they function as subjects, objects (direct, indirect or prepositional). But before I go further, I would like to review some of the prior works done on Hausa complementation. I will first begin with Eulenberg 1972.

(A) Eulenberg 1972.

In his dissertation titled “Complementation phenomena in Hausa”, Eulenberg is more concerned with complementation as used in a wider sense. That is in cases where “one linguistic element enters into nexus with another, such as nexus between a verb and its subject and noun phrases whether or not those NPs contain embedded sentences and also the nexus between various grammatical particles and their complements”, (pp. 2). He
himself mentions that he will not attempt an exhaustive description of Hausa complementation, but rather point out some of those facts which he feels deserve particular attention. He began by positing a basic rule of the complementation system as in the following:

(23)  \[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{S} \]

He mentions that this rule recognizes the existence of noun phrases which have the internal structure of sentences both embedded and non-embedded ones. And they can function as complements of verbs and prepositions even though not all verbs may have sentential complements, and some verbs require sentential complements. He thus did not include nouns as among the items that take sentential complements. Another rule he gives is the one in which relative clauses are formed which he calls “relativization rule” formulated as in follows:

(24)  \[ \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{S} \]

The next thing he talks about is the set of rules that are used in Hausa complementation. The first one he discusses is the subject pronoun deletion rule in which a subject pronoun is deleted obligatorily if it contains no more information than its person-aspect prefix. Thus in:

(25)  \[
\begin{align*}
\text{(Shī) yā} & \quad \text{kāmā dōkī.} \\
\text{he} & \quad \text{3ms.-perf. catch} \quad \text{horse}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He caught a horse’

the pronoun \textit{shī} ‘he’, is deleted obligatorily, since its semantic content is fully represented by the prefix \textit{yā} ‘3ms.-perf.’, whereas in:
(26)  A u d ü  y a  k a m à  d ö k i .  
        A u d ü  3ms.-perf. catch  horse

    'Adu caught a horse'

the noun subject A u d u cannot be deleted without changing the semantic content of the sentence. I will not go into the details on the issue of the non-occurrence of independent pronouns in subject position. For a detailed discussion of this issue (cf. Yalwa 1992). What is interesting in Eulenburg's discussion on this deletion rule is his use of it in sentences embedded as relative clauses and complements as well as to non-embedded sentences. Consider the following sentences:

(27) a.  S a r k i  y a  s a  A u d ü  y a  z ō  w u r i - n - s a .  
        E m i r  3ms.-perf. make A u d ü  3ms.-perf. come place-of-him

        'The Emir made Adu come to him'

b.  S a r k i  y a  s a  y a  z ō  w u r i - n - s a .  
        E m i r  3ms.-perf. make 3ms.-perf. come place-of-him

        'The Emir made him come to him'

c.  S a r k i  y a  s a  s h i l y a  z ō  w u r i - n - s a l .  
        E m i r  3ms.-perf. make him 3ms.-perf. come place-of-him

        'The Emir made him come to him'

d.  S a r k i  y a  s a  [ s h i l y a  z ō  w u r i - n - s a l ] .  
        E m i r  3ms.-perf. make he 3ms.-perf. come place-of-him

        'The Emir made him (=he) come to him'

In these examples, the sentence in (27b) is derived from the sentence in (27d) by the obligatory rule of subject deletion. Similarly, the sentence in (27c) is derived from the sentence in (27d) as well, by the optional rule of complement subject raising. That is the subject-raising rule place a copy of the subject of the complement sentence into direct-object position after the matrix verb. He gives the following phrase markers to illustrate
the processes where in (28a we have a structure before subject-raising while in 28b after subject raising, ignoring the S and subject NP nodes):

(28)  a.

```
     VP
    /\    
   /  \   
  V    NP
     /\    
    /  \   
   S    NP
      /\    
     /  \   
    NP  NP
      /\  /\ 
     /  /  /  
    [ +PRO ] [ +PRO ]
  sā  shī  yā zō wurinsā
```

'--- made him come to him

b.

```
     VP
    /\    
   /  \   
  V    NP
     /\    
    /  \   
   S    NP
      /\    
     /  \   
    NP  NP
      /\  /\ 
     /  /  /  
    [ +PRO ] [ +PRO ]
  sā  shī  shī  yā zō wurinsā
```

'----- made him [he] come to him'
The rules have to be ordered as follows:

(29) a. Subject-raising
    b. Subject pronoun deletion
    c. Subject pronoun incorporation.

According to him “wherever subject-raising applied, object pronoun incorporation would act on the resulting structure to give the raised subject pronoun the surface form of a direct object pronoun ...” (Eulenberg 1972:115). As we can see the processes is too complex. I will therefore assume as is generally assumed in current syntactic description that we need a simplified system of rules which will interact with some sub-system of grammar to account for certain processes that used to be accounted in TGG by positing too many rules. Since I am not concerned with the description of predicates taking object clauses, I leave it open here whether the object pronoun originates from the subject position of the embedded clause as he puts it or it rather occupying its D-structure level, i.e. in object position of the matrix clause. In this sense, where the transitive verbs like s ā ‘make/cause’ does not surface with an object at the S-structure level, one may assume that the object position is still available and there in an implicit null argument occupying that position. Details aside we may represent sentence (27c) as in the following tree diagram (also details omitted):
With regard to the sentence in (27d) above, it should be noted that this sentence is not an occurring surface structure if it is assume that the pronoun *šēh* 'he' is in the subject position of the complement. The only way to interpret this sentence is to assume that the pronoun *šēh* 'he' is a topic which should not be possible in a complement to the causative verb *sā* 'make/cause'. However, if we assume that there is an implicit argument (which functions more like the object pronoun *šēh* 'him' as in (31b) below) before the pronoun, then it is possible to have the pronoun *šēh* 'he' in topic. The implicit argument is then an unspecified NP which controls the pronoun in topic as illustrated in the following (see Brody 1987 and the references cited there for the theoretical discussion on implicit arguments):

(31) a. *Sark̲i* yā sā IAj [TopP [TOP [NP *šēh* (kām)]]] --- *Emir* 3ms.-perf. make (he) he prt.

[IP Proj yā zō wuri-n-sāj].
3ms.-perf. come place-of-him

'The Emir made him (=he) come to him'
b. Sarkī yā sā shīj [Top P [Top [NP shī (kām)]] j --- Emir 3ms.-perf. make (he) he prt.

[IP Proj yā zō wuri-n-ṣāj]].
3ms.-subj. come place-of-him

‘The Emir made (= asked/instructed) him to come to him’

Some of the verbs that may also take IA are the control verbs like bāri ‘allow/let/permit’, hanā ‘prevent/disallow/prohibit’, kyālē ‘allow/let’, sō ‘like/want’ etc. Note that even if the notion of IA is not used, the independent pronoun shī ‘he’ cannot be in the Spec position of the complement clause as I discussed elsewhere.

The next rule he discusses is extraposition from subject position and extraposition from object position. He assumes that the transformation puts a copy of the complement sentence into sentence-final position immediately dominated by the S-node, and then pronominalizes the original complement sentence, leaving the third person masculine singular pronoun shī ‘he’, where the complement sentence was located. The sentences he used as examples are:

(32) a. yā kāmātā mü tāfī.
3ms.-perf. be fitting 1pl.-subj. go

‘It is fitting/better that we go’

b. nā sāni tanā nān.
1s.-perf. know 3fs.-cnt. here

‘I know that she is here’

This, he demonstrates by giving the following phrase markers for extraposition from subject position in (33) and extraposition from object in (34):
As I mentioned elsewhere no independent pronoun is available in the subject position of a clause with morphological INFL (see Yalwa 1992). So we need not have the abstract pronoun *shī* ‘it’ in the object position of the verb *sanî* ‘to know’ (see Eulenberg 1972:117-119). There are at least two ways to account for the sentences *nā sanî (ta)nā nān* and *nā san (ta)nā nān* ‘I know that she is here’ without positing the structures given by Eulenberg in (34). The first way to account for these sentences is that we may assume that at the syntactic level there is a an ‘implicit argument’ in object position of the verb *sanî/san* ‘to know’ which will be coreferential with the subject of the complement clause. This subject can then be deleted under identity with the implicit argument. However, this is unnecessary since at the semantic level it is actually the complement that is really the object of the verb *san/sanî*. That is the semantic object of *sanî* is not the implicit object (or the pronoun posited by Eulenberg), it is the complement. In other words, it is not *her* I know, it is the fact of *her being here*. The only difference between the sentence with *sanî* and that with *san* is that while the former does not require an overt object the latter obligatorily requires an overt object. This is illustrated in the following dialogues:
(35)  A.  Bàlã, yâu fa Lawânw zâ-i tâfi Kanô.
Bala today prt.Lawan 1fut.-3ms. go Kano

‘Bala, indeed Lawan is going to Kano’

prt. 1s.-perf. know  prt. 1s.-perf. know that

‘Indeed, I know’  ‘Indeed, I know that’

B3:  *Ai, nã san Ø.
prt. 1s.-perf. know

‘Indeed, I know’

(36)  A.  Bàlã, yâu fa Lawânw zâ-i tâfi Kanô.
Bala today prt.Lawan 1fut.-3ms. go Kano

‘Bala, indeed Lawan is going to Kano’

B1:  Ai, nã sanî ([ (cêwâ) [zâ-i tâfi Kanô]]).
prt. 1s.-perf. know that 1fut.-3ms. go Kano

‘Indeed, I know that he will go to Kano’

B2:  Ai, nã san *([[ (cêwâ)] [zâ-i tâfi Kanô]].
prt. 1s.-perf. know that 1fut.-3ms. go Kano

‘Indeed, I know that he will go to Kano’

Here we can see that while sanî may take a null object in (35) san on the other hand cannot. Similarly, when the verbs are followed by a clausal object as in (36) the same restriction applies. That is the verb san must be followed by a complement while sanî does not have to be followed by a complement in response to the A’s statement. So the only difference between sanî and san is syntactic rather than semantic.

The second way to account for the structures in (34) is to posit an empty subject position occupied by a null pronominal in subject position of the complement as is done in current syntactic descriptions. The verb sanî ‘know’, in (34) does not require an overt direct object pronoun as posited by Eulenberg. In fact the examples given by Eulenberg beg for an analysis on whether in these examples there is really a subject to object raising
rule or not. The examples show that a lot must be said about these constructions which unfortunately little is said in Hausa syntactic descriptions (but see Newman forthcoming). I do not intend to discuss this issue of raising to object in this study. I will however talk about extraposition of sentential complements.

(B) Bagari 1972.

Let me now briefly discuss Bagari's paper of (1972) titled "NP Complementation in Hausa." What he considers NP complementation in Hausa involve both simple NPs and clauses functioning as sentences. Some of the examples he gives are illustrated in the following:

(37) a. Audù yanâ sô-n [lábâri-n].
Audù 3ms.-cnt. liking-of story-def.
'Audu likes the story'

b. Audù yanâ sô-n [rubûtu-n wâsïkâ].
Audù 3ms.-cnt. liking-of writing-of letter
'Audu likes letter-writing' =
'[Audu likes writing a letter']

c. Audù yanâ sô(-n) [yâ rubûtâ wâsïkâ].
Audù 3ms.-cnt. wanting(-of) 3ms.-subj. write letter
'Audu likes/wants to write a letter'

d. Audû yâ sanî [cêwâ [Bâlā yâ rubûtâ wâsïkâ]].
Audû 3ms.-perf. know that Bala 3ms.-perf. write letter
'Audu knew that Bala has written a letter'

He assigns the following tree diagrams as the simplified structures of the above sentences:
The structure in (b) illustrates where the verb takes a subjunctive complement, while that in (c) takes tensed complement which he calls the cēwā-complement. He then describes
the different properties of the two types of complements. This include their distributions and the nature of their embedding. While I am not disputing his claim that all the items in parenthesis are objects of different sorts, there are however some issues he raised which need some elaboration. Some of these are (a) the function of the element he calls genitive link -n attached to the matrix verb in (37a-c), and certain sentences which he considers as ungrammatical which are actually perfectly grammatical to me and to the speakers of the standard dialect he described. To him it is the absence of complementizer with some predicates while with others it is its presence that rules out the sentences. Some of these sentences are illustrated in the following (note that the stars in these sentences are his’).

See also pages 39-40 of his 1972 paper for details:

(39) a. *nā yi məmāki-n [yā təfi].
   Is.-perf. do surprise/wonder-of 3ms.-perf. go/leave
   ‘I am surprised that he has gone’

   b. *nā ji haushi-n [yā təfi].
   Is.-perf. feel anger-of 3ms.-perf. go/leave
   ‘I am angry that he has gone’

(40) a. *nā daukā [cəwā [gōbe zə-i təfi]].
   Is.-perf. think/consider that tomorrow 1fut.-3ms. go/leave
   ‘I thought that he was going tomorrow’

   b. *nā zətə [cəwā [shī dōlō nə]].
   Is.-perf. think that he fool cop.
   ‘I thought he was a fool’

It is to be noted that all the Kano dialect speakers I consulted with regard to the grammaticality of the above sentences consider these sentences as perfectly grammatical. I will take up this issue in chapter 3 dealing with complementizers. Turning now to the position of the genitive linker -n, Bagari claims that verbal nouns like sō ‘like/want’,
take -n obligatorily when followed by noun(s), but optionally when followed by sentential complements. Here I will tentatively argue that there are two reasons why the linker is obligatory with verbal nouns taking noun/pronoun complements while optionally with sentential complements. This is due to Case assignment and theta-marking. In other words, since verbal nouns do not have the full feature of [+V], they cannot assign Case to their complements. Since the NP complement requires Case obligatorily, we have to resort to the process of -na insertion (cf. Tuller 1986 for full discussion of this rule).

Similarly, since only verbs and prepositions seem to assign Case to their complements (in Hausa) and also theta mark their complements, so the verbal noun cannot theta mark its object. Therefore this genitive linker assigns Case as well as theta marks the object NP. With regard to sentential objects, the theta marking is optional and it is assigned to the whole complement, if we assume that only simple NPs are theta marked obligatorily in Hausa. In fact it is possible that the requirement that the linker that occurs before sentential complements will be relaxed in the speech of generations to come due to grammaticalization processes. There are so many very important issues raised in Bagari’s 1972 paper, and in his dissertation of 1976. This involves the use of the particle dà as embedded/subordinate clause introducer. Bagari couldn’t determine its true function in subordinate clauses and in the nominalized clauses - hence the question mark for its gloss in the examples he gives in the dissertation. I plan to examine them in some details in chapter 3 of this study.

(C) McHugh 1984.

In his paper titled ‘the Subjunctive in Hausa: A non-finite verb form’ McHugh argues that the traditional description of Hausa subjunctive failed to characterize it correctly in terms of the tense, aspect, and mood system. According to him, Hausa subjunctive is really an inflected non-finite verb form, hence it is not a case of TAM, since
it has the feature [+AGR - TNS]. He demonstrates this by comparing Hausa subjunctive and the infinitive forms of other European languages like English and Portuguese. I am not going to argue on whether the McHugh's characterization of Hausa subjunctive is or is not correct in this study (for a new characterization of Hausa subjunctive, see Newman forthcoming). I will however mention that there are some claims he makes in his paper with regard to the uses of subjunctive with certain predicates whose complements express propositions with truth values. He claims that these predicates never take subjunctive complements. I think that this statement is too strong. Predicates like cē, 'say', fà'dā 'say/tell', f'aukā 'take, consider', yi tsàm mānī 'think/expect/consider' etc. which he gives in his list of verbs taking complements do take subjunctive complements either as first object or second object in the sentence structure. I will not however discuss the syntax of these predicates in this dissertation since they are all verbs taking object clauses. I will however refer to them where there is a need for that.

(D) Tuller 1986.

With regard to Tuller's work, there isn't much to be said since she dealt with so many issues connected with subordination (both adverbial and non-adverbial ones). There are two issues she did which motivated me to undertake this study and the one I did in 1988 and 1992. These are Binding and Control and the discussion on raising predicates. With regard to binding, I was able to add more data and analyses in my M.A. thesis. It is to be noted that her work is the only one where one finds something written on Control phenomena in Hausa at the time I started working on this dissertation. My unpublished paper of 1988 then followed dealing with binding and control. Unfortunately I will not be able to talk about binding and control in this study due to constraints on time and space. As for predicates like kàmātā and dòlè (nè) that may look like raising predicates,
and which actually due not allow raising as is found in English, are going to be the main concern of this study.

(E) Dimmendaal 1989.

Dimmendaal 1989:97-98 however argues that the genitive linkers -r/-n and the particle dā should be treated as constituents of the matrix clauses. He gives a number of examples to justify his claim. He goes on to say that dā operates either as a particle obligatory with matrix verbs, or as a particle which is used in combination with a preceding noun in order to make the complement phrase specific or definite. But there are other cases where it would be difficult to consider da as an obligatory part of the matrix verb as we will see in chapter 3. One thing seems to be clear is that it is a clause introducer and it functions like a complementizer in cases where cēwā is not present. If it co-occurs with cēwā/wai ‘that’, it seems then to function more like a preposition -- hence it acts like a Case assigner to the complementizer cēwā which is semantically a verbal noun. It may also be possible to consider it as a true complementizer, hence a case of a doubly filled COMP. This conclusion is tentative though. For this reason I intend to examine the distribution of this particle in detail in chapter 3 in an attempt to determine its true function. But before I conclude this overview, let me give a brief discussion on complementation of tensed complements.

1.6 Clauses as Objects of Predicates.

Complements in Hausa can be governed by verbs and copulas, they can be governed by adjectives, nouns and prepositions. They occur in positions where NPs are found and they function as subjects, objects (direct, indirect or prepositional). I begin first with tensed clauses.
1.6.1 Tensed Clause as Object of Predicates.

Tensed clauses in Hausa can occur as complements of either verbs or nouns. The tensed clauses can be headed by different types of complementizers such as cewa/wai, kō, idan etc. meaning “that, whether/if, if” respectively. The following are illustrations of some of the tensed complement types:

(41) (i) As Object of Verb:

(a) [Ip Aabū tā daukā [CP (wai) ---- Aabu 3fs.-perf. take it/consider/think (that)
    [Ip Lādij zā tā sō Bālāk]].
    Ladi 1fut. 3fs. like/love Bala

‘Abu thought that Ladi will like/love Bala’

(b) [Ip Sānī yā gayā wa Aabū j [CP (cwā) ---- Sani 3ms.-perf. tell dat.-Aabu that
    [Ip Proj zā-i sayā matāj mōtā]].
    1fut.-3ms. buy dat.-her car

‘Sani told Abu that he will buy her a car’

(c) [Ip gwāmnāj yā sā suj [CP (wai) ---- governor 3ms.-perf. make them that
    [Ip Proj zā su māyō dā kudi-n gwāmnati-n]].
    1fut.-3pl. return with money-of government-ref.

‘The governor made them to return the government’s money’

(ii) As Object Complement to a Noun:

(a) [Ip Proj mun sāmi lābāri-n [CP (cwā) ---- 1pl.-perf. get/find news/information that
[lp Shagarij yā cinya zâbê-n]].
Shagari 3ms.-perf. win election-ref.

'We heard the news that Shagari has won the election'

(b) [lp Proj yā yi mâmâki-n [cp (wai) ----
 3ms.-perf. do surprise that

[lp mâta-r-sâj tanâ dà jùnâ biyu]].
wife-of-him 3fs.-cnt. with body two

'He was surprise that his wife is pregnant'

(c) [lp Bintâj tanâ zàto-n [cp (wai) [lp Audûj zâ-i ----
 3fs.-cnt. thinking-of that Audû 1fut.-3ms.
àurë tâj bana]].
marry her this year

'Binta thinks that Audu will marry her this year'

(iii) As Prepositional Object:

(a) [lp Audûj yâ matsâ [pp à kân [cp (wai) sai ----
 3ms.-perf. insist on/about that ought to

[lp Proj yâ àurë Bintâj]].
3ms.-perf. marry Bintâ

'Audu insisted (on the fact) that he ought to marry Binta'

(b) [lp yârâ-nj sun nàce ?[pp dà [cp (wai) sai ----
children-def. 3pl.-perf. insist with/about that ought to

[lp bâba-n-sûj yâ sai musûj sâbabbî-n kêkunâ]].
father-of-them 3ms.-perf. buy dat.-them new-of bicycles

'The children insisted (about the fact) that their father must buy them new bicycles'

(c) [lp Audûj yâ tilàstâ minîj [pp à kân [cp (wai) sai ----
Audû 3ms.-perf. pressure dat.-me on/about that ought to

[lp Proj nà bā shi âgōgō-nal]].
3ms.-perf. give him watch-of-me

'Audu pressured me (about the fact) that I must give him my watch'
1.6.2 Subjunctive Clause as Object of Predicate.

Subjunctive clauses in Hausa can occur as objects of matrix predicates, and also as complements of nouns. The subjunctive complement may also be headed by an overt complementizer with some predicates. The following are given as representative of subjunctive clauses functioning as direct objects of their predicates:

(42) (i) **As Object of a Verb:**

(a) [IP Bâlāi bâ-i dâmu dâ [IP Bâraunj yâ gan shiʃiʃ/k Bala neg.-3ms. worry with Baraunj 3ms.-subj. see him à can bala]. at/in there neg.

‘Bala did not mind (for) Baraunj to see him there’ or ‘Bala did not mind Baraunj’s seeing him there’

(b) [IP Mubârakî yâ sœ [CP (cêwâ/wai) --- Mubarak 3ms.-perf. want/like that

[IP Lawânj yâ kömâ gidâ dâ wurî]].

Lawân 3ms.-subj. return home at early

‘Mubarak wanted it that Lawan return home early’

(c) [IP Sâniʃi yâ nêmî Râboj [CP (dâ) ----- Sani 3ms.-perf. look for Rabo that

[IP Proʃʃ/ʃ yâ bâ shi makull-i-n gidâ-n-sâ]]. 3ms.-subj. give him key-of. house-of-him

‘Sani looked for Rabo to give him the key of his house’

(ii) **As Object Complement to a Noun:**

(a) [IP Proʃʃ na bâyar dâ izini-n [CP (cêwâ) --- 1s.-perf. give-CAU. permission-of that

[IP Bâlāj yâ âuri Zâinabû]].

Bala 3ms.-subj. marry Zainabu

‘I have given the permission for Bala to marry Zainabu’
(b) [Ip Sarki yan roko-n talakawaj [cp (da) ---
Emir 3ms.-cnt. begging/asking-of poor/masses that

[Ip Proj su goyi ba ya-n gwamnati-n soja]].
3pl.-subj. support=rally behind-of government-of military

'The Emir begs the masses to support the military government'

(c) [Ip Proj yakara batar mini rai [Ip Pro in ga ---
3ms.-hab. damage dam-me mind-of 3ms.-subj. see

[Ip Jatauj yan shan giat]].
Jatau 3ms.-cnt. drinking-of alcohol

'It makes me angry to see Jatau drinking alcohol'

(iii) As Prepositional Object:

(a) [Ip Pro na aminc [pp akar [cp (cewa) sai ---
Is.-perf. agreed on/about that prt.=ought to

[Ip Ali ya aurini Zainabu]].
Ali 3ms.-subj. marry Zainabu

'I agreed on (the fact) that Ali ought to marry Zainabu'

(b) [Ip Pro za mu roki gwamnati [pp a bisar ----
1fut.-1pl. beg/request government on/about

[Ip Pro ta gina mana makaranta-r sakandare]].
3fs.-subj. build dat-us school-of secondary

'We will request/ask the government to build us a secondary school'

(c) [Ip Ladi tanar baki-n ciki [pp a bisar [cp (cewa) ---
Ladi 1fs.-cnt. angry on/about that

sai [Ip Ali ya rabu da ita]].
ought Ali 3ms.-subj. separate with her

'Ladi is angry with regard to the fact that Ali must leave her'
1.6.3 Nominalized Clause as Object of Predicate.

Nominalized clauses in Hausa can occur as objects of verbal matrix predicates, and also as complements of nouns. These instances are illustrated in the following:

(43) (i) As Object of a Verb:

(a) [IP Shugabā Bushi yā kàgu dà [NP PROj cì-n leader 3ms.-perf. eager with eating-of zâbé-n bana]].
election-of this year

‘President Bush is eager to win this year’s election’

(b) [IP Lawàni yā bükäci [NP PROj táfiyā gidà]].
Lawàn 3ms.-perf. need going home

‘Lawan needed to go home’

(c) [IP PROj yā hörë nij [IP dà [NP [VP PROj gamà 3ms.-perf. warn me with finish aiki-n-aj dà wurí]]]].
work-of-me with early

‘He warned me to finish my work early’

(ii) As Object Complement to a Noun:

(a) [IP PROj nā yi shāwarâ-r [NP PROj aure-n 1s.-perf. do decision-of marrying-of yärinyâ-r]].
girl-ref.

‘I have decided to marry the girl’

(b) [IP PROj inâ dà shā’awâ-r [NP PROj sàye-n 1s.-cnt. with interest-of buying-of sābuwa-r môtà bana]].
new-of car this year

‘I have the interest of buying a new car this year’
(c) \[\text{IP Proj sun yi māmāki-n [NP Proj ziyārā-r --- 1s.-perf. do surprise-of comning-of}}\]

Sarki-n Kanō (zuwā) gāri-n-sù]]. Emir-of Kano going/to town-of them

'They were surprised with the visit to their town by the Emir of Kano'

(iii) As Object of Preposition:

(a) \[\text{IP Proj tā amincē [pp dā [NP Proj zuwā-n ---- 3fs.-perf. agree/believe with coming-of su Audù yāu]]]. they Audù today}

'She was certain about Audu (and others)'s coming today' or 'She agreed on Audu (and others)'s coming today'

(b) \[\text{IP Proj nā wāhalā matukā [pp ō bisā/kān ---- 1s.-perf. suffer extremely on/about [NP Proj kōkari-n nēma-r wā Audù aiki-n bankīl]]]. attempt-of looking-of dat. Audū work-of bank}

'I suffered a lot/very much in my attempt to get Audu a bank job'

(c) \[\text{IP Proj mun jī dādī [pp danganē dā ---- 1pl.-perf. feel good regarding with [NP Proj sāmū-n zamā-n lāfiyā ā kasa-r-mū]]]. getting-of living-of health in country-of-us}

'We were happy regarding achieving peaceful existence in our country'

The above examples in (41-43), show cases where complements are governed by predicates like verbs, copulas, nouns, and prepositions. In the chapters to follow I will give some cases where sentential and non-sentential argument clauses occur as subjects of predicates other than the ones given in the above examples. It will be shown that tensed complements, subjunctive complements, and nominalized clauses can be subjects. Subject arguments can be introduced by cēwā or wāi complementizers. They can be
introduced by certain complementizers like kō or dà. I will however restrict myself to subjunctive and nominalized complements. This concludes my review on works done on Hausa complementation and a general overview of the form of complementation in Hausa. I now turn to the description of subjunctive and nominalized complements occurring as subjects of the complement taking expressions under study in this work.

NOTE TO CHAPTER 1

1. In some TAMs, the marker of subject agreement can be dropped if there is an overt noun phrase subject in the Spec of IP or if there is an antecedent NP outside the IP which shares its phi-features with the AGR in the root IP. If there is not a lexical NP subject, the subject is shown by the agreement marker (a weak pronoun) which cannot co-occur with an overt (independent/strong) pronoun in Spec of IP. A Pro subject cannot occur in Spec of IP if the AGR is dropped and there is no coindexable NP in the higher projection as in topic. This is so because nothing can then identify the Pro as required by the condition on Pro identification (cf. Tuller 1986 and Yalwa 1992).
CHAPTER 2  **Predicates with Propositional Subject Complement in the Subjunctive.**

2.0  **Introduction.**

In this dissertation I will discuss the syntax of subjunctive and nominalized complements that function as subjects of certain complement taking expressions (henceforth CTE). Most of these CTEs are predicates that are used to express either deontic or epistemic modalities. In Hausa, the head of the complement taking expression can either be a verb, a particular kind of nominal or a copular word. According to Noonan (1985:127-8), modal predicates in English for instance, can take complements that refer either to future events or states relative to the time reference of the complement taking predicate, or potential events, or states-of-affairs. These predicates therefore take reduced complements like subjunctives and infinitives. In Hausa these predicates normally take subjunctives and nominalized complements, though some may take tensed complements. The infinitive does not occur as a category distinct from subjunctive or nominalized complements.

In this chapter I will give a brief syntactic description on the possible and impossible surface structures of the subjunctive propositional complements and nominalized complements of the CTEs under study. The chapter will be divided into sections. In these sections I will show that the complements to these CTEs cannot occur in the specifier position of the root clause. In subsequent chapters I will examine various constructions that will confirm my claim made in this chapter. That is in surface structure subjunctive propositional complements do not occur in the pre-predicate canonical subject position of these CTEs. I will not however discuss the nature of “Tough Movement Expressions”, Complementation of Hausa Aspectual verbs, or that of the “Experiencer Constructions” in Hausa.
2.1 Propositional Subject Complements in the Subjunctive.

2.1.1 Overall Surface Form of Sentences with Subjunctive Propositional Complements.

It should be mentioned at the outset that the complement to these predicate expressions under discussion, whether it be a subjunctive or nominalized clause has to be compatible with the semantics of the entire matrix predicate (verbal, nominal, or copula). This is not so with the other types of predicates that are directly or indirectly governed by the matrix predicates like those that take object complements. Furthermore, it must also be mentioned that semantically, the modalities of these CTEs blend into each other. So any classification based on semantic grounds will be arbitrary since this study does not concentrate on the semantics of modality but rather on syntactic behavior. In fact most of the expressions belong to one or more groups. A semi-exhaustive list of some of the CTEs I will be discussing in this chapter is given in appendix 1. I will therefore classify them into five main syntactic categories/groups (depending on whether the complement taking predicate is a verb, a noun, or a copular word).

2.1.2 Brief Syntactic Categorization of the CTEs:

In this section, I will confine my discussion to the subject complement function. The following is a brief selection from the list of CTEs taking sentential or nominalized subject:

(1) (a) INFL. + V(int.) + (PP):  Meaning(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yà câncantà</td>
<td>'It's suitable/fitting/appropriate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yà dâcê (dâ X)</td>
<td>'It's appropriate/proper/suitable (for/with/to X)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yà fàskarà</td>
<td>'It is impossible/difficult/hard to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yà hâlattâ (gâ X)</td>
<td>'It is legal/allowed/lawful (for X)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yà hârâmtà (gâ X)</td>
<td>'It is illegal/inappropriate/unlawful (for X)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
yā kāmātā
yā kyāutu
yā yiwu
zā-i dācē (dā X)

'It is better/necessary/fitting'
'It's better/nice/suitable'
'It will be possible/likely'
'It will be appropriate (for/with X)'

(b) INF/V/VN + (NP)* + (PP):

yā fi dācēwā
yā fi/yi kyāu
yā ragē ruwa-n X
yanā bākāntā wā X rāi
yanā dāmū-n X
yanā yiwuwā
yanā bā wā X haushī
zā-i yi/фи kyāu (gā X)

'It's most appropriate/far better'
'It is much better/more suitable'
'It is up to X (to)'
'It displeases X/makes X sad'
'It worries X/makes X unhappy'
'It may be possible/likely'
'It makes X angry/unhappy'
'It will be much better/more suitable/appropriate (for X)'
'It will be easy (for/with X)'
'It will be hard/difficult (for X)'
'It will annoy/distress X'
'It will disturb/pester X'

(c) Yanā -(INF.) + dā + NP + (PP):

yanā dā ãmfānī (gā X)
yanā dā kyāu (gā X)
yanā dā muhimmancī (gā X)
yanā dā saukī (gā/ã wurin X)
(yanā) dā wāhalā/wūyā

'It is important/essential (for X)'
'It is nice/better (for X)'
'It is important/essential (for X)'
'It is easy/simple/not difficult'
'It is hard/difficult/impossible'

(d) NP + nē + (PP):

dōlē nē (gā X)
hārāmū-n nē (gā X)
lāifī nē (gā X)
māi yiwuwā nē
mūgūwa-r dābī'ā nē/cē
mawūyācī nē (gā X)
nufi-n X nē
saurā X nē
shirme nē (gā X)
tilās nē (gā X)
wājībī nē (gā X)

'It's necessary/obligatory (for X)'
'It is illegal/unlawful (for/to X)'
'It is a sin/crime/unlawful (for X)'
'It is likely/possible/probable'
'It is a bad habit'
'It is difficult/hard/impossible'
'It is X's intention'
'It remains X/it is almost X'
'It is nonsensical/foolish/stupid'
'It is necessary/obligatory'
'It is incumbent/necessary'
There are also negative counterparts of these CTEs. A few examples are given below:

(2) a. **NEG. + INF + V + NEG. + (PP):**

- **意义:**
  - bă-ì câncañtà ba
    - "It is inappropriate/improper etc."
  - bă-ì dáçë ba (dà/gà X)
    - "It is improper/inappropriate"
  - bă-ì hàlattà ba (gà X)
    - "It is not lawful (religiously)"
  - bă-ì kámätà ba
    - "It is inappropriate/not nice"
  - bă-ì kyàutù ba
    - "It is inappropriate/improper"
  - bă zà-ì yi kyàu ba
    - "It will not be good/nice/O.K." 
  - bă zà-ì yi wùyá/wàhalà ba
    - "It will not be hard/difficult"

(b) **NEG. + (Pron. + Prep.) + NP:**

- **意义:**
  - bă (shi dá) àmfànní
    - "It is not important/useful"
  - bă (shi dá) kyàu
    - "It is not good/nice/fine/O.K."
  - bă (shi dá) wùyá
    - "It is not difficult/hard"

(c) **NEG. NP + NEG. + nè + (PP):**

- **意义:**
  - bă dàidài ba nè
    - "It's not appropriate/right/correct"
  - bă dólë ba nè (gà X)
    - "It's not necessary/obligatory"
  - bă hàramùn ba nè (gà X)
    - "It is not illegal/unlawful/forbidden"
  - bă tìlás ba nè (gà X)
    - "It is not necessary/obligatory"

(d) **NEG. + NP + (PP).**

- **意义:**
  - bă/băbù (wàni) aìbù
    - "There's nothing wrong/no problem/it does not matter"
  - bă/băbù saukì (gà X)
    - "It is not easy (for/to X)"
  - bă/băbù wàhalà (gà X)
    - "It is not difficult/hard (for X)"
  - bă/băbù kyàu
    - "It is improper/not good/not nice"
  - bă/băbù dádì
    - "It is not nice/good/appropriate"
  - bă/băbù làfì
    - "It is not bad/wrong/improper"
  - bă/băbù dólì/tìlás (gà X)
    - "It is not necessary (for/to X)"
One thing to be clear about is that not all positive CTEs have also the alternative negative counterpart. For instance, some of the CTEs in (2a-c) are strictly the negative counterparts of the positive CTEs. In other words, the negative CTEs in (2b) for instance are the negative counterparts of the positive CTEs of the "have constructions" type, while those in (2c) are the negative counterparts of the 'non-negative copular CTEs'. Some of the negative CTEs illustrated in (2d) however do not have a clear-cut positive counterparts. In other words some of the negative CTEs in this group are ambiguous as to what kind of positive CTE they negate. Consider the following as illustration of this fact:

(3)  
    a. yanâ dâ dâdî  
        'It is nice/good'
    b. yanâ dâ láifî  
        'It is wrong/not good'

(4)  
    a. bâ (shi dâ) dâdî  
        'It is not nice/good'
    b. bâ (*shi dâ) láifî  
        'It is not wrong/bad'

(5)  
    a. bâbû (*shi dâ) dâdî  
        'It doesn't have niceness' =  
        'It is not nice/good'
    b. bâbû (*shi dâ) láifî  
        'It doesn't have blame' =  
        'It is not blamable/wrong'

The negative CTEs in (4) here seem to be the positive counterparts of the positive CTEs in (3). But notice that the negative CTE in (4b) may not be the positive counterpart of the one in (3b). Hence, the negative CTEs in (4) may be the negative counterparts of two different positive CTEs of different constructions. It is clear to see that when the elements in the parentheses are omitted. In this case both the CTEs in (4) could be the negative counterparts of the positive CTEs of "existential construction" type. If however the elements are there, then they are the negative counterparts of the positive CTEs of the "have construction" type. But note further that only (4a) is possible in this sense. With the negative morpheme bâbû, only the "existential" interpretation is possible when the
elements in the parentheses are omitted. These contrasts indicate that it is not always the case that if one gets a positive form of a CTE, it is also always possible to get the negative counterpart of that CTE.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(6) Rashi-n (lack of) NP + nē:} & \quad \text{Meaning(s):} \\
\text{Rashi-n} & \quad \text{ādalci nē} \quad \text{‘It is injustice/unfair’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{arziki nē} \quad \text{‘It is a display of lack of insolence’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{āl barkā nē} \quad \text{‘It is a bad behavior’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{da’ā nē} \quad \text{‘It is an act of indiscipline/immoral’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{da’ī’ā nē} \quad \text{‘It is a bad habit/behavior’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{dauriyā nē} \quad \text{‘It is lack of courage’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{gaskiyā nē} \quad \text{‘It is untrue/a bad act’} \\
\text{Rashin} & \quad \text{ladābī nē} \quad \text{‘It is an act of indispline/impolite’} \\
\text{etc.} & \quad & 
\end{align*}
\]

These nominal CTEs taking subjunctive propositional complements and nominalized clauses are too numerous to give the full list here. They also have a very diverse meanings some of which are overlapping. From this brief list of the CTEs under study, we can see that verbal, nominal, and copular complementation can be categorized into the following order:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(7) a.} & \quad \text{Complementation by a verb as in yā kāmātā, yā dācē, yā cāncantā, yā/yā yiwu, etc.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Complementation by a verb fi/yi + noun as in yā fi/yi kyāu, zā-i fi/yi kyāu, zā-i fi/yi amfānī etc.} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Complementation by a preposition + noun as in yanā dā wahalā/wūyā, yanā dā sauki, yanā dā muhimmancī etc.} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{Complementation by a NP + Copula as in dölē nē, tilās nē, wāutā nē, rashī-n hankālī nē, rashī-n tūnānī nē.} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Note that the complementation patterns given in (7) could further be summarized as in the following:

(8)  
   a. INF + Verb (intr.) (yā kàmätà/dācë/cànçantà/yìwu, etc.)  
   b. INF + Verb (tr.) (yā yi/fi kyaú/daidai/wúyá, etc.)  
   c. INF + dà + Noun (yanà dà kyaú/àmfâni, etc.)  
   d. Noun + nē (dålê/hārâmùn/tîlås/wâjìbì/watakilà nē, etc.).  
   e. NP (neg.) + Linker (-n) + NP + nē (rashì-n hankâlì nē etc.).

The patterns in (7) indicate that the TAM of the CTE is not only in the perfective but other TAM may also be used. Similarly, These forms may also occur with negation. The negative particles can be used to negate the modality of the CTE and the propositional complement or the modality of the whole sentence. This is illustrated in the following negative CTE forms:

(9)  
   a. bà + INF + Verb (intr.) ba (bà-i kàmätà/dācë ba, etc.)  
   b. bà + INF + Verb (tr.) ba (bà-i yi/fi kyaú/daidai ba, etc.)  
   c. bà + shi + dà + Noun (bà shi dà kyaú/àmfâni, etc.)  
   d. bà/bàbù + NP (bàbù aibù/àmfâni/wâhalâ/wúyá, etc.)  
   e. bà + Noun + ba + nē (bà dålê/tîlås/wâjìbì ba nē, etc.)

We will see in later sections how these patterns (and others not mentioned here) are used.

2.2  The Form and Position of the Propositional Complement.

2.2.1  The Form of the Complement.

Having given a rough description of these predicate expressions (CTEs) taking clausal complements, I now begin the syntactic description of the subjunctive sentential complement used as a propositional subject. I begin with the form of the complement. In this subsection, I will show that in Hausa the structures represented in (10a-b) are the
surface structural forms of propositional subjunctive subject. I will argue that the structure in (10c) does not exist in Hausa unless there is an intonational break before the CTE, and this will indicate a different syntactic structure.

(10)  a.  \[[e] \text{CTE (matrix clause)} + [\text{Subjunctive Subject Clause}]\]
     b.  \[[\text{Cêwa/Wai} + [\text{Subjunctive Subject Clause}] + \text{PRO-S-form} +\n         \text{Matrix/Root Clause}].\]
     c.  \*[\text{Cêwa/Wai} + [\text{Subjunctive Subject Clause}] + \text{CTE}].

Restricting my discussion on subjunctive propositional complement for the moment, I will tentatively assume that the structures in (10a-b) represent the complementation of subjunctive subject/propositional complement. It is also the structure found in at least three other different but related constructions in surface structures. These constructions are subjunctive subject/propositional clauses in some complex transitive/intransitive patterns of complementation occurring in post-predicate position, nominalized complement constructions, and tough-movement constructions. These constructions will be discussed in separate chapters. I now begin with the positions where such a subjunctive propositional complement may or may not occur with these CTEs.

2.2.2 The Position of the Propositional Complement.

Before I get into my investigation on the interaction of these CTEs and their complements, it is important to mention that subjunctive clauses in Hausa have many general uses. They function as complements of many predicates most of which will take infinitival complements in a language like English. Subjunctive clauses may function as subjects or objects of matrix clauses. It will be shown that the general characteristics of subjunctive subject complement is to occur after the complement taking predicate expression. In other words, in surface structure, these CTEs do not allow their deep
structure subjects to occur in the canonical subject position (Spec of IP). They require their underlying (DS) subject to be moved to their post-position. There are however others where extraposition is optional. Some of these CTEs are those that may take tensed complements in addition of their taking subjunctive complements. This will be explained later. In the course of my description I will try to investigate (a) why subjunctive sentential subject clauses cannot occur in their canonical subject position at S-structure, and (b) the function(s) of subjunctive subject clauses in the post-CTE position. In this regard, I will also discuss issues on the possibilities or otherwise of topicalization/left-dislocation, Wh-movement constructions, including clefting and pseudo-clefting, and other relevant movement transformations in subsequent chapters. In addition, I will also examine the interaction of various TAMs with respect to the syntax of the complementation pattern of CTEs such as yà kàmàtà-group versus dölè nē-group.

In this section I shall examine the validity of my claims made above. The arrangement of this section is as follows. In 2.2.2.1 I shall examine the position of the postposed subject complement. In this regards, I will argue that it normally occurs in post-CTE position if it is not nominalized. In 2.2.2.2 I show that a nominalized complement does not naturally occur in post-predicate position of the CTEs under study. In 2.2.2.3 I argue that tensed complement cannot occur as a propositional subject of these CTEs. In 2.2.2.4 I discuss some apparent tensed complements of these CTEs where it will be shown that they are actually not the propositional subjects. Similarly, in 2.2.2.5 I will show that in surface structure, a subjunctive propositional subject cannot remain in its canonical deep structure subject position (i.e. specifier of IP). For this claim, I will give a detail description of Hausa complementizer system in chapter 3 showing where the complementizers may or may not occur and its relation with both the root clause and the subjunctive propositional complement. Finally, I shall also examine various transformations in chapters 4-7 to strengthen my claim of this section.
2.2.2.1 Complement Must be in Post-CTE Position.

In this subsection I will explore the syntax of these CTEs and the position of the complements they may take. As we saw in the above selected list of the complement taking expressions, there are a large number of predicates (CTEs) in Hausa taking propositional subjunctive clauses and nominalized clauses as subjects. These CTEs take propositional clauses as their logical subject arguments. I will first begin with the surface structures of *yā kāmātā*, and *dōlē (nē)* groups. My first claim is that the form of the subject complement must be in subjunctive if it is not nominalized. To see this, consider the following examples (where, the arguments of the CTEs are the bracketed subjunctive complement clauses):

(11) a. \[ e_i \ yā \ kāmātā \ [Ip \ Tānī \ tā \ biyā \ hārājī]_i \]
    3ms.-perf. be fitting Tānī 3fs.-subj. pay tax
    ‘It is fitting/better that Tānī should pay taxes’

b. \[ e_i \ yā \ dācē \ [Ip \ Bālā \ yā \ gyārā \ hali-n-sā]_i \]
    3ms.-perf. be suitable Bālā 3ms.-subj. mend behavior-of-him
    ‘It is fitting/better that Bala should behave appropriately’

c. \[ e_i \ yā \ cāncantā \ [Ip \ masōyā-n \ sù \ yi \ aurē]_i \]
    3ms.-perf. be appropriate lovers-def. 3pl.-subj. do marriage
    ‘It is fitting/appropriate that the lovers should get married’

d. \[ e_i \ yā \ kyātu \ [Ip \ [e] \ nā \ gamā \ aikī-n-āl]_i \]
    3ms.-perf. be good 1s.-subj. finish work-of-me
    ‘It is better/nice/desirable that I should finish my work’

e. \[ e_i \ yā \ yiwu \ [Ip \ [e] \ kā \ zama \ sarkī]_i \]
    3ms.-2fut. be possible/likely 2ms.-subj. be/become emir
    ‘It is possible/likely that you would become the Emir’
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f. [e]i yā fi kyāu [IP [e] mū tafi gidā yānzul]i
   3ms.-perf. exceed good/nice 1pl.-subj. go home now

   'It is much better that we should go home now'

g. [e]i yanā yiwuwā [IP [e] kā àuri Bintā]i
   3ms.-cnt. be possible/likely 2ms.-subj. marry Bintā

   'It is possible/likely that you would marry Bintā' =
   'It is possible/likely for you to marry Bintā'

h. [e]i yanā dā wūyā [IP [e] sū yi aurē banal]i
   3ms.-cnt. with difficult 3pl.-subj. do marriage this year

   'It is impossible that they would get married this year' =
   'It is impossible for them to get married this year'

i. [e]i yanā dā muhimmanci [IP [e] mū gamā aiki-n]i
   3ms.-cnt. with importance 1pl.-subj. finish work-ref.

   'It is important that we should finish the work'

j. bā [e]i shi dà āmfānī [IP [e] à tafi gidā yānzul]i
   neg. it .with importance IMP.-subj. go home now

   'It is useless/unimportant that one should go home now'

In all these examples the subjunctive subject complements have either null or lexical subjects. And they occur in post-CTE position coindexed with the null element in the root clause. Notice that all the CTEs used in the above examples are those containing morphological INFL followed by a nominal or verbal predicate. Copular CTEs may also take subjunctive sentential complement as propositional subject in post-CTE position as illustrated in the following:

(12) a. [e]i tīlās nē [IP Audū yā kōmā gidā]i
   necessary cop. Audū 3ms.-subj. return home

   'It is necessary/a must that Audū should return home' =
   'Audū must return home'
b. [el] dōlè nē [ip [e] yà ãuri Bintå]i
necessary cop. 3ms.-subj. marry Bintå

'It is necessary that he should marry Bintå' =
'He must/ought to/should marry Bintå'

c. [el] wajibi nē [ip Musůlmī sù yi Sallah]i
obligatory cop. Muslim 3pl.-subj. do Sallah Prayer

'It is obligatory that Muslims perform the (Sallah) Prayer' =
'A Muslim must say/perform the (Sallah) Prayers'

d. [el] hāramūn nē [ip [e] mū shā giyā]i
unlawful/forbidden cop. 1pl.-subj. drink alcohol

'It is unlawful that we drink (any) alcohol' =
'We are prohibited/forbidden to drink (any) alcohol'

e. [el] hálāk/s/1 nē [ip [e] kā šā madarak]i
lawful cop. 2ms.-subj. drink milk

'It is lawful/allowed/permitted that you drink milk' =
'You are allowed/permitted to drink milk'

f. [el] māi yiwuwā nē[ip [e] nà sāyi sābuwa-r mōtā]i
has possibility cop. 1ms.-subj. buy new-of car

'It is possible/likely that I would buy a new car' =
'I might possibly buy a new car'

g. [el] watakīlā nē [ip [e] sù yi aurē bana]i
probably cop. 3pl.-subj. do marriage this year

'It is probable/possible that they would get married this year' =
'It is probable/possible for them to get married this year'

h. [el] saurā kādan (nē) [ip [e] tā gama aiki-n]i
remain a bit more cop. 3fs.-subj. finish work-ref.

'It remains a little bit (of time) for her to finish the work' =
'She almost finished the work'

i. [el] rashī-n tūnānī nē[ip [e] kà ci bāshi-n nan]i
lack-of thinking cop. 2ms.-subj. eat loan-ref. that

'It is a bad idea/foolish that you should get/receive that loan'
j. bâ [e]|i abî-n kunyâ ba nê [IP mútûm yâ ----
   neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. person 3ms-subj.

kwâna à gida-n sûrûka-n-sâ|î
   spend night at home-of in-laws-of him

‘It is not shameful/a shameful thing for a person to sleep overnight at/in
his in-laws' house’

In these examples, all the complements of these copular CTEs occur in the subjunctive
just like in the cases with CTEs having morphological INFL. It is therefore clear that in
the examples illustrated in (11 through 12), we can see that the subjunctive propositional
complement functions as subject of the CTE even though it occurs in the post-CTE
position. It also functions as the event/activity which the CTE expresses. That is the
subject of the complement is the performer of such activity/event. It can therefore be
concluded that these sentences indicate that a subjunctive propositional subject in Hausa
always follows the CTE whether the subject complement has an overt or null subject.

2.2.2.2 Complement May not be Nominalized in Post-CTE Position.

The question now is can this subject clause be nominalized in post CTE position?
Consider the following examples:

(13) a. *[e]|i yâ kâmâtâ [NP biyâ-n hârâjî]î
       3ms.-perf. be fitting paying-of tax

   ‘It is fitting/better paying the taxes’

b. *[e]|i yâ yiwu [NP aure-n Bintâtî]
       3ms-2fut. be possible/likely marriage-of Bintá

   ‘It is possible/likely Bintá's marriage’ =
   ‘Bintá's marriage is likely/possible’

c. *[e]|i yâ fi kyâu [NP tâfiyâ gidâ yânzulî]
       3ms.-perf. exceed good/nice/better going home now

   ‘It is much better going home now’
d. *[e]i tīlās nē [NP kōmāwā gidā]i
   necessary cop. returning/going back home

   'It is necessary returning/going back home'

e. *[e]i watakilā nē [NP sāye-n sābuwa-r mōtā]i
   probably cop. buying-of new-of car

   'It is probable/possible buying a new car'

f. *[e]i rashī-n tunānī nē [NP ci-n bāshī-n nan]i
   lack-of thinking cop. eating-of loan-ref. that

   'It is senseless/a bad idea getting that loan'

The answer seems to be no. As we can see from these examples, when a nominalized complement occurs in post-CTE position, it cannot be nominalized (with a few restrictions to be discussed in the chapter on complementation of nominalized clauses). In other words, these examples indicate that a subject complement in subjunctive cannot be nominalized when it occurs in post-predicate position of most of the CTEs under discussion. Let me now then turn to the possibility of tensed complements occurring as propositional subject complements to these CTEs.

2.2.2.3 Propositional Complements Cannot be Tensed.

With the exception of a few CTEs under study (see below), complements to these CTEs cannot be tensed as illustrated in the following examples:

(14)

a. *[e]i yā kāmātā [IP Tankō yā biyā hārājī]i
   3ms.-perf. be fitting/better Tankō 3ms.-perf. pay tax

   'It is/was fitting/better that Tankō paid taxes'

b. *[e]i yā kyāutu [IP [e] nā gyārā halī-n-ā]i
   3ms.-perf. be good 1s.-perf. mend behavior-of-me

   'It is/was better/nice/desirable that I behaved appropriately'
c. *[^e]_i yā hāramtā [^p [e] kunā ci-n ʊŋgùlu]_i
   3ms.-perf. be unlawful 2pl.-cnt. eating-of vulture

   'It is/was unlawful/disallowed/prohibited that you are eating vulture' =
   'It is/was unlawful/prohibited/disallowed for you eating vulture'

d. *[^e]_i yanā dā wūyā [^p [e] zâ-i yi aurē banal]_i
   3ms.-cnt. with difficult 1fut.-3ms. do marriage this year

   'It is/was impossible that he will get married this year'

e. *[^e]_i bā shi dā kyāu [^p [e] zā kâ zâgi mutânē]_i
   neg. it with good/nice 1fut.-2ms. abuse/insult people

   'It is/was not good that you will abuse/insult people'

(15) a. *[^e]_i tilâs nē [^p Aabù tanâ kómâwâ gidâ]_i
   necessary cop. Aabù 3fs.-cnt. returning home

   'It is/was necessary that Aabù is returning home'

b. *[^e]_i wâjibî nē [^p [e] kanâ yi-n Sallâh]_i
   obligatory cop. 2ms.-cnt. doing-of Sallâh Prayer

   'It is/was obligatory that you are Praying (=Sallâh)'

c. *[^e]_i hârâmûn nē [^p [e] kâ shä giyâ]_i
   unlawful/forbidden cop. 2ms.-perf. drink alcohol

   'It is/was unlawful that you drank alcohol'

d. *[^e]_i rashî-n tûnânî nē [^p [e] kâ-kân ci bāshi-n nan]_i
   lack-of thinking cop. 2ms.-hab. eat loan-ref. that

   'It is a bad idea/foolish that you get/receive that loan'

e. *[^e]_i bâ abî-n kûnyâ bâ nē [^p [e] zâ-i kwâna ---
   neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. 1fut.-3ms. spend night
   à gida-n sürûka-n-sâ]_i
   at home-of in-laws-of him

   'It is not shameful/a shameful thing that a person/one will sleep overnight
   at his in-laws' house'
These examples clearly show that tensed complements cannot occur as propositional subjects to these CTEs under study. If however certain conditions are not imposed most of these sentences will be grammatical. But note that even with this conditions, there are still some dubious cases (see below). I discuss these in the next two subsections beginning first with a brief discussion on some discourse facts.

2.2.2.4 Some Discourse Facts.

Let me now briefly demonstrate why such sentences should be considered as separate sentences. First consider a situation where there are two speakers A and B, where speaker A makes an assertion/statement while speaker B responds to such an assertion/statement, indicating that such a proposition is likely, probable, possible, desirable/better/appropriate, difficult or impossible, etc. That is the CTE can stand alone with empty complement. Consider the following:

(16) Speaker A: [Ip Tankò yā biyā hàràjì].
    Tankò 3ms.-perf. pay tax

    ‘Tankò has paid the taxes’

Speaker B: Tô, [Ip [e] yā kàmātâ]./[bā-i kàmātâ ba].
    well/o.k., 3ms.-perf. be better neg.-it be fitting neg.

    ‘Well, it is better/desirable’ // ‘It is not fitting/desirable’

(17) Speaker A: Gâ wasu [çp wai [Ip [e] sù Mùsùlmì nê], ---
    here are some (people) comp. they Muslim cop.

    (àmmà) [Ip [e] sunâ shâ-n giyâ]].
    but 3ms.-cnt. drinking-of alcohol

    ‘Here are some people who happen to be Muslims and drinking alcohol’
Speaker B: (Kāi!) [IP [e] yā hàramtā ([IP [e] sù shā)]).  
3ms.-perf. be unlawful 3ms.-subj. drink

'What!, it is prohibited/forbidden (that they should drink (it))'

(18) Speaker A: [IP Audù zà-i yi aurē bàdì].
Audù 1fut.-3ms. do marriage next year

'Audù will get married next year'

Speaker B: [IP [e] mài yiwuwā nē]/[bà [e] mài yiwuwā ba nē].
has possibility cop. neg. has be possible neg. cop.

'It is possible/probable/likely' / 'It is not possible'

(19) Speaker A: [IP Bàlā yánā sò-n Bintā].
Bàlā 3ms.-cnt. loving-of Bintā

'Bàlā is in love with Bintā'

Speaker B: [IP [e] watakīlā (nē)].
probably cop.

'Well, it is probable/likely'

If we look at these examples, we can see that in a specific discourse context, it is clear that it is possible for speaker A to use a tensed complement, and the speaker B to use a CTE clause, which may either stand alone or be followed by an extra assertion for or against the proposition made by the speaker A. That is the CTE can stand alone with empty complement or be followed by another complement clause as illustrated in (17B).

Furthermore, in these examples we can see that the English word “it”, is represented as null in Hausa and has a proposition as its “referent”. Here the proposition to which reference is made is a separate sentence, which just happens to follow. Similarly, when speaker B uses the negative form of the CTEs, the sentences becomes grammatical as illustrated in some of the examples. Now what about subjunctive complements?

We have so far seen that it is possible to put a tensed complement in front of the CTE (with an intonational break). And it is also possible to separate the matrix clause
from the complement clause as the preceding examples illustrate. With regard to the latter case if instead of tensed clause the speaker A uses a subjunctive complement, the sentence becomes ungrammatical with some CTEs depending on the contexts as the following examples illustrate:

\[(20)\] Speaker A: \[\vert P\ \text{Audù yà yi aurè bàdi}.\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Audù} & \quad 3\text{ms.-subj. do marriage next year} \\
\text{'Audu should get married next year'} &
\end{align*}
\]

Speaker B: \[*\vert P\ [e] mái yiwuwā nē [e]].
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{has possibility cop.} &
\end{align*}
\]

'It is possible/likely'

\[(21)\] Speaker A: \[\vert P\ \text{Aabù tà dàwù gida-n miji-n-tà}.\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Aabù} & \quad 3\text{fs.-subj. return house-of husband-of-her} \\
\text{'Aabu should return to her husband's house'} &
\end{align*}
\]

Speaker B: \[*\vert P\ [e] yà yiwu [e]].
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{3ms.-2fut. be possible/likely} &
\end{align*}
\]

'It is possible/likely'

\[(22)\] Speaker A: \[\vert P\ [e] kà sō Bintà].
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{2ms.-subj. like/love Bintà} &
\end{align*}
\]

'Stou should love/like Binta'

Speaker B: \[*\vert P\ [e] watakîlā nē [e]].
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{probably cop.} &
\end{align*}
\]

'It is probable/likely'

But where a CTE like \(yà kàmàtà\) and those similar to it is uttered, the sentence becomes grammatical as indicated in the following:
(23) Speaker A: [ɪp Tanko yâ biyâ hârâjî].
    Tanko 3ms.-subj. pay tax
    ‘Tanko should pay taxes’

Speaker B: Tô, [ɪp [e] yâ kâmâtâ].
    well, 3ms.-perf. be better/desirable
    ‘Well, it is better/desirable’

(24) Speaker A: [ɪp Aabù tâ kômâ gidâ-n miji-n-tâ].
    Aabù 3fs.-subj. return house-of husband-of-her
    ‘Aabù should return to her husband’s house’

Speaker B: [ɪp [e] yâ dai dâcê].
    3ms.-perf. prt. be better/suitable
    ‘It would have been better/appropriate/desirable’

There are also certain instances where an anaphoric elements such as wannân/wânnan ‘this/that’, hakà(n) ‘this/thus’, or yî-n hakà (-n) ‘doing that/thus’, can be used. These elements refer to the assertion/statement” made by the speaker A. In this situation most of the ungrammatical sentences illustrated above can become grammatical when such a Pro-form is used. These sentences can also be grammatical with subjunctive complement used by the speaker A as a statement as illustrated in the following:

(25) Speaker A: [ɪp Audù kà yi aurê bàdî].
    Audù 2ms.-subj. do marriage next year
    ‘Audu should get married next year’

Speaker B: Tô, [ɪp wannân zâ-i kâmâtâ].
    well, this 1fut.-3ms. be better/desirable
    ‘Well, this will be better/desirable’
(26) Speaker A: [ɪp [e] kí kōmā gīda-n miji-n-ki].
2fs.-subj. return home-of husband-of-you

'You should go back to your husband's house'

Speaker B: Kāi! Inā! [ɪp wannān zā-i yi wūyā].
wow no way this 1fut.-3ms. do difficulty/hard

'Wow! no way! this will be impossible'

(27) Speaker A: [ɪp Aabū tā säi sābo-n gidāl].
Aabū 3fs.-subj. buy new-of house

'Aabu should buy a new house'

Speaker B: [yɪ yī-n hakhān], [ɪp bā zā-i yi kyāu ba].
doing-of this/thus neg. 1fut.-3ms. do good neg.

'Doing this, it will not be good/nice'

(28) Speaker A: [ɪp [e] mú tāfī gidā yānzu].
3ms.-subj. go home now

'Audu should get married next year'

Speaker B: [ɪp wannān bā māi yiwu[wā bā nē].
this neg. has possibility neg. cop.

'This is not possible/likely'

(29) Speaker A: [ɪp Aabū tā dāwō gīda-n miji-n-tā].
Aabū 3fs.-subj. return house-of husband-of-her

'Aabu should return to her husband's house'

Speaker B: [ɪp wannān bā zā-i yiwu ba].
this neg. 1fut.-3ms. be possible/likely neg.

'It is possible/likely'

(30) Speaker A: [ɪp [e] kā sō Bintā].
2ms.-subj. like/love Bintā

'You should love/like Binta'
Speaker B: [IP [VP yi-n hakà] watakilà nē].
              doing-of this probably cop.

'Training this is probable/likely'

It is clear that this brief demonstration indicates that these post-CTE tensed
"complements" must be considered as separate sentences. In these cases the CTE may
superficially look like taking tensed complements on the surface, but it is not as
demonstrated in the above examples. Note further that, in the above examples we can see
that the English word "it", is null in Hausa and has a proposition as its "referent". The
proposition to which the reference is made is a separate sentence, which just happens to
follow. Since it is claimed that a subjunctive complement cannot precede the modal
expression, we would not expect a tensed "complement" to appear there either. So, for
pragmatic reasons, it would be a little strange for someone to say:

(31) a. *[IP Audù yā tàfi gidāl(,) [IP [e] yanā dà kyāu].
              Audù 3ms.-perf. go home 3ms.-cnt. with good/nice

       'That Audu has gone home, it is/was nice'

   b. *[IP Bàlā zā-i ãuri Bintà(,)] [IP [e] yā kàmātà].
              Bàlā 1fut.-3ms. marry Bintà 3ms.-perf. be better

       'That Bala will marry Binta, it is better/desirable/fitting'

where the tensed complement can be considered as occurring outside of the root IP, or in
the following where it is assumed to occur in the specifier position of the root IP (with or
without a pause after the complement):

(32) a. *[IP Audù yā biyā bāshi-n(,) yanā dà kyāu].
              Audù 3ms.-perf. pay loans-ref. 3ms.-cnt. with good

       'That Audu paid the loans is/was nice/good'
b. *[IP Balā zā-i ãuri Bintâ(,) yă kămatâ].
   Bāla 1fut.-3ms. marry Bintā 3ms.-perf. be better/fitting
   '(That) Bala will marry Binta is better/desirable'

These are all ungrammatical, though one could imagine it as someone uttering it out of thinking to himself. However, it seems to me that this is only acceptable when uttered with an intonational break as indicated with the comma and headed by a complementizer céwā or wai "that" (to be discussed later), as opposed to say:

(33) a. *[IP [e] mú biyā bāshi-n(,) yanā dā kyāu].
   1pl.-subj. pay loans-ref. 3ms.-cnt. with good
   '(That) we should pay the loans is/was nice/good'

b. *[IP [e] ki yi aure bana(,) yă yi kyāu].
   2fs. do marriage this year 3ms.-perf. do good/nice
   '(That) you should get married this year is good'

with subjunctive complement in the specifier of IP which seems bad to me with or without the intonational break (I will take up this matter where they can be transformed to grammatical ones). It is therefore clear now that these tensed sentences (see also the next subsection on some apparent tensed complements) can best be regarded as "afterthoughts" in a kind of right dislocated position, hence, the use of a pause before most of these CTEs. I conclude therefore that they are not complements to the CTEs under study.

2.2.2.5 Some Apparent Cases of Propositional Tensed Complements.

In subsection 2.2.2.3 above we have seen that sentences with tensed complements following these CTEs are ungrammatical. There are however a few instances where we get grammatical ones. The first case involves instances where the
CTE can be followed by a tensed complement optionally headed by a complementizer cēwā or wai meaning 'that' (to be discussed in detail in chapter 3) respectively. Another case is where some of the CTEs may be followed by a pause, an adverbial clause, or sometimes a simple PP. And most of the CTEs that may take such tensed clauses include some of the possibility, probability, likely, and certainty groups such as māi yiwuwā nē, 'it is possible/likely' yà/tà yiwu, 'it is possible/likely' watakīlā nē, 'it is probability/likely', etc., as well as some of the experiencer groups like yanā V wà X NP ‘it verb X NP’, yanā V/VN NP ‘it verb/verbal noun NP’ etc. And in most cases there is a pause before the CTEs. With some of the CTEs, the tensed clauses may follow them without necessarily any pause. This is mostly where the complementizer is not present. First consider instances where the CTE is followed by a tensed complement optionally headed by a complementizer cēwā or wai:

(34) a. [e] ī yà yiwu(,) [CP (cēwā) [IP Audū yā tafī]]j
   3ms.-2fut. be possible that Audū 3ms.-perf. leave
   ‘It is possible/likely that Audu has left’

b. [e] ī yanā bā ni māmāki(,) [CP (cēwā/wai) ---
   3ms.-cnt. give-dat. me surprise that
   [IP [e] kā kāsā gamā aiki-n dá wuri]]j.
   2ms.-perf. be unable finish work-ref. with early
   ‘It surprises me that you failed to finish the work early’

c. [e] ī māi yiwuwā nē(,) [CP (cēwā) [IP Ali zā-i tafī]]j.
   has possibility cop. that Ali 1fut.-3ms. leave
   ‘It is possible/likely that Ali will leave/go’

Note that the complement clause in (34a) for instance is not an object of the intransitive verb yiwu, ‘be possible/likely’, but rather a postposed subject of the whole predicate expression yà yiwu, ‘it will be possible/likely’. It is however similar to other
cēwā/wai clauses in the sense that (a) the cēwā/wai can be deleted, and (b) it is semantically associated with the CTE yā yiwu. In these sentences and also in those where there is a pause before the CTE, I assume that the two clauses (i.e. the root -CTE clause and the post-CTE clause) are separate. Note that it is hard to realize the presence of a pause in a written text. It is also plausible to assume that in cases of these apparent tensed clauses following these CTEs, there is actually a “concealed” complement that occurs before the CTEs which has the meaning “one/someone to say/see that” or “to assume/consider that”, “the fact/idea/theory that”. In other words we may assume that the complement is underlyingly there but is omitted in the examples given earlier. Note that the subject of such a complement does not have to be only the impersonal one. Similarly, the verb in the subjunctive complement also does not have to be cē ‘say’). The following illustrate the presence of such a concealed complement (see also Mair 1990 for English examples):

(35) a. [e]i zā-i dācē(,) [IP [e] à cē [IP Audū yā ---- 1fut.-3ms. be suitable Imp.-subj. say Audū 3ms.-perf.

gamā aiki-n-sà yau)]i.
finish work-of-him today

'It would/will be nice for one to say that Audu has finished his work today’

b. [e]i yanā dā wūyā [IP [e] à cē [IP [e] zā kā --- 3ms.-ctn. with difficulty/hard Imp.-subj. say 1fut.-2ms.

iyà biyà-n bāshi-n dā wuri)]i.
be able paying-of loan-ref. with early

'It is/was impossible/unlikely to say that you could pay the loan early’

c. [e]i yanā bā ni māmāki(,) [CP [e] à cē --- 3ms.-ctn. give-dat. me surprise Imp.-subj. say
[IP Ali yanâ zâgi-n 'yâ'ya-n-sâ]i.
Ali 3ms.-cnt. insulting-of children-of-him

'It surprises me to say that (= the fact that) Ali insults/abuses his children'

d. [e]i yanâ dâmû-n-â(,) [CP [e] à cè ---
3ms.-cnt. worrying-of-me Imp.-subj. say

[IP [e] kînâ tsiîkârî-n mîjî-n-ki à fîîlî]i.
3fs.-rel. perf. tickling-of husband-of-you at field

'It worries me if/when you tickle your husband openly'

a. [e]i yâ yiwu(,) [CP (cêwâ) [IP Audû yâ tâfî]i
3ms.-2fut. be possible that Audû 3ms.-perf. leave

'It is possible/likely that Audu has left'

b. [e]i yanâ bâ ni mâmäki(,) [CP (cêwâ/wai) ---
3ms.-cnt. give-dat. me surprise that

[IP [e] kâ kâsâ gamâ aiki-n då wurî]i.
2ms.-perf. be unable finish work-ref. with early

'It surprises me that you failed to finish the work early'

(36) a. [e]i hârâmûn nê(,) [CP idan [IP [e] kâ shâ giyâ]i
forbidden cop. if/when 2ms.-perf. drink alcohol

'It is/was unlawful if you drank alcohol'

b. [e]i rashî-n tûnâni nê, [CP idan [IP [e] ka-kân ci àladê]i
lack-of thinking cop. if 2ms.-hab. eat pig

'It is a bad idea/foolish if you (habitually) eat pork'

c. [e]i bâ abî-n kunyâ ba nê(,) [CP idan [IP [e] yanâ ---
neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. if 3ms.-cnt.

kwâna à gida-n sûrûka-n-sâ]i
at home-of in-laws-of him

'It is not a shameful thing if he sleeps overnight at his in-laws' house'
d. [e]i mài yìwuwà nè(,) [çp idan [iP e] yā sàyi mòtâ]]i has possibility cop. if 3ms.-perf. buy car

'It is/was possible/likely if/when he has bought a car'

c. [e]i mài yìwuwà nè(,) [çp (cèwà) [iP Àli zà-i tâfi]]i has possibility cop. that Àli 1fut.-3ms. leave

'It is possible/likely that Ali will leave/go'

Note that the pleonastic use of the verb ‘say’ and some other verbs of propositional attitude is also very frequent in English as well. Mair (1990:25) provides examples like the following:

(37) ‘I often think’, Treece said rather smugly, ‘that it’s equally true to say that genius is an infinite capacity for faking pains’. (pp. 25 #23).

(38) ... and to/say that they are - more brutal than any other section of the community #just/simply isn’t true# - (pp. 25 # 24).

But even Mair herself admits that “strictly speaking, these sentences are slightly incongruous. Only the statement themselves (i.e. the that-clauses) can be true or false, but not the act of saying them” (pp. 25). Furthermore, in a footnote she continues to note that “note that such pleonastic infinitives occur only with predicates expressing absolute truth or falseness but not with those denoting degrees of likelihood (cf. ‘It’s just not probable/likely to say that the earth is flat’). Sentence-initial ‘to say that’ is often similar to idiomatic collocations such as the fact/idea/theory that. It helps speakers to avoid highly marked non-extrapolated that-subject clauses .... (pp. 242)”.

Now, let us consider first, cases where a conditional tensed clause may follow these CTEs:

(39) a. [e]i yā dácè(,) [çp idan [iP Audù yā àuri Bintà]]i 3ms.-perf. be suitable if/when Audù 3ms.-perf. marry Bintà

'It would/will be nice if/when Audu had married Binta'
b. [e] yanâ dà wuyá.(,) [CP idan [IP [e] zâ kâ iyâ ----
   3ms.-cnt. with difficulty/hard if/when 1fut.-2ms. be able
   biyâ-n bâshi-n dâ wur[i].
   paying-of loan-ref. with early

   'It is/was impossible/unlikely if you could pay the loan early'

c. [e] yanâ bâ ni mâmåki(,) [CP idan ----
   3ms.-cnt. give-dat. me surprise if/when
   [IP Áli yanâ zâgi-n 'yâ'ya-n-sâ][i].
   Áli 3ms.-cnt. insulting-of children-of-him

   'It surprises me if/when Ali insults/abuses his children'

d. [e] yanâ dâmû-n-â(,) [CP idan ----
   3ms.-cnt. worrying-of-me if/when
   [IP [e] kinâ tsikâri-n miji-n-ki à ñûâ][i].
   3fs.-rel. perf. tickling-of husband-of-you at field

   'It worries me if/when you tickle your husband openly'

(40) a. [e] hârâmûn nê(,) [CP idan [IP [e] kâ shâ giyâ][i]
   forbidden cop. if/when 2ms.-perf. drink alcohol

   'It is/was unlawful if you drank alcohol'

b. [e] rashi-n tûnâni nê, [CP idan [IP [e] ka-kân ci âladê][i]
   lack-of thinking cop. if 2ms.-hab. eat pig

   'It is a bad idea/foolish if you (habitually) eat pork'

c. [e] bâ âbi-n kunyâ ba nê(,) [CP idan [IP [e] yanâ ----
   neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. if 3ms.-cnt.
   kwâna à gida-n sûrûka-n-sâ][i]
   at home-of in-laws-of him

   'It is not a shameful thing if he sleeps overnight at his in-laws' house'

d. [e] mái yîwuwâ nê(,) [CP idan [IP [e] yâ sàyi môtâ][i]
   has possibility cop. if 3ms.-perf. buy car

   'It is/was possible/likely if/when he has bought a car'
There are however certain cases where even if there is a pause before the CTE, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. The following are ungrammatical:

(41) a. *[{\textit{e}i} lall\textbar \textit{n\textbar{e}}, [\textit{CP idan [\textit{IP Aud\textbar{u} yan\textbar{a} gid\textbar{a}]i.}}
certainly cop. if/when Aud\textbar{u} 3ms.-cnt. home

'\textit{It is certain if/when Audu is at home now}''

b. *[{\textit{e}i} til\textbar{as} n\textbar{e}(,) [\textit{CP idan [\textit{IP Aab\textbar{u} tan\textbar{a} kom\textbar{a}w\textbar{a} gid\textbar{a}]i}}
necessary cop. if Aab\textbar{u} 3fs.-cnt. returning home

'\textit{It is/was necessary if Abu is returning home}''

c. *[{\textit{e}i} w\textbar{a}jib\textbar{i} n\textbar{e}(,) [\textit{CP idan [\textit{IP [ \textit{e} kan\textbar{a} y\textbar{i}\textbar{n} Sall\textbar{a}h}]i}}
obligatory cop. if/when 2ms.-cnt. doing-of Sall\textbar{a}h

'\textit{It is/was obligatory if/when you are Praying}''

The ungrammaticality of these sentences may have something to do with the semantics of the CTE and the TAM used in the post-CTE clause (a discussion of this will require an in-depth semantic study of the CTEs and the clauses following them. I therefore leave this issue open). But note that when these sentences are uttered as they are, they seem to be incomplete sentences. However, when they are followed by certain clauses, they then become grammatical. What is important here is that adverbial tensed clauses may follow some of the CTEs under study. When they do however, it should not be construed that they are complements to the CTEs. They are actually adjunct clauses. Here, we may recall that comparable English sentences with predicates like the ones in these Hausa sentences at one time have been claimed that their final clauses (i.e. the conditional clauses) function as "subjects", but they cannot however be generated by an extraposition rule (see Jackendoff 1977:97). If these "when/if" clauses actually function like subjects in the same way their subjunctive counterparts we saw above do, then it should be possible to front
them. That is to occur in the pre-CTE position. This however is not borne out, since some of the CTEs do not seem to allow this fronting. Consider the following:

(42) a. \[\text{[Cp idan [Ip Audù yā àuri Bintà], (wannàn lallai), if Audù 3ms.-perf. marry Bintà this surely [Ip [e] yā dàcè]. 1fut.-3ms. be suitable/nice} \]

‘If/when Audu had married Binta, (this indeed), (it) is nice/good’

b. \[\text{[Cp idan [Ip [e] kíná tsikāri-n miji-n-ki à fíī hakà], if/when 2fs.-cnt tickling-of-of husband-of-you at field this [Ip [e]i yanà dámù-n-ā matukà]. 3ms.-cnt. worrying-of-me extremely} \]

‘If/when you tickle your husband openly this way, it worries me so much’

---

c. \[\text{[Cp idan [Ip [e] zä kā iyyà biyà-n bāshi-n dà wuri]], if 1fut.-2ms. be able paying-of loan-ref. with early [Ip [e]i yanà dà kyāu]. 3ms.-cnt. with nice/good} \]

‘If you could pay the loan early, it is nice/good’

---

d. \[\text{*[Cp idan [Ip [e] zä kā iyyà biyà-n bāshi-n dà wuri]], if 1fut.-2ms. be able paying-of loan-ref. with early [Ip [e]i yanà dà wùyà]. 3ms.-cnt. with difficulty/hard} \]

‘If you could pay the loan early, it is impossible/difficult/hard’

---

e. \[\text{*[Cp idan [Ip Āli yā sāyi sābuwa-r mōtâ]], ---- if Āli 3ms.-perf. buy new-of car [Ip [e]i mái yiwwüwā nē]. has possibility cop.} \]

‘If/when Ali has bought a new car, it is possible/likely’
As we can see from these examples, not all predicates will allow this fronting (compare the sentences in (42a-c) with those in (42d-e). A clear example is mài yìwuwā nè, yanā yìwuwā, and yanā dā wùyā as seen in the above examples. Note that these CTEs and those mentioned in (41) above require another clause or complement in the subjunctive as illustrated in the following:

(43) a. [Cp idan [Ip [e] zā kā iyā biyā-n bāshi-n dā wuri]], if 1fut.-2ms. be able paying-of loan-ref. with early
[Ip [e] yanā dā wùyā [Ip [e] sù kai kā kōtū]].
3ms.-cnt. with difficulty/hard 3ms.-subj. take you court

‘If you could pay the loan early, it is impossible that they would take you to court’

b. [Cp idan [Ip Ali yā/yà sàyi sàbuwa-r mōtā]], --
if Ali 3ms.-perf./rel.-perf. buy new-of car
[Ip [e] mài yìwuwā nè [Ip [e] yā bā ni tsōhuwā-r]i has possibility cop. 3ms.-subj. give me old-ref.

‘If/when Ali has bought a new car, it is possible/likely that he will give me the old one’

Furthermore, this possibility may sometimes depend very much on the kind of adverbial conditional clause that is used. Let me now turn to other cases where a temporal, manner tensed adverbial clause or a relative clause follows these CTEs. Consider the following:

(44) a. [e]i yā yi kyāu [Cp tundā ---- 3ms.-perf. do good/nice/better since
[Ip Audū yā/yà biyā bāshi-n dā wuri]], Audū 3ms.-perf./rel.-perf. pay loan-ref. with early

‘It is/was better/nice since Audu has paid the loans early’

b. [e]i yā yi kyāu [Cp dā ---- 3ms-perf. do good/nice/better that/for/by
\[ [\text{IP } \text{e k}a \quad \text{g}am\text{a a}ki-n \text{ y}au]]_{i}. \\
\text{2ms.-rel.-perf. finish work-ref. today} \\
\]

'It is/was much better that/when you completed the work today'

c. \[ [\text{IP } \text{e l}i \text{ y}an\text{a} \quad \text{b}a \quad \text{n}i \text{ m}am\text{\=a}ki \text{ [CP y}add\text{a} \quad \text{---} \\
\quad \text{3ms.-cnt. give-dat. me surprise how} \\
\quad \text{]}_{i}. \\
\]

'\text{It surprises me how Ali insults/abuses his children}'

d. \[ [\text{IP } \text{e l}i \text{ y}an\text{a} \quad \text{d}am\text{\=u}-n-a \text{ [CP }\text{ duk} \text{ l}\text{\=ok\=aci}-n \text{ d}a \quad \text{---} \\
\quad \text{3ms.-cnt. worrying-of-me all time-def. that} \\
\quad \text{]}_{i}. \\
\]

'\text{It worries me any time that/whenever you tickle your husband openly}'

e. \[ [\text{IP } \text{e l}i \text{ m}ai \text{ yi}wuw\text{a} \quad \text{n}e \text{ [CP t}un \text{ t}\text{\=u}ni \text{ (m}a) \quad \text{---} \\
\quad \text{has possibility cop. long long ago prt.} \\
\quad \text{]}_{i}. \\
\]

'\text{It is/was possible/likely that (long ago) Ali has bought the new car}'

These examples indicate that a temporal/manner adverbial tensed clause or a relative clause may follow some of the CTEs as adjuncts. Like in the case of the conditional clauses, it should not be construed that they are complements to the CTEs. This is also clear if the clauses are fronted as in the following:

(45) a. \[ [\text{CP y}add\text{a} \text{ [IP Ali y}ak\text{\=e} \quad \text{z}agi-n \quad y\text{\=a}ya-n-s\text{\=a}]], \quad \text{---} \\
\quad \text{how} \quad \text{Ali 3ms.-rel. perf. insulting-of children-of-him} \\
\]
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(wannan lamari), [iP [e] yanā bā ni māmāki].
this issue 3ms.-cnt. give-dat. me surprise

'The way (= how) Ali insults/abuses his children, this issue surprises me'

b. [CP lōkacı̈-n dā [iP Audū ya biyā bāshi-n --
time-def. comp.=when Audū 3ms.-rel.-perf. pay loan-ref.
dā wuri]], [iP [e] yā yi kyāu].
with early 3ms.-perf. do good/nice/better

'The time (=when) Audu paid the loan early, it was nice/good/appropriate'

c. [CP dā [iP Audū ya biyā bāshi-n --
comp.= when Audū 3ms.-rel.-perf. pay loan-ref.
dā wuri]], [iP [e] yā bā ni māmāki].
with early 3ms.-perf. give me surprise

'When Audu paid the loan early, it was surprised'

As we can see from these examples, with relative clauses and time adverbial clauses, this fronting is also possible. Note that the clause in sentence (45c) may also be a relative clause where the head noun is omitted. Here if the head noun is present the sentence is grammatical. If however it is omitted the sentence becomes not as good as when it is present, hence the contrast between the last two sentence (see Bagari 1976 for these types of clauses). Note also not all CTEs will allow this fronting just like in the earlier cases we saw with “if/when” clauses. This is illustrated in (46). But these sentences may be improved if another clause/complement follows the root clause or where there is a head noun as in (47b). These clauses must however be considered separate if they are to be considered as grammatical.

(46) a. *[CP dā [iP Audū ya biyā bāshi-n --
comp.= when Audū 3ms.-rel.-perf. pay loan-ref.
dà wuri], [IP e yanâ dà wūyā]. with early 3ms.-cnt. with difficult/hard

'When Audu paid the loan early, it was impossible/hard'

b. *[cp tun tuni [IP Ali yā/ya sāyī sābuwa-r mōtā]],
   long long ago Ali 3ms.-perf./rel.-perf. buy new-of car

[IP e]i māi yiwuwā nē.
   has possibility cop.

'Long ago Ali has bought a car, it is possible/likely'

(47) a. *[cp tun tuni [IP Ali yā/ya sāyī sābuwa-r mōtā]],
   long ago Ali 3ms.-perf./rel.-perf. buy new-of car

[IP e]i māi yiwuwā nē [IP e] yā bā ni tsōhuwā-r].
   has possibility cop. 3ms.-subj. give me old-ref.

'Long ago Ali has bought a new car, it is possible/likely that he will give me the old one'

b. [NP māgana-r [cp wa]i[cp tun tuni [IP Ali yā/ya ---
   talk/issue-def. that long ago Ali 3ms.-perf./rel.-perf.

sāyī mōtā]], [IP e]i māi yiwuwā nē.
   buy car has possibility cop.

'The saying that long ago Ali has bought a car, it is possible/likely'

As in the earlier ungrammatical sentences we saw above, another clause/complement of the CTEs must follow the CTEs before the sentences become grammatical. And the whole structure of the sentences would have to be altered an issue which I don’t intend to go into. One thing to note though is that, with predicates taking object clauses, there is no problem for a subjunctive sentence to occur as an adverbial clause. Discussion of this type of construction is also not our concern here (see Bagari 1976 for a detailed description of Hausa subjunctive adverbial clauses in general).

To conclude this subsection, it is clear through the discussion we had so far that even though the sentences exemplified above may superficially look like they are
propositional complements of the CTEs, they are however not. It seems to me therefore, that when these apparent tensed complements occur before these CTEs, they are not in the same sentence as the modal expressions. That is they actually occur as separate sentences, hence, the need for a pause before them. And any of these expressions could be used with a null complement which is understood to have been deleted. The question now is how can this be demonstrated? I turn to this issue now.

2.3 Subjunctive Propositional Complement in Pre-CTE Position.

In the previous sections I have discussed the overall surface form of sentences with CTEs which take subjunctive propositional complements. There, I briefly indicated that the general pattern is for the CTE to take a complement in subjunctive as its logical subject. In this respect I have shown that tensed clauses do not occur as subjects of the CTEs under study (as indicated in examples 14-15 above). But rather these tensed clauses occur as right dislocated afterthoughts) and, that nominalized complements do not occur in post-CTE position of these CTEs as well. And, from the examples given so far, it is clear that the expressions such as yā kāmātā, yā dācē, yā fi kyāu, dōlē nē, māi yiwuwā nē, saura kādan (nē) etc. can take propositional subjunctive complement in their post-predicate position as their surface structure subject. This seems to indicate that all these CTEs require that their logical clausal subject be in their post position. It should be noted that with some speakers, there must be a pause after the CTEs saurā kādan nē, and, that the copula nē after kādan should be deleted. It is therefore clear that it can be concluded that the examples discussed above indicate that both CTEs with morphological INFL and copular CTEs share the same properties in that (a) the form of their complements must be in subjunctive, (b) the complements cannot be nominalized (with few exceptions to be discussed), and finally, (c) the complements cannot be tensed. The question now is can this propositional subjunctive complement
appear in pre-CTE subject position as the logical subject in surface structure as is the case in a language like English? I turn to this issue next.

2.3.1 Complement Cannot be in Subject (Spec of IP) Position:

2.3.1.1 Complements of the yā kāmātā-group.

It is generally assumed in the literature that sentential subject (with a large number of complement taking predicates) may occur in the pre-predicate position (see Rosenbaum 1967, Hudson 1971, Delahunty 1983, McHugh 1984:4-5 and the references cited there). In Hausa, can a subjunctive propositional subject complement really occur in Spec of IP of the root clause as the logical surface structure subject as is found in English? Consider first the following examples from the yā kāmātā-group:

(48) a. *[IP [IP Tankò yà biyà hārāji] yà kāmātā].
   Tankò 3ms.-subj. pay tax 3ms.-perf. be fitting/better
   ‘(That) Tanko should pay taxes is fitting/appropriate/desirable’

b. *[IP [IP [e] kù gyārā halī-n-kù] yà dace].
   2pl.-subj. repair behavior-of-you 3ms.-perf. be suitable
   ‘(That) you should mend/correct your behavior is appropriate/desirable’

c. *[IP [IP [e] ki tàfī gida yàu] yà fi kyau].
   2fs.-subj. go home now 3ms.-perf. exceed good/nice
   ‘(That) you should go home now is much better’

d. *[IP [IP [e] mú yi atisāyè yanzu] yana da kyau].
   1pl.-subj. do exercise now 3ms.-cnt. with good/nice
   ‘(That) we should exercise is good’

e. *[IP [IP [e] â sāmi gòrò à L.A.] yana da wūyā].
   Imp.-subj. get/find kolanuts in L.A. 3ms.-cnt. with hard
   ‘(That) a person/one would find kolanuts in L.A. is impossible/difficult’
As is evident from the above examples, the answer to the above question is in the negative. That is in surface structure, subjunctive sentential subject in Hausa cannot remain in its deep structure canonical subject position. Thus the structure of such sentences can be represented roughly in a tree diagram like the following:

(49)

It seems that this structure is not possible because an IP cannot immediately dominate another IP within the same root clause. In fact we will see later that even if it dominates an NP/CP as is assumed in the literature the structure would still be ungenerable unless some kind of transformation is assumed to have taken place. This will be discussed in the section on the interaction of the CTEs, the subject complements, and the complementizers.

2.3.1.2 Complements of the Copular CTE-group.

If subjunctive propositional complement cannot remain in its deep structure position in the specifier position of the *yā kāmātā*-group of CTEs, what about the copular ones? In other words do the two types of CTEs differ or behave in the same
manner as we observed above when their logical subjects occur in post-CTE position? To find out this consider the following:

(50) a. *[IP [IP [e] kà àuri Bintà] dòlë nē].
   2ms.-subj. marry Bintà necessary cop.
   ‘(That) you should marry Binta is necessary’

b. *[IP [IP Aabù tà yi Sallàh] wājibī nē].
   Aabù 3fs.-subj. do prayer obligatory cop.
   ‘(That) Abu should pray is obligatory’

c. *[IP [IP [e] kù shā giyâ] hāramūn nē].
   2ms.-subj. drink alcohol unlawful cop.
   ‘(That) you should/for you to drink alcohol is unlawful’

d. *[IP [IP [e] nà sāyi sābuwa-r mōtā] mâi yiwuwa nē].
   1s.-subj. buy new-of car has possibility cop.
   ‘(That) I should buy a new car is possible/probable’

e. *[IP [IP [e] à gamà àbinci] saurā kiris nē].
   IMP.-subj. finish food remain a little cop.
   ‘(That) one should finish (cooking) the food remain a little bit of time/is almost’

f. *[IP [IP [e] kù ci bāshī dà yawâ] rashi-n tūnānī nē].
   2pl.-subj. eat loan with many lack-of thinking cop.
   ‘(That) you should take too many loans is a bad idea’

Looking at these sentences, it is clear that the same constraint that applies to the yā kamātā-group of CTEs is also applicable to the copular CTEs. This non-occurrence of the subjunctive propositional complement in pre-predicate position (within the root IP) is obligatory even where the subject of the complement is null as illustrated in some of the examples above. The structure of these sentences with copular CTEs as a whole may be represented roughly as follows:
From the foregoing description we can see that there is no doubt that these CTEs under discussion take subjunctive propositional subjects. But these propositional subjects cannot occur in sentence initial subject position of the complement taking expressions. If they do occur there, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. This is so if we consider the ungrammaticality of the examples in (48 and 50) where it becomes very clear that the subjunctive propositional subjects in Hausa do not occur in pre-CTE (Spec of IP) position in surface structure. Their preferred slot is at the end of the sentence (as we saw earlier in sentences illustrated in (11-12), indicating that all such clauses must in fact be in post-predicate positions at S-Structure. In other words I assume that in normal utterance, they do not occur in the specifier position of the root IP/S as indicated in the above tree diagrams. The question now is can we have a complementizer heading the postposed propositional subject and when the complement occur in pre-CTE position? I will defer this question until in chapter 3 on Hausa complementizers. Before that let me briefly discuss the role/status of the objects occurring after some of the CTEs given in 2.1.1 above.
2.4 On the Status of the NP in the Sequence [e] CTE + P + NP + CP/IP:

In the previous sections, I have shown that subjunctive propositional complements always follow the CTE whether the subject has overt or null subject. The question now is can we have an object NP immediately following the CTE before the postposed propositional complement? In other words will that NP be part of the matrix root clause as object or can it be the subject of the postposed propositional complement where that NP is preceded by such prepositions like àkàn, gà, and dà ‘on/about, to/for’, and with/to/for’ respectively? The aim of this subsection is then to find out the answer to this question. My discussion will however be brief.

There are certain instances where we find an extra NP between these CTEs and the postposed propositional complement. One such case is where an oblique or direct object follows the CTE (verbal, nominal, or copular word). First consider a case where a CTE with morphological INFN is followed by a PP:

2.4.1 CTEs with Morphological INFN (Verbal-Type):

(52) a. \[
\text{[e]i yā kāmātā [pp à gārē mūj]} \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting/better to/for us}
\]
\[
\text{[jp [e]j mú biyā hārājī dà wurilī]} \quad \text{1pl.-subj. pay tax with early}
\]

'It is fitting/better for us to pay taxes early'

b. \[
\text{[e]i yā kāmācē kāj [jp [e]j kā dainā kurbāwā]} \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting you 2ms.-subj. stop sipping}
\]

'It is better/fitting/desirable for you to stop drinking (alcohol)'

c. \[
\text{[e]i yā kāmāci Bàráu} \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting/better Bàráu}
\]
d. \([\text{IP } \{e\}_j \text{ yā } \text{ câncantà } [\text{pp } \text{ gā } \text{ dālibā-nj}]]\)---  
3ms.-perf. be suitable to students-ref.

\([\text{IP } \{e\}_j \text{ sù } \text{ bā } \text{ dā } \text{ himmā } \text{ à } \text{ kārātu-n-sūj}]]\)  
3pl.-subj. give-CAU. effort in study-of-them

'It is desirable for the students to give a concerted effort in/towards their studies’

e. \([\text{IP } \{e\}_i \text{ yā } \text{ câncāncē } \text{ kūj } ]\)---  
3ms.-perf. be fitting/appropriate/suitable you

\([\text{IP } \{e\}_j \text{ kū } \text{ taimākā } \text{ wā } \text{ jūnāl}]\)  
2pl.-subj. help dat. each other

'It appropriate/desirable for you to help each other’

f. \([\text{IP } \{e\}_i \text{ yā } \text{ câncānci } \text{ mutānē-nj } ]\)---  
3ms.-perf. be fitting/suitable people-ref.

\([\text{IP } \{e\}_j \text{ sù } \text{ taimākā } \text{ wā } \text{ jūnāl}]\)  
3pl.-subj. help dat. each other

'It appropriate/desirable for the people to help each other’

g. \([\text{IP } \{e\}_j \text{ yā } \text{ dācē } [\text{pp } \text{ 7gā/dā } \text{ Bālāj}]/[\text{pp } \text{ dā } \text{ shīj}] ]\)---  
3ms.-perf. be appropriate to/for/with Bāla with he

\([\text{IP } \{e\}_j \text{ yā } \text{ gyārā } \text{ hali-n-sāj}]\)  
3ms.-subj. mend behavior-of-him

'It is fitting/better for Bala/him to behave appropriately’

2.4.2 CTEs with Morphological INFL (Nominal-Type).

(53) a. \([\{e\}_i \text{ zā-i fi } \text{ dācēwā } [\text{pp } \text{ dā } \text{ sūj}]/[\text{pp } \text{ dā } \text{ mutānē-nj}]]\)---  
1fut.-3ms. exceed suitability to they to people-ref.
\[ [\text{IP [e]} \text{ j̓ su} \text{ dingā ziyyartā-r jūnāl}] \]
\[ 3\text{pl.-subj. keep on visiting-of each other} \]

'it will be more appropriate/proper/desirable for them/the people that they keep visiting each other/we visit each other more often'

b. \[ [\text{IP [e]} \text{ j̓ kī auri mīji na gārīl}] \]
\[ 3\text{ms.-cnt. with importance to you} \]

'it is important for you to marry a reliable/good husband'

c. \[ [\text{IP [e]} \text{ j̓ shī dā āmfānī [pp ē gārē kā]}] \]
\[ 2\text{fs.-subj. marry husband of good/reliable} \]

'it is useless/unimportant for you that you keep abusing/insulting people'

In these examples we can see that a PP can occur between the CTE and the postposed subject complement. The PP is part of the root clause though. Note that for some speakers, the sentences are much better if some of the CTEs are immediately followed by a CP/IP rather than being separated by a PP or when there is a pause before the PP, which may also indicate that the PP is part of the root clause. Other CTEs with morphological INFL that may take PP + CP/IP include the following: zā-i yī kūyāu gā ‘it will be nice to/for X’, zā-i yī saukī gā X ‘it will be easy to/for X’, zā-i yī wūyā/wāhālā gā X ‘it will be hard/difficult/impossible for X’, yā fī kūyāu gā X ‘it is much better for X’, yanā dā āmfānī gā X ‘it is important/useful to/for X’, yanā dā kyāu gā X ‘it is nice/good for/to X’, yanā dā muhimmancī gā X ‘it is important/essential to/for X’, yanā dā saukī gā X ‘it is easy for X’, yanā dā wūyā/wāhālā gā X ‘it is hard/difficult/impossible for X’, bā shī dā āmfānī gā X ‘it is not important for X’, bā shī dā āmfānī/kūyāu/muhimmancī ‘it is not important/nice/essential for X’, yanā bā wā X māmākī/hausūhī ‘it
surprises/annoys X', yanā dā ban haushi/māmāki gā X 'it is annoying/surprising to X', yanā gigītā X 'it frightens X', yanā yi wu wā gā X 'it is possible/likely for X', etc. Now let us consider cases with copular CTEs:

2.4.3 Copular CTEs.

(54)  a. [el]i tilās  nē [Ip ā gārē shijj] [Ip elj yā jē gidā]i
necessary cop. to/for him 3ms.-subj. go home

'It is necessary/obligatory for him to go home'

b. [elj dōle  nē [Ip ā gārē kijj] [Ip elj kij biyya ---
necessary cop. to you 2fs.-subj. pay

bāshi-n-ā dā wuri]
loan-of-me at early

'It is necessary on/upon you that you should pay back the loans early'

c. [el]i bābbā-n nauyī  nē [Ip ā kān kūj] [Ip elj kū ---
big-of responsibility cop. on you 2pl.-subj.
tāimākā wā jūnā]i
help dat. each other

'It is a big responsibility on/upon you that you should help each other'

d. [el]i wājibī  nē [Ip ā kān múj] [Ip elj mú yī Sahā]i
obligatory cop. on/upon us 1pl.-subj. do prayer

'It is obligatory on/upon us that he pray/to pray'

e. [elj hārāmūn nē [Ip ā gārē múj] [Ip elj mú shā ---
forbidden cop. to us 1pl.-subj. drink

giyā a kōwānē hāl|]i
alcohol in/at any/every condition/state

'It is forbidden for us to drink (any) alcohol under whatever/any condition'
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f. [e]₁ rash₁-n túnání nɛ [pp à gârē kâj] ----
  lack-of thinking cop. to/from you

[ıp [e]₁ kâ ci bâsh₁-n nan₁]i
  2ms-subj. eat loan-ref. that

'It is a bad/foolish idea for you to get/receive that loan'

g. bâ [e]₁ abî-n kunyâ bâ nɛ [pp gâ mûtûm]j--
  neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. to/for person

[ıp [e]₁ yâ kwâna à gida-n sûrûka-n-sâ]i
  3ms-subj. spend night at home-of in-laws-of him

'It is not shameful that a person sleep overnight at/in his in-laws' house'

Like cases with verbal or nominal CTEs, these examples with copular CTEs also follow
the same pattern. In other words a PP can occur between the copular word and the
postposed prepositional complement. The PP is part of the root clause though, and it is
always optional. Note that with copular CTEs, there are few CTEs that tend to lower the
grammaticality of the sentence (for some speakers) when the CTEs take a PP which is
then followed by a CP or IP. These sentences are illustrated in (55) below. The PP is also
always optional.

(55) a. ?[e]₁ mài yiwuwâ nɛ ?[pp à gârê ni]j [ıp [e]₁ nà ----
  has possibility cop. to/for me 1ms-subj.

  iyâ sàye-n sâbuwa-r môtâ]i
  be able buying-of new-of car

'It is possible/likely for me that I may be able to buy a new car'

b. ?[e]₁ watakiłâ nɛ ?[pp gâ masôyâ-n]j ----
  probably/perhaps cop. to lovers-ref.

[ıp [e]₁ sù yi aurë yânzul]i
  3pl-subj. do marriage now

'It is probable/possible for the lovers to get/be married now'
c. ʔ[e]i saurā kiris (nē) [PP ā gārē nij] -----
    remain a little bit cop. to/for me

    [IP [e]j nā gamā ʿabincī-n]i
    1s.-subj. finish food-ref.

'It remains a little bit (of time) for me to finish (cooking) the food'

From these examples, it became clear that CTEs like hāramūn nē, ḥālās nē, wājibi nē etc., may subcategorize for a PP followed by a CP or IP. However, they preferably take PPs + IPs not PPs + CPs. While CTEs like hāramūn nē, ḥālāk nē, wājibi nē, are optionally S-bar deleting predicates, CTEs like māi yiwuwa nē, saurā kiris nē, and a few others not mentioned do not freely take a PP + CP like the other copular CTEs exemplified in (53-55) above. In fact for most speakers māi yiwuwa nē and saurā kiris nē do not even take a PP object except of course in a parenthetical expression like saurā kiris nē, a ganin Aabū, tā gamā ʿaiqī-n ‘It remains a little bit of time, according to Aabū/in Aabū’s opinion, for her to finish the work’ (see chapter 3 on complementizers).

Finally, it should also be noted as I mentioned earlier, that there seems to be some differing grammaticality judgment on this issue. Some speakers reject the sentences in (55) for instance, some accept it, while still others are not sure whether the PP should be there or not. I therefore have to admit here that I have no clear-cut solution to this problem. It might be a lexical or morphological problem which I am not going to get into. I therefore use question marks before the sentences because of the native speakers' differences with respect to their grammaticality judgments. This indicates that these CTEs may actually prefer to take just bare IP complements where the S-bar/CP is assumed to have been deleted. The question is can the object of the preposition or the object that is directly govern by a verb function as the subject of the subjunctive propositional complement? I briefly discuss this issue now.
2.4.4 A PP Object Cannot be both the Object of the Prep. and at the Same Time the Subject of the Subjunctive Propositional Complement.

The main reason for bringing these examples is to find out if the noun complements to the prepositions such as gá (+ noun) ‘to/for’, à gárē (+ pronoun), ‘to (+ pronoun)’, àkán ‘on/about/with regard to’, dà ‘with’, or the NP governed by the matrix verb as in kâmāci A bdù or kâmācē shī may function as the subjects of the complement clauses as we find in a language like English where the preposition ‘for’ may sometimes be used as a complementizer in a ‘for-to’ complements.

2.4.4.1 Some Constituency Tests.

In the previous subsection I have indicated that in Hausa, a preposition and a noun following it form one constituent, that is, a PP. Therefore, those CTEs allowing PPs which may be followed optionally by a complementizer (as we shall see later) are not totally S-bar deleting CTEs in Hausa. I therefore assume that in Hausa there are no structures like the following for both CTEs with morphological INFL and copular CTEs:

(56) a. *[e]i yā kâmātā [çp gā [ıp mutânē-nj sù biyā
     3ms.-perf. be fitting/better for people-ref. 3pl.-subj. pay
     hārājī]i

     ‘It is fitting/better for the people to pay taxes’

b. *[e]i yanā yiwuwā [çp gā [ıp A bdùj yà sådu dà
     3ms.-cnt. be possible/likely to/for Audù 3ms.-subj. meet with
     Bintā à Kanō]i
     Bintā in Kano

     ‘It is possible/likely for Audu to meet Binta in Kano’
(57)  a. **[e]i wājībī nē [CP à kân [IP kōwāj yà yi Sallāh]]i**
    obligatory cop. on everyone 3ms.-subj. do prayer
    'It is obligatory on everyone that he/she should pray/do the Prayers'

c. **[e]i dōlē nē [CP (ā) gärē [IP nīj in tāfi dā wuri]]i**
    necessary cop. to me 1s.-subj. leave/go with early
    'It is necessary for me that I should leave/go early' =
    'It is necessary for me to leave/go early'

c. **[e]i māi yiwuwā nē [CP gā [IP Audūj yà sāyi gidā]]i**
    has possibility cop. to/for Audū 3ms-subj. buy house
    'It is possible/probable/likely for Audu to buy a house'

These examples show that a preposition like gā/ā gärē ‘to/for’, can never govern
the subject of the postposed complement across the IP. This indicates that it is not a
complementizer. The prepositional phrases clearly are complements to the matrix
predicate and the complement must follow them. This is clearer in the following where
both sentences are ungrammatical when the PP is moved to the end of the sentence and
the object of the preposition is bound by the subject of the complement:

(58)  a. **[e] yà kāmātə [IP [e]i yàj biyā hārājī ----
    3ms.-perf. be fitting 3ms.-subj. pay tax

    [pp gā Audūj]].
    for/to Audù
    'It is better that he pay taxes to/for Audù'

b. **[e] yà kāmātə [IP Audūj yàj biyā hārājī ----
    3ms.-perf. be fitting Audū 3ms.-subj. pay tax

    [pp gärē shiːj]].
    for/to him
    'It is better that he pay taxes to/for Audù'
Another piece of evidence that can be used to test this claim involves the possibility for fronting of the PP/AdvP to the beginning of the sentence. Consider the following:

(59) a. \[TP \{\text{TOP} \{\text{pp } gā \text{ Tankòj} \}, \{\text{IP } \text{Pro } yā \text{ kāmātā } \text{ for Tankò } \text{ 3ms.-perf. be fitting/desirable} \} \{\text{IP }[\text{e}]_i/j \text{ yā } \text{ biyā hārājī} \}\} \]

\[3ms.-subj. \text{ pay tax} \]

'For Tanko, it is better that he/j should pay taxes'

b. \[TP \{\text{TOP} \{\text{pp } gā \text{ Audūj} \}, \{\text{IP } [\text{e}] \text{ tīlās } \text{ nē } \text{ for Audū necessary cop.} \} \{\text{IP }[\text{e}]_i/j \text{ yā } \text{ kömā gidā} \}\} \]

\[3ms.-subj. \text{ return home} \]

'For Audu, it is necessary that he/j should return home'

(60) a. \[CP \{\text{pp } gā \text{ Tankòj nē } \{\text{IP } \text{Pro } y a \text{ kāmātā } \text{ for Tankò cop. 3ms.-rel.-perf. be fitting/desirable} \} \{\text{IP }[\text{e}]_j \text{ yā } \text{ biyā hārājī} \}\} \]

\[3ms.-subj. \text{ pay tax} \]

'It is/was to Tankoj that it is better that he/j pay the taxes'

b. \[CP \{\text{pp } gā \text{ Audūj nē } \{\text{IP } [\text{e}] \text{ tīlās } \text{ Ī } \text{ for Audū cop. necessary cop.} \} \{\text{IP }[\text{e}]_j \text{ yā } \text{ bà dā kudī-n} \}\} \]

\[3ms.-subj. \text{ give-CAU. money-ref.} \]

'lt is to Auduj that it is necessary that he/j should give the money'

These examples indicate that the PP can be topicalized (where the NP is set off by a pause) or Wh-moved to COMP by clefting. Notice that with clefting, the person who is to carry out the event/activity in the complement clause is someone other than the person in that is wh-moved to COMP. Whereas in the case of topicalized NP, the performer of the action to be carried out can either be the topicalized NP or someone else as indicated in the
coindexing of the two NPs. These issues will be discussed in chapters 4-7. This
possibility of preposing the whole PP confirms our claim that the NP object of the
preposition is not the subject of the propositional complement, but rather part of the
matrix clause. If it were the subject of the complement clause, we would expect the
sequence PP + IP/CP to be preposed by wh-movement or topicalized together as in the
following:

(61)  

\[ *[\text{IP} [\text{CP} [\text{PP gā Tankō [\text{IP Pro} yā biyā hārājī]]}] --- \\
\text{for Tankō 3ms.-subj. pay tax yā kāmātā]}, \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting/desirable/better} \]

For Tankō to pay taxes (it) is fitting/better/desirable'

\[ *[\text{IP} [\text{CP} [\text{PP gā Audū [\text{IP Pro} yā kōmā gidā]]}] --- \\
\text{for Audū 3ms.-subj. return home tīlās nē]}, \text{necessary cop.} \]

For Audū to return home (it) is necessary'

(62)  

\[ *[\text{TOP} [\text{IP gā Tankō}] [\text{IP Pro} yā biyā hārājī fal]]}, \\
\text{for Tankō 3ms.-subj. pay tax prt. [IP [e] yā kāmātā]}, \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting/desirable/better} \]

As for Tanko to pay taxes, (it) is fitting/better/desirable'

\[ *[\text{TOP} [\text{IP gā Audū}] [\text{IP Pro} yā kōmā gidā fal]], \\
\text{for Audū 3ms.-subj. return home prt. [IP [e] tīlās nē]}, \text{necessary cop.} \]

As for Audu to return home, (it) is necessary’
These examples show that when such wh-fronting or topicalization is done the sentence becomes ungrammatical. Since this movement operation is not possible, it then confirms our claim that the NP of the PP is not part of the propositional complement and cannot be subject of the complement as well. These sentences also indicate that Hausa does not have a homophonous complementizer like the English ‘for’ which may function as both a true preposition and a complementizer ‘for’. (see Bresnan 1972:77-92, Thompson and Silva 1977 and the references cited there). In Hausa, when a preposition like gâ occurs after a CTE, the NP after it must be an oblique object. The NP does not function as both the oblique object and at the same time the nominative subject of the propositional complement. If however the preposition is not there, the NP after the CTE is the subject of the complement clause. Furthermore, an object NP governed by the CTE (as in CTE + NP + CP/IP) is always part of the root clause.

2.4.5 General Conclusions.

The above examples show that the prepositions that head the object NP just before the CP/IP do not behave like the English preposition “for” or “of”. If Hausa has such prepositions the above sentences in (61-62) should be grammatical. However, these sentences will not be grammatical even if the preposition + NP are separated by a pause intonationally. That is if there is a break before the complement clause headed by the prepositions and the root IP, and whether the sequence is topicalized, clefted, or pseudo-clefted (these processes will be discussed in chapters 4-5). Other tests that can be used involve the binding and control relationships between the object PP and a subject or object occurring in the complement clause. For the moment it is possible to assume that there does not seem to be any syntactic evidence to show that in Hausa, in a sequence of a preposition + NP, such an NP object could be considered as the subject of the
propositional subject complement, or that a preposition like gâ can occur in the COMP position governing the specifier position of an IP of the root clause (see Rosenbaum 1967:106, and Thompson and Silva 1977 for discussion of English ‘for’ where it is claim that the English preposition ‘for’ in comparable contexts given above is a complementizer and at the same time the subject of the complement is also the object of the preposition).

Finally, it should be noted however, that this view on English subject clause of the type “for + NP + infinitive” is also disputed. Many scholars assume that the preposition in such a sequence is a ‘true’ preposition and the NP is its object forming a PP. The subject of the complemen clause is deleted under identity with the prepositional object (for this view or otherwise, see Aijmer 1972:91, Lasnik and Fiengo 1974:563, Menzel 1975:207, Bresnan 1972[1979]:264, Buysens 1987, Eagleson 1972, Faraci 1974, and Jørgensen 1975:134, 1981, 1982 and the references cited there).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 It is to be noted that CTEs like yà kasâncè, ‘it happened’, yà nûnà álām â-r/alâmu-n, ‘it appears/indicates’, yà filə à fili, ‘it appears clearly/it is clear’, which may take infinitival clauses in languages like English, cannot take subjunctive clauses in Hausa. The only CTE above that may take subjunctive sentential subject is kasâncè, but only when the INFL of the CTE is in the TAM other than the perfective, especially the future or continuative TAMs. In other words, it is possible only when the event/activity described in the propositional subject is not realized, hence, the non-occurrence of perfective TAM in the CTE if it is followed by a subjunctive complement. This possibility of kasâncè to take subjunctive propositional complement is illustrated in the following:

(i) [e] yanâ iyâ kasâncèwâ ----
    3ms.-cnt. be able to becoming/happenning/turning out

    [ip mútûm yà sâmì rahamâ] in yà yi irì-n wànnan aiki-n.
    person 3ms.-subj. get/find mercy if 3ms.-pst. do kind-ref. that work-ref.
    'It could happen for a person to be blessed (with mercy) if he has done such a work/activity'

(ii) [e] yà iyâ kasâncèwâ ----
    3ms.-2fut. be able to being/becoming/happenning/turning out

    [ip mútûm yà sâmì rahamâ] in yà yi irì-n wànnan aiki-n.
    person 3ms-subj. get/find mercy if 3ms.-pst. do kind-of. that act/work-ref.
    'It could happen for a person to be blessed (with mercy) if he has done such a work/activity'
(iii) [e] zâ-i iyâ kasâncêwâ ----
    1fut.-3ms. be able being/becoming/happening/turning out
[îp [e] mú iyâ sâmû-n rahâmâ ta yi-n irî-n wannân aikî].
    1pl.-subj. be able getting-of mercy by doing-of type-of this act
'It could happen that we might be blessed by doing this kind of activity'

2 Note that with some of these CTEs, the ungrammaticality of constructions may be due to some semantic mismatch between the CTE and the tensed complements. In other words, there may be a requirement of "TAM matching" between the two clauses. That is if the CTE is perfective, in most cases the clause will also preferably be in perfective. If the CTE has progressive TAM, the complement may also occur in progressive or future TAM. Similarly, if the CTE is in the future TAM, the complement may also take a future or progressive TAM. With the latter two, this is understandable, since both progressive and future TAM are usually required with an undetermined propositional complements. And this is why in cases where a subjunctive occurs, it is also possible for future or progressive TAM to occur. I will not however go into this issue since doing so will take me off the course.

3 According to some speakers, some of these sentences can be acceptable only when certain contexts are provided. Some of such contexts are (a) where the speaker is talking to him/herself, (b) where the subjunctive sentence is uttered with a high pitch, in a kind of reprimanding manner, or, (c) as an advise to the addressee. But even these few speakers claim that the most natural way to utter all the sentences is for the complement sentence to occur in post-CTE position.
CHAPTER 3  The System of Hausa Complementizers Heading Subjunctive
Propositional Complements.

3.0  Introduction

In this chapter I shall give a descriptive survey of some of the complementizers and particles introducing complements and clauses. By a survey I mean that the description is not going to be a complete one since this dissertation is mainly on subjunctive propositional complements and nominalized complements of CTEs under discussion. The chapter is therefore concerned with two issues. The first is to present a description of complementizers, since there is a need to set up grammatical category of complementizers in any description of complementation, and the second is to establish the facts that in normal utterance, the presence of Hausa complement introducing words such as cêwā ‘that’, wai ‘that’, kadà/kar ‘lest’, kô ‘whether’, kô dâ ‘even if’, kô dâ ‘even when/if’, kô (... kô) ‘either/whether ...X... or ...Y’, and the subordinate introducing word dâ ‘with/that/when/which/for/to etc.’, which may all may head a subjunctive propositional complement does not always make such a sentence grammatical.

In this regard, I will show that a subjunctive propositional complement (whether it has a null or overt subject) never requires any governing preposition like gâ ‘to/for’ or dâ ‘with/that/to/for’ from the COMP position. And that is the case whether the complement is in post-CTE or pre-CTE positions and this is also the case whether such complement is assumed to be in a position outside of the root clause or remains in its logical subject position (i.e. Spec of IP). My aim is therefore to discuss the relationship between these complementizing and clause introducing morphemes, the CTEs, and the subjunctive propositional complement in either post-CTE or pre-CTE positions. Discussing the role of these complementizing morphemes and particles with object complements will however be briefly touched on where there is only a need for that.
3.1 Defining the Terms: A Brief Review of the Literature.

The term complementizer was first introduced by Rosenbaum (1967) where he considers words like 'that, for-to, if, whether, and POSS-ing', to be the formatives/morphemes that introduce complements. Since then, many linguists have adopted this term. Bresnan (1970, 1972) in particular used this term, and also introduced the term COMP to be a position where the complementizers are found. She introduced COMP as a category label heading its own projection $S' \rightarrow$ COMP $S$ as the structure of every sentence whether it is an embedded clause or a main clause. This has been the position taken by many grammarians. There is however many controversies as to how many complementizers may occur in a single COMP position or even the structure of the COMP itself (see Bresnan 1972, Chomsky 1973, Huang 1977, Grimshaw 1977, Grimshaw 1979, Grimshaw and Bresnan 1978, Goldsmith 1981, and Reinhart 1978, 1980, and particularly 1982). All these authors at least agreed on one thing. And this thing is the fact that the COMP is the position which contains complementizers (whatever formative is considered as a complementizer, and irrespective of what properties this element may have). There have been several analyses on how complementizers are represented in deep structure and how they may appear in surface structure (see MacCawley 1988 volume 1 and the references cited there for a review of such positions taken by many linguists working on English complementation).

With regard to sentential subjects however, it has been generally assumed that in a language like English for instance, the grammatical roles of subject filled by a simple NP in a pre-predicate position can also be filled by an embedded complement headed by a complementizer like 'that' or 'for ...to', (see Rosenbaum 1967 for English, and Bagari 1972:35-46 for Hausa). And this depends whether the complement is a tensed, infinitival, or nominalized one. One thing that has to be noted though is the fact that, some of the
points raised with regard to the position of complementizers and the complements they head (together with the transformations involved) may only be applicable to English. For instance in Hausa, with predicates taking object complements, the occurrence of these complementizing words such as cewā and wai is very common though not obligatory overt but with the CTEs under study here, the occurrence of such complementizing words (and others mentioned above) with subjunctive propositional complement (when it occurs in its logical pre-CTE position) is not as common as in the case of predicates taking object clauses (see Bagari 1972, Tuller 1986, and Dimmendaal 1989 for discussion on complementizers, particularly with object complements).

3.2 The Complementizers of Hausa: The Surface Facts.

In most Hausa descriptions on complementation, words like cewā, wai ‘that’, kō ‘whether’, kō ...kō ‘either .. or ..’, kadā/kar, ‘lest’ don/dōmin ‘in order/so that/because’, dà ‘with/that/to/for’, and various prepositions are considered to be complementizers (cf. Bagari 1972, 1976, Tuller 1986, Dimmendaal 1989, and the references cited there). While it is well documented that a lot of CTEs taking subjunctive object complements are regularly headed by these complementizing words, very little has been said about the relationship between these complementizing words and CTEs like yā kāmātā, dölè nē, etc., which take subject propositional complements. In this chapter it will be shown that subjunctive propositional complements to these CTEs may also be headed by some of these complementizing words more regularly than expected. I will only deal with cewā ‘that’, wai ‘that’, dà ‘with/that/to/for’, and the particle kō with its various functions as well as where it co-occurs with another kō as conjunctions kō ...(kō) ‘either/whether ...X ... or ...Y’. The negative clause introducing particle kadā/kar ‘lest’ will however be dealt with in a different chapter dealing with the issue
of negation within the CTEs and the subjunctive propositional complements. I shall now
give a description of these complementizing words one by one.

3.2.1 The Status of Cèwā Complementizer.

There has been a considerable discussion on complements introduced by the
formative cèwā in Hausa descriptions on complementation. This formative has the
meaning of ‘saying’ when it is not used as a complementizer. It is actually derived from
the word cè ‘to say’, and therefore a verbal noun or nominalized form of the verb. But
syntactically, it seems to have at least some of the functional category properties of
“complementizer”, in that it’s literal meaning ‘saying’ is obviously lost in many of the
contexts where it occurs. In these cases the meaning of cèwā when used as a
complementizer is just ‘that’. Cèwā however, is not a “neutral” complementizer like
English ‘that’ or French ‘que’, and use of it is not only optional, but in fact, the option of
using it is far less frequent than its use in texts to introduce subject complements, such as
complements of yā kāmātā, dōlē nē, etc., or even the object complements to such
predicates like sanī ‘to know’, só ‘want/like’ in older texts. There is however a
tendency by modern writers (especially the younger generation), and in spoken utterances
to use it more often with object complements than is usually expected (see for example the
novel by Dan’azūmi Bāba Cēdiyar ‘Yangūrāsā, “Rikicin Dūniyā”).

3.2.1.1 Cèwā as a Morpheme Introducing Varieties of Clauses.

While the majority of predicates taking complements or clauses introduced by the
formative/clause introducer cèwā are tensed (where the TAMs make independent
statements in the “real-world”, and even where the TAM is of the future type), there are
however a significant number of subjunctive complements that are also introduced by this
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complementizing word. Here the subjunctive “tends to carry the notion that the action/event is contingent upon some other notion (Furniss 1991:99-100)”. Such predicates taking subjunctive complements/clauses include gàrgadà ‘warn/admonish’, nèmà ‘seek’, ýumartà ‘order’, shàwartà ‘advise’, to mention just a few (see Parsons 1981, Bagari 1972, 1976, Furniss 1991, Jaggar 1992 and the references cited there for discussions on these types of complements). These and other semantic categories of predicates not mentioned regularly introduce object complements with cèwà as the complementizing word. Perhaps a few examples will illustrate:

(1) a. Audù yà fàdà [çp cèwà [íp Áli zà-i gàyyàcè shì]]. Audù 3ms.-perf. mention saying=that Áli 1fut.-3ms. invite him

   ‘Audù said that Áli will invite him’

   b. yàrā-n sun tsayà [çp cèwà [íp [e] sun maidò -- children-def. 3pl.-perf. insist saying=that 3pl.-perf. return

   manà dà kudi-n-mù]]. dat.-us with money -of-us (Furniss 1991:100).

   ‘The children insisted that they had paid us back our money’

(2) a. Sarkì yà gàrgàdè kù [çp cèwà ---- Emir 3ms.-perf. admonish you saying=that

   [íp [e] kù biyà hàrājì-n]]. 2pl.-subj. pay tax-def.

   ‘The Emir admonished/warned them that they should pay the taxes’

   b. yàrā-n sun tsayà [çp cèwà [íp [e] mù mayar -- children-def. 3pl.-perf. insist saying=that 1pl.-subj. return

   musù dà kudi-n-sù]]. (Furniss 1991:100). dat.-them with money-of-them

   ‘The children insisted that we should pay them back their money’
These examples indicate that cēwā is functioning as a complementizer introducing an object complement. The examples in (1) indicate where the complementizing word introduces tensed object complements while in (2) it shows where subjunctive object complements are headed by the same complementizing word. Note that the verb cē “to say” itself, can be the main predicate taking a complement and such a complement cannot be directly introduced by the complementizing word cēwā. Nor can it be possible even where there is another NP separating cē and the complement (unless of course there is a performance error in spoken utterance which is usually heard from time to time). Consider the following sentences where the complements of cē in (3) are with tensed TAM while those in (4) are with subjunctive TAM:

(3) a. Audù yā cē [CP Ø [IP Āli zā-i gayyācē shī]].
Audù 3ms.-perf. say Ø Āli 1fut.-3ms. invite him

‘Audù said that Āli will visit him’

b. *Audù yā cē [CP cēwā [IP Āli zā-i gayyācē shī]].
Audù 3ms.-perf. say saying=that Āli 1fut.-3ms. invite him

‘Audù said that Āli will visit him’

(4) a. Sarkī yā cē [CP Ø [IP [e] kū biyā hàrāji-n]].
Emir 3ms.-perf. say comp. 2pl.-subj. pay tax-def.

‘The Emir said that you should pay the taxes’

b. *Sarkī yā cē [CP cēwā [IP [e] kū biyā hàrāji-n]].
Emir 3ms.-perf. say saying-of=that 2pl.-subj. pay tax-def.

‘The Emir said that you should pay the taxes’

These examples show that with both tensed and subjunctive complements of the predicate cē, the complementizer cēwā cannot be overtly present. Hence the ungrammaticality of the (b) examples. Note that the verb here introduces clauses of indirect discourse.
Furthermore, the verb *cé* may introduce clauses of supposition or assertion of the following types:

(5)  

a.  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Audù yā cé, "cē mā [ɪp [e] ya dácē ---} \\
&\quad \text{Audù 3ms.-perf. say sayprt. 3ms.-perf. be appropriate}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&[ɪp [e] kà tàfi yànzú], \ \text{ai [ɪp [e] bà zai yi} \\
&\quad 2ms.-subj. go now prt. neg. 1fut.-3ms. do
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{kyàu ba [ɪp [e] kà àri mótà-r Aabù].} \\
&\text{good/nice neg. 2ms.-subj. borrow car-of Aabù}
\end{align*}
\]

'Audù said, "suppose, that it is appropriate that you should go now", well, it will not be nice that you should borrow Aabù's car'

b.  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dà zà à cē [ɪp [e] ki dingà tāshì ---} \\
&\quad \text{prt. 1fut.-IMP. say 2fs.-subj. keep on waking up}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dà sassâfe], dà [ɪp [e] bà wai [ɪp [e] zā ki iyà --} \\
&\quad \text{with early morning prt. neg. doubt 1fut.-2fs. be able}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{gamà aiki-n cikin watà dàya]).} \\
&\text{finish work-def. in month one}
\end{align*}
\]

'Suppose/say, "that you would keep waking up early in the morning", you would certainly be able to finish the work in one month'

Apart from introducing complements of verbs like those illustrated above, *céwā* may also introduce complements to nouns or copular words (see propositional complements to copular CTEs below). Note that the above examples show that the complementizing word *céwā* does not actually add any significant structural syntactic role to the complement (see also Dimmendaal 1989:96). This is due to the fact that it can be deleted without any drastic change in the structure. Semantically, however, there is a distinction in meaning when it is used to introduce a complement or a clause either in pre-predicate or post-predicate positions. It may add the meaning of "the fact/saying/assertion that" whether the complement is a subject or an object one. This will be clearer in the discussion of the
examples to follow. For now I will just assume that there is an indication that this complementizer may have some semantic value (see Bresnan 1972[9]:70-77 for the English complementizer ‘that’ and its semantic role).

3.2.1.2 Cewa as a Complementizer in Post-CTE Position.

I begin first with the instances where the cewa complementizing word introduces subjunctive propositional complements in post-CTE-position. The sentences in (6-7) below illustrate where the subjunctive propositional complement may occur with the (optional) complementizer cewa in post-CTE position:

(6)  
a. [e]i yā kāmātā [CP (cewā) [IP [e] mū biyā hārājī]]i  3ms.-perf. be fitting that 1pl.-subj. pay tax

'It is fitting/better/desirable that we should pay taxes'

b. [e]i yanā yiwuwā [CP (cewā) [IP [e] nā àuri Diije]]i  3ms.-cnt. be possible that 1s.-subj. marry Diije

'It is possible/likely that I will marry Diije' 

c. [e]i yanā dā muhim mancī [CP (cewā)] ----- 3ms.-cnt. with importance that

[IP [e] kī gamā aiki-n banal]i  2fs.-subj. finish work-def. this year

'It is important that you finish the work this year'

(7)  
a. [e]i dōlē nē [CP (cewā) [IP [e] yā àuri Bintā]]i necessary cop. that 3ms.-subj. marry Bintā

'It is necessary that he should marry Bintā'

b. [e]i māi yiwuwā nē [CP (cewā) [IP [e] nā sāyi mōtā]]i has possibility cop. that 1ms.-subj. buy car

'It is possible/likely that I would buy a car'
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In all these sentences, the subjunctive propositional complements are headed optionally by the complementizer cēwā. But it should be mentioned that with some speakers, usually the sentences are much better without the complementizer, hence, the optionality of cēwā. Semantically, it only shows the meaning that the propositional complement it heads is a “fact” in the sense that the event/action to be carried out by the subject referred to in the complement of the CTE is a fact. Note that when cēwā occurs between the root CTE and its post-posed complement, there is usually a tendency to have a little pause before the CTE, indicating that the complements to such CTEs might sometimes be right dislocated ones as they may also be left dislocated structures when they occur in pre-CTE position. But see Tuller 1986:166 who claims that “complementizers must be present in the complement of radā ‘whisper’, and bā māmākī ‘give surprise’. According to her, lack of complementizer forces a reading where the complement of radā (for instance) is a direct quote”. As the above examples show, this is not always so, especially with the experiencer predicates like yanā dādādā/faranṭā rān X ‘it pleases X’, yanā dā ban shā‘awā ‘it is interesting’, etc. I will take up this issue in the chapter on topicalization of subjunctive propositional complements. Let me now turn to cēwā complementizer introducing subjunctive propositional complement in pre-CTE position.

3.2.1.3 Cēwā as a Complementizer in Pre-CTE Position.

As I mentioned earlier, the presence of the complementizer cēwā to head such a subjunctive propositional complement does not seem to save the sentence from being ungrammatical (but see McHugh 1984 and Bagari 1972 on cēwā complements). The sentence can be grammatical if there is however a pause after the complement clause and,
whether the complement is headed by cēwā or not. Consider the following illustrating this fact:

(8)  a. \[\text{[CP (cēwa-r)\textsuperscript{2} [IP Tankō yā biyā hārājī]], --- saying-of.=that Tankō 3ms.-subj. pay tax} \]
\[\text{[IP [e] yā kāmātā].} \]
\[\text{3ms.-perf. be fitting/better/desirable} \]

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that Tankō should pay taxes is desirable'

b. \[\text{[CP (cēwā) [IP [e] kū shā giyā]], --- that 2pl.-subj. drink alcohol} \]
\[\text{[IP [e] yā hārāmtā].} \]
\[\text{3ms.-perf. be unlawful} \]

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that you should drink alcohol is forbidden'

c. \[\text{[CP (cēwā) [IP [e] in fid dā kāinā dāgā láifí-n]], -- that 1s.-subj. get out with myself from fault-def.} \]
\[\text{[IP [e] yā zama dölè (nē) a gārē nī].} \]
\[\text{3ms.-perf. become necessary cop. to me} \]

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that I should free myself from the allegation is desirable/necessary'

(9)  a. \[\text{[CP (cēwa-r) [IP [e] kā àuri Bintā]], --- saying-def.=that 2ms.-subj. marry Bintā} \]
\[\text{[IP [e] mài yiwuwā nē].} \]
\[\text{has possibility cop.} \]

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that you should marry Bintā is possible/likely'

b. \[\text{[CP (cēwā) [IP [e] nā kōmā gida], [IP [e] tīlās nē].} \]
\[\text{that 1s.-subj. return home necessary cop.} \]

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that I should return home is necessary'
c. \[\text{CP (cěwā)} \ [\text{IP [e] à tunā bāya]}], \ [\text{IP [e] rōkō nē}].\]

that imp.-subj. remember past begging cop.

\(\text{‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that one should remember the past is desirable’}\)

If there is no comma (as in writing), or an intonational break (as in a spoken utterance), the sentence becomes unusual and is mostly rejected. To see this, consider the following examples with cěwā complementizer introducing the complement and without a pause before it:

\(\text{(10) a. } \ast \text{ [IP [CP (cěwā-r)] [IP Tankō yà biyā hārājl]] ----}}\)

\(\text{saying-def.=that Tankō 3ms.-subj. pay tax}\)

\(\text{yā kāmātā]. 3ms.-perf. be fitting/better/appropriate}\)

\(\text{‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that Tankō should pay taxes is appropriate’}\)

b. \(\ast \text{[IP [CP (cěwā)] [IP [e] à sāmi gōrō à L. A.]] --}}\)

\(\text{that IMP.-subj. get/find kolanuts in L.A.}\)

\(\text{yanā dā wūyā]. 3ms.-cnt. with hard/difficulty}\)

\(\text{‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that a person/one would find kolanuts in L.A. is impossible’}\)

\(\text{(11) a. } \ast \text{[IP [CP (cěwā)] [IP Audū yà kōmā gidā]} dōlē nē]. \text{that Audū 3ms.-subj. return home necessary cop.}}\)

\(\text{‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that Audū should return home is necessary’}\)

b. \(\ast \text{[IP [CP (cěwā)] [IP [e] nā sāyī mōtā]} māi yiwuwā nē]. \text{that 1s.-subj. buy car has possibility cop.}}\)

\(\text{‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that I should buy a new car is possible/likely’}\)

The following are therefore rough representations of the two types of structures of these sentences where (12a) represents sentences with morphological INFL while (12b) represents structures with copular predicate phrase:
(12) a. *[[IP [CP [G COMP [IP X ]]] [ι′ AGR VP/NP]].
b. *[[IP [CP [G COMP [IP X ]]] [PredP. NP COP.]].

Where CP is assumed to be in Spec of IP of the root clause.

The above sentences clearly show that the subjunctive propositional complements to the CTEs under study do not seem to occur in the specifier position of the root clause, but rather in the peripheral position of the IP. Since the COMP position may or may not be filled as our examples indicate, it is then clear that the CTEs taking subjunctive propositional complement are both S and S-bar taking predicates. When the complementizer cēwxā occurs in COMP, it just introduces the propositional complement as a “fact”. That is the complementizer has the meaning of ‘the fact that/the saying or assertion that’. This assertion can either be made by somebody else reported by the speaker or by the speaker him/herself. Similarly, this proposition is what the CTE expresses, appraises, or comments about, whether it is a positive or a negative one. The cēwxā complementizer then adds the meaning of ‘definiteness’ (see Bresnan 1972:70-77). That is the definiteness is on whether the proposition is already determined or yet to be determined in a future occurrence. Furthermore, this assertion is a reported fact rather than something to be disputed about (see also Dimmendaal 1989:100-101). It is therefore plausible to assume that the complementizer cēwxā has some semantic value which is to “definitize” the propositional content of the complement.

3.2.2 The Status of Wai Complementizer.

The main meaning of the particle wai is ‘they/one (impersonal) say’. Unlike cēwxā however, this word seems to be a “pure” complementizer. That is, it is not related to any known noun, verb or preposition. The only context that may indicate its nounness is when it is reduplicated as waiwai, meaning ‘a gossip/rumor’ in a sentence like: nā jī
an cê lâbârin waiwai nê “I heard that the story is a rumor”. That is why wai always carries the meaning of “reported or second hand information”. Syntactically, the meaning of wai when used as a complementizing word is just ‘that’. Semantically, however, there is a distinction between wai and cêwâ complementizers, when they are used to introduce a complement/clause in either pre-predicate or post-predicate positions. This difference, though not really a profound one, may be an indication that these complementizers may have some semantic differences with respect to the complements they introduce. This issue will be clearer in the discussion to follow in the general discussion on the two complementizers.

3.2.2.1 Wai as a Particle Introducing Varieties of Clauses.

Wai can be used to introduce varieties of phrases and clauses which may fill subject or object positions. For instance phrases introduced by wai may occur in certain positions as appositional NPs or function as clause adjuncts at the end of clauses. That is, it may function as a “phrasifier” in clauses with parenthetical expressions (see Kraft 1963:159 volume 2 for the definitions of these terms). Let us consider simple cases as in the following:

(13)  a. [e] mun sâmē su [i p [e] sunâ wani wâsâ] ----
     1pl.-perf. find them 3pl.-cnt. certain game

     wai (shi) Marwâ.
     comp. it Marwa

     ‘We found them playing a certain game called/known as Marwa’

b. bà shi yiwuwâ [i p mûtûm yà ji tâusäyi-n ----
     neg. it be possible person 3ms.-subj. feel pity-of
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wani, wai don sâbô. (KYTK, p.38).
someone comp. because-of acquaintence/familiarity

'It is not possible for a person to feel pity for someone just because of acquaintance'

In these examples wai is functioning as a phrase introducer occurring within an appositional NP, or as an adjunct NP or clause. Wai may also act as an introducer of object clauses. It may also optionally be preceded or followed by some Wh-words or by the complementizer cëwâ. Discussion on this type of complementizer orderings will be taken up later. The following illustrate one example of such use of wai as a complementizer:

(14) \[\text{[IP [e] an bâ dâ ûmârni-n [CP (cëwâ) wai ---}
\[\quad \text{Imp.-perf. give-CAU. order-of saying=that that}
\]
\[\quad \text{[IP [e à kôrî Darmân dâgâ Nâjêriyâll]], ---}
\[\quad \text{Imp.-subj. drive away Darmân from Nigeria}
\]
\[\quad \text{[CP don shi [CP wai [IP bâ da-n kasâ ba nè]]].}
\[\quad \text{because he that neg. son-of country neg. cop.}
\]

'An order was given to expatriate Darman from Nigeria just because it was alleged that he is alien/not a Nigerian'

Wai may also function as an introducer of subordinate clauses after propositional and mental attitude verbs. Basically all the predicates that can take clauses introduced by cëwâ complementizer (as illustrated above in the section on cëwâ) may also allow wai to introduce such clauses. It may also function as a complementizer optionally followed by another adverbial complementizer dômîn/don with the meaning of "in order that/so that". That is, it may co-occur with don/dômîn to introduce purpose clauses with subjunctive TAM as in the following sentences illustrate:

(15) a. .... Hajîyâ Gânâ cê takè kai tâ makarantâ ---
\[\quad \text{Hajîyâ Gânà cop. 3fs.-rel.-perf. take her school}
\]
wai don kar å bar tà tà tafi ita kadai, comp. comp. neg. IMP.-subj. leave her 3fs.-subj. go she alone
tà hâdù dà Gide sù yi znànè. (SG)-1:17). 3fs.-subj. meet with Gide 3pl.-subj. do chat

‘It is Hajiya Gana that takes her to school, so that she is not left alone to go alone to meet Gide so that they have a chat’

b. bâ-i kâmätâ [IP [e] kà wulâkântà talakâwâ ba neg.-3ms. be fitting 2ms.-subj. belittle poors neg.
[Çp wai (don) [IP [e] kà nünà(a) [IP [e] kà fì comp. comp. 2ms.-subj. show 2ms.-perf. exceed

sù àbi-n hannu]]].
them things-of hand

‘It is not appropriate to treat the poor so harshly/badly in order to show (them/others) that you are wealthy’

Finally, wai may also function as an introducer of any independent clause by occurring at the beginning of the sentence. Consider the following:

(16) a. [Çp wai [Çp hànkâkà (nè) [IP bâ yà yì-n kwai]]].
comp. crow cop. neg. 3ms.-cnt. doing-of egg

‘It is said/they say that it is crow that does not lay eggs’

b. [Çp wai [IP [e] dôlè nè [IP [e] kà sà wândô]].
comp. necessary cop. 2ms.-subj. wear pants

‘It is said that it is necessary that you should wear pants’

c. .... ta yàyà zà à yi à cê [Çp wai [IP [e] yà ----
by how 1fut.-imp. do imp.-subj. say that 3ms.-perf.
fi kyâu [IP mûtûm yà yi âmfânî dà ----
exceed good/nice person 3ms.-subj. do/make use with
kwa kwalo warsa [pp b a tare da sani n zu ciya ba]]]

brain neg. together with knowing-of heart neg.

(SGJ-2:72).

'...how can it be the case/possible that it is much better for a person to think without the knowledge of his heart'?

The above discussion so far indicate the various functions of the particle \textit{wai}. The examples given so far have shown that \textit{wai} is a kind of general formative whose occurrence is not restricted to only one position. It is shown that it can occur in sentence initial or medial positions. But its role as complementizer introducing propositional complements to the CTEs under study is yet to be established. I turn to this issue now beginning with its occurrence in post-CTE position as a complementizer.

3.2.2.2 \textit{Wai} as a Complementizer in Post-CTE Position.

Even though syntactically, wherever ce\textit{wæ} occurs \textit{wai} may also occur in that same position (especially in post-CTE position), \textit{wai} however has a different semantic role. It can introduce many types of subordinating clauses or simple clauses in sentence initial position, since its main function is to show a kind of "uncertainty or a non-committed" state of affairs about the proposition of the CTE. Let me first discuss its role in introducing the subjunctive propositional complement in postposed position (i.e. at the end of the sentence). Consider the following:

\begin{align*}
\text{(17) } & \quad a. \quad [e]_i \text{ yā kəmatā [cp (wai)] [ip Tənī tə biyā hərəjī]}_i \\
& \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting that Tənī 3fs.-subj. pay tax}
\end{align*}

'It is fitting/better/desirable that Tənī pay taxes'

\begin{align*}
\text{(17) } & \quad b. \quad [e]_i \text{ yā həramtā [cp (wai)] [ip [e] mū ci shəhə]}_i \\
& \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be unlawful that 1pl.-subj. eat hawk}
\end{align*}

'It is unlawful/disallowed/prohibited that we hawk/falcon'

\begin{align*}
\text{(17) } & \quad c. \quad [e]_i \text{ yanā da mu himmanci [cp (wai)] ------} \\
& \quad \text{3ms.-ent. with importance that}
\end{align*}
[Ip [e] kù ga gwamnà à gidà]\i
2pl.-subj. see governor at home

‘It is important that you see the governor at home’

d. [e]i yanà dá kyàu [CP (wai) ------
3ms.-cnt. with good/nice that

[Ip [e] yà tàimàki gàjiyàyyü]\i
3ms.-subj. help destitutes/poor

‘It is good/nice that he should help the needy/poor’

(18) a. [e]i dòlè nè [CP (wai) [Ip Àli yà àuri Bintà]\i
necessary cop. that Àli 3ms.-subj. marry Bintà

‘It is necessary that Àli should marry Bintà’

b. [e]i watakìlà nè [CP (wai) [Ip [e] kà ci zàbè-n]\i
perhaps/probably cop. that 2ms.-subj. cat election-def.

‘It is probable/likely that you will win the election’

c. [e]i mài yiìwùwà nè [CP (wai) [Ip [e] nà sàyì mòtà]\i
has possibility cop. that 1ms.-subj. buy car

‘It is possible/likely that I would buy a car’

d. [e]i bà ābì-n kunyà ba nè [CP (wai) ------
eg. thing-of shame neg. cop. that

[Ip [e] ki kwàna à gida-n sùrùkaï]\i
2fs.-subj. spend night at home-of inlaws-of him

‘It is not shameful for you to sleep overnight at/in inlaws’ house’

These examples show that both CTEs with morphological INFL and copular CTEs can be followed by \textit{wai} complementizer introducing their subjunctive propositional subjects. Note that the occurrence of \textit{wai} in post-CTE position is optional just like in the case of \textit{cëwà} complementizer we saw earlier. Let me now turn to its occurrence in pre-CTE position introducing subjunctive propositional complements.
3.2.2.3 Wai As a Complementizer in Pre-CTE Position.

Like in the case of cewa complementizer, wai may also head a subjunctive propositional complement in pre-CTE position, and there does not seem to be a difference in grammaticality whether it is present or not. The sentence will be grammatical as long as there is an intonation break before the propositional complement. This is illustrated in the following:

(19) a. [IP [CP (wai)] [IP Tankɔ yà biyà hərəjì]], ----
    that Tankɔ 3ms.-subj. pay tax

[IP [e] yà kəmətə].
3ms.-perf. be fitting/better/desirable

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that Tankɔ should pay taxes is fitting/appropriate'

b. [IP [CP (wai)] [IP [e] in fid dà kàinə dàgà
    that 1s.-subj. get out -CAU. with myself from
ləiʃ-f-n]], [IP [e] yà zama dələ (nə) à gərə ni].
fault-def. 3ms.-perf. become necessary cop. to me

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that I should free myself from the allegation is desirable/necessary'

(20) a. [IP [CP (wai)] [IP Audù yà àuri Bintə]], ----
    that Audù 3ms-subj. marry Bintə

[IP [e] məi yiwwə nə].
has possibility cop.

'(The fact/saying/assertion) that Audù should marry Bintə is possible/likely'

b. [IP [CP (wai)] [IP [e] kà ki biyə-n hərəjì-n ---
    that 2ms.-subj. refuse paying-of tax-def.
(21)  a.  *[Ip [CP (wai) [Ip [e] à sāmi gōrō à L. A.]] ---
    that IMP.-subj. get/find kolanuts in L.A.
    yanā dā wūyā]  
    3ms.-cnt. with hard/difficulty

    '(The fact/saying/assertion) that a person/one would find kolanuts in L.A.
    is impossible'

  b.  *[Ip [CP (wai) [Ip Audū yā kōmā gidā] dōlē nē].
    that Audū 3ms.-subj. return home necessary cop.

    '(The fact/saying/assertion) that Audū should return home is necessary'

(22)  a.  *[Ip [CP (wai) [Ip [e] à sāmi gōrō à L. A.]] ----
    that IMP.-subj. get/find kolanuts in L.A.
    [Ip [e] yanā dā wūyā].
    3ms.-cnt. with hard/difficulty

    '(The fact/saying/assertion) that a person/one would find kolanuts in L.A.
    is impossible'

  b.  *[Ip [CP (wai) [Ip [e] nā sāyi sābuwa-r mōtā]] ----
    that 1s.-subj. buy new-of car
The rough representations of the two types of structures of these sentences represented in (12) for cêwâ complements can also be used to represent those introduced by wai complementizer. It should be noted that even though syntactically, where cêwâ occurs wai may also occur there (especially in post-CTE position), wai however has a different semantic role. It can introduce many types of subordinate clauses or simple clauses in sentence initial position, since its main function is to show a kind of "uncertainty or a non-committed" state of affairs about the proposition of the CTE (be it appraisal or not). Furthermore, it may be shifted to many positions in a sentence, a fact that is not possible with cêwâ. Let me now turn to the general discussion and interaction of the complementizing words cêwâ and wai.

3.2.3 General Discussion on Cêwâ and Wai Complementizers:

The examples discussed above clearly show that in Hausa, subject complements have a tendency to occur with certain complementizers, particularly the cêwâ and wai complementizers, contrary to what is assumed in other works on this topic (see Bagari 1972:41, sentences 42a-c). In this paper, Bagari claims that sentences like the following are grammatical where the complementizer cêwâ does not occur before the CTE:

(23) a. yâ kâmâtâ mû ga (cêwâ) lâllai ---
    3ms.-perf. be fitting/better lpl.-subj. see comp. emp.-prt.
    hakâ dîn bâ tâ fârû ba. (Bagari's #39).
    this emp.-prt. neg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg.

'IT is better that we should see that this really does not happen' =
'We must see for certain that this does not really happen'
b. yā kāmātā mū ga lallai hakā din
3ms.-perf. be fitting/better 1pl.-subj. see emp.-prt. this  emp.-prt.

bà tā fāru ba. (Bagari's # 41a).
eg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg.

'It is better that we should certainly see that this does not happen'

c. yā kāmātā mū ga hakā din lallai
3ms.-perf. be fitting/better 1pl.-subj. see this  emp.-prt. emp.-prt.

bà tā fāru ba. (Bagari's # 41b).
eg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg.

'It is better that we should see that this does not really happen'

d. yā kāmātā mū ga hakā din ----
3ms.-perf. be fitting/better 1pl.-subj. see this  emp.-prt.

bà tā fāru ba lallai. (Bagari's # 41c).
eg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg. emp.-prt.

'It is better that we should see that this does not happen really/surely'

e. yā kāmātā lallai mū ga hakā din ----
3ms.-perf. be fitting/better emp.-prt. 1pl.-subj. see this  emp.-prt.

bà tā fāru ba. (Bagari's # 41d).
eg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg.

'It is better that we should really see that this does not happen'

f. yā gayā wà 'yan-jāridū (cēwā) wai jihā-r-sā ----
3ms.-perf. tell dat. reporters comp. comp. state-of-him

bā tā sāmū-n tāmakō isasshē. (Bagari's # 40).
eg. 3fs.-cnt. getting-of aid enough

'He told the reporters that his region/state does not get enough aid'

According to Bagari, when the complementizer is “deleted” then the particle “lallai” (which I consider to be an adverb), may seem to function like complementizers (note that he considers deletion rather than insertion of the complementizer cēwā, for this argument see Bagari 1972:39-41). But as he correctly puts it, this is not usually the case since the
particle/adverb can be moved around in various places in the sentence, a fact that is not possible with complementizers (note that Bagari tries to compare the distributional differences between the complementizer cēwā and the adverbal particle lallai in the sentences in (23)). For this reason, according to him, the sentences in (24) below are all ungrammatical because cēwā being a complementizer and not a an emphatic particle like lallai cannot be moved around in a sentence (compare with the sentences in (23) above). Therefore, the complementizer cēwā cannot occur before the CTE introducing the propositional complement as in (24c), head a root clause as in (24a), or occur at the end of a sentence as in (24b):

(24) a. *yā>kāmatā mū ga hakā din cēwā ---
     .3ms.-perf. be fitting/better 1pl.-subj. see this emp.-prt. comp.
     bā tā fāru ba.
     neg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg.

     'It is better that we should see that this does not happen' =
     'We must see for certain that this does not happen'

b. *yā>kāmatā mū ga hakā din
     3ms.-perf. be fitting/better 1pl.-subj. see this emp.-prt. comp.
     bā tā fāru ba cēwā.
     neg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg. comp.

     'It is better that we should see that this does not happen' =
     'We must see for certain that this does not happen'

b. *yā>kāmatā cēwā mū ga hakā din ---
     3ms.-perf. be fitting/better comp.=that 1pl.-subj. see this emp.-prt.
     bā tā fāru ba.
     neg. 3fs.-perf. happen neg.

     'It is better that we should see that this does not happen' =
     'We must see for certain that this does not happen'
Bagari states that the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (24a-c) is due to the fact that “the complementizer has one position only in relation to the embedded sentence, viz. it always immediately precedes the complement sentence, and, wherever the sentence is moved (by extraposition), it takes the complementizer with it (Bagari 1972:41)”. While it is true that cēwā cannot be inserted at the end of a sentence like (24b) where it does not head a complement, it is however certainly possible for cēwā to be inserted in (24a and c). I find these sentences grammatical. This is also the case with wai when it is inserted in the same position where cēwā is inserted. It is therefore my belief that the complementizers cēwā and wai may optionally be inserted between the CTE and the propositional complement as seen in the earlier examples discussed so far. Usually these complementizers may occur with many complement taking predicates that would regularly take other types of complements (i.e. those taking object complements refer to sentences in (1-2 and 6-7) above on cēwā complementer, and (17-18) for wai complementer for instance. There we can clearly see that these complementizers may be inserted in post-CTE position introducing a postposed subjunctive propositional subject. In all these sentences, the complementizers may however be null or empty. And in cases where the complementizer is null it must be assumed that the IP is outside the root clause. The predicate then acquires the status of a S-bar deleting one whether it is verbal, nominal, or copula.

Similarly, we have seen from the data presented so far that in Hausa, when the subject complement occurs in pre-CTE position and there is no pause before the CTE, the sentence is considered odd, hence ungrammatical. It does not matter whether there is a complementizer or not heading the subjunctive propositional subject. One may however speculate that sentence initial complementizers must be inserted because they provide a clear indication that the following noun, verb or copula are subordinate. This reasoning is clearer with cēwā than with wai. The reason may be due to semantics rather than
syntax. The question now is how can we show any syntactic and/or semantic difference(s) between these two complementizers? I turn to this issue now.

Apart from introducing the complement clause in sentence initial position, these complementizers may also introduce the root CTE-clause first and then followed by the complement, where the complement is in postposed position (i.e. at the end of the sentence). Recall that in our earlier discussions both cèwà and wàí complementizers may be inserted to introduce subjunctive propositional complements in pre-CTE position. But when such a propositional sentence is in a postposed position, only wàí is possible to occur at the beginning of a sentence introducing the root CTE-clause. This is a very clear instance where the two types of complementizers differ. Consider the following as illustration of this fact (see also the sentences in 14 and 16 above):

(25) a. \[\text{IP} [\text{CP wàí [IP} [e] yá kàmâtà]](,) [\text{IP} [e] ki tàfi]. \text{that} 3ms.-perf. be fitting/better 2fs.-subj. go

‘(They say it that) it is fitting/appropriate. (That) you should go/leave’

b. \[\text{IP} [\text{CP wàí [IP} [e] tìlàs nè]](,) [\text{IP} [e] mù kómà gidà]. \text{that necessary cop.} 1pl.-subj. return home

‘(They say it that) it is necessary/a must. (That) we should return home’

(26) a. \[*\text{IP} [\text{CP cèwà [IP} [e] yá dàcè]](,) \text{--- that} 3ms.-perf. be suitable/appropriate

\[\text{IP} [e] kà gyàrà hali-n-kà]. \text{2ms.-subj. mend behavior-of-you}

‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that it is desirable/fitting/better. (That) you should behave appropriately’

b. \[*\text{IP} [\text{CP cèwà [IP} [e] dòlé nè]](,) \text{--- that necessary cop.}
2ms.-subj. marry Bintà

‘(The fact/saying/assertion that) it is necessary. (That) Audu should marry Binta’

Note that in these sentences, the root clause introduced by cewà or wai and the complement following it must both be considered as separate clauses as indicated in the translations. And this is the case whether there is a pause before the root clause or not. The sentences in (25) are therefore possible while those in (26) are not possible, unless there is another proposition following the whole sentence, in which case the first propositional complement is the complement of the root clause (i.e. the two clauses being the subject of the following second root clause). Therefore the structure represents a subject and a predicate, and they are separate clauses as illustrated in the following:

(27) a. [I]p [CP cewà(r)/wai [I]p [e] yà kàmàtà ---
that /that 3ms.-perf. be fitting/better/desirable

[I]p Tànì tà biyà hàràjìll], [I]p [e] bà-i dàmè tà ba].
Tànì 3fs.-subj. pay tax neg-it worry her neg.

‘(The fact/saying/assertion) that it is desirable/fitting that Tànì should pay taxes, (it) does not bother her’

that/that 3ms.-perf. be suitable Bálà 3ms.-subj.

gyàrà hali-n-sàll]], [I]p [e] yànà dà kyàu].
mend behavior-of-him 3ms.-cnt. with good/nice

‘(The fact/saying that) it is fitting/better that Bala should behave appropriately (it) is nice/good’

Observe that in these sentences, the presence of the complementizer cewà or wai is obligatory. Without it, the sentence becomes ungrammatical even with a pause before the root or propositional complement. One further interesting thing about these complementizers that is worth talking about is the fact that two or more complementizers
may occur in a COMP position adjacent to each other. In this instance some of the marginally grammatical or odd sentences above can become fully grammatical either when the complementizer like cèwà precedes wài or vice versa. Consider the following:

(28) a. \[ [IP [CP cèwà(r) wài [IP [e] yà kàmàtà --- that that 3ms.-perf. be fitting

\[ [IP [e] tà tàfì gidà]][], [IP [e] bà-i dàmè tà bá].
3fs.-subj. go home neg.-3ms.-perf. worry her neg.

'The fact/saying that it is desirable that she should go home, (it) does not bother her'

b. \[ [IP [CP cèwà(r) wài [IP [e] tìlàs nè [IP Audù yà --- that-def. that necessary cop. Audù 3ms.-subj.

kòmà gidà gòbe][], [IP [e] yà yi dàidài].
return home tomorrow 3ms.-perf. do right/correct

(The fact/saying that) it necessary/a must that Tankò should return home tomorrow, (it) is right/appropriate'

In (28), the complementizer cèwà comes first. And it has the meaning of "the fact/saying that". That is what it introduces is a fact even though the proposition that follows is also headed by the complementizer wài. That proposition introduced by wài is a mere hearsay according to the speaker and he/she does not commit himself/herself to the truth of the proposition. Similarly, in (29) below where the complementizer wài comes first, we get the same function of wài.

(29) a. \[ [IP [CP wài cèwà(r) [IP [e] yà kàmàtà --- that that 3ms.-perf. be fitting/better

\[ [IP [e] tà tàfì gidà]][], [IP [e] bà-i dàmè tà bá].
3fs.-subj. go home neg.-3ms.-perf. worry her neg.

'As they say, the fact that it is desirable/fitting that she should go home, (it) does not bother her'
b. \[\text{IP [CP wai cêwa(r)] [IP [e] tìlås nē [IP [e] mù --- that that-def. necessary cop. 1pl.-subj.}
\]
\[\text{kömå gidå gòbe]]}, [IP [e] yå yi dайдåi].
return home tomorrow 3ms.-perf. do right/correct

'(As they say, the fact that) it necessary that we should return home tomorrow is right/appropriate'

Note also when the subjunctive propositional complement occurs in pre-CTE position, cêwå may occur in sentence initial position introducing the complement, while wai may also introduce the root clause appraising/commenting about the complement sentence. If the two complementizers are however reversed, the sentence becomes ungrammatical as indicated in (30).

(30) a. \[\text{IP [CP cêwar [IP Tankò yå biyå håråjîl]]. --- that-def. Tankò 3ms.-subj. pay tax}
\]
\[\text{[CP wai [IP [e] yå kàmåtàå]]. that 3ms.-perf. be fitting}
\]

'(The saying/assertion that) Tankò should pay taxes (they say) (it) is desirable/appropriate'

b. \[\text{IP [CP wai [IP Tankò yå biyå håråjîl]], --- that Tankò 3ms.-subj. pay tax}
\]
\[\text{[CP *cêwå [IP [e] yå kàmåtàå]]. that 3ms.-perf. be fitting/better/desirable}
\]

'(They say that) that Tankò should pay taxes is desirable/appropriate'

It is clear from these sentences that these complementizers have semantic roles rather than just syntactic ones. This possibility of having two complementizers adjacent to each other, and probably in one COMP position is not as expected in syntactic theory (but see Reinhart 1978 for Hebrew and Riemsdijk and Williams 1986:161. I return to this issue later). Perhaps one may assume that they actually occupy different COMP positions,
hence, we have a case of stacked or iterative CPs rather than one single COMP position. I have no solution to offer with respect to this issue. Furthermore, this possibility of having two or more complementizers adjacent to one another does not only apply to the combination of *cēwā* and *wai* occurring in the same (or different) COMP node(s), but also possible with other combinations of complementizers and particles as we shall see below with the particles *dà* and *kō*.

In conclusion, we have observed that a full sentence can be introduced by *wai*, where *wai* can either function as a general clause introducing particle or as a full complementizer. As for *cēwā* however, it can only introduce a subordinate clause and cannot occur anywhere in a sentence like *wai*. The reason for this is clear: *wai* means "what follows is second-hand information or a claim that the speaker, is not necessarily reporting as correct or true", whereas *cēwā* literally means ‘saying’, though it could also be translated as ‘*that*’. Historically speaking, and probably even in modern Hausa, what follows *cēwā* is a complement to the verb *cē*, ‘say’, but since *cēwā* is a verbal noun, not a conjugated verb, it cannot stand alone as the matrix verb of a sentence. This difference is even clearer in simple sentences like the following where sentences in (34a-b) are contrasted with those in (31c-d):

(31)  

a. \[[\text{CP} \text{ wai \ [\text{IP} \text{ hānkākā \ bā \ yā \ yi-n \ kwai}]}.\]  
that=they say crow neg. 3ms.-cnt. doing-of eggs

‘They say/reported) that a crow does not lay eggs’

b. \[[\text{CP} \text{ wai \ [\text{IP} \text{ [e] \ kā \ zō \ dà wuri}]}.\]  
that 2ms.-subj. come with early

‘You have been asked to come early/they say you should come early’

c. *\[[\text{CP} \text{ cēwā \ [\text{IP} \text{ hānkākā \ bā \ yā \ yi-n \ kwai}]}.\]  
that=saying crow neg. 3ms.-cnt. doing-of eggs

‘That a crow does not lay eggs’
I therefore conclude that the two complementizers are different semantically while similar in some syntactically determined contexts, especially in post-CTE position, where both cëwâ and wai may occur in that same slot.

3.3 The Status of Dà as a Complementizer.

In this section I will explore the function of the particle dà. Specifically, I will provide evidence that it can function as a complementizer introducing propositional complements of the CTEs under study. But before I do that, it seems to me that there is a need to show its other functions as a conjunction, a preposition of various sorts, as well as a general subordinate clause introducer morpheme. In the case where it function as a complementizer I will rely heavily on the discussions made in Bagari 1976 and Dimmendaal 1989. I begin first with its functions other than as a complementizer.

3.3.1 Dà as a Conjunctive Particle ‘and’ (NP + dà + NP).

The particle dà is one of the most functional words in Hausa syntax. This is so due to the fact that it has numerous functions and meanings depending on where it is used and in which type of construction it is found (see Kraft 1963 and 1970 for a detailed discussion on the uses of the particles dà and sai). Dà may be used as NP conjoiner and as a preposition of various sorts such as ‘with, of, for, and to’. In what follow I present some of these uses of the particle dà in various sentence types. The particle dà may be used to conjoin NPs, or NPs and other maximal projections. This is illustrated in the following:
(32)  

a.  
\[ \text{ýa dàcë [I² [NP Audù dà Bintà] sù tāfi gidā].} \]

\[ \text{3ms.-perf. be suitable Audù and Bintà 3pl.-subj. go home} \]

'It is appropriate that Audù and Bintà should go home'

b.  
\[ \text{[I² [NP ci-n nāmà-n ūngūlu] dà [NP shā-n giyāl] ñග à gārē mū].} \]

\[ \text{3ms.-perf. be unlawful/banned to us} \]

'Eating vulture's meat and drinking alcohol is forbidden for us'

c.  
\[ \text{[I² [e] rashi-n tunānī nē(,) [NP kai dà māta-r-kā] ñç lack-of thinking cop. you and wife-of-you} \]

\[ \text{[I² [e] kù kārbi bashi-n nan dà ruwāl].} \]

\[ \text{2pl.-subj. accept loan-def. that with water=interest} \]

'It is senseless that you and your wife to take/accept that loan with interest'

In these sentences we can see dà conjoins nouns as in (32a), nominalized clauses as in (32b), and a pronoun and a noun phrase as in (32c). The conjunctive particle dà cannot however be used to conjoin sentences. The following is therefore ungrammatical (see also Bagari 1972:37 footnote 6 for further discussion):

(33)  

\[ *[e] ña dàcë [I² Audù ña tāfi gidā] dà (kuma) \]

\[ \text{3ms.-perf. be suitable Audù 3pl.-subj. go home and also} \]

\[ \text{[I² [e] ña daukō mōta-r-sā].} \]

\[ \text{3ms.-subj. take car-of-him} \]

'It is appropriate that Audù should go home and he should bring his car'

3.3.2  
Dà as a Preposition ‘with/at/by/in’ etc. (NP + dà + NP).

The particle dà may be used as a preposition of various sorts as illustrated in the following:
(34) a. [e] yanā bā ni shā'awā [IP [e] nà ga Bintā ---
3ms.-cnt. give me interest Is.-subj. see Bintā
[pp dà sābuwa-r môtā].
with new-of

car

'It makes me feel great/good/happy to see Bintā with a new car'

b. bā shi dā kyāu [IP [e] ki dingā rābuwā dà ---
eg. it with good/nice 2fs.-subj. keep on separating with=from
da-n-ki [Cp in [IP [e] zā ki zō nān gidā-n]].
son-of-you if 1fut.-2fs. come here house-def.

'It is not good that you should keep on separating (yourself) from your child if you are coming to this house'

c. [e] yā kāmātā [IP [e] mū jē can dà yâmama].
3ms.-perf. be fitting 1pl.-subj. go there at evening

'It is better that we go there in the evening'

3.3.3 *Dà* as a Complement/Subordinate Clause Introducer:

The status of *dà* as a subordinate clause introducer and the constructions containing it have received a considerable discussion in Hausa syntactic descriptions on complementation phenomenon. Apart from its function as a noun/NP conjoiner and a preposition as illustrated above, *dà* may also functions as a sort of a "general complementizer" for a variety of clauses, including relative clauses, certain adverbial clauses, and certain object complements. However, its status as a complementizer in certain constructions is not without a problem. This is particularly clear where it heads a subjunctive complement or clause of certain predicates. The problem is actually due to the fact that there is no infinitive form of the verb in Hausa, and in places where an infinitive would be expected a *dà* followed by a subjunctive or nominalized complements are usually found (see Kraft 1963, 1970, Bagari 1976:151-164; Tuller 1986, Furniss 1991,
Abdoulaye 1992, and Jaggar 1992 a detailed discussion on *dà* as a clause introducer of various types).

Let me now briefly explore the contexts where *dà* occurs in several types of constructions mentioned above. I will begin first by reviewing two earlier descriptions on *dà* as a marker for subordination. These are Dimmendaal 1989:97-98 and Bagari 1976. Dimmendaal claims that the particle *dà* should be considered as a constituent of the matrix clauses in sentences like the following:

(35)  

a. mënë në niyyà-r macjì dà [ shigä ciki-n gizo]?  
what ID goal-of snake with entering inside-of gizo  
(Dimmendaal # 33 pp. 98)  
‘What is the snake’s idea behind entering Gizo?’

b. lökáci-n aurë kë nan dà [ yìn kwai]. (Dimmendaal # 34)  
season-of marriage cop. there with doing-of eggs.  
‘The season of marriage and laying of eggs is thus’

c. inà murnà dà [ gani-n yaddà .... ] . (Dimmendaal # 35)  
ls.-cnt. pleasure-of with seeing-of how  
‘I am pleased with seeing how ....’

According to him the particle *dà* is obligatory when a noun is followed by a VP-type complement as in (35a-c) above. Furthermore, *dà* may also function as an obligatory particle with some verbs as in the following:

(36)  

a. yà aikà dà sàkô [ cèwà sù dainà yàke-yàkel].  
3ms.-perf. send with message that 3ms.-subj. stop fighting  
(Dimmendaal # 27, pp. 96).  
‘He sent a message that they should stop fighting’

b. bà-i kûla dà [ kô nawà sukà mutù] ba.  
neg.-3A care with if how many 3A die neg.  
(Dimmendaal # 30)  
‘He did not care however many met with their death’
He concludes that the particle *dà* "can be combined with complementizers but it is incompatible with an S-bar complement type ... (Dimmendaal 1989:98)". While it is correct to consider *dà* as part of certain matrix predicates (sociative verbs, see Parsons 1981:354-370) like *kùlù (dà)*, *lùrà (dà)* 'observe/pay attention/care etc.', *màntà (dà)* 'forget (about/with)', *tunà (dà)* 'remember (with)', *ràbu (dà)* 'part (with)', *amîncè (dà)* 'agreed (with)', *aikà (dà)* 'send (with)' etc., the obligatoriness of *dà* is by no means always the case when some of them take object complements/ clauses (see also Jaggar 1992:35-36, and Furniss 1991:84-87).

Similarly, in such sentences as those in (35) above, the particle *dà* is sometimes obligatorily deleted when the nominalized complement is preposed as in (37a) (depending on the predicate used) but optional when the complement is a sentential one. In fact even in sentences like (37b-c), the particle is optional as in (38). Consider the following:

(37) a. yà aikà sàkò [çp cèwà sù dainà yàke-yàke].
  3ms.-perf. send message that 3ms.-subj. stop fighting
  'He sent a message that they should stop fighting'

  neg.-3A care if how many 3pl.-rel.-perf die neg.
  'He did not care however many met with their death'

c. [e] yà màntà dà màganà-r.  
  3ms.-perf. forget with/about talk-def.
  'He forgot about the matter/issue'

d. [e] yà màntà màganà-r.  
  2ms.-perf. forget talk-def.
  'He forgot the matter/issue'

(38) a. [çp [ñp shìgà cìkì-n gîzò nè]]ì [ñp niyyà-r màcjì tì].  
  entering-of inside-of gizò cop. goal-of snake
  'It is entering inside Gizò that is the idea of the snake'
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b. \[\text{[CP (dà) [\text{NP gani-n yaddà sukè ....} nèli --- with seeing-of how 3pl.-rel.-cnt. ..... cop.}}\]

\[\text{[Ip [e] nakè murnà tį].} \quad \text{1s.-rel.-cnt. happy/please}\]

'It is (with) seeing how they ....... that I am pleased'

c. \[\text{[CP (dà) [Ip [e]i sù dainà yàke-yàke nè]} --- with 3pl.-subj. stop fighting cop.\]

\[\text{[Ip [e] ya aikà sàkò garè sùį].} \quad \text{3ms.-rel.-perf. send message to them}\]

'It is that they should to stop fighting that he sent a message'

As we can see particle dà can be deleted with certain verbs when followed a noun object. Similarly, with sociative verbs like mântà (dà), aikà (dà), it is usually the case that the dà is preferably retained when it is followed by a subjunctive clause as illustrated in the following:

(39) a. \[\text{[e] kā mântà [CP (dà) [Ip [e] kā zò dà shį].} \quad \text{2ms.-perf. forget with/about/that 2ms.-subj. come with it}\]

'You forgot (about the fact) that you should come with it'

b. \[\text{[e] mun aikà sàkò [CP (dà) [Ip [e] sù dainà fàdà].} \quad \text{1pl.-perf. send message that 3pl.-subj. stop fighting}\]

'We sent a message that they should stop fighting'

c. \[\text{[e] yā aikà dà sàkò [CP (dà) (cèwà) [Ip [e] sù --- with message comp. that 3pl.-subj.}\]

\[\text{dainà yàke-yàke-n]]. \quad \text{stop fighting-def.}\]

'He sent with a message that they should stop the fightings'

These sentences show that dà may sometimes function like a preposition which goes with the matrix verb while in other cases it functions as an independent word more like a
complementizer. While it is not my goal to argue for or against the conclusion reached by Dimmendaal with regard to the status of $dâ$ in the examples he gives, it seems to me however that the conclusion that $dâ$ should be considered as a constituent of the matrix clause does not help us much in identifying its function in such sentences. There are instances where it is preferred if not required to occur in the COMP position away from the matrix predicate. But I leave this issue here.

So far, my discussion just indicates that $dâ$ can be used as a preposition meaning “with/for”, a connector of NPs or of a matrix predicate, and as a subordinate clause introducer where it functions as a complementizer. Its status as a complementizer introducing subjunctive propositional complement however is not yet discussed. Let me now examine other uses of $dâ$.

3.3.4 Dâ as a Neutral Complementizer (Bagari 1976).

I will now turn to its function as a subordinate clause introducer. As mentioned earlier, I will here rely heavily on the discussions made in Bagari 1976. Bagari identifies three major constructions where $dâ$ is used to introduce subordinate clauses of relative clauses, some adverbial clauses, and nominalized clauses. What follows is a brief discussion of these clauses and some comments about them (for a detailed discussion of $dâ$ in these constructions see Parsons 1981, and Bagari 1976:151-164):

3.3.4.1 Dâ Introducing Relative Clauses.

The particle $dâ$ can function as a complementizer which introduces relative clauses of various types. Its closest translation equivalent in English is ‘that’. Consider the following as illustration of some of its occurrences as a complementizer:
It can be seen from these examples that the particle *då* introduces relative clauses headed by nouns in the CPs of (45a-d). The particle functions as a complementizer in each of the sentences. It is however not derived from a demonstrative as found in some Chadic languages (see Frjzyngier 1993:497-508 for the discussion on Mufun relativizer *de*). Many Chadic languages have real relative pronouns which originally derived from demonstratives and which agree in phi-features with their antecedents (see for instance Frjzyngier 1993:497-508 for the discussion on Mufun relativizer *de*). In Hausa *då* is
just a relative clause maker which does not have any reference in phi-features with the head noun in the CP of the relative clause. It is clear from these examples that the relative clause introducer in Hausa is the same irrespective of what the head noun is and it is undoubtedly a complementizer as described in many analyses of Hausa relative clause formation (see Bagari 1972, 1976, Rufa’i 1983, Tuller 1986, and Abdoulaye 1992).

3.3.4.2 Dà Introducing Adverbial Clauses.

Apart from its role in functioning as a relativizer, the particle dà can also be used to introduce certain adverbial clauses. Consider the following:

(41) a. [e] zà-i yi kyâu [IP [e] kà biyà hâràjì], ----
    1fut.-3ms. do good/nice 2ms.-subj. pay tax

    [CP dà [IP lôkaci-n biyà yâ isô]].
    comp.=as soon as time-of paying 3ms.-perf. arrive

    ‘I would be nice to pay the taxes as soon as the time to pay (it) has arrived’

b. [e] yâ bâ ni mâmâkî [CP dà ----
    3ms.-perf. give me surprise comp.=when/by

    [IP [e] kukà ki gaisâwâ dà jùnà]].
    2pl.-rel.-perf. refuse greeting with each other

    ‘I was surprised when you refused to greet each other’

c. [e] gâra [IP [e] mû kômâ gidâ [CP dà ----
    would be better to 1pl.-subj. return home comp.=than

    [IP [e] mû shà iri-n wannàn wâhalâ]].
    1pl.-subj. drink type-of this difficulty

    ‘We would rather go back home than experience this kind of difficulty’

d. [e] dôlè nê [IP [e] kù shà ruwâ nan dà nan], ----
    necessary cop. 2pl.-subj. drink water there and there
[Cp ðà (zárar) [Ip ränā tā fādī]].
comp. the moment sun 3fs.-perf. fall

‘It is necessary that you should break your fast as soon as the sun sat’

e. [e] wājibi ně ã gärē mú [Cp (dā) [Ip [e] mú yî ----
obligatory cop. on/to us that 1pl.-subj. do
aiki-n Hajîl], [Cp dā [Ip [e] mān sāmi isàssu-n kudî]].
work-of Hajj comp. 1pl.-perf. get enough-of money

‘It is obligatory on us that we should perform the pilgrimage (to Mecca) as soon as we have sufficient money (to do so)’

As Bagari (1976:155) correctly puts it, the clauses introduced by the particle dâ do not contain any reflex of any NP in the main clause and the clause itself can be fronted:

(42) a. [Cp ðâ [Ip lōkâci-n biyâ-n hârâjî yā karâtö]], ---
comp. time-of paying-of tax 3ms.-perf. approach

[Ip [e] zā-i yî kyāû [Ip [e] kâ biyâ shî]].
1fut.-ms. do good/nice 2ms.-subj. pay it

‘As soon as the time for paying taxes arrived, it would be nice to pay it’

b. [Cp ðâ [Ip [e] kükâ kî gaisâwâ ðâ jûnâ]], ---
comp.=when 2pl.-rel.-perf. refuse greeting with each other

[Ip [e] yâ bâ ni mâmâkî]].
3ms.-perf. give me surprise

‘When you refused to greet each other, I was surprised’

c. [Cp ðâ [Ip [e] mú shâ irî-n wannàn wàhâlâ]], ---
comp. 1pl.-subj. drink type-of this difficulty

[Ip [e] gâra [Ip [e] mú kômâ gîdâ]].
it would be better to 1pl.-subj. return home

‘Rather than to experience this kind of difficulty, we should better go back home’

d. [Ip ðâ (zárar) [Ip rânâ tâ fâdî]], [Ip [e] dôle nê ----
comp. the moment sun 3fs.-perf. fall necessary cop.
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The moment the sun set, it is necessary that you should break your fast

As soon as you have sufficient money, it is obligatory that you should perform the pilgrimage (to Mecca)

These types of adverbial clauses may also be introduced by dà when they are nominalized. There may also be some tense restrictions with certain TAMs. Space will however not allow me to go into this issue now (see Bagari 1976:155-157 for details).

3.3.4.3 Dà Introducing Subject and Object Complements.

The status of dà as a complementizer that has generated a number of analyses is where it is used to introduce subject and object sentential complements as well as nominalized clauses. Like in the other cases we saw on the uses of dà introducing subordinate adverbial clauses of various sorts, I will also here depend very much on the discussion in Bagari 1976. Bagari 1976 analyzes the particle dà as a kind of neutral subordinate clause marker. The following show such uses of dà:

(43) a. sai iyala-n Yâgwalgwal sukâ ûmarci Gide ---
    then family-of Yagwalgwal 3pl.-rel.-perf. order Gide

   [CP dà [IP [e] yà zö sü táfî gidâ]]. (SGJ-1:15).
   that 3ms.-subj. come 3pl.-subj. go home

   '...then the Yagwalgwal's family ordered Gide that he should come (out)
   so that they go home'

b. Ji-n hakà, sai ya sâ wannan likità ------
    hearing-of this then 3ms.-rel.-perf. make this doctor
ya zō ya bā Fārfēsā shāwara-r dā --
3ms.-rel.-perf. come 3ms.-rel.-perf. give professor advice-def. that

yā kyālē wadānnan yārā sū ci-gāba dā ---
3ms.-subj. let these children 3pl.-subj. continue with

sōyayyā-r-sū.
love-of-them

(SGJ-1:14).

‘On hearing this, the doctor then advised the professor that he should let these children continue with their love/romance’

c. Sarkī yā gārgādē sū [Cp (dā) [Ip [e] sū biyā --
Emir 3ms.-perf. admonish them that 3pl.-subj. pay

hārāji-n dā wurī]].
tax-def. with early

‘The Emir admonished them to pay the taxes early’

d. ... sānnan kuma tā ga nā mātsu dā ----
and then also 2fs.-perf. see 1s.-perf. press comp.=with

in yi aurē.
1s.-subj. do marriage

(SGJ-2:20).

‘And then she realized that I was pressed hard/eager to/wanted very much to get married’

e. ‘yan siyāsā sun tilāstā wā shūgābā-n [Cp dā ----
politicians 3pl.-perf. force dat. leader-def. comp.

[Ip [e] yā yi ritāyā ā wannān shēkarā]].
3ms.-subj. do retirement in this year

‘The politicians have forced the president to retire in this year’

f. [e] yā dōkantā [Cp (dā) [Ip [e] à rantsar dā --
3ms.-perf. eager/anxious that IMP.-subj. swear with

shī shūgāba-n kasā]].
him leader-of country

‘He was anxious/eager that he would be sworn in as president’
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In these sentences it is clear that the particle dà introduces subjunctive sentential complements as arguments of the predicates bā dà ūmärni ‘give order’, gàrgadā ‘admonish/warn’, mātsu ‘be pressed hard/anxious’, tīlāstā ‘force/coax’, dōkantā ‘be eager/anxious’, and also yi allā–allā ‘be eager/anxious’ not illustrated here. The fact that these subjunctive sentences are complements of these predicates can be seen from the possibility of replacing them with their nominalized counterparts or even with simple noun phrases. Consider the following:

(44) a. hūkumā tā ūmārcē sū [pp dā [IPA e] gāmā aiki-n --
authority 2fs-perf-order them with finishing work-def.

[ā yāū di-n nān]].
at today adv-prt-def here

‘The authority has ordered them to finish the work this very day’

b. Sarkī yā gàrgādē sū [pp dā [NP e] biyā-n hārāji-n]]
Emir 3ms-perf-admonish them with paying-of tax-def.

‘The Emir admonished them to pay the taxes/with paying taxes’

c. [e] yā dōkantā [pp dā [NP hawa-n kujēra-r mulki]]
3ms-perf-be eager with climbing-of chair-of rule

‘He is eager/anxious to be on the throne of power’

(45) a. hūkumā tā ūmārcē sū [pp dā [NP aiki tukurul]]
authority 3fs-perf-order them with work great/lot

‘The authority ordered them to work very hard’

b. Allāh yā gàrgādē mū [pp dā [NP yi-n Sallāh]]
Allāh He-perf-admonish us with doing-of prayer

‘Allāh Has admonished us with praying’

c. [e] yā dōkantā [pp dā [NP shūgabanci-n]]
3ms-perf-eager/anxious with leadership-def.

‘He was eager/anxious for the leadership’
While it is not possible to front the subjunctive sentential complements as correctly argued for by Bagari 1976:157-8, it is however possible to wh-move the whole dà complement as a cleft as in (46). This is also possible with their nominalized counterparts. But it is not grammatical when it is topicalized as in (47). The following illustrate these instances:

(46) a. \[\text{CP} \quad (C \quad dà) \quad \text{IP} \quad (e) \quad \text{sù} \quad \text{biyā hārāji-n dà wuri nē}]]_i \quad \text{comp.} \quad 3\text{pl.-subj. pay tax-def. with early cop.}

\[\text{IP} \quad \text{Sarkī ya} \quad \text{gārgādē sū tì}.\]
\text{Emir 3ms.-rel.-perf. admonish them}

'It was that they should pay the taxes that the Emir admonished them'

b. \[\text{CP} \quad (C \quad dà) \quad \text{IP} \quad (e) \quad \text{rantsar} \quad dà \quad \text{shī shūgābā nē}]]_i \quad \text{comp.} \quad \text{swearing-CAU. with him leader cop.}

\[\text{IP} \quad (e) \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{dōkantà tì}.\]
\text{Emir 3ms.-rel.-perf. be eager}

'It was (with) swearing him in as the president that he is eager'

(47) a. \[\text{TOP} \quad (C \quad dà) \quad \text{IP} \quad (e) \quad \text{sù} \quad \text{biyā hārāji-n dà wuri fa}]](,) \quad \text{comp.} \quad 3\text{pl.-subj. pay tax-def. with early prt.}

\[\text{IP} \quad \text{Sarkī ya} \quad \text{gārgādē sū}.\]
\text{Emir 3ms.-perf. admonish them}

'As for them that they should pay the taxes, the Emir admonished them'

b. \[\text{TOP} \quad (C \quad dà) \quad \text{IP} \quad (e) \quad \text{rantsar} \quad dà \quad \text{shī shūgābā (kām) }] (,) \quad \text{comp.} \quad \text{swearing-CAU. with him leader prt.}

\[\text{IP} \quad (e) \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{dōkantà}.\]
\text{Emir 3ms.-perf. be eager}

'As for him being sworn in as president, he is eager'

Note that the object clauses alone cannot be fronted leaving the particle dà behind. This may indicate that the particle itself is not part of the predicate of the matrix IP, but rather
an independent element occurring in CP of the complement clause. Topicalization here is also impossible just like in the previous cases. Consider the following:

(48) a. \*[CP [C Ø [IP [e] sù biyā hārāji-n dá wuri nê]i comp. 3pl.-subj. pay tax-def. with early cop. 

[IP Sarkī ya ġārgādē sù [C dá [IP ti]]].

Emir 3ms.-rel.-perf. admonish them comp.

'It is that they should pay taxes early that the Emir admonished them to'

b. \*[CP [C Ø [NP [e] rantsar dá shī shūgābā nê]]i comp. swearing-CAU. him leader cop.

[IP [e] ya dōkantā [C dá [IP ti]].

3ms.-perf. be eager comp.

'It is being sworn in as the president that he is eager to'

(49) a. \*[TOP [IP [e] sù biyā hārāji-n dá wuri (kām))]i(,)-- 3pl.-subj. pay tax-def. with early prt.

[IP Sarkī yā ġārgādē sù [C dá [IP ti]].

Emir 3ms.-perf. admonish them comp.

'As for them that they should pay the taxes, the Emir admonished them to'

b. \*[TOP [C Ø [NP [el rantsar dá shī shūgābā (kām)]]i(,)-- comp. swearing-CAU. him leader prt.

[IP [e] yā dōkantā [C dá [IP ti]].

3ms.-perf. be eager comp.

'As for him being sworn in as president, he is eager to'

If however, the fronted complement is "resumed" by a pronoun or a kind of a 'Pro-form', which is coreferential with it (i.e. governed by the particle d'ā), the sentence becomes grammatical whether the fronted complement is clefted or topicalized to sentence initial position. The following are therefore all grammatical:
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(50) a. \[\text{[CP [IP [e] sù biyā hárāji-n dà wuri nē]]}_3\text{pl.-subj. pay tax-def. with early cop.}
\]
\[\text{[IP Sarki ya gàrgādē sù [CP dà [ yi ]}_i]]\text{.}
\text{Emir 3ms.-rel.-perf. admonish them comp. doing}
\]
‘It is that they should pay the taxes early that the Emir admonished them’

b. \[\text{[CP [NP [e] rantsar dà shī shūgābā nē]}} ----
\text{swearing-CAU. him leader cop.}
\]
\[\text{[IP [e] ya dōkantā [CP dà [IP [e] à yi]]].}
\text{3ms.-rel.-perf. be eager comp. IMP.subj. do}
\]
‘It is swearing him in as the president that he is eager (for someone) to do’

(51) a. \[\text{[TOP [IP [e] sù biyā hárāji-n dà wuri (kâm)]], ----}
\text{3pl.-subj. pay tax-def. with earlyprt.}
\]
\[\text{[IP Sarki yā gàrgādē sù [CP dà [ hakā]].}
\text{Emir 3ms.-perf. admonish them comp. thus}
\]
‘As for them that they should pay the taxes early, the Emir admonished them for/with that’

b. \[\text{[TOP [NP [e] rantsar dà shī shūgābā kâm]], [IP [e] yā}
\text{swearing-CAU. him leader prt. 3ms.-perf.}
\]
\[\text{dōkantā [CP dà [IP [e] à yi masā hakā-n]]].}
\text{be eager comp. IMP.-subj. do to-him thus-def.}
\]
‘As for swearing him the president, he is eager for one to do that for him’

From these examples we can see that subjunctive sentential subjects (adverbial and non-adverbial ones) and nominalized/gerundive complements/clause, as well as simple NPs may be introduced by the particle dà. And these complements may or may not be fronted depending on the type of derived structure one gets and, also depending on the contexts as well. There are however some tense restrictions which I do not plan to get into here (see Bagari 1976:158-159 for such discussions).
What is important here is the fact that the particle *dà* in these constructions functions as a complement or clause introducer. With some predicates, *dà* is obligatory, with some it is optional, while with others it is completely disallowed. Bagari 1976:161 argues that in cases where it is either obligatory or optional involve non-adverbiacl subordinate clauses. Whereas in cases where it is disallowed or integrated as a preposition involve instances where the clause is an adverbiacl one. And he goes on asserting that "the reason why the neutral subordinate *dà* is either disallowed or integrated into a preposition in subordinate adverbiacl clauses has to do with the fact that adverbiacl clauses are generally introduced by semantically significant prepositions which can themselves function as subordinators. Therefore, when the neutral subordinator *dà* co-occurs with such adverbiacl prepositions, it becomes redundant and so it is either deleted or merged with the preposition (Bagari 1976:162)". Note that the complementizer *dà* may also co-occur with other complementizers *céwà* and *wai* as illustrated in the following:

(52) a. [e] mun rôkë sù [CP (dà) (céwà)] [IP [e] sù taimàkà] lpl.-perf. beg them with that 3pl.-subj. help wà jùnà].
  dat. each other

'We asked/beged them that they should help each other'

b. Sarkì yà gàrgàdë mù [CP (dà) (céwà)] [IP [e] mù ---
  Emir 3ms.-perf. admonish us with that 1pl.-subj.

dainà sùkà-n gwàmnâtì].
  stop criticizing-of government

'The Emir admonished us to stop criticizing the government'

c. [e] yà dòkàntà [CP (dà) (wai)] ----
  3ms.-perf. be eager with that
[t̪e] yà zama shūgāba-n kasāl] 3ms.-subj. become leader-of country

‘He was eager that he would become the head of state’

d. Bintà ta kàllì kanne-n-tà Audà dà Garba, Bintà 3fs.-rel.-perf. look younger brothers-of-her Audà and Garba

sànnan ta āikē sù dà sù jē sù --- then 3fs.-rel.-perf. send them COMP. 3pl.-subj. go 3pl.-subj.

daǔkò matà jàka-r-tà. (SGJ-2:51). take for-her bag-of-her

‘Bintà looked at her brothers, Audà and Garba, and she sent them to go and bring to her her bag’

As we can see from these examples, the particle dà may either occur alone or co-occur with the complementizers cēwā and wai. Note the optionality of both formatives. And there does not seem to be any reason to argue that dà in these sentences is part of the predicates rōkā, gārgadā, or dōkantā. The question now is can this particle dà also introduce subjunctive propositional complements of the CTEs under study? I turn to this issue now.

3.3.5 Dà Introducing Subjunctive Propositional Complements in Post-CTE Position.

Having discussed the function of the particle dà in various types of constructions, let me now investigate its function in introducing other types of nominalizations. The dà complementizing particle can be used to introduce subjunctive propositional complements. Consider the following sentences: 4

(53) a. .... don kūwa rāyuwa-r-ki zā ki shiryā saī wandà -- comp. adv.-prt. life-of-you 1fut.-2fs. plan except one who

kikà ga [t̪e] yà dācē [CP dà [t̪e] ki --- 2fs.-rel.-perf. see 3ms.-perf. be suitable comp. 2fs.-subj.
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zaunâ dâ shî]]i live with him

‘.. because it is your life that you are going to plan. Except the person whom you consider that it is fitting/better for you to live with= it is only you who will determine the person you think is best suitable to you’

b. [e]i yâ câncantâ [CP (dâ) [IP [e] sù yi --- 3ms.-perf. be fitting/appropriate comp. 3pl.-subj. do

aurê à wannân shëkarâ]]i

marriage at/in this year

‘It is fitting/appropriate for them to/that they get married in this year’

c. [e]i yâ härâmtâ [CP (dâ) [IP [e] kù ci àladê]]i

3ms.-perf. be unlawful comp. 2pl.-subj. eat pig

‘It is disallowed/forbidden/prohibited for you to/that you eat pork’

d. [e]i yanâ dâ muhimmançî [CP (dâ) [IP [e] mü gamâ 3ms.-cnt. with importance comp. 1pl.-subj. finish

aiki-n-mù à yâu din nân]]i

work-of-us at today emp.-prt. here

‘It is important that we finish our work this very day’

(54) a. [e]i wâjîbî nê [CP (dâ) [IP [e] kù yi Sallâh kullum]]i

obligatory cop. comp. 2pl.-subj. do Sallâh every day

‘It is obligatory that you perform the (Sallâh) Prayer everyday’

b. [e]i härâmûn nê [CP (dâ) [IP [e] mü shâ giyâ]]i

forbidden cop. comp. 1pl.-subj. drink alcohol

‘It is forbidden/prohibited for us to drink (any) alcohol’

c. [e]i saurâ kàdan nê [CP (dâ) [IP [e] tà gamâ àbînci-n]]i

remain a little cop. comp. 3fs.-subj. finish food-def.

‘It remains a little bit of time for her to finish (cooking) the food’

d. [e]i bâ àbî-n kunyâ ba nê [CP (dâ) -----

neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. comp.
[IP[e] à kwāna à gida-n sūrūkai]$_i$
IMP.-subj.spend night at home-of inlaws-of

'It is not shameful/a shameful thing that/for a person to sleep overnight at inlaws’ house’

These examples indicate that it is possible to have the complementizer $dā$ introducing the propositional subject in post-CTE position. However, the occurrence of $dā$ as a complementizer on the other hand is not as free as that of $cé wā$ and $wái$ complementizers. That is, it has very limited occurrences with the CTEs under study, in the sense that many people tend or even prefer to leave it out. In other words, while it is clear from the above examples that the particle $dā$ can introduce subjunctive propositional complements of the CTEs under study, this is not however the general pattern, since there are certain CTEs that do not allow the presence of $dā$ to head their subjunctive propositional complements. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, there is no overwhelming agreement by native speakers with regard to the grammaticality of some of the sentences introduce by $dā$. Some of these examples are the following:

(55) a. *[e]$_i$ yâ yiwu [CP dâ [IP[e] tâ kōmâ gidâ]]$_i$
3ms.-2fut. be possible/likely comp. 3fs.-subj. return home

'It is possible/likely that she would return home’

  b. *[e]$_i$ yanâ yiwuwâ [CP dâ [IP[e] nà gamâ aiki-n]]$_i$
3ms.-cnt. be a possibility comp. 1s.-subj. finish work-def.

'It is possible that I will finish the work today’

(56) a. *[e]$_i$ mái yiwuwâ nê [CP dâ [IP[e] nà sáyi môtâ]]$_i$
has possibility cop. comp. 1s.-subj. buy car

'It is possible/likely for me to buy a car’

  b. *[e]$_i$ watakîlâ nê [CP dâ [IP[e] kû yi aûrê yâu]]$_i$
probable/perhaps cop. comp. 2pl.-subj. do marriage today

'It is probable that you would get married this year’
Note that, here one cannot make a general conclusion by imposing the issue of ‘transitivity’ of the predicates in the root clause. That is to assume that a verb like \( \text{kamātā} \) is intransitive, and so cannot select a CP headed by a complementizer. And that nouns like \( \text{kyāu}, \text{wūyā}, \text{dācēwā} \) etc. also cannot select a CP headed by \( \text{dā} \) in the sense that they cannot theta-mark the CP since they are non-verbals. This cannot be right since a verb like \( \text{kamātā} \) can take other complementizers like \( \text{cēwā} \) and \( \text{wai} \) and may also take a direct object by been used transitively (see below). This also applies to the nominal CTEs or the copular ones. Furthermore, other intransitive verbs like \( \text{dācē}, \text{kyāutu} \) and \( \text{yiwu} \) also may select \( \text{cēwā} \) and \( \text{wai} \) complementizers. And \( \text{dācē} \) itself can select a CP headed by \( \text{dā} \). The only consistent pattern observed above is that most of the CTEs that reject \( \text{dā} \) are among the ‘possibility’ and ‘probability’ group. Perhaps, this problem may best be explained by stipulating that the possibility or otherwise for any CTE to select a CP headed by \( \text{dā} \) is the lexical property of each individual CTE.

However, one interesting thing to note is that with most of the CTEs under study, the complementizing particle \( \text{dā} \) may introduce their extraposed propositional subject complements when there is an “object” in the root clause. In other words some of the CTEs that reject \( \text{dā} \) in the above examples may allow it now when there is an object NP or PP/AdvP intervening between them. Consider the following:

\[
(57) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} \quad & \quad [\text{e}] \quad \text{yā} \quad \text{kamācē} \quad \text{kā} \quad [\text{IP} \quad (\text{dā}) \quad [\text{IP} \quad [\text{e}] \quad \text{kā} \quad \text{dainā} \quad \\
& \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be better you comp.} \quad \text{2ms.-subj. stop/cease} \\
& \quad \text{kurbāwā}], \\
& \quad \text{sipping=drinking alcohol} \\
& \quad \text{'It is better/fitting for you to stop drinking (alcohol)'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{b.} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{[e] yā cāncānce kūi [IP (dā) [IP [e]] kū ----} \quad \\
& \quad \text{3ms.-perf. be fitting/suitable you comp.} \quad \text{2pl.-subj.}
\end{align*}
\]
'It appropriate/desirable for you to help each other'

c. [e] yanā dā kyāu [pp à gārē kij] [cp (dā) ----
3ms.-cnt. with good/nice to you comp.

[ɪp [e]i kī àuri mijt na gāril].
2fs.-subj. marry husband of good/reliable

'It is nice for you to marry a reliable/good husband'

d. [e] yanā dā muhimmancī [pp gā Aabūi] ----
3ms.-cnt. with importance to/for Aabū
cp (dā) [ɪp [e]i tā sāyi mōtā bana].
3fs.-subj. buy car this year comp.

'It is important to/for Aabù that she buy a car this year'

e. [e]i bā shi dā kyāu [pp à gārē kāi] [cp (dā) ----
neg. it with good/nice to you comp.

[ɪp [e]i kā dingā zāgi-n mutānē]i
2ms.-subj. keep on insulting/abusing-of people

'It is not good/nice/appropriate for you that you keep abusing/insulting people'

(58) a. [e] tilās nē [pp à gārē shij] [cp (dā) [ɪp [e]i yā ----
necessary cop. to/for him comp. 3ms.-subj.
kōmā gidā bana]].
return home this year

'It is necessary/obligatory for him to return home this year'

b. [e] hāramūn nē [pp à gārē mūj] [cp (dā) ----
unlawful cop. to us comp.

[ɪp [e]i mū shā giyā à kōwānē hālī].
1pl.-subj. drink alcohol in any condition

'It is forbidden for us to drink alcohol under whatever/any condition'
c. [e] mái yiwuwa nê [pp â gârê ni] [ÇP (dâ) ----
has possibility cop. to/for me comp.

[IP [e]i nà iyâ sàye-n sâbuwa-r mûtâ-r yàu]].
1ms.-subj. be able buying-of new-of car-def. today

'It is possible/likely for me that I may be able to buy a new car today'

d. [e] rashì-n dââ nê [AdVP à kasâshe-n Afirkâ] [ÇP (dâ) -
lack-of etiquette cop. in countries-of Africa comp.

[IP mútùm yà ci àbinci dà hannu-n hagu]].
person 3ms.-subj. eat food with hand-of left

'It is (showing of) lack of good manners in African countries for a person to eat with a left hand'

e. [e]i bâ ábi-n kunyâ ba nê [pp gâ mútùmî] [ÇP (dâ) ----
neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. to/for person comp.

[IP [e]i yà kwâna à gida-n sùrùka-n-sà]].
3ms.-subj. spend night at home-of inlaws-of him

'It is not shameful/a shameful thing that a person sleep overnight at/in his inlaws' house'

It is clear from the above description that it is possible for the complementizing particle dâ to occur between most of these CTEs and the subjunctive propositional complement which occurs in post-CTE position. And the majority of them with or without an intervening object. It is shown that not all CTEs however, allow this possibility. Furthermore, even though such CTEs allowing this pattern are very few, such possibility is not the most widely used one. Speakers tend to do away with the complementizer dâ. And not only dâ, even the other complementizers discussed earlier (i.e. ñewâ and wâi) are preferably omitted. But this does not mean that dâ never occurs in a sequence like [e] CTE + (NP/PP) + dâ + [COMPLEMENT]. The data discussed so far show that all of these CTEs may select a CP headed by dâ if there is an intervening object NP, a PP or an AdvP. I therefore conclude that the particle dâ here is a complementizer and it may
introduce a subjunctive propositional complement in post-CTE position just as it does for subordinate adverbial clauses and relative clauses discussed earlier.

3.3.6 Dà Introducing Propositional Complements in Pre-CTE Position.

Let me now turn to the complementizing particle dà introducing propositional complements in pre-CTE position. The following are just two examples from both types of CTEs with or without an intonational break before the propositional complements adjoined to the root IP:

(59) a. *[IP [CP dà [IP Tankò yà tàfi]](,)([e]) yà kàmàtà].
    comp. Tankò 3ms-subj. go 3ms-perf. be fitting
    ‘That Tankò should go/leave is fitting/appropriate’ =
    ‘For Tankò to leave/go is fitting/appropriate’

b. *[IP [CP dà [IP Audù yà kòmà gidà]](,)([e]) tìlás nè].
    comp. Audù 3ms-subj. return home necessary cop.
    ‘That Audù should return home is necessary’ =
    ‘For Audù to return home is necessary’

One thing we can see from these examples is that dà cannot occur in pre-CTE position. In other words, it cannot introduce a subjunctive propositional complement in pre-CTE position with the meaning of either ‘that X should do Y’ or ‘for X to do Y’, and this is whether the complement is assumed to be in the specifier position of the root IP or in the peripheral position of the IP. That is these sentences will also be ungrammatical even if the complements occur in the CP as clefts as in (60) or occur in topic as topicalized CPs as in (61). This is illustrated in the following:

(60) a. *[CP [C dà [IP Tankò yà biyà hàrãji nè]] ---
    comp. Tankò 3ms-subj. pay tax cop.
It is very clear then that dâ cannot introduce propositional complements of these CTEs in pre-CTE position. Note that this is the same problem we found with object complements earlier (see the examples in 48-49 above).

3.3.7 General Discussion and Conclusions on the Particle Dâ.

The description given so far shows that the particle dâ in some cases functions as a complement or clause introducer (a complementizer) and in other cases functions as a conjunction or preposition of various types. One interesting thing to note is that the conclusion reached by Bagari (1976) is that the particle dâ should be regarded as a
neutral marker of subordination. While he does not mention its categorical status as a complementizer, he however concludes that it functions just like the English "to-complementizer" (see the table on page 164 of Bagari 1976). It is this line of argument that I take. That is, I consider this particle as a complementizer. I assume that the particle $dâ$ introducing subjunctive object complements discussed above is actually a complementizers like $cëwâ$ and $wai$. In fact $dâ$ is the only word that is used to join NP's, to mean 'with', to introduce relative clauses, and to introduce various kinds of "temporal" and "cohesive" adverbial clauses.

As for $dâ$ introducing sentential complements, it is actually expanding in its scope. This is clear if one looks at older texts, even from earlier in this century, one would find much less use of $dâ$ or any other overt complementizer with sentential complements. In other words, it seems to me that the use of overt complementizers in general, and $dâ$ in particular, is expanding, possibly as a result of contact with English. One source of this expansion could be from the print and broadcast media, where a lot of the news-type stuff is translated from English. This expansion probably could be directly shown in Hausa by careful text counts comparing earlier and more recent printed literature, particularly in the Hausa newspapers like "Gaskiya Ta Fi Kwabó", "Álfijir", "Álbishir", "Násihā, Ámānā, "Ál-mizān", "Himmā", "Fitilār Katsina", "Zumā", "Magūrī", and Hausa journals like "Hantsi", "Rānā", and "Lökācī", (thanks to Professor Schuh for this very important suggestion). Since most of the "real language" examples used in this thesis come from the writer and his contemporaries as well as modern texts by younger authors, it is not surprising that the CTEs under study, and also some of the mental and psychological attitude verbs as well as some of the manipulative verbs are shown to select the complementizers $cëwâ$, $wai$ and $dâ$ more regularly than expected (see for instance, the examples rejected by Bagari when the predicate selects $cëwâ$ complementizer).
Furthermore, these complementizers have a clear semantic role as earlier suggested. \textit{Cëwā} being a more regular complementizer introducing complement clauses of numerous types of predicates (especially the assertive and some perception verbs taking object complements). \textit{Waï} is a more general complementizer introducing similar complements as those of \textit{cëwā}, but with the added meaning of a "reported or second hand information". Information which the speaker is not committed to it, hence, a mere hearsay. While \textit{dâ} on the other hand is mostly found with predicates taking subjunctive object complements with mostly the general meaning "that". And it is expanding its status as a complementizer especially in the language use of the younger generation.

3.4 The Status of the Particles \textit{Kô} and \textit{Kô (..Kô)}

The particle \textit{kô} has several functions in Hausa syntax. It may function as a complementizer. It may function as a "conjunction" for NPs, clauses, sentences, as well as other various grammatical categories. Furthermore, it may co-occur with some interrogative words to form Wh-expressions or indefinites quantified NPs. And finally, it may introduce any kind of independent sentence whether it is a "statement" or a "yes/no" question. In the discussion to follow, I will examine each of these various occurrences of the particle \textit{kô} (see also Meyers 1974:247-264 for similar discussion on \textit{kô} based on its uses as a \textit{modality} particle). I will attempt to show that its occurrence with subjunctive propositional complement does not necessarily always make it a complementizer. In other words it may function as a complementizer or a "disjunctive correlative".

3.4.1 \textit{Kô} as a General Introducer of Clauses in a Yes/No Question Context.

The particle \textit{kô} may be used to introduce varieties of clauses which require an answer with a yes or no. The main function of it here is to use politeness in asking a
question (note that the word shin, a discourse particle, may also be used for the same purpose and may also co-occur with kō). The general meaning of shin is 'by the way', 'do you happen to know', etc., and it has the function of introducing questions of doubt).

Consider the following where kō is used as a question morpheme:

(62) a. kō [Ip [e] ná kāwō mukū ruwā [Ip [e] kū shā]]?  
   Q. 1s.-subj. bring dat.-you water 2pl.-subj. drink
   'Could/should I bring you some water to drink?'

b. [Ip yārò-ń yà wānke mötā-ń] kō?  
   boy-def. 3ms.-subj. wash car-def. Q.
   'Should the boy wash the car?'

(63) a. (shin) kō [Ip [e] kā sāmi Audù á gidǎ kúwǎ]?  
   Q. Q. 2ms.-perf. find Audù at home prt.
   '(By the way) did you in fact find Audù at home?'

b. [Ip [e] zā ki bā ni rànce-ń kudí] kō?  
   1fut.-2fs. give me lending-of money
   'You would lend me some money, wouldn't you?'

(64) a. kō [Ip [NP zuwā-ń gwānnā gidǎ-n-á] yā yi kyāu]?  
   Q. coming-of governor house-of-me 3ms.-perf. do nice/good
   'Did the governor's coming to my house was appropriate/o.k.?'

b. [Ip [NP shā-ń giyā] hārāmün nē] kō?  
   drinking-of alcohol unlawful/forbidden cop. Q.
   '(Is it the case that) drinking alcohol is forbidden/prohibited?'

Observe that kō in these sentences introduces several types of clauses. In (62) it introduces subjunctive clauses, in (63) tensed clauses, and in (64) nominalized clauses. Note that in the (b) examples it occurs at the end of the sentences. When it occurs at the end of the whole clause/utterance, it functions as a reduced clause for kō bā haka ba
nē “isn’t it thus/so?” which gives the sentence the equivalent of the English tag question (see Cowan and Schuh 1976:200 and 217 for details). Note further that the particle kō here is operating as an introducer of a question (see Meyers 1974:254 where it is argued that it is not necessarily a question word itself). Similarly, apart from kō being a particle introducing a sentence that requires the addressee to respond with an answer as either yes or no, it is usually the case for the remaining part of the answer to be optional. In other words one could respond to such question in (67a) and (69b) above as indicated in the following:

(65) a. I, ([IP [e] kà] [yp kāwō manā ruwā-n[IP [e] mū shā]]). yes 2ms.-subj. bring dat.-us water-def. 1pl.-subj. drink

‘Yes, (bring us the water to drink’

b. I, ([IP [NP shā-n giyā]) hārāmūn nē]). yes, drinking-of alcohol forbidden cop.

‘Yes, drinking alcohol (it) is forbidden/prohibited’

It also functions as a complementizer like the Q-morpheme used in the literature except that the Hausa Q-morpheme is overt not an abstract element in the deep structure (see Klima 1964, Baker 1968, 1978:118-124 and 1989 for this usage for English, and also Schuh 1974, Cowan and Schuh 1976:86 for a very clear discussion on the particle kō used as a clause introducer). It is therefore clear that the function of kō in these sentences is to introduce a clause as well as a complementizer, and it can be omitted just like the case other complementizers we saw earlier. Note that if it is not inserted there, the sentences will still be grammatical, and here the “question intonation” strategy being sufficient enough to illicit a ‘yes/no’ answer. Consider the following:
(66) a. [Ip Tàñì tà yi bårçì hår gòmà shà biyu-n rànnà]?
   Tàñì 2fs.-subj. do sleep until ten and two-of day
   ‘Should Tàñì sleep until 12.00 noon?’

b. [Ip [Np çì-n nàmà-n àgwàgwa] hàràmùn nè]?
   eating-of meat-of duck unlawful cop.
   ‘Is eating duck meat forbidden?’

The above examples indicate that kò as a particle introducing clauses of yes/no question. The particle may be omitted as long as question intonation strategy is used. However, the use of kò makes the question to be more of a polite one. In other words, its presence merely makes the deference overt. I therefore assume that kò in these contexts is a complementizer as well as a general particle introducing a “yes/no” question, irrespective of the TAM of the clause it introduced. Note that the fact that it introduces an element of politeness cannot be an argument against its complementizerhood. This is so, since many complementizers have independent meaning beyond their purely syntactic function. Unlike in English, it seems to be the case that Hausa has an overt Wh-complementizer, kò, that can fill the SPEC position of a CP when the CP is the root clause of a yes/no question. This is particularly of some interest inasmuch as people have been proposing underlying complementizers in this position for English since the late 1960’s at least (see Baker 1978 and Karttunen 1977). The kò here is an overt complementizer not just an empty Wh-operator. Before discussing its other functions let me investigate its function in introducing subjunctive propositional complements.

3.4.1.1 Kò in Pre-CTE Position as a Question Introducer.

Kò as a question operator may introduce a propositional subjunctive complement in pre-CTE position with the meaning of either ‘is it the case (that)?” or ‘is it so?’. Like in the case of the complementizer cèwà or wài introducing subjunctive propositional
complement in pre-CTE position, the complement introduced by kō must be outside the root IP in order for it to be grammatical in normal expected utterance. The following sentences are therefore grammatical:

(67) a. [Cp kō [IP [e] nà biyā hārājī]], [IP [e] yā kāmātā]? Q. 1s.-subj. pay tax 3ms.-perf. be fitting
   'Is it in fact the case that I should pay taxes, (it) is desirable/fitting?'

   'For us to drink alcohol, (it) is forbidden/prohibited, isn't it?'

Similarly, if the particle kō introduces the root clause (i.e. the CTE-clause), where the subjunctive propositional complement of the CTE is postposed, it is also the root clause and what follows it that is questioned or inquired about. That is, the sentence as a whole is of a yes/no type even though it is only the root clause that is headed by the particle kō. In other words, the particle may have a wide scope over the whole utterance. Consider the following:

(68) a. kō [IP [e] yā kāmātā [IP [e] mú biyā hārājī]]? Q. 3ms.-perf. be fitting 1pl.-subj. pay tax
   'Is it desirable/appropriate that we should pay taxes?'

b. [IP ̀Aadō yā dācē [IP [e] yā zama sarkī]] kō? Àado 3ms.-perf. be appropriate 3ms.-subj. become emir Q.
   'Àdo is fit to become the Emir, isn't he/it so?'

(69) a. kō [IP [e] tílās nē [IP [e] nā kōmā gidā gōbel]]? Q. necessary cop. 1s.-subj. return home tomorrow
   'Is it necessary that I should return/go back home tomorrow?'
b. [Ip [e] hàrāmùn nē [Ip [e] mú shā giyā]] kō?
forbidden cop. Ipl.-subj. drink alcohol Q
‘It is forbidden for us to drink alcohol, isn’t it so?’

These examples illustrate the fact that kō introduces a yes/no question, and it is the clause immediately following kō as well as the complement that is inquired about. This is so since the complement is in the scope of the matrix expression (with expressions like yā kāmātā or tīlās (nē), their very function is as a sort of operator on their complement), the complement must also be in the scope of the kō question marking complementizer. And as we saw above with the simple cases of kō introducing various clauses, kō here is also just an optional question operator particle/complementizer, since it does not have to be overt to make a question. Question intonation strategy alone can be used to elicit a yes/no answer. Note further that the occurrence of kō in pre-CTE position also requires (optionally) a pause before the subjunctive propositional complement or the root clause it introduces. (We will see later that the correlatives kō ... kō may also require such conditions).

3.4.1.2 Kō in Post-CTE Position as a Question Introducer.

In a normal simple declarative “statement” kō as a question particle meaning “is it the case that/so” cannot occur in post-CTE position introducing a postposed subjunctive propositional complement. The following sentences are therefore all ungrammatical:

(70) a. *[e]l yā kāmātā kō [Ip Tānī tā biyā hārājī]l
3ms.-perf. be fitting Q. Tānī 3fs.-subj. pay tax
‘It is fitting/better/desirable that Tānī should pay the taxes’

b. *[e]l dōlē nē kō [Ip [e] yā àuri Bīntā]l
necessary cop. Q. 3ms.-subj. marry Bīntā
‘It is necessary that he should marry Bīntā’
If however the root clause is uttered with a question intonation and is followed by an intonational break, the particle *kō* can occur before the CTE introducing the postposed complement of the CTE. In this case also both the root clause and the complement are questioned. Note that here the two clauses may be considered as separate. Consider the following:

(71) a. [e] yā kāmātā, [Cp kō [Ip [e] tā biyā hārāji-n]]?
3ms.-perf. be fitting Q. 3fs.-subj. pay tax-def.

‘Is it fitting/better/desirable that/whether she should pay the taxes?’

b. [e] bā shi dà kyāu, [Cp kō (wai) [Ip [e] à ci àladē]].
neg. it with good Q. that IMP.-subj. eat pig

‘Is it not good/appropriate that/whether one should eat pork?’

(72) a. [e] tilās nē, [Cp kō (sai) [Ip [e] yā yi azūmī]]?
necessary cop. Q. prt.=should 3ms.-subj. do fasting

‘Is it necessary that he should do fasting?’

b. [e] bā ābi-n kunyā ba nē, [Cp kō (wai) -----]
neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. Q. that=they say

[Ip [e] à kwāna à gida-n sūrūkaili]?
IMP.-subj. spend night at home-of in-laws

‘Is it not shameful/a shameful thing that/whether a person should sleep overnight at/in in-laws’?

These sentences show that *kō* may occur as a clause introducing word in post-CTE position but with some constraints. Namely, that (a) there should be an intonational break before the CTE preceding the particle and (b) there should be a question intonation accompanying the utterance. Notice that some adverbial particles or even the complementizer *wai* or *cēwā* may follow or precede the particle *kō* just before the postposed complement introduced by *kō*. When the CTE is negated *kō* may have as well
the meaning of a Wh-complementizer “whether” as we can see in the (b) sentences of (71) and (72) above. Note further that just like in the simples cases we saw earlier \( k\bar{\sigma} \) here functions as a general clause introducer, hence, a complementizer. And since it is an overt Wh-operator, it may be omitted freely as long as the “question intonation” strategy is employed.

3.4.1.3 Discussion of the Question Introducing Particle \( k\bar{\sigma} \):

If we look at the function of \( k\bar{\sigma} \) as an operator particle introducing sentences or clauses in a yes/no sentence, and where the particle has the meaning of ‘is it the case that’, ‘is it so’, we can say that the sentence(s) introduced by it can all be considered as “independent sentences”. That is, in the root CTE, the speaker is trying to solicit a suggestion or an advice. Such an appraisal or comment can either be made by him/herself, or as mentioned earlier, it could be a case where he/she is just reporting to the listener what someone else has said. And this is the case whether that proposition is true or not. When the operator particle occurs in sentence initial position heading a subjunctive propositional complement, the speaker is also indeterminate as to the truth value of the propositional content which the CTE is appraising or commenting about. When this is the case, it is the root clause that the doubt is all about rather than on the propositional complement. And as in the previous cases, the speaker seeks a suggestion, advice, or opinion from the listener to help him/her make a final decision about the proposition. In other words, the doubt is on the propositional complement in post-CTE position. Similarly, in a tag question case for instance, the speaker is asking the listener as to whether the event/action expressed in the utterance should or should not be carried out, or whether the appraising/comment expressed by the CTE is true or not.
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Furthermore, as we saw in the case of cēwā and wai complementizers earlier, where there is a possibility of having one complementizer introducing one clause in pre-CTE position and another introducing another clause in post-CTE position, the question operator particle kō (also a complementizer) can also participate in these kinds of processes. Consider the following:

(73)  \[\text{[CP kō [IP [e] dōlè nē, [CP (cēwā/wai) [IP [e] kā tāfī]]]?} \]
      \quad \text{Q. necessary cop. that 2ms.-subj. go}

‘Is it necessary, that you should go/leave?’

However, when the subjunctive propositional complement occurs in pre-CTE position, only wai can occur before the root clause and this is the case whether the complement is assumed to be in Spec of IP of the root clause or outside of it in a dislocated position. Note however that cēwā cannot occur in the CP. Consider the following:

(74)  \[\text{[CP kō [IP Tankô yà biyā hārājī], [CP wai/*cēwā ------} \]
      \quad \text{Q. Tankô 3ms.-subj. pay tax that/that}

\[\text{[IP [e] yā kāmātā]?} \]
      \quad \text{3ms-perf. be fitting}

‘Is it the case that Tanko should pay taxes, that it is desirable/appropriate?’

(75)  \[\text{[IP [CP cēwə(r) [IP Tankô yà biyā hārājī]], [CP kō ---} \]
      \quad \text{saying-def.=that Tankô 3ms.-subj. pay tax Q.}

\[\text{[IP [e] yā kāmātā]?} \]
      \quad \text{3ms-perf. be fitting}

‘(The fact/saying that) Tanko should pay taxes, is it desirable/appropriate?’

(76)  \[\text{[IP [CP wai [IP [e] mū shā giyā]], [CP kō[IP [e] hārāmūn nē]?} \]
      \quad \text{that 1pl.-subj. drink alcohol Q. forbidden cop.}

‘(They say that) we should drink alcohol, is it forbidden/prohibited?’
The subject complement and the root clause should however be considered as separate sentences, since each can stand by itself as an independent sentence. One final issue on the function of kō as a question introducer is its ability to indicate disjunctive nature of yes/no questions. It is well known that ‘yes/no’ questions semantically tend to indicate the occurrence of a question in an embedded matrix clause which may indicate either negative or positive disjunction. In other words the underlying form of a yes/no question implies something like the following (see Karttunen 1977):

(77) kō Áli yà biyā hărājī (kō kada yà biyā)?
Q Áli 3ms.-subj. pay tax or neg. 3ms.-subj. pay

‘Is it (the case) that Áli should pay taxes or is it not the case that he should pay?’ =
‘Is it (the case) that Áli should pay taxes or is it not the case that X should pay?’

Here we may assume that the second disjunct is omitted but it is the first kō which functions as a general interrogative operator. Hence, it has scope over the whole utterance, and we may assume that it occurs in the Spec of CP, and it is the WH-complementizer ‘whether’. Note that when the second clause is not omitted, then the whole utterance is an alternative or disjunctive questions which indicates a choice between two propositions in which one must be responded to (I will discuss this in the next section).

In conclusion to this subsection, it is clear that from the examples discussed so far, that the particle kō can occur sentence initially or medially (as long as there is an intonation break before the clause it introduces). The fact that it may be followed by other particles or complementizers in particular, may indicate that its general function is to introduce constituents as well as function as a complementizer. It is a complementizer since at least from the examples we saw so far Hausa allows “doubly filled” complementizer positions (see the interaction of cēwā, wai, and dā discussed earlier).
Before moving to its function as a “correlative” where it co-occurs with another kō, let me now investigate other uses of kō.

3.4.2 Kō as a Conjunctive Particle Meaning ‘or’.

The particle kō may be used to conjoin/link NPs, clauses, and complements. The most common way to use it is to put it before each of the elements that are conjoined. It may come either at the beginning of the constituents that are joined or somewhere within such constituents, especially simple NPs. Consider first the following involving simple cases of conjunction with kō having the meaning “or”:

(78)  a. [e] ya dace [Ip [e] kà sàyi [Np Honda kō Toyota]].
     3ms-perf. be proper 2ms-subj buy Honda or Toyota
     ‘It better/appropriate that you should buy Honda or Toyota’

b. [CP [Np riga [Advp baƙa kō farāl] (cè)] [Ip [e] ya -----
gown black or white cop. 3ms-rel-perf.
kàmātā [Ip [e] kà sà yâu]].
     be fitting 2ms-subj wear today
     ‘It is a black or a white gown that you should wear today’

(79)  a. [e] yā dace [Ip [e] kù biyà hârâjî] kō -----  
     3ms-perf. be suitable 2pl-subj pay tax or
     ([Ip [e] kù biyà) [Np jangâli]].
     2pl-subj pay cattle-tax
     ‘It is desirable that you should pay poll-taxes or (you should pay) the cattle-taxes’

b. [e] bâ âbi-n kunyâ ba nê [Ip [e] à kwâna --
eg. thing-of shame neg. cop. IMP-subj spend night
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à gida-n surūkai, kō mā [IP e] à shā furā à can].
at home-of in-laws-of' or even IMP.-subj. drink gruel at there

'It is not shameful/a shameful thing for a person/someone to sleep overnight at/in in-laws' house or even to drink gruel there'

From these examples, we can see that the particle kō can be used to join clausal complements as in (79a-b), NPs as in (83a), or AdvPs as in (78b). Another function of kō is where it co-occurs with the particle dā or dâ in concessive adverbial clauses. Here it introduces concessive and other conditionals which has little to do with our discussion of complementizers heading clausal complements. And in fact discussing these types of clauses would take me way off the theme of this thesis. I would just assume that the kō in introducing these clauses occurs in the CP as a complementizer (see Kraft 1963, Meyers 1974:256-258 and Cowan and Schuh 1976:216, Bagari 1972:41-42, Meyers 1974:258-259, Bagari 1976, Tuller 1986:81-87, Furniss 1991:111-113, and Jaggar 1992:127-129 for more discussion on this particular function of kō with the particles dâ/dâ with its various meanings).

3.4.3 The Kō ... (Kō) Construction Meaning 'either/whether...or' or as a
Conjunction Meaning 'even if/when'.

The particle kō may occur in a sequence to introduce clauses and complements. In this case the sequence kō ... kō functions as correlative particles, and is used to introduce and conjoin two or more constituents. Usually they have the meaning of “either/whether-S/NP/AdvP/PP ....or ...S/NP/PP/AdvP”, and “even-S/NP/PP/AdvP ... or .. S/NP/AdvP/PP”. I will first begin by showing the function of kō in introducing complements of the CTEs that this thesis is about. In the following sentences, the correlative kō .. kō is used to conjoin a series of complements:
(80) a. [e] yā kāmatā(-), kō [IP Tānī tā biyā ārāji], 3ms.-perf. be fitting either Tānī 3fs.-subj. pay tax
kō (kō/kūwa) [IP [e] ã daurē ta].
or prt IMP.-subj. tie/imprison her

'It is fitting/better/desirable that either Tānī pays the taxes or she be imprisoned'

b. bā [e] shi dā kyāu(-), kō [IP [e] kā zāgi mutānē], neg. it with good either/whether 2ms.-subj. abuse people
kō (kuma) [IP [e] kā yi dā su].
or prt. 2ms.-subj. do with them

'It is not good/appropriate either/whether you should abuse/insult people or back-bite on/about/against them'

(81) a. [e] hārāmūn nē(-), kō [IP [e] mū shā giyā], kō ---- unlawful cop. either 1pl.-subj. drink alcohol or

[IP [e] mū sayar dā ita], kō mā ----
1pl.-subj. sell-CAU. it or prt.=even

[IP [e] mū bāyar dā ita gā wani].
1pl.-subj. give-CAU. it to someone

'It is prohibited for us either to drink (any) alcohol, or to sell it, or even to give it to someone'

b. [e] bā ābi-n kūnyā ba nē(-), kō [IP [e] ã kwāna -- neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. either Imp.-subj. spend night
ā gida-n sūrūkai], kō mā [IP [e] ã shā furā ã can].
at home-of in-laws-of or even IMP.-subj. drink gruel at there

'It is not shameful/a shameful thing for a person either/whether to sleep overnight at/in in-laws' house or even to drink gruel there'

It is in this order that the sequence of the two kō's combinely, function as conjunctions. Furthermore, as these sentences show, the function of the correlative in such structures is to introduce as well as to conjoin sentences, clauses, NPs, AdvPs etc. They do not seem to function as complementizers like cēwā, wai, or even the complementizer dā. In
other words, the correlatives with the meaning of ‘either/whether ... X ... or ... Y’; ‘even... X ... or ...Y...’, may allow clauses or subjunctive propositional complement(s) to occur in such a sequence. Note that in this instance, there must be another complement separating the first kə meaning ‘either/whether’ and the second kə with the meaning ‘or’. It is only when we have such a structure that the sentence becomes grammatical (whether there is a pause before the CTE or not).

The particle kə may occur in pre-CTE position where the initial kə may either mean ‘whether’ or ‘either’, while the subsequent one or more kə following the first one invariably means 'or'. Consider first the following examples where it introduces the first alternative from set(s) of alternatives out of the postposed subjunctive propositional complements or clauses (note that here also the sequence of kə ... kə ... has the meaning “either/whether ... X .. or ...Y”):

(82) a. kə [ɪp Tànî tə biyə hərəjɪ], kə [ɪp [e] à ----
either/whether Tànî 3fs.-subj. pay tax or IMP.-subj. 

cːaurə tə], wannān ābʊ lalle, [ɪp [e] yə kəmətə].
tie/imprison her this thing prt.=surely 3ms.-perf. be fitting

‘Whether/either Tànî should pay the taxes or she should be imprisoned, surely/in fact this thing, (it) is desirable/fitting/better’

b. kə [ɪp [e] mʊ sha giyə], kə [ɪp [e] mʊ sayar da
either/whether 1pl.-subj. drink alcohol or 1pl.-subj. sell-CAU.

ita], kə mə [ɪp [e] mʊ bəyar ɣə wani], -----
it or prt.=even 1pl.-subj. give-CAU. to someone

[ɪp duːk [e] hərəmʊn nə ə gərɛ mʊ].
all unlawful/forbidden cop. on/upon us

‘Whether/either for us to drink (any) alcohol, or we sell it, or we even give it to someone else, all this (it) is forbidden/prohibited for us’
The particle *kō* meaning 'whether', or 'either' may also introduce a root-CTE clause first, and then followed by the clauses or complements connected by the other *kō*. This is illustrated in the following:

(83)  

a.  
\[ kō \, [Ip\, [e] \, yā \, kāmātā \, [Ip \, Tānī \, tā \, biyā \, hārājī], \]  
\[ \text{whether/either} \, 3\text{ms.-perf. be fitting} \, Tānī \, 3\text{fs.-subj. pay} \, \text{tax} \]  
\[ kō \, (mā)\, [Ip\, [e] \, bā-i \, kāmātā \, ba], \, \text{wannān} \, \text{lamārī}, \]  
\[ \text{or} \, \text{prt.} \, \text{neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting} \, \text{neg. this} \, \text{issue} \]  
\[ [Ip\, [e] \, bā-i \, dāmē \, tā \, ba]. \]  
\[ \text{neg.-it worry} \, \text{her} \, \text{neg.} \]  

'Whether/either it is desirable/fitting that Tānī should pay taxes, or it is not desirable/appropriate, this issue, (it) does not bother her'

b.  
\[ kō \, [Ip\, [e] \, tīlās \, nē \, [Ip\, [e] \, ki \, kōmā \, gīdā \, gōbē]], \]  
\[ \text{whether} \, \text{necessary} \, \text{cop.} \, 2\text{fs.-subj. return home tomorrow} \]  
\[ kō \, mā \, [Ip\, [e] \, bā \, tīlās \, ba \, nē], \, [Ip\, [e] \, bā \, ābī-n \, \text{---}} \]  
\[ \text{or} \, \text{prt.=even} \, \text{neg. necessary} \, \text{neg. cop.} \, \text{neg. thing-of} \]  
\[ dāmuwā \, ba \, nē \, gā \, \text{hukūmār} \, \text{makaranta}], \]  
\[ \text{worry} \, \text{neg. cop. to} \, \text{authority-of school} \]  

'Whether/either it is necessary that you should return home, or it is not necessary, it does not worry the school authority'

In these examples, the speaker is giving alternatives with regard to the truth content or the occurrence of the proposition. He/she is reporting/presenting to the listener alternative propositions either of which could be what the CTE expresses, and which he/she does not need/solicits any response from the listener. That is the speaker does not have any interest with regards to the contents of the alternatives. He/she has a different one of his/her own.

In this instance, the use of the correlatives is different from the one we saw earlier in the sense that in the former one, there is a set of alternatives to be chosen, while in the latter, none of the alternative is to be chosen. Note that here the first *kō* can either be translated...
as "either" or "whether", in which case it functions as a wh-word. The question now is can kō function as a true wh-complementizer? I turn to this issue next.

If only one single kō occurs in post-CTE position with function to conjoin the CTE-clause and the postposed subjunctive complement, the sentence becomes ungrammatical as illustrated in the following:

\[ (84) \]

a. *[e]i yā dācē [cP kō [IP Tānī tà biyā hārājil]]i 3ms.-perf. be proper or/whether Tānī 3fs.-subj. pay tax.

'It is fitting/appropriate or/whether Tānī should pay the taxes'

b. *[e]i dōlē nē [cP kō [IP [e] yā àuri Bintā]]i necessary cop. whether 3ms.-subj. marry Bintā

'It is necessary whether he should marry Bintā'

The only instance where the initial kō may function more like a WH-complementizer is where the root clause is negated as we saw in the previous discussions in the examples of (80b) and (81b) above. The question now is can this conclusion be applied in the context where one of the correlatives occur in sentence initial position introducing a root-CTE clause or propositional complement? That is, can it function just as a clause/complement introducer without having the function of complementizing such a clause/complement? I turn to this issue now.

As we saw in the above examples on kō ... kō as correlatives, a single kō may also be used to introduce a 'Wh-clause' where the predicate is a wh-complementizer taking one, or where the CTE-clause of the predicates under study is a negated one as we saw in some examples earlier. However the function of kō as a Wh-complementizer is limited with respect to the CTEs under study. The following are a few examples illustrating this limited use of kō as a true Wh-complementizer in post-CTE position
(note that these sentences would be much better with $k\ddot{o}$ in the Spec of CP as indicated in the examples, see also footnote 5):

(85) a. [e] bà-n sanî ba [CP kō [IP [e] yā dācè --- neg.-1s.-perf. know neg. whether 3ms.-perf. be appropriate

[IP [e] in sayar dà mòtā-t-t-a à wannān shēkarâ]].

Is.-subj. sell-CAU. car-of-me in this year

'I do not know whether I should sell my car this year'

b. [e] bà-n fāhimci [CP kō wāî [IP [e] yā ---- neg.-1s.-perf. understand whether who 3ms.-rel.-perf.


be fitting/desirable 1s.-subj. elect leader

'I do not know who it is that it is desirable for me to elect as the president'

c. Ālî bà-i gānē [CP kō mēî [IP [e] akā cē --- Ālî neg.-3ms.-perf. know whether what Imp.-rel.-perf. say

[IP [e] dōlē nē [IP [e] yā sāyā tî ]] ba.

necessary cop. 3ms.-subj. buy neg.

'Ālî didn't understand what (was it) that he was asked/told to buy'

(86) a. [e] shirmē nē [CP kō mēî [IP [e] zā kā yi [tî]]],

nonsense/foolish cop. whether what=whatever 1fut.-2ms. do

[IP [e] kā tūntūbî Audû].

2ms.-subj. seek opinion Audû

'It is nonsense/foolish that whatever you plan to do that you should contact/seek the opinion of Audû'

b. [e] rashî-n tūnānî nē [CP (wai) [CP kō mēî [IP [e] zā kā -- lack-of thinking cop. that whatever 1fut.-2ms.

yi [tî]]], [IP [e] kā yī (shi)i à gûrgûje].

do 2ms.-subj. do it in hastiness

'It is senseless that whatever/everything you are going to do, that you should do it in a haste'
c. [e] yâ cancantà [CP (cèwà/wai) [CP kòwài] 3ms.-perf. be appropriate that whoever

[IP [e] kà ganî [tì] [IP [e] kà bà shì ità]]. 2ms.-rel.-perf. see 2ms.-subj. give him her

'It is appropriate that whoever you see, you should give it to him'

Notice that the sentence in (85) contains predicates that select a wh-complementizer (due to effect of negation), even though the clause introduced by kō is the root CTE clause that contains the predicate (sanî ‘know’) that does not seem to select a wh-complementizer. Notice that in all these cases the clause introduced by the question word/Wh-word kō, is not the direct complement of the CTE but rather the clause intervenes between the complement of the CTE and the CTE itself. Similarly, in (85-86b), the first kō may be translated as ‘whether’, or ‘either’, just like in some of the cases we saw in the discussion on correlatives. The question now is can a single kō be used to introduce subjunctive propositional complements or root clauses other than in cases like (85-86) as well? In other words, can the particle kō function as a wh-complementizer?

The answer seems to be yes, and this involves an instance where there is an NP head followed by kō. Consider the following:

(87) a. [IP [CP màgànà-r [C kò [IP [e] yà kàmàtà --- talk-def. whether 3ms.-perf. be fitting

[IP Tàñì tà biyà hàrâjì]]. [IP [e] bà-i dàmë tà bà]. Tàñì 3fs.-subj. pay tax neg-it worry her neg.

'The saying/assertion/issue (of) whether it is desirable/fitting that Tàñì should pay taxes, (it) does not bother her'

b. [IP [CP cèwà-r [C kò [IP [e] dòlè nè [IP [e] kà --- saying-of=that whether necessary cop. 2ms.-subj.
àuri Bintà][]], [[p [e] àbù nē māi kyāu].
marry Bintà
thing cop. one having good

'The saying/assertion whether it is necessary for you to marry Bintà is a
good thing/appropriate/desirable'

In these examples, the particle kō functions as a true Wh-complementizer occurring in
the complementizer position, while the head noun is in the Spec of CP. The speaker here
is not giving alternatives for a choice to be made by the addressee, but rather stating
his/her opinion with regard to the truth content of the proposition. He/she is
reporting/presenting to the listener his/her decision between one or more propositions
made either by the addressee or someone else. Note that in the correlative constructions,
the first particle may also have the meaning ‘whether’ as we saw earlier. But there, there
is a presentation of alternatives from which one proposition is to be chosen or where both
the alternatives are not to be chosen by the speaker.

Note further that kō may also combine with some adverbials and/or ideophones
to form expressions like kō kādan, kō kiris, ‘not a bit/little’, kō kas ‘not a
bit/none’, or interrogative expressions like kō ((ta) hālin) yāyā/kākā ‘(by)
whatever condition of/by any condition/way, or by all means/any how’. These
expressions can be used in sentences like in the following:

(88)  a.  bà-i cânçantà [[p [e] kà ci mutunci-n-tà] ba, --
neg.-3ms.-perf. be suitable 2ms.-subj. eat honor-of-her neg.

kō kādan.
even a little

'It is inappropriate/undesirable that you should badly treat/humiliate Aabù
at all'

b.  [CP [[p àbù-n [C dà [i p [e] kà yì]]], kō kādan,
thing-def. that 2ms.-rel.-perf. do even a little
Negp, bā [Ip [e] daidai ba nē].
   neg. correct/right neg. cop.

'What you did is completely undesirable/wrong'

c. kō ta hāli-n yāyā, [Negp, bā [Ip [e] zā-i yiwu ---
even by condition-of how neg. 1fut.-3ms. be possible
[Ip [e] in bā kā mōtā-tā] ba].
   Is.-subj. give you car-of-me neg.

'By no means would it be possible at all that I should give you my car' =
'There is no way that I should give you my car'

d. bā-i kāmātā [Ip [e] yā bā kā ruwā-n] ba,
   neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting 3ms.-subj. give you water-ref. neg.
kō kiris/kis/dis.
even a little

'It is not desirable that he should give you the water, even a little/drop (of
it)'

As we can see from these examples kō here introduces some adverbial expressions just
like the way it introduces simple NPs we discussed in (3.4.3) above, except that there is
an element of inherent negation in the expression like kō kādan/kiris. However, the
expressions kō yāyā/kākā need a special treatment in the sense that almost all
interrogative words may co-occur with kō (see footnote #5 below for some list of them).

Another regular combination of kō dā is with the relative INFL as in kō dā,
yakè meaning ‘even though’, and is used in sentences like the following:

(89) a. [Ip kō dā yakè [Ip [e] tā yi makā láifi],
even with 3ms.-rel.-cnt. 3fs.-perf. do dat.-you wrong

[Ip [e] bāi kāmātā [Ip [e] kā zāgē tā ba]].
   neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting 2ms.-subj. insult/abuse her neg.

'Even though she did you wrong, it is not appropriate to insult/abuse her'

b. [Ip [e] shirnē nē [Ip [e] ki ci bāshi-n nan]],
   foolish/nonsense cop. 2fs.-subj. eat loan-ref. that
[ɪp kə dà yakè dai [ɪp [e] kǐnə ciki-n wàhàlə].
even that 3ms.-rel.-cnt. prt. 2fs.-cnt. inside-of difficulty

'It is stupid/foolish to take that loan, even though you are in
(financial)difficulties'

These sentences are also conditional ones. In this cases the speaker is more concerned
with the truth value of the conditional in that even though the implication (\( p \rightarrow Q \)) in the
conditional sentence is true, this does not however mean that the presupposition (\( P \))
entails that the action/event/assertion contained in the complement should hold (for this
analysis, see Meyers 1974 and Bagari 1976).

Finally, the clause introducing particle \( kə \) may also interact with other
complementizers like \( cëwə \) and \( wai \). The particle may either precede or follow these
complementizers depending on the type of sentence used. That is, whether it is a
"statement" or a "yes/no" question type as illustrated in the following (we may note that
the English translation here may not be a grammatical English sentence):

(90) a. [e] yā kāmātə [çp kə wai/cëwə[ɪp [e] nə təfì]]?
3ms.-perf. be fitting Q. that /that 1s.-subj. leave

'Is it fitting/desirable whether that I should leave?'

b. [ɪp [çp kə wai/cëwə [ɪp [e] mʊ shə giyə]](,) --- Q. that /that 1pl.-subj. drink alcohol

[ɪp [e] hàràmùn ne]?
unlawful/forbidden cop.

'(Is it the case that) for a Muslim to drink (any) alcohol, (it) is prohibited'

If however these sentences are read or pronounced as "statements", the sentences will be
ungrammatical, irrespective of the order of the complementizers and the particle \( kə \) and,
whether they occur in pre-CTE or post-CTE positions.
To conclude this subsection, we have seen that $k\bar{\delta}$ does not always have the function of a complementizer. In other words, it does have the meaning ‘whether/if’, as well as the correlative meaning ‘either-S... or-S/NP/PP’ etc. Its use as a complementizer is mainly where it has an ‘exclusive’ or ‘dubitative’ sense as regard to the reference to the proposition or event in the complement that is expressed in the root CTE. Note that in the literature, the word ‘either’, itself is assumed to be related to the complementizer ‘whether’ (see Bresnan 1972:65-66). This assumption can sometimes be applied to Hausa wh-complementizer $k\bar{\delta}$, since it can also be used to introduce object complements of the wh-types (to be discussed later). It is in this case that it has the meaning of ‘whether/if” or where there is one or more propositions which the speaker is disputing, and he/she is coming up with his/her own decision with regard to the propositional content expressed in the CTE. Its full discussion as a Wh-complementizer will however take me beyond my present goal. I therefore leave its discussion as such.\textsuperscript{5}

3.5 General Conclusions.

From the foregoing discussion, we have seen that the complementizer $c\text{\textperiodcentered}w\text{\textperiodcentered}\bar{\text{a}}$ mainly introduces complements of ‘strongly assertive’ predicates and ‘reported utterances’. The function of $w\text{\textperiodcentered}i$ complementizer on the other hand, is much clearer in the sense that it introduces a sentence which add a meaning of non-commitment with respect to the truth value of the assertion that follows (see Dimmendaal 1989:96-97 for valuable discussion). In this case, the speaker is just reporting an assertion which he/she credited it to someone and, he/she does not associate him/herself with the validity of the proposition. It is just a hearsay or second-hand information. This complementizer also adds the meaning of uncertainty, surprise, or disputuation with respect to the propositional content of the subject complement.
The particle *ḳö* may add the meaning of uncertainty, indetermination, or solicitation about either the truth value of the complement or for seeking an opinion from the listener about making a choice between two or more alternative propositions. And it may also function as a wh-word meaning ‘whether’ or an operator of a Wh-question. The clause introducer *dâ* does not introduce the propositional subject complements of some of the CTEs under discussion in post-CTE position. In fact it never occurs in pre-CTE position except as noted earlier, where the complement sentences/clauses that occur in pre-CTE position, are clefted (or topicalized which are signaled by a pause before the complement/clause). And this is the case whether there is a complementizer or not. This is an indication that it is the “focus” feature that is relevant in these cases. If however the subject complement is not sentence initial but is in post-CTE position, all complementizers can be more readily omitted with all CTEs as indicated in chapter 2. The meanings connected with each individual complementizer or an operator might suggest that these morphemes are not just fillers of the COMP slot, but rather add cohesion to the relationship between the CTEs and their propositional complements or clauses (as in various adverbial clauses touched on in the previous discussions).

Finally, it becomes clear then that it is plausible to assume that subjunctive sentential subjects in Hausa do not occur in pre-CTE (Spec of IP) position in surface structure unless they are followed by a pause indicating that they are actually at the peripheral position of the root clause. Their preferred slot is at the end of the sentence, indicating that in normal utterance, all such clauses must in fact be in post-predicate positions at S-Structure. In other words I assume that in normal utterance they do not occur in the specifier position of an IP/S of the root clause as indicated in the schema (12) above. This is so whether the subject complement is headed by a complementizer or not. (I will later provide more evidence that show that they actually occur in other places peripheral to the root IP). I have also demonstrated how these complementizers may
interact with one another. And some of them may co-occur adjacently, either in the same COMP position or in separate COMPs of the same sentence, a process that is not well defended by the GB theory.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1 The complements of cewá may follow a wide variety of CTEs, that belong to a variety of semantic classes. These include (a) propositional attitude predicates like aminc ‘trust/agree/believe’, yárday ‘agree/approve/believe/consent’, dauká ‘consider/take (it) that’, yi tsäm Léni ‘think/suppose’, zata ‘think/imagine’, etc., (b) desiderative predicate like yi fátá ‘hope’, so ‘wish (not in the sense of ‘want/like’), (c) utterance predicates like fádá ‘tell to/mention’, gáyá ‘tell to/inform’, bayyana ‘explain/describe’, kára (dá) ‘added with/by/continued with/by’, yi álka ‘(make/do) promise’, akalwará ‘promise to’, (d) predicates of knowledge and acquisition like gán ‘understand/come to know’, sani ‘know’, fáhimát ‘understand/realize’, gani ‘realize/come to understand (when used in non-perception context)’, zátá ‘think/imagine’, (e) experiencer and commentative predicates like ji tsör ‘(feel) fear’, dám (dá) ‘worry (about/with)’, yi mura ‘be happy/pleased’, ji haushi ‘feel/be angry’, yi bakin cik ‘be angry/regret’.

2 Note that the -r here is the genitive linker meaning ‘of’, and not the definite or referential marker. This is clear because of the tone, which would be falling if it were the definite suffix -r. The use of this genitive linker is very common in the dialect used in this thesis. In some Hausa dialects they do not use it with the complementizer cewá (see Bagari 1972:37 footnote number 7).

3 Note that it is also possible to insert the complementizers cewá and wai before the CTEs under study as well as with object embedding predicates, like the “dynamic nouns” and some “mental/psychological attitude verbs” mentioned in Bagari 1972:39-40. In other words the following sentences considered to be ungrammatical by Bagari, are all grammatical to me:

(a). *ná yi mamakin 0 yá táfí. (Bagari's #35b).
   ls.-perf. do surprise-of 3ms.-perf. leave/go
   I am surprised (that) he has gone'

(b). *ná ji haushi-n 0 yá táfí. (Bagari's #36b).
   ls.-perf. feel anger-of 3ms.-perf. leave/go
   I am angry/sad (that) he has gone'

(c). *ná dauká cewá gobe zá-i táfí. (Bagari's #37b).
   ls.-perf. consider that tomorrow 1 Fut.-3ms. leave/go
   I thought (that) he was going tomorrow'

(d). *ná zata cewá shi doló ně. (Bagari's #38b).
   ls.-perf. think that he fool cop.
   I thought (that) he is a fool'

(e) yá zata [céwá bá zá-i zö dá wuri bal] (Dimmendaal 1989:103 # 54)
   3ms.-perf. think that neg. 1Fut.-3ms. come with early neg.
   'He thought that he will come early'
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It is therefore perfectly grammatical to have a null/empty complementizer in post-predicate position of the sentences in (a and b). That is they may or may not be inserted in the COMP position. Similarly, it is also grammatical to insert the complementizers cēwā and wai before the predicates of the sentences in (c-e). For further discussion on this issue, see Bagari 1972:39-41 and Dimmendaal 1989:103-105.

4 It is to be noted that in some of these sentences I place an asterisk or question mark in front of the complementizer dā. This is to indicate that there are some dialectal and/or idiodeictal differences among the speakers I consulted with regard to the acceptability of the sentence with dā introducing the subjunctive propositional subject. Therefore judgments on these sentences are hazy.

5 Another very important function of the particle kō is where it may combine with other NPs to form compound wh-expressions and simple quantified NPs. In the former case (with kō written as a separate word), the kō serves as the introducer of a clause (a complementizer occurring in the SPEC of CP) and wā (nē nē), mē (nē nē) as NP’s within the clause. Other expressions of these forms include kō wā/kō wā(nē nē) (m.); kō wā(cē cē) (f.); kō su wā(nē nē) (pl.) ‘whoever’; kō mē/kō mē(nē nē) ‘whatever’; or ‘whichever’; kō wānnē (nē); kō wācē cē (f.); kō wādānnē nē (pl.) ‘each’; ‘every’; ‘everyone’; ‘any’; ‘someone’; kō inā (nē) ‘wherever’; ‘everywhere’; ‘anywhere’; kō yàushē (nē) ‘whenever’; ‘anytime’; ‘every time’; ‘always’; ‘all the time’; ‘no matter when’; kō yāyā (nē) or kō ta yāyā ‘no matter how’; ‘however’; ‘in every way’; ‘in whatever way’; kō dā yākē ‘although’; ‘even though’; ‘even if’; etc. And the latter case where they are simple quantified NP’s are kō wā ‘everyone/each one’ and kō mē/kō māi ‘everything/anything’. While this chapter is not on the morphology of these wh-expressions and quantified NP it seems to me that a syntactic and/or semantic distinction needs to be made between kō wā vs. kō wā and kō mē vs. kō mē. And I believe that they have different syntactic properties. For me, and in most spoken utterances one would hear the sentences with kō wā and kō mē rather than just with wā or mē (cf. most of the description of these Wh-expressions and quantified NP’s as in Tuller 1986). Space will not however allow me to discuss the syntax of these words here (for a detail discussion of these expressions see Bagari 1976 especially chapter 4, Cowan and Schuh 1976:276-7, Parsons 1981:554; 556; and 589-601, and Jaggar 1992:118-123). I will take up this matter in the section on Wh-movement.
CHAPTER 4  Negation of the Matrix CTE Clauses and their Subjunctive Propositional Complements

4.0  Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the form and function of negation within these CTEs and their complements. I will also examine the syntactic and semantic relationship between them. This description will basically be on (a) the position/function of the negative particles within the root clause, (b) the position and function of the negative words within the complements, and (c) the scope of negation within the CTE clause and the complement where necessary. Other transformational operations will be used where need be in order to determine the scope of the negation within the root clauses and their complements.

4.1 The Forms of the Negative Morphemes.

There are about seven ways to indicate negation in Hausa. Five ways involve the use of the discontinuous negative morphemes $ba(a) ... ba$ (or its variants with one $ba$ or $bābū/bā$ used for the negative existential construction). The sixth way involves the use of the negative adverb $kadā/kār$ ‘lest’ which is the only negative marker used to introduce imperatives/commands in the subjunctive (see Newman 1971 for historical derivations of these negative morphemes), and the seventh way is the use of an “inherent negative lexical word” within a subjunctive complement or tensed clause (see Kraft 1963/70, Newman 1971:183-195, Newman and Newman 1977, and Abdulkadir 1991 for the discussion of the first six types of negations). We may recall that in chapter 2 I introduced the patterns of negation of the CTEs under study where I indicated that the TAM of the CTE does not only occur in the perfective TAM, but also with other TAMs as well. The negative particles/morphemes can be used to negate the modality of the CTE,
the modality of the propositional complement, or the modality of the whole sentence depending on the scope of the negation.

4.1.1 Negation in Simple Sentences.

The negative markers are used to negate tensed, subjunctive, nominalized, and copular clauses as well as nouns and other constituents. With the discontinuous negative morphemes *ba .... ba* however, the relative word order of the second negative morpheme (henceforth NEG-2) and the element(s) it co-occurs with is not strict. For instance, NEG-2 may be placed before or after the copular word. The other negative morphemes on the other hand always occur in sentence initial position. And the type of sentence used will determine which type of negative marker(s) is to be used. That is whether it is the discontinuous one or the single one. There is never a negative sentence (synchronously) with only the final NEG-2 in Hausa. It is the NEG-1 that is always obligatory in order to have a negative sentence or constituent. The following is a rough representation of the surface word order of the Hausa negative sentences:

(1) NP NEG-1 Predicate (NEG-2) (ADV)

(2) NEG= *kadà* CP/IP (ADV)

The type of negation in (1) indicates that the constituent negation used is of the entire predicate if the discontinuous negative markers are used, which may or may not include sentence level adverbial phrase(s) or simple adverbial PPs. The surface word order in (2) represents the form of negation of subjunctive and imperative sentences by using the negative marker *kadà* "lest". In this case the scope of negation ranges over the whole sentence, and this I consider to be a "sentence negation". The position of the "lexical negative" words which may occur in the complement clause is not represented here. I will defer the discussion on the *kadà* and the lexical negative words until later sections.
Before I discuss the negation of the CTEs under study and their complements, let me illustrate some simple cases of negation for exposition. Consider first the following:

(3)  
a. \[ \text{\text{IP Audù bá-i zō makarántā ba].} \]  
\text{Audù neg.-3ms.-perf. come school neg.}  
'Audù didn't come to school'  
b. \[ \text{\text{IP yárā-n bā/bā zā sū zō ba yāu].} \]  
\text{children-def. neg. 1fut.-3pl. come today neg. today}  
'The children will not come today'  
c. \[ \text{\text{IP Áli bā wāwā ba nē].} \]  
\text{Áli neg. stupid/foolish neg. cop.}  
'Áli is not stupid/a fool'  
d. \[ \text{\text{IP Aabù bā ta dá miji].} \]  
\text{Aabù neg. 3fs.-cnt. with husband}  
'Aabù does not have a husband/is not married'  
e. \[ \text{\text{IP Audù bā yā zuwā makarántā].} \]  
\text{Audù neg. 3ms.-cnt. going school}  
'Audù does not go/is not going to school'  

These sentences illustrate the use of these negative morphemes with various TAMs except that they cannot be used with the subjunctive TAM. Note that in Hausa, a negated constituent may also be focussed. I turn to this issue next.

4.1.2 Negative in Focus.

When a constituent like an NP is focussed i.e. preposed, the negative marker may either precedes the NP or follows the NP. This depends on what is intended to be negated and the kind of negation used. In what follows I give a partial description on the placement of negation in focus construction (I discuss focus and other Wh-constructions in chapter 5).
In Hausa a constituent in a sentence may be focussed to CP. This is shown in (4) where in (a) the subject is focussed, in (b) the goal object is focussed, while in (c) it is the VP that is focussed. Note that here VP must be nominalized when it undergoes this movement. And the evidence for the movement is the change of the INFL from ū to ya and the insertion of the focus marker nē/cē :

(4) NPFOCUS CLAUSE:

a. \( [\text{CP } \text{Audū nē } [\text{IP tī ya } ] \ jē \text{ makarantāi}]. \)
   \text{Audū} \ cop. \ 3ms.-rel.-perf. \ go \ school
   'It is Audū who went to school’

b. \( [\text{CP makarantāi cē } [\text{IP Audū ya } ] \ jē \ tī]. \)
   \text{school} \ cop. \ Audū \ 3ms.-rel.-perf. \ go
   'It is the school that Audū went’

c. \( [\text{CP zuwā } \text{makarantāi nē } [\text{IP Audū ya } ] \ yii]. \)
   \text{coming/going school} \ cop. \ Audū \ 3ms.-rel.-perf. \ do
   'It is coming/going to school that Audū did’

In these sentences no negation is involved. Only a NP is focussed. Another instance where NP is focussed and the clause is negated is represented in (5), where the discontinuous negative markers are used to negate only the clause:

(5) NPFOCUS ba CLAUSE ba:

a. \( [\text{CP Audū nē } [\text{IP tī bā yā } ] \ zō \text{ makarantā ba}]. \)
   \text{Audū} \ cop. \ neg. \ 3ms.-rel.-perf. \ come \ school \ neg.
   'It is Audū who didn’t come to school’

b. \( [\text{CP makarantāi cē } [\text{IP Audū bā yā } ] \ jē \ tī bā]. \)
   \text{school} \ cop. \ Audū \ neg. \ 3ms.-rel.-perf. \ go \ neg.
   'It is school that Audū didn’t go’
Here the focussed NP then is out of the scope of negation. Such a focussed constituent may also be negated excluding the clause. This is illustrated in the following:

(6) \[ \text{bā NPFOCUS ba CLAUSE:} \]

a. \[ [\text{CP bā Audù bā nē [IPA ti ya zō makarantā]].} \]
   \[ \text{neg. Audù neg. cop. 3ms.-rel.-perf. come school} \]
   ‘It is not Audù who came to school’ = ‘Someone did, but not Audù’

b. \[ [\text{CP bā makarantāi ba cē [IPA Audù ya jē ti]].} \]
   \[ \text{neg. school cop. neg. Audù 3ms.-rel.-perf. go} \]
   ‘It is not school (where) Audù went’ = ‘But he did go somewhere’

c. \[ [\text{CP bā zuwā makarantāi ba nē [IPA Audù ya yi]].} \]
   \[ \text{neg. coming school neg. cop. Audù 3ms.-rel.-perf. do} \]
   ‘It is not coming to school that Audù did’ = ‘But he did something else’

In these sentences the discontinuous negative morphemes flanked the focussed NP in the focus position (i.e. the CP). And the scope of the negation is restricted to the focussed NP. The rest of the clause is not affected. In other words the event of clause is not negated. The interpretation of (6a) for instance, is thus: “it is not Audu who came to school, somebody did come, but not Audù”. Another instance where there is a somewhat similar interpretation is represented in (7). Here both the focussed constituent and the clause are negated:
(7) bâ NPFOCUS CLAUSE ba:

a. [CP bâ Audù nê [IP ti yà zô makarantâ ba]].
   neg. Audù cop. 3ms.-rel.-perf. come school neg.

'It is not Audù who came to school' =
'Someone did come to school, and he is not Audù'

b. [CP bâ makarantâj cê [IP Audù ya jê ti ba]].
   neg. school cop. Audù 3ms.-rel.-perf. go neg.

'It is not school (where) Audù went'

c. [CP bâ zuwâ makarantâj nê [IP Audù ya yiî ba]].
   neg. coming school cop. Audù 3ms.-rel.-perf. do neg.

'It is not coming to school that Audù did'

The sentences in (7) and those in (6) have essentially the same structure. There may however be some subtle differences in meaning between these two, but the difference is not between what is negated and what is not negated. Another structure where both focussed NP and clause are negated is represented in (8):

(8) bâ NPFOCUS (ba) ba CLAUSE ba:

a. [CP bâ Audùi (ba) nê [IP ti bâ yà zô -----]
   neg. Audù neg. cop. neg. 3ms.-perf. come
   makarantâ ba]].
   school neg.

'It is not Audù who didn’t come to school' =
'Audù did, but someone didn’t'

b. [CP bâ makarantâi (ba) cê [IP Audù bâ ya -----]
   neg. school cop. neg. Audù neg. 3ms.-rel.-perf.
   je ti ba]].
   go neg.

'It is not school (where) Audù didn’t go' =
'He went somewhere'
c. \[CP \, \text{bà zuwà makarantāj} \, (ba) \, nē \, [\text{IP} \, \text{Audù} \, bà \, --- \, \text{neg. coming school} \, \text{neg. cop.} \, \text{Audù} \, \text{neg.} \, \text{ya} \, \text{yij} \, \text{ba}]].\]

3ms.-rel.-perf. do neg.

'It is not coming/going to school that Audù didn't do'

As we can see from these examples, the meaning involved is no different from that of (7) since here also both the focussed NP and the clause are negated. Both elements are within the scope of the negation. The interesting thing here is that the parenthesized \((ba)\) is not needed, meaning that the final \(ba\) is serving as NEG-2 for both the NEG-1’s. While the sentence is grammatical with or without the parenthesized \((ba)\), it is however preferable to omit it. However, there may be a subtle meaning difference parallel to the bracketed alternatives just above. One final thing to be noted however is that when the interpretation of the negation is intended to include both the focussed NP and the clause, the whole sentence must contain both NEG-1 and NEG-2 if the sentence is of the type that requires the use of the discontinuous negative markers. In other words one cannot use the normal predicate negation as in the following:

(9) a. \*[\[CP \, \text{bà Audù} \, nē \, [\text{IP} \, \text{tī} \, \text{ya} \, \text{jē makarantā Œ}]].\]

3ms.-rel.-perf. go school neg.

'It is not Audu who went school'

b. \*[\[CP \, \text{bà makarantāj} \, nē \, [\text{IP Audù} \, \text{ya} \, \text{jē tī Œ}]].\]

Audù 3ms.-rel.-perf. go neg.

'It is not home (where) Audù went'

c. \*[\[CP \, \text{bà zuwà makarantāj} \, nē \, [\text{IP Audù} \, \text{ya} \, \text{yij} \, Œ]].\]

Audù 3ms.-rel.-perf. do neg.

'It is not coming/going to school that Audu did'
These sentences are out since the second negative (NEG-2), is not present at the end of the clause. If it is there at its original slot, the sentences would be grammatical as we saw in the previous examples. Having exemplified how negative morphemes work in simple sentences, let me now investigate how it works with the CTEs under study.

4.1.3 Negation of Matrix Clauses (i.e. CTE Root Clauses) and their Complements.

When a root clause is negated the meaning of the action/event within the complement clause may or may not be affected. This depends very much on the meaning of the root CTE and the kind of negation used in both the root clause and the subject complement. In other words the meaning of the modality within the root CTE may affect the truth value of the proposition or the occurrence of events, that is performed by the subject of the complement. And this is so whether the subject of the complement is controlled by another NP in the higher clause or not. Matrix predicates may be interpreted with a semantic equivalence like “it is not the case that IP/CP”. This is a constituent negation of a sentence type. That is only the constituent(s) enclosed by the negative markers is/are affected. Consider the following examples:

(10) a. [ei] bá-i kámatà ba [ip [e] kà zàgi mutànè]i. neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting neg. 2ms.-subj. insult people

‘It is not fitting that you should insult/abuse people’

b. [ei] bâ zà-i yi kyàu ba [ip [e] mú tâfi gidà yànzulì]. neg. 1fut.-3ms. do good neg. 1pl.-subj. go home now

‘It will not be nice/good that we should go home now’

c. [ei] bâ shi dà âmfânì [ip [e] kù shà giyà]i. neg. it with importance 2pl.-subj. drink alcohol

‘It is useless/not important that you should drink alcohol’
d. [e]i bā dōlē ba nē [IP [e] ki àuri Âli]i.
   neg. necessary neg. cop. 2fs.-subj. marry Ali
   'It is not necessary that you should marry Ali'

e. [e]i bā ābī-n kūnyā ba nē [IP [e] nà kwāna ---
   neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. 1s.-subj. spend night
   à gida-n sūrūkai-n-ālī.
   at/in home-of in-laws-of-me
   'It is not a shameful thing for me to spend night at my in-laws’ house'

In each of the above sentences, only the root clause (i.e. the CTE-clause) is negated. We may then assume that it is not the entire sentence (i.e. the root clause and its propositional complement) that is negated, but the interpretation of the whole sentence would be something like “for every ‘proposition X’, it is not the case that Y should do X”, even though the negation occurs in the root clause. The scope of negation is however restricted to the root clause only, hence a narrow scope interpretation.

Both root clause and its subjunctive propositional complement may also be negated. Here the entire sentence is negated and has the semantic equivalent of “for every ‘proposition X’, it is not the case that Y should do X (= IP/CP)” as well. I consider this negation as the “sentence negation” type in contrast to the “constituent S” type we saw in (10). There may however be a subtle difference between the previous case and this one, due to the fact that the discontinuous negative morphemes flanked the whole sentence. It is to be noted though that the positioning of NEG-2 at the end of the sentence does not change the meaning of the complement as the following simple examples show:

   neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting 2ms.-subj. insult people neg.
   'It is not fitting that you should insult/abuse people'
b. [e]i bā dōlē nē [Ip {e} ki àuri Ali]i ba.
   neg. necessary cop. 2fs.-subj. marry Ali neg.

   'It is not necessary that you should marry Ali'

c. [e]i bā abi-n kunyā nē [Ip {e} nā kwāna
   neg. thing-of shame cop. 1s.-subj. spend night
   à gida-n sūrūkai-n-ā]i ba.
   at/in home-of in-laws-of-me neg.

   'It is not a shameful thing for me to spend night at my in-laws' house'

d. Tānimū ya cē, [Ip {e}i bā zā-i yi dādi ---
   Tanimu 3ms.-perf. say neg. 1fut-3ms. do nice

   [Ip {e} à cē [Ip {e} nā fadā miki à nānli]i ba]].
   Imp.-subj. say 1s.-perf. tell to-you at here neg.

   'Tanimu said, “it will not be nice that I should tell you (it) here”'

The negation here is over the whole utterance. That is it is not restricted to the root clause.

It is therefore clear from these examples that in Hausa it is possible to negate the root clause alone or the root clause together with its propositional complement, and there is no real semantic difference between the two ways of placing the negative operators.

However, if the subjunctive propositional complement is negated alone by using the negative morpheme ba(a) ..... ba or its variants, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

Note the gloss in the INFNs of the examples in (12). Here it is the subjunctive TAM in the propositional complement that is negated by the negative operators bā ... ba. The negation is not intended for complements with other TAMs. If it were, these sentences would be grammatical. So the following are ungrammatical:

(12) a. *[e] ya kāmātā [Ip {e} bā kā zāgi mutānē ba].
   3ms.-perf. be fitting neg. 2ms.-subj. insult people neg.

   'It is not fitting that you should insult/abuse people'
b. *[e] dōiē ne [IP [e] bā ki àuri Āli ba].  
necessary cop. neg. 2fs.-subj. marry Āli neg.

'It is not necessary that you should marry Āli'

The general constraint I propose here (though not new in the literature), is that the negative operator *ba(a) .... ba* or its variants are never used to negate subjunctive complement as indicated in the following:

(13) *[X ba(a) Y (ba)* (Z)]

Where Y is in subjunctive TAM and the second ba precedes or follows Z.

The discontinuous negative morpheme *ba(a) .... ba* or its variants may also occur in sentences with extensions of adverbiacl clauses of various sorts. However, it is the discontinuous type that is of interest here, since the crucial negative particle is the final one (i.e. NEG-2). As we saw earlier with simple indicative sentences, the second ba (NEG-2) does not seem to have a fixed slot in the VP. This seems to be the case even where there is an adverbal clause following the subjunctive complement. Consider first cases where NEG-2 occurs between the complement and the adverbal clause:

(14) a. [e] bā-i hàramtā [IP [e] kū ci nāmā-n  
neg.-3ms.-perf. be forbidden 2pl.-subj. eat meat-of
  ḡwāgwālī ba [AdvP ā kullum].
duck neg. at/in every day

'It is not forbidden/prohibited for you to eat duck meat everyday'

b. [e] bā-i dācē [IP [e] kā ci kōme]i ba
  neg.-3ms.-perf. be appropriate 2ms.-subj. eat anything neg.

[CP kāfin [IP [e] ā yi makā tiyātā-r]].
before 1pl.-subj. do to-you operation-ref.

'It is not good/desirable that you should eat anything before they operate on you'
c. {e} bâ zâ-i kyàutu [IP {e} kâ bar ni á nän]í
neg. 1fut.-3ms. be nice/appropriate 2ms.-subj. leave me at here
ba [CP bâvan [IP {e} nā gyârâ makâ môtâ-r tâkâ]].
neg. after 1s.-perf. repair to-you car-ref. of-you
'It is not appropriate that you should leave me here after I have repaired
your car'

d. {e} bâ dôlê nê [IP {e} kâ kômâ gidâli]í ba [CP kô dá
neg. necessary cop. 2ms.-subj. return home neg. even if
IP {e} mun gamà aiki-n nâmû] [AdvP dá wuri].
1pl.-perf. finish work-ref. of-us with early
'It is not necessary that you should return home after we finished our
work early'

e. {e} bâ lâllai nê [IP {e} mû yîfushî dá manajâ-n]í
neg. necessary cop. 1s.-subj. do be angry with manager-ref.
ba [CP sabôdà [IP {e} yî hanâ mu bâshi-n]].
neg. because 3ms.-perf. prevent us loan-ref.
'It is not necessary that we should be angry with the manager because he
denied us the loans'

f. {e} bâ zâ-i yîwu [IP {e} kà dingâ shá-n giyàli]
neg. 1fut.-3ms. be possible 2ms.-subj. keep drinking-of alcohol
ba [CP duk lôkàci-n [C dá [IP {e} zâ kà zò Masallâci]]].
neg. any time-def. that 1fut.-2ms. come mosque
'It is not appropriate that you should drink alcohol this very day'

The NEG-2 may also occur at the end of the whole utterance as illustrated in the following
sentences:

(15) a. {e} bâ-i hàramtâ [IP {e} kû ci nâmâ-n ---
neg.-3ms.-perf. be forbidden 2pl.-subj. eat meat-of
âgwâgwali] [AdvP à kullum] ba.
duck at/in every day neg.
'It is not forbidden/prohibited for you to eat duck meat everyday'
b. [e]i bã-i dâcê [IP [e] kâ ci kämêl]i ---
   neg.-3ms.-perf. be appropriate 2ms.-subj. eat anything

   before 1pl.-subj. do to-you operation-ref. neg.

   'It is not good/desirable that you should eat anything before they operate on you'

c. ....ya kämâ cê mâtâ bã tã kyâutâ ba, don ----
   he started telling to-her neg. she be appropriate neg. because

   bã-i kâmâta [CP in [IP wâsâ zà tã yi masà]],
   neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting if playing 1fut.-2fs. do to-him

   [IP [e] tä ringâ tsêkalâ-r-sâ [CP à lokâci-n [C dã ---
   she keeps on teasing-of-him at time-def. that

   [IP [e] yakê gânâwâ dã Ubângijîl]] ba. (SGJ-1:4)
   3ms.-rel.-cnt. meeting with God neg.

   '...he started telling her that it is not an appropriate behavior from her,
   because it is not appropriate that if she is going to play jokes/tease with
   him that she does that when he is meeting with God (i.e. when he
   puts/preoccupied himself/all his thoughts and prayers towards God)'

d. [e]i bã zâ-i kyâutu [IP [e] kâ bar ni à nân]i---
   neg. 1fut.-3ms. be nice/appropriate 2ms.-subj. leave me at here

   [CP bâyan [IP [e] nã gyârâ makhâ môtâ-r tãkâ]] ba.
   after 1s.-perf. repair to-you car-ref. of-you neg.

   'It is not appropriate that you should leave me here after I have repaired
   your car'

e. [e]i bã dôlê nê [IP [e] kâ kömâ gidâl]i [CP kõ dã
   neg. necessary cop. 2ms.-subj. return home even if

   1pl.-perf. finish work-ref. of-us with early neg.

   'It is not necessary that you should return home after we finished our
   work early'
f.  [e]₁ bā lallai nê [IP [e] mū yi fushi dā manajə-n]₁ neg. necessary cop. 1s.-subj. do be angry with manager-ref.

[CP sabôdâ [IP [e] yâ hanâ mu bəshi-n] ba.]
because 3ms.-perf. prevent us loan-ref. neg.

'It is not necessary that we should be angry with the manager because he denied us the loans'

As we can see from these sentences, the second negative *ba* may either occur before or after the adverbial clauses with little if any meaning difference. The only difference is the preference for it to occur in the root clause where the sentence initial *ba*(a) (NEG-1) and the clause final *ba* (NEG-2) both function in placing the matrix predicate in the scope of negation (to be discussed later), or where the second *ba* occurs before the complement preceding the adverbial clause as illustrated in (14) above. There are however, a few cases where there seems to be a problem when NEG-2 comes at the end of the adverbial clause, even though NEG-2 may seem to appear anywhere in the VP of the matrix clause, but its occurrence is preferably at the immediate position before the complement not after the adverbial phrase. This involves cases where certain particular prepositions/adverbs head the adverbial clause. The following are a few examples of such cases:

(16) a. *[e]₁ bā-i dācē [IP [e] yâ biyā hårâji-n]₁ ---
neg.-3ms.-perf. be proper 3ms.-subj. pay tax-ref.

much less Imp.-subj. say 1fut.-Imp. imprison him neg.

'It is/was not appropriate that he should pay the taxes, much less to say that he be imprisoned'

b. *[e]₁ bā māi yiwuwap nê [IP [e] nà sâmë shili] neg. one having possibility cop. 1s.-subj. find him

even-with-it-is 3ms.-cnt. home at now neg.

'It is not possible that I would find/get him even though he is home now'
c. ʔ^[el]i bā ḥārāmūn nē [IP [el] kā ɕi nāmā-n ākuyā];i

neg. forbidden cop. 2ms.-subj. eat meat-of goat

instead-of of pig neg.

'It is not forbidden for you to eat goat meat instead of that of pig'

The sentences in (16a-c) are ungrammatical because the second ba (NEG-2) cannot be placed beyond the end of the maximal projection of which it is a part (and in these cases, beyond the end of the root clause). This is so because the elements bālē, kō dā yakē, and màimakon all introduce clauses outside the root clause (i.e. they introduce adjunct clauses). Note that the sentence in (16c) may sound like a grammatical sentence, but not all the people I consulted reject it, hence the asterisks and the question mark. A lot of them insist that the second ba (NEG-2) should not be at the end of the sentence. It may occur either in the root clause or after the postposed complement. Therefore, the statement made above also holds for (16c) where màimakon na āladē is actually a nominalization of a clause màimakon kā ɕi na āladē, which would be a clause outside the root clause. These facts and those discussed earlier therefore indicate that the position of the second ba (NEG2) in the sentence is sometimes fixed and sometimes not, depending on what follows the postposed complement of the CTE, and also the type of the CTE used in the root clause. One thing to note though is that whatever the position of the second ba- (i.e. whether it occurs between the postposed subjunctive propositional complement and the adverbial clause, or at the end of the whole sentence containing the adverbial clause, there does not seem to be a significant change in meaning as long as the first b(a) occurs in the root CTE clause.
4.2 The Status of the Prohibitive $kada/kar$ as a Negative Morpheme.

4.2.1 $kada/kar$ in Simple Sentences.

In the previous subsections I have indicated that a subjunctive clause or complement cannot use the negative markers found elsewhere that use $ba(a)...ba$ or its variants. In order to negate such a complement a general negator of subjunctive must be used. This morpheme is the prohibitive $kada/kar$ which is a special adverbial particle used to introduce a negative command in subjunctive. Unlike the discontinuous negative morpheme(s) and its other variants, $kada$ always comes at the beginning of the sentence that it negates. Hence, $kada$ is used by a speaker to express his/her mood toward the propositional content of the sentence it introduces. In this section I describe the function of this morpheme in simple sentences and in complex sentences. Before I get into that let me briefly discuss the form of imperatives and hortative sentences.

There are basically two ways to form an imperative sentence in Hausa. The first type is the one in which a special form of a verb is used and this is the only type of Hausa verbal sentence where a preverbal subject is never used. Note that, imperative verb forms are characterized by tonal changes, i.e. it is not just the absence of a subject pronoun which distinguishes imperative from other TAMs. This tonal change is much clearer with verbs having two or more syllables, which having a low and high or a low and low tonal patterns. The second type is one in which a preverbal subject is used with or without an overt lexical subject. In this form of the imperative all person subjects (i.e. nouns or pronouns) can be used. And it has a hortative meaning. In addition, the preverbal pronoun is always in the subjunctive TAM which must share all the phi-features of the subject NP whether it is in Spec of IP or outside of it (see Cowan and Schuh 1976:122-123, 334-335, Jaggar 1992:93-98 for a detailed discussion of these verbs and the
constructions in which they occur). Here are a few examples where the first type is indicated in (17) and the second type in (18):

(17) a. shigō dāki-n!
come in/enter room-ref.

‘(You should) come/enter into the room!’

b. gāmā aiki-n nākā dá wuri!
finish work-ref. of-you with early

‘(You should) finish your work early!’

(18) a. [Ip [e] kà shigō dāki-n]!
2ms.-subj. enter room-ref.

‘(You should) come into the room!’

b. [Ip [e] ki gāmā aiki-n nāki dá wuri]!
2fs.-subj. finish work-ref. of-you with early

‘(You should) finish your work early!’

These sentences are used as imperatives/commands whether there is an overt subject or not just as in English (see Pelmutter and Soames 1979, McCawley 1988). These imperative and hortative forms can be negated by placing the prohibitive kadā at the beginning of the sentence to negate the command. But as mentioned earlier, unlike the ba(a) negative morphemes, the complement that kadā introduces and negates must always be in the subjunctive. Using negative subjunctive is then a way in which to express negative imperative and negative exhortations in Hausa. These usages are illustrated in the following (compare the contrast between the sentences in (19) with earlier sentences in (3) above:

(19) a. [Ip kadā [e] kà shigō dāki-n]!
leșt=neg. 2ms.-subj. enter in room-ref.

‘You should not come into the room!’
b. \([ip \ kadâ \ [e] \ ki \ tâfi \ gidâ]]\).
   \(\text{lest}=\text{neg.} \ 2\text{fs.-subj.} \ \text{go} \ \text{home}\)

   'You should not go home!'

c. \([ip \ kadâ \ [e] \ kù \ shâ \ giyâ \ à \ kô'ina]]\).
   \(\text{lest}=\text{neg.} \ 2\text{pl.-subj.} \ \text{drink} \ \text{alcohol at anywhere}\)

   'You should not drink alcohol at anywhere'

d. \([ip \ kadâ \ [e] \ mü \ yi \ fâdâ \ dà \ sü]]\).
   \(\text{lest}=\text{neg.} \ 1\text{pl.-subj.} \ \text{do} \ \text{fighting with them}\)

   'Don't we quarrel with them/we should not quarrel with them'

e. \([ip \ kadâ \ Âli \ yà \ yi \ gyâtsâ \ à \ nân]]\).
   \(\text{lest}=\text{neg.} \ Âli \ 3\text{ms.-subj.} \ \text{do belch} \ \text{at here}\)

   'Âli should not belch here'

f. \([ip \ Âli \ kadâ \ yà \ tâfi \ gidâ \ gôbe]]\).
   \(Âli \ \text{lest}=\text{neg.} \ 3\text{ms.-subj.} \ \text{go} \ \text{home tomorrow}\)

   'Âli should not go home tomorrow'

Notice the alternative placement of the subject Âli in (19e-f). Here there is no difference in meaning whether Âli precedes or follows kadâ. In some cases the use of a sentence with kadâ is synonymous with the meaning of the one negated by the other negative morphemes. For instance, in the following sentences, the interpretation is semantically the same:

(20) a. \([ip \ kadâ \ [e] \ à \ yi \ rantsuwâ \ dà \ Allâh \ à \ kân \ karya]\).
   \(\text{neg.}=\text{lest} \ \text{Imp.-subj.} \ \text{do} \ \text{swearing with} \ \text{Allâh} \ \text{on} \ \text{falsehood}\)

   'No false swearing in the name of Allâh=God'

b. \(\text{bandâ} \ (yi-n) \ rantsuwâ \ dà \ Allâh \ à \ kân \ karya\).
   \(\text{without/excluding doing-of} \ \text{swearing} \ \text{with} \ \text{Allâh} \ \text{on} \ \text{falsehood}\)

   'No (doing/making of) false swearings in the name of Allâh'
Finally, *kadà* may be used to introduce negative subjunctive complements to nouns and purpose clauses where it is often translated in English as ‘*lest*’. In this case it is usually preceded by a purpose clause complementizer *don/dômìn*, having various meanings like ‘*in order that*’, ‘*so that*’, etc. This use of *kadà* is illustrated in the following sentences:

(21) a. [e] nà rubūtā sâkô-n [ÇP (don) [Ip kadà [e] nà ---
    ls.-perf. write message-ref. comp. lest 1s.-subj.

mântâ shi]].
    forget it

‘I wrote down the message/note so that I don’t forget it’

b. [Ip [e] mun sanar dâ kū [ÇP (don) [Ip kadà [e] kū ---
    1pl.-perf. inform you (pl.) comp. lest 2pl.-subj.

yi rashi-n ladâbî]].
    do lack-of respect

‘We informed you so that you do not misbehave’

c. [e] kū tâfi dâ rigâ-r ruwâ [ÇP (don) [Ip kada ---
    2pl.-subj. go with gown-of-rain comp. lest

[e] kū shâ dükâ-n ruwā]].
    2pl.-subj. drink beating-of water-rain

‘Take a rain coat lest you get soaked (from rainfall)’

d. [e] mü tâfi dâ wuri [ÇP (don) [Ip kadà wani yà ---
    1pl.-subj. go with early comp. lest someone 3ms.-subj.

rigâ mü sâye-n-tâ]].
    precede us buying-of-it

‘Let’s go quickly lest someone else buy it before us (=we reached there)’

e. [e] sukâ kamâ mazā, [Ip kadà dai à yi ---
    3pl.-rel.-perf. catch men lest prt. Imp.-subj. do
zânce-n mâtâ].  
(talking-of women)  
(Abraham 1959:174).

'Then they captured males, not to mention women'

In summary to this subsection, we have so far seen that the morpheme *kadâ* serves to negate only subjunctive complements or clauses of various types. These include imperative, hortative, object clauses and some adverbial clauses in the subjunctive. The question now is can it also be used to negate the subjunctive propositional complements of the CTEs under study? I turn to this issue in the next subsection.

4.2.2 *Kadâ/kâr in Post-CTE Position.*

In this subsection I will discuss the use of *kadâ/kâr* negative marker that introduces and negates subjunctive complements to the CTEs like *yâ kâmâtâ* and *dôlê nê*. In other words I will investigate its behavior when the complement occurs in either pre-CTE or post-CTE positions. This morpheme seems to have the clearest meaning among all the other complementizers and other clause introducing particles discussed so far. It has a clear-cut meaning of negating the subjunctive propositional complement which the CTE expresses, appraises, or comments about. The negative marker expresses a negative condition with respect to the propositional content of the subject complement (see Dimmendaal 1989:102). And when this negative marker is omitted, the truth value of the whole modality of the proposition is affected, in the sense that the complement is devoid of negation unless there is a lexical negative word in it. Consider the following examples where the sentences in (22-23) show how the subjunctive propositional complement is negated by using the negative subjunctive marker *kadâ* (note that a complementizer may occur between the CTE and the complement introduced by *kadâ*, as indicated in some of the examples):
(22) a. [e]i yā kəmatə [ČP (wai)] [íp kədə Tən̂i tə ---- 3ms.-perf. be fitting that lest Tən̂i 3fs.-subj.
          biyə hərəji-n]i
          pay tax-ref.

          'It is fitting/better/desirable that Tən̂i should not pay the taxes'

b. [e]i yā kyəutu [ČP (cəwə)] [íp kədə [e] nə ---- 3ms.-perf. be good/desirable that lest 1s.-subj.
      yi fushi də məganə-r-sə]i
      do angry with talk-of-him

      'It is better/nice/desirable that I should not be angry with what he said'

c. [e]i yanə də muhimmanə [ČP (cəwə-r) [íp kədə ---- 3ms.-cnt. with importance that lest
      [e] mū nənə fushi-n-mū də yawə]i
      1pl.-subj. show anger-of-us with many/much

      'It is important that we do not show to much of our anger'

d. [e]i yanə də kyəu [ČP ə [íp kədə [e] kə zəgə shi]]i
      3ms.-cnt. with good/nice lest 2fs.-subj. abuse him

      'It is good/appropriate that you should not abuse/insult him'

e. [e] bə-i dəmə ni ba [ČP kə [íp [e] sə ci ---- neg.-3ms.-perf. bother me neg. whether 3pl.-subj. eat
      əbinci-n]i, kə [íp kədə [e] sə ci (shə)].
      food-ref. or lest 3pl.-subj. eat it

      'It does not bother me whether they eat the food or not'

(23) a. [e]i wəjibī nə [ČP (cəwə)] [íp kədə [e] kə shə giyə]i
      obligatory cop. that lest 2fs.-subj. drink alcohol

      'It is obligatory that you should not drink alcohol'

b. [e]i dələ nə [ČP (wai)] [íp kədə [íp [e] sə təfə gidə]i
      necessary cop. that lest 1pl.-subj. go home

      'It is necessary that they should not go home'
These examples show that the negation of the subjunctive complements of these CTEs with the prohibitive kada behave exactly like that of the predicates we saw earlier. However, there is some problem here. Some CTEs that we would expect to allow this kind of negation do not do so. For instance, in the sentences in (24) below, some of the sentences are ungrammatical either due to (a) the presence of inherent negation contained within the noun or verb of the root clause (like the intransitive verb häramtā and the noun wūyā), (b) having double negation in root and complement clauses, (c) the occurrence of CTEs indicating non-realized action/event in the root clause, or (d) where the CTE with morphological INFL is from the "possibility, likely, or probable" group. (Note that some of these sentences would be grammatical if the CTE clause and the negated complement are considered as separate sentences):

(24)  a. *[e]i yā häramtā [ıp kada [e] kū yi azûmil]i
      3ms.-perf. be forbidden lest 2pl.-subj. do fasting
      'It is/was unlawful/disallowed/prohibited that you should not do fasting'

   b. *[e]i yā yiwu [ıp kada [e] yā zama sarki]i
      3ms.-fut. be possible lest 3ms.-subj. be/become emir
      'It is possible/likely that he will not become Emir'
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c. *[e]i yanâ yiwuwâ [Çp Ø [Ip kadâ [e] kà àuri Bintâ]]i
   3ms.-cnt. be possible/likely  lest  2ms.-subj. marry Bintâ
   ‘It is possible/likely that you should not marry Binta’

d. *[e]i yanâ dà wûyâ [Çp Ø [Ip kadâ [e] sù tàfi gidâ]]i
   3ms.-cnt. with difficult  lest  3pl.-subj. go home
   ‘It is impossible for them not to go home’

Like in the cases of complements of CTEs with morphological INFLs, the following with copular CTEs are also ungrammatical due to the same reasons mentioned above:

(25) a. *[e]i hârâmùn nê [Çp (cêwâ) [Ip kadâ [e] mû ci---
   unlawful  cop.  that  lest  1pl.-subj. eat
   nâmâ-n àladë]]i
   meat-of  pig
   ‘It is unlawful for us not to eat pork’

b. *[e]i mài yiwuwâ nê [Çp Ø [Ip kadâ [e] nà säyi---
   has possibility  cop.  lest  1ms.-subj. buy
   sâbuwa-r môtâ]]i
   new-of  car
   ‘It is possible/likely that I will not buy a new car’

c. *[e]i watakîlà nê [Çp Ø [Ip kadâ [e] sù zô yâu]]i
   probably  cop.  lest  3pl.-subj. do today
   ‘It is probable/possible that they should not come today’

d. *[e]i saurâ kadân (nê) [Çp Ø [Ip kadâ [e] tà gamâ]]i
   remain a bit more  cop.  lest  3fs.-subj. finish
   ‘It remains a little bit (of time) for her not to finish’

The above piece of data clearly indicate that there are some restrictions with regard to the use of the negative marker kadâ to negate the propositional complements of some types.
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of root CTEs. The restrictions are not uniformly applicable to all the expressions. There are differences between the expressions as we have shown throughout our discussion. One such difference can be found in using two different negative markers in the same sentence, an issue which I discuss in the next subsection.

4.2.3 Multiple Negative Markers in a Clause/Sentence.

In this subsection, I will discuss sentences in which there are both \( b(a) \) \ldots \( b a \) (or its variants) and the subjunctive negative marker \( k\dot{a}d\dot{a} \) in the same sentence. With some CTEs it is possible, while with some this combination causes the negated sentence to be ungrammatical. In this case if the CTE clause and the propositional complement that is negated by \( k\dot{a}d\dot{a} \) are considered as two different sentences or separate sentences, then this kind of negation is possible. But even here there is a restriction with respect to the position of the NEG-2. With some CTEs, it may occur either in the (root) clause or in the \( k\dot{a}d\dot{a} \) clause, while with some it can only occur in the root clause. Consider first cases where the two types of negatives occur in the same sentence with NEG-2 in the root clause and the sentence is grammatical:

\[(26) \quad \text{a. } \begin{array}{c} \text{IP [e]i b\dot{a}-i} \\
\text{k\breve{a}m\breve{a}t\breve{a} b a [CP (wai) ---}
\text{neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting neg. that}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP k\dot{a}d\dot{a} [e] k\breve{u} biy\breve{a} h\breve{a}r\breve{a}jil]]
\text{. least 2pl.-subj. pay tax}
\end{array}\]

‘It is undesirable that you should not pay taxes’ = ‘You should pay’

\text{b. } \begin{array}{c}
\text{IP [e]i b\dot{a} z\dot{a}-i ky\breve{a}utu b a [CP (wai) [IP k\dot{a}d\dot{a} ---}
\text{neg. 1fut.-3ms.be nice neg. that least}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{[e] m\breve{u} biy\breve{a} h\breve{a}r\breve{a}jil]]
\text{. 1pl.-subj. pay tax}
\end{array}\]

‘It will not be nice/fitting that we should not pay taxes’ = ‘It would be nice that we should pay’
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c. \( [\text{e}]_1 \text{ bā ābi-\text{n} kunyā ba nē \{CP (wai) \} \text{[Ip kadā --- neg. thing-of shame neg. cop. that lest}}
\[\text{[Ip [e] ā kwāna ā gida-\text{n} sûrûkai\}]}_i
\text{Imp.-subj. spend night at home-of in-laws}

'It is not shameful/a shameful thing for a person not to sleep overnight at/in in-laws’ house’ i.e. ‘One should spend the night there, and it is not a shame to do so’

Here it appears that negating the root clause imposes a selection on the kind of negation that will appear in its propositional complement. It seems that for such a sentence to be grammatical, the NEG-2 must occur in the same root CTE clause. If however the second negative (NEG-2) occurs at the end of the whole sentence, the sentence becomes less acceptable by some speakers as illustrated in the following (note that some speakers accept these sentences as fully grammatical, while others consider it as not so good):

(27) a. ?\([\text{Ip [e]}_1 \text{ bā-i kāmātā \{CP (wai) \} [NegP kadā ---- neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting that lest}}
\[\text{[Ip [e] kù biyā hārājī\} bali.]}
\text{2pl.-subj. pay tax}

‘It is undesirable that you should not pay taxes’

b. ?\([\text{Ip [e]}_1 \text{ bā zā-i yiwu \{CP (wai) \} [NegP kadā ---- neg.1fut.-3ms. be possible/likely that lest}}
\[\text{[Ip [e] kā tāfi gida yāu\} _i bali.}
\text{2ms.-subj. go home today neg.}

‘It will not be possible that you should not go home today’

c. ?\([\text{Ip [e]}_1 \text{ bā rashī-n tūnānī nē \{CP (wai) \} [NegP kadā ---- neg. lack-of thinking cop. that lest}}
\[\text{[Ip [e] kā kārbi bāshī-n nan\}]}_i bali.
\text{2ms.-subj. take/receive loan-ref. that neg.}

‘It is not a bad/foolish idea that you should not to take that loan’
d. ?[ɪp [e] bā ābi-n kunyā nē [çp (cèwā) [neg. thing-of shame cop. --- lest

[ɪp [e] a kwāna a gidā-n sūrūkai]]i bāli.
Imp.-subj. spend night at home-of in-laws neg.

'It is not shameful/a shameful thing for a person not to sleep overnight at/in in-laws' house'

These sentences indicate that NEG-2 must not be at the end of the whole sentence for all speakers, hence the use of the question mark in these sentences. Some of the speakers consulted prefer to have sentences where there is an immediately following subjunctive complement or where the NEG-2 is in the root clause and a lexical negative verb in the complement. In fact they are uncomfortable with the use of kadā when NEG-2 is at the end of the whole sentence.³

But these same speakers also accept sentences with inherent negative expression(s) in the root clause and then kadā introducing its complement in post-CTE position. For instance, in the following sentences it is possible to have grammatical sentences even in cases where there is a double negation in the sentence. That is negative CTE/inherent negative word of the root clause followed by kadā complement clause. With certain CTEs however, the NEG-2 of the disjunctive negative morpheme, must occur in the root clause as in the earlier examples we saw. Consider the following:

(28) a. [e]i rashi-n tunānī nē [ɪp kadā [e] kā kārāi ----
    lack-of thinking cop. lest 2ms.-subj. receive/take

bāshi-n nan]i
loan-ref. that

'It is a bad/foolish idea for you not to get/receive that loan'

b. [e]i bā rashi-n tunānī ba nē [çp ə [ɪp kadā ----
    neg. lack-of thinking neg. cop. ---

lest
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[e] kà kàrbì bāshì-n nàñ]]ì  
2ms.-subj. take/receive loan-ref. that

'It is not a bad/foolish idea that you should not to take that loan'

But the occurrence of NEG-2 in the root clause does not always make this kind of negation possible since there are cases where even if NEG-2 is in the root CTE clause or at the end of the whole sentence, the sentence will still be ungrammatical due to semantic mismatch between the meaning of the CTE and that of the content of the propositional complement as illustrated in the following:

(29)  

a. *[e]ì bā'ì yi muhimmançì bā [çp (wai)] [ìp kâdà ----  
neg. 1fut.-3ms. do importance neg. that lest

[e] kà  
zàgi mutàné]].  
2ms.-subj. abuse people

'It is not be important/essential for you not to abuse/insult people’

b. *[e]ì bā tilâs ba nè, [çp (wai)] [ìp kâdà ----  
neg. necessary neg. cop. that lest

[e] kì  
kômâ gidà]]ì  
2fs.-subj. return home

'It is not necessary that you should not return home’

c. *[e]ì bā wâjibì bā nè [çp (cêwâ)] [ìp kâdà ----  
neg. obligatory neg. cop. that lest

[e] mù  
shà giyà]]ì  
1pl.-subj. drink alcohol

'It is obligatory that we should not to drink (any) alcohol’

Note that the same situation is obtained even with some predicates that take object clauses as in the following example from Abraham 1959:51 which is ungrammatical due to the double negation, i.e. negative verb hanà ‘prohibited/disallowed/forbidden’ in root
clause and *kadâ negating the object clause (note though that for Abraham, this is grammatical):

\[
(30) \quad *[e] \text{ an } \text{hanê mu } [\text{ip kadâ } [e] \mu \text{ shâ bârâsâ]}
\]

Imp.-perf. prevent us lest 1pl.-subj. drink liquor/alcohol

'We’ve been forbidden to drink liquor/alcohol'

Note that the ungrammaticality of some of the sentences we saw above is not the norm with copular CTEs, since it is possible with some copular CTEs for the second *ba to occur at the end of the whole sentence as illustrated in the following (see also CTEs with morphological INFL above):

\[
(31) \quad a. \quad [e]_i \text{ bâ dölè } \text{ba nê } [\text{cp (cèwâ)}] [\text{ip kar } [e] \text{ kà } \text{ ci neg. necessary neg. cop. that least 2ms.-subj. eat}}
\]

nâmà-n gafiyâ]i

meat-of bandicoot

'It is lawful/allowed/permitted for you not to eat meat of bandicoot'

\[
b. \quad [e]_i \text{ bâ dölè } \text{nè } [\text{cp (wai)}] [\text{ip kar } [e] \text{ kà } \text{ ci --- neg. necessary cop. that least 2ms.-subj. eat}}
\]

nâmà-n gafiyâ]i ba.

meat of bandicoot neg.

'It is lawful/allowed/permitted for you not to eat meat of bandicoot'

To conclude this subsection, it is clear that the above pieces of data show that the negative subjunctive marker *kadâ/kar may be used to negate the subjunctive propositional complement of most of the CTEs under study. And those CTEs that resist this pattern of complementation are those of the possibility/likely and probability group, and in cases where some of the CTEs with morphological INFL occur in the negated form. One thing to note however, is that the negative subjunctive marker *kadâ/kar does not seem to be
as free as the other clause introducing particles and the complementizers cēwā and wai that we discussed in the previous chapter. That is, not all CTEs allow kadā to head their propositional subjunctive complement in post-CTE position. For instance, some CTEs whose propositional complement is headed by kadā/kar are grammatical, some are totally ungrammatical (due to some semantic mismatch, like double negation, i.e. negation in both the root clause and in the complement or the presence of an inherently negative word in the complement (to be discussed more below), while some are marginally grammatical.

The interplay of the syntax and semantics of the CTEs and the complement with negation is surely very complex. Drawing a generalization for their behavior will however take me well beyond the goal of this dissertation. Perhaps the problem has something to do with the kind of CTE that appears in the root clause as indicated in various examples above. This issue will be taken up in the future research. This ends my discussion on kadā in post-CTE position. The question now is how do we express negation of the propositional complements of these CTEs where kadā won't work? Before discussing this issue however let us see the possibilities of having kadā in pre-CTE position.

4.2.4 Kadā/kar in Pre-CTE Position.

The kadā/kar negative marker cannot occur in pre-CTE position more freely as cēwā and wai complementizers do. That is, it cannot introduce a propositional subject complement in pre-CTE position with the meaning of 'should not' unless there is some qualification after the root clause or when the two clauses are considered separate. Since this pattern is not found in normal structures I am dealing with, I will defer further discussion of it until in the section on its interaction with other complementizers. I will therefore just give two examples to illustrate what I mean here for it not occurring in pre-
CTE position. The following sentences are grammatical with or without a pause before the root-CTE (as long as the two clauses are considered as separate or the complement is a topic):

(32) a. \[ [\text{Tp kadà Tankò yà biyà hârâjì (fa)]]]. / lest Tankò 3ms.-subj. pay tax prt.
\[ [\text{Tp [e] yà kàmâtâ}].
3ms.-perf. be fitting/better

'(That) Tankò should not pay taxes, (it) is fitting/desirable'

b. \[ [\text{Tp kadà [e] kà kömâ gidâ (kàm)]]. / lest 2ms.-subj. return home
\[ [\text{Tp [e] tîlâs nê}].
necessary cop.

'(That) you should not return home is necessary/obligatory'

When the negative marker \textit{kadà}/\textit{kar} occurs in sentence initial position, introducing the subjunctive propositional complement, the sentence sounds odd when there is no pause before the complement. The only possible way to make it grammatical is when \textit{kadà}/\textit{kar} negates only the subjunctive propositional sentence without the root clause. And in this case it is not a complement but rather a simple negative "imperative" sentence, and \textit{kadà}/\textit{kar} being the subjunctive negative marker. Nothing more now needs to be said about it. I now turn to the issues relating to lexical negative verbs that serve the purpose of negating complements where \textit{kadà} won't work.

4.2.5 The Use of Lexical Negative Words in Complements Where \textit{Kadà} Won't Work.

In the previous sections, we have seen how \textit{ba}(a) ... \textit{ba} (and its variants) and \textit{kadà} are used to negate sentences of different types of predicates. In the section on
kadà occurring in post-CTE position we observed that there are certain CTEs that do not allow kadà to negate their propositional complements due to either the intrinsic nature of the CTEs, or semantic mismatch between the CTEs and the propositional contents of their complements. In this subsection I will briefly look at the use of certain "lexical negative" words that will serve the same purpose of kadà in negating the propositional complements of those CTEs that do not allow it to negate their subjunctive complements.

There are in Hausa some words that are inherently negative in nature of their meaning. Most of these verbs are what I elsewhere call aspactual/modal verbs (see Pilzsczikowa 1960, Jaggar 1977, Parsons 1981, Yalwa 1991, 1994, Newman (forthcoming) for a detailed discussion of them). Some of these verbs include dainå 'cease/stop doing', fäså 'postpone/fail to', gazå 'fail to do/fall short of/be below in sth./be unable', käså 'fail to/fall short of/be insufficient/be unable to', kī 'refuse', kārē 'finish doing', rābu (då) 'not to do as usual', and raså 'lack/be without/fail to do', etc. just to mention a few. Semantically, these predicates are interpreted as having negative component in their meaning. And their presence in a complement or root CTE may bring about difference in meaning in the whole sentence. The following are a few examples in their use as root predicates:

(33) a. [e] mun raså [çp àbì-n [ç då [IP [e] zå mú yìl]].
1pl.-perf lack/fail thing-def. that 1fut.-3ms. do

'Ve are unable to do the thing that we are going to do'=
'Ve don't know what to do'

b. [e] yå dainå [NP shå-n wâhalå].
3ms.-perf. ceases/stop drinking-of=experiencing difficulty

'He no longer/ceased to experience difficulties'
c. Audù yā gazā [Sc ńi (á) kudí].
   Audù 3ms.-perf. be below me in money
   ‘Audu is not as rich/wealthy as I am’

d. [e] kā ki [NP jī-n màganâ-r mahâifi-n-kà].
   2ms.-perf. refuse hearing-of talk-of father-of-you
   ‘You refused/failed to listen to your father/what your father said’

e. [e] tā ki [IP [e] tā ji màganâ-t-ā].
   2fs.-perf. refuse 3fs.-subj. hear talk-of-me
   ‘She refused/failed to listen to me/what I said (to her)’

With the exception of ki, all the other predicates take a nominalized complement only as object. Notice that in each of these sentences there is an element of negation even though no regular negative morpheme is used. In order to reverse this negativity, a negative morpheme can be used. The negative morpheme can be the ba(a) type or the subjunctive negative marker kadà. When kadà is used though, the TAM of the clause must be changed to subjunctive. This is illustrated in the following:

(34) a. [e] bà mû rasâ [Cp àbî-n [C dà [IP [e] zâ mû yîl]] ba.
   neg. 1pl.-perf. lack/fail thing-def. that 1fut.-1pl. do neg.
   ‘We were not unable to do the thing that we are going to do’=
   ‘It is not the case that we don’t know what to do’

b. [e] bà-i dainâ [NP shâ-n wâhalâ] ba.
   neg.-3ms.-perf. ceases/stop drinking-of=experiencing difficulty
   ‘He didn’t ceased from/stop experiencing difficulty/hardship’

c. [e] kadà [e] kà ki [NP jî-n màganâ-r mahâifi-n-kà]
   lest=neg. 2ms.-subj. refuse hearing-of talk-of father-of-you
   ‘You should not refuse/fail to listen to your father/what your father said’

d. [e] kadà [e] tà gazâ [Sc kî à kî-n wâhalâ].
   lest=neg. 2fs.-subj. fall short of you (3fs.) in hating-of difficulty
   ‘(Don’t let her be below you in hating experiencing hardship’
As we can see from these examples, these aspectual and modal verbs can co-occur with negative morphemes. The function of negation here is to counter the meaning of the proposition expressed by the lexical negative words, i.e. from negative to positive assertion or command. Note that these negative predicates may also occur in sentences with the CTEs like yā kâmātâ, māi yiwuwā nē etc. When they do occur in a negative sentence, they lose their negative meaning as we saw above. That is the sentence may lose its negativity to indicate a strong affirmative sense of the sentence. But when they occur in non-negative sentence, they take the function of the negative markers. In fact most of the CTEs that do not allow kadâ to negate their complements, would now allow negation of such complements when one of these lexical negatives occur in their complements. The use of these negative verbs is illustrated first with CTEs having morphological INFL in (35) and those of copular types in (36):

(35)  
   a.  [e]i yā hâramtâ [i]p [e] kū dainâ gaisâwâ  
        3ms.-perf. be forbidden  2pl.-subj. cease/stop greeting  
        dā jünâli  
        with each other  
       ‘It is forbidden that you should stop greeting each other’  =>  
       ‘You are expected to resume greeting each other’  
   b.  [e]i yâ yiwu [i]p [e] yâ kâ sô-n zama sarki]i  
        3ms.-2fut. be possible  3ms.-subj. refuse liking-of becoming Emir  
       ‘It is possible/likely that he will refuse to like becoming Emir’  
   c.  [e]i yanâ dâ wûyâ [i]p [e] kâ gazâ ni kudi]i  
        3ms.-cnt. with difficult  3pl.-subj. be below me money  
       ‘It is impossible that you will not have as much money as I have’  
   d.  [e]i zâ-i bâ ni mâmâkî [i]p [e] ki râsâ  
        1fut.-3ms. give me surprise  2fs.-subj. fail to
sāmū- n  aiki- n  ā nan Kanô]i.
getting/finding-of work-ref. at there Kano

‘It will surprise me that you will fail to get that job in Kano’

e.  [e]i yanâ  bâ ni haushi [ɪp [e] kí  kāsâ gamâ ---
   3ms.-cnt. give me anger  2fs.-subj. fail  finish

àbinci-n  à cikin awâ biyu]i.
food-ref.  in  hour two

‘It makes me mad that you will be unable to finish the food in two hours’

(36)  a.  [e]i hârâmûn  nê [ɪp [e] kû  dainâ layyâ]i
   unlawful/forbidden  cop.  2pl.-subj. cease/stop layya

‘It is forbidden for you to stop doing the (religious) sacrifices (of
animals)’

b.  [e]i māi yiwuwâ  nê [ɪp [e] nà  gazâ sāmū-n ----
   has possibility  cop.  1ms.-subj. fail to getting-of

dama-r  sâye-n  sâbuwa-r  môtâ-r]i
chance-of buying-of new-of  car-ref.

‘It is possible/likely that I will not be able to get the chance of buying the
new car’

c.  [e]i watakîlâ nê [ɪp [e] sù  kí yi-n aurê banâ]i
   probably  cop.  3pl.-subj. refuse doing-of marriage this year

‘It is probable/possible that they would not be getting married this year’=
‘It is probable/likely that they would refuse to be married this year’

d.  [e]i saurâ kâdan (nê) [ɪp [e] tà  kâsâ gamâwâ]i
   remain  a bit more cop.  3fs.-subj. be unable finish

‘It remains a little bit (of time) for her to be unable to finish the work’=
‘She almost failed to finish (it)’

These lexical negative verbs may also occur in the complements of negativized CTEs as in
the following:

(37)  a.  [e]i bâ-i  kâmätâ [ɪp [e] kâ  rasâ ----
   neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting  2ms.-subj. fail to
tâimako-n-sâ]i ba.
helping-of-him neg.

'It is better that you should not fail/not to help him'

b. [e]i bâ shi dâ kyâu [IP [e] kâ dainâ ziyartâ-r-mû]i
neg. it with good/nice 2ms.-subj. stop/cease visiting-of-us

'It is not good/appropriate for you to stop visiting us'

c. [e]i bâ tîlâs ba nê [IP [e] ki kî kômâwâ gidâ]i
neg. necessary neg. cop. 2fs.-subj. refuse returning home

'It is not necessary that you should refuse to return home'

d. [e]i bâ wâjibî ba nê [IP [e] mû kî bô kà ita]i
neg. obligatory neg. cop. 1pl.-subj. refuse give you it

'It is not obligatory that we should not to give it to you’

In some cases the combination of kadâ and a lexical negative verb in one sentence may generate an ungrammatical sentence as the following sentences show:

(38) *[e]i zâ-i bâ ni mâmâkî [IP kadâ [e] ki kâsâ ---
1fut.-3ms. give me surprise lest=neg. 2fs.-subj. be unable to
gâmâ aíki-n nân dâ wûrî]i.
finish work-ref. that with early

'It will surprise me that you would not be unable to finish that work early'

The interesting thing to note here is that while it is easy in English to say “it is possible that he will not become Emir,” by using the negative marker ‘not’, a comparable Hausa sentence like that cannot be expressed by using the negative marker kadâ as in (*yâ yiwu kadâ yà zamà sárkî) or as in the preceding sentences.4

Similarly, the CTE yanâ dâ wuyâ which refuses to allow kadâ to negate its complement as we saw earlier now may be followed by an adverbial clause in TAM other than the subjunctive. Note that I assume that the adverbial clause is not a direct
complement of the CTE. Rather it is an adjunct. Evidence for this is when the adverbial clause is placed at the beginning of the sentence. The ungrammaticality of such a sentence in (39e) suggests itself. I therefore assume that there is a "concealed" subjunctive clause with perhaps an impersonal subject as indicated in (39d). And in fact most of the people consulted have offered both forms (see footnote 3). That is with the concealed subjunctive complement or with the adverbial clause (note that some of the English glosses might be ungrammatical, but the Hausa sentences are certainly grammatical):^5

(39) a. \( [e] \) yan\( \dot{a} \) dà w\( \dot{u} \)y\( \dot{a} \) \[ CP idan \[ IP [e] bà s\( \dot{u} \) k\( \dot{a} \)m\( \dot{a} \) --
3ms.-cnt. with difficult if neg. 3pl.-perf. return
gid\( \dot{a} \) ba ban\( \dot{a} \)].
home neg. this year

'It is impossible (for it to be the case that) they haven't gone home this year' = 'They did go home this year' OR
'It is impossible if they would not return/go back home this year'

b. \( [e] \) yan\( \dot{a} \) dà w\( \dot{u} \)y\( \dot{a} \) \[ CP idan \[ IP [e] bà z\( \dot{a} \) s\( \dot{u} \) t\( \dot{a} \)f\( \dot{a} \) gid\( \dot{a} \) ba ban\( \dot{a} \)].
3ms.-cnt. with difficult if neg. 1fut.-3pl. go home
ba à wann\( \dot{a} \)n sh\( \dot{e} \)kar\( \dot{a} \)].
neg. in this year

'It is impossible if they would not go home in this year' =
'They would go home this year'

c. *[CP idan [IP [e] bà s\( \dot{u} \) t\( \dot{a} \)f\( \dot{a} \) gid\( \dot{a} \) ba ban\( \dot{a} \)].
3ms.-cnt. with difficult if neg. 3pl.-perf. go home neg. this year
((IP [e]) yan\( \dot{a} \) dà w\( \dot{u} \)y\( \dot{a} \]).
3ms.-cnt. with difficult

'If they haven't really gone home this year, it is impossible' =
'If they had not gone home this year, it would be impossible'

(40) a. \( [e] \) yan\( \dot{a} \) dà w\( \dot{u} \)y\( \dot{a} \) \[ IP [e] bà s\( \dot{u} \) j\( \dot{e} \) gid\( \dot{a} \) ba y\( \dot{a} \)u].
3ms.-cnt. with difficult neg. 3pl.-perf. go home neg. today

'It is impossible (for one to say) that they haven't gone home today' =
'They did go home today' OR
'It is impossible if (one say that) they will not go home today'
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b. [e] yanâ dâ wûya [Ip [e] à cê [Ip [e] bà su ---
3ms.-cnt. with difficult  Imp.-subj. say  neg. 3pl.-perf.

jë gidâ ba yâuñi].
go home neg. today

‘It is impossible to say that they haven’t gone home today’ = ‘They did actually go home’

The above pieces of data clearly indicate that there are some restrictions with regard to certain CTEs and the negation of their complements. We have already seen that negation with the *ba*(a) ... *ba* and its variants do not pose much problems. The main constraint is that their subjunctive complements cannot be negated by *ba*(a). But the second negative may be moved around in the sentence with also some constraints. The only negative marker that can be used to negate subjunctive complement is *kadâ*. But not all CTEs allow this kind of negation. In this case Hausa uses lexical negative verbs (the aspectual/modal auxiliary verbs) to negate complements that cannot be negated by *kadâ*. In other words, these verbs are used rather than the normal negative operator a lot more than English would. For instance, it would be normal to say the sentences in (41) instead of those in (42):

(41) a. [e] yâ [ku zuwâ makanrantâ yâu].
3ms.-perf. refuse coming school today

‘He refused to/did not come to school today’

b. [e] nà rasâ [âbî-n dà [zâ-n cë]].
1s.-perf. fail to thing-def. that 1fut.-1s. say

‘I don’t know what to say’

(42) a. [e] bà-i zô makanrantâ ba.
neg.-3ms.-perf. come school neg.

‘He didn’t come to school’
b. [e] bà-n san [àbì-n dà [zà-n cé]] bā.
   neg.-ls.-perf. know thing-def. that 1fut.-ls. say neg.
   'I don't know what I will say'

It is clear from these examples that the principles of negation are the same. These respective pairs in (41-42) mean essentially the same thing and all are grammatical. In the case of subjunctive complement clauses, the option to use negative operator kadā is not always available with a lot of CTEs, so in this case the negative verb is the only option, and a natural option given the fact that Hausa likes this type of construction as is evidenced in the examples given in this subsection.

4.2.6 The Interaction of kadā/kār with Other Complementizers.

If we look at the interaction of kadā/kār, and complementizers like cēwā and wai, as well as the clause introducing particles kō and dā, we can see that it is possible to have some of these complementizers and particles to co-occur with it adjacent to one another (we have already seen cases where it co-occurs with the purpose clause complementizers above). Note that it is not my goal to argue here whether the negative particle is a complementizer or not. But for those who consider it as a complementizer, this is another evidence that in Hausa one could have two or more complementizers in the COMP position. I leave this issue to further research at some time. Consider first where complementizers cēwā and wai co-occur with kadā/kār in post-CTE position (I use NegP here just for convenience):

(43) a. [e] já jàkà [çp wai/cēwā [NegP kadà ---
   3ms.-perf. be fitting that/that lest
   [Ij Tàńi tà biyà hàràjí]]jí.
   Tàńi 3fs.-subj. pay tax
   'It is fitting/desirable that Tani should not to pay the taxes'
b. [e]i dölè nē [CP wai/cēwā [NegP kadà ----- necessary cop. that/that lest

[IP [e] ya àuri Bintà]]i.
3ms-subj. marry Bintà

'Is it necessary that he should not marry Binta’

Where the subjunctive negative marker kadà/kār precedes, we find that only wai can follow it, since cēwā is not a particle like wai which can be moved around in a sentence. The sentences in (44) are therefore grammatical while those in (45) are odd, and in fact rejected by many speakers consulted:

(44) a. [e]i yā kāmātā [NegP kadà [CP wai ----- 3ms-perf. be fitting lest that

[IP Tāni tā biyā hārājī]]i.
Tāni 3fs-subj. pay tax

'It is fitting/desirable (not to be the case that) Tani should pay the taxes’

b. [e]i dölè nē [NegP kadà [CP wai ----- necessary cop. lest that

[IP [e] kā àuri Bintà]]i.
2ms-subj. marry Bintà

'It is necessary (not to be the case that) you should marry Binta’

(45) a. *[e]i yā kāmātā [NegP kadà [CP cēwā ------ 3ms-perf. be fitting lest that

[IP Tāni tā biyā hārājī]]i.
Tāni 3fs-subj. pay tax

'It is fitting/desirable (not to be the case that) Tani should pay the taxes’

b. *[e]i dölè nē [NegP kadà [CP cēwā ------ necessary cop. lest that
[Ip [e] kà àuri Bintà]],
2ms.-subj. marry Bintà

'It is necessary (not to be the case that) you should marry Binta'

Similarly, the order of the particle/Wh-operator kō followed by kadā is possible while kadā followed by kō is odd in a "yes-no" question sentence type. Compare the sentences in (46) with those in (47) which are ungrammatical:

(46) a. [Ip [CP kō [Negp kadā [Ip Tankò yà biyā hārājî]]], Q. lest Tankò 3ms.-subj. pay tax

[Ip [e] yā kāmātā]? 
3ms.-perf. be fitting

'(Is it the case that) that Tanko should not pay taxes (it) is desirable/appropriate?'

b. [Ip [CP kō [Negp kadā [Ip Audù yà kōmā gidâ]]], Q. lest Audù 3ms.-subj. return home

[Ip [e] tilas nē]? 
necessary cop.

'(Is it the case that) that Audu should not return home, (it) is necessary?'

(47) a. *[Ip [Negp kadā kō [Ip Tankò yà biyā hārājî]]], --- lest Q. Tankò 3ms.-subj. pay tax

[Ip [e] yā kāmātā]? 
3ms.-perf. be fitting

'(Is it not to be the case that) that Tankò should pay taxes, (it) is desirable/appropriate/better?'

b. *[Ip [Negp kadā kō [Ip Audù yà kōmā gidâ]]], --- lest Q. Audù 3ms.-subj. return home

[Ip [e] tilas nē]? 
necessary cop.

'(Is it not to be the case that) that Audù should return home (it) is necessary?'
There is also a possible complex order where two complementizers and kada may occur in a row. I will not however discuss this pattern for space and complexity reasons. The following are just a few examples of such possibilities:

\[(48) \quad \text{a. \ } [\text{IP CP cewa-r wai NegP kada IP Tanko yà --- saying-def.=that that lest Tanko 3ms.-subj.}]\]

\[\text{biyà hàrājilili, IP e yà kàmàtà]. \text{pay tax 3ms.-perf. be fitting}\]

'\&(The fact/saying/assertion, (as they say)) that Tanko should not pay taxes, (it) is desirable/appropriate\'

\[(48) \quad \text{b. \ } [\text{IP CP cewa-r NegP kada CP wai IP Audù yà ---- saying-def.=that lest that Audù 3ms.-subj.}]\]

\[\text{kòmà gida bana]ilili, IP e yanà dá kyàul. return home this year 3ms.-cnt. with nice/good}\]

'\&(The fact/saying/assertion, as they say), that Audù should not return home this year, (it) is good/fine/O.K.\'

In conclusion, it is clear that the facts presented here with regard to the interaction of complementizers and other clause introducing particles is not different from what has already been explained in the previous chapter on complementizers. And the only interesting thing is the co-occurrences of two complementizers in the same CP as in [céwa wai/wai céwa + kada + IP] or when the two complementizers are separated by kada as in [céwa kada wai + IP]. Since kada itself is not a complementizer like céwa or wai, it is not surprising that the complementizers céwa/wai can precede it, filling a COMP position that was empty in a clause with kada alone. It is also not surprising that wai can follow kada, since it is a fact that wai can be slipped into places other than clause boundaries. This is not possible with céwa as illustrated earlier in chapter 3 on complementizers. It is my belief that kada is not a real complementizer but rather a negator of subjunctive clauses. It is used to change the
modality of the complement clause, a function that is not always available with cēwa or wai. Let me now turn to the scope issue regarding negation of the CTEs and their subjunctive complements.

4.3 Scope of Negation in Root CTE Clauses and their Subjunctive Complements.

4.3.1 Broad and Narrow-Scope Negations.

In the following subsection I will be concerned with the issues of scope of negation and the problems of determining it. There are problems of ambiguity that may arise where indefinite NPs and quantifiers are negated. A potential problem of scope is where the negative words are placed in both the root and complement clauses, most of which I have discussed in various subsections above. I will not however discuss the problem of scope in negated universal quantifiers. Rather I will discuss the issue of the determination of scope in simple and complex negative sentences where ba(a) ... ba (and its variants), kadå, and lexical negative verbs are used to negate sentences with CTEs under study.

Since the constituent to be negated may be flanked by the discontinuous negative morphemes ba(a) ...(ba) or preceded by one of its variant ba(a) or the negative subjunctive marker kadå, the scope of the negation could then be regarded as moving from left to right, since the presence of a negative operator is always necessary at the beginning of the sentence not at the end of it. Recall that I assume that there is a “NegPhrase” that dominates all the constituents that are flanked or preceded by the negative operators. In other words the constituents are actually dominated by the NegPhrase, and they fall into the scope of the negative morpheme(s) (I have not however given any evidence on how a Negphrase should be generated in Hausa negative sentences. This is due to the scope of the dissertation (for discussion on this issue, see
Abdulkadir 1991). Since any major constituent in Hausa can be negated, the scope of negation then can either be broad or narrow. In a narrow-scope negation, the negation may only affect the root clause. This kind of negation occurs with all the CTEs under study. The complements to these CTEs may be interpreted as true with respect to the opposite truth value of the CTEs, i.e. whether the CTE clause is negated or is in the affirmative. The CTE clause is then interpreted as ‘what is conveyed/expressed in the complement, it is not the case that this is so’. The proposition is supposed to be the opposite of what the matrix CTE supposes. Consider the following contrasts between the (a) and the (b) sentences:

(49)  

a. \[e_i \text{ yā kāmātā } [IP [e]\text{ kā sāyi mōtā-rl}]i.\]  
\[3ms.-perf.\text{ be fitting 2ms.-subj. buy car-ref.}\]  
‘It is fitting/desirable that you should buy the car’

b. \[e_i \text{ bā-i kāmātā bā [IP [e]\text{ kā sāyi mōtā-rl}]i.}\]  
\[neg.-3ms.-perf.\text{ be fitting neg. 2ms.-subj. insult car-ref.}\]  
‘It is not fitting/desirable that you should buy the car’

(50)  

a. \[e_i \text{ yā zama dōlē nē à gārē ni [CP (dā) --- 3ms.-perf. be necessary cop. on/to me that}\]  
\[[IP [e]\text{ nā kōmā gidā bana}]i.\]  
\[1s.-subj. return home this year\]  
‘It is necessary for me to return home this year’

b. \[e_i \text{ bā-i zama dōlē nē à gārē ni bā --- neg.-3ms.-perf. become necessary cop. on/to me neg.}\]  
\[[CP (dā) [IP [e]\text{ nā kōmā gidā bana}]i.\]  
\[that 1s.-subj. return home this year\]  
‘It is not necessary for me to go home this year’
In these examples we can see that the meaning of the modality is different in each pair of the sentences. In (49a) and (50a) the meaning is equivalent to saying that “there is something X and it is the case that X is fitting/necessary, while in (49b) and (50b) it is directly the opposite of (49a) and (50a). It is equivalent to saying that “there is something X (to be done by Y), and it is not the case that X is fitting/necessary”. Note that in the (a) examples, the meaning of the complements does not have the implication that the event/action in it is absolutely carried out. It might have taken place where the speaker is reporting its occurrence prior to his/her reporting. On the other hand it might not have taken place. And here the speaker is reporting to the listener that it is fitting or necessary that it should take place at sometime in the future. Where the comment/appraising in the root clause is negative, it is exactly the opposite of the previous sentence. In other words the complement of the negated CTE is now outside the implication of fitting or necessity is the case, but rather the possibility of it not been the case. This kind of meaning is also applicable to the possibility and obligatroy group of CTEs. Consider the following:

(51) a. \([el] \text{ mài yiwuwa} \ në [IP \ [e] sù zō \ yâu]\).  
\[\text{has} \ \text{possibility cop.} \ \text{3pl.-subj. come today}\]

'It is possible that they would come today'

b. \([el] \ bā \text{ mài yiwuwa} \ b\ \text{a} \ në [IP \ [e] sù zō \ yâu]\).  
\[\text{neg. has} \ \text{possibility neg. cop.} \ \text{3pl.-subj. come today}\]

'It is not possible/likely that they would come today'

(52) a. \([el] \text{ dölë} \ në [IP \ [e] kī kōmā gidā yâu]\).  
\[\text{necessary cop.} \ \text{2fs.-subj. return home today}\]

'It is necessary that you should return home today'

b. \([el] \ bā \text{ dölë} \ b\ \text{a} \ në [IP \ [e] kī kōmā gidā yâu]\).  
\[\text{neg. necessary neg. cop.} \ \text{2fs.-subj. return home today}\]

'It is not necessary that you should return home today'
In (51a), the epistemic case, the implication is that “there is some event/action X, such that the occurrence of X is a possibility”. Its counterpart in (51b) however, says that “there is something X, such that the occurrence of X is not possible (i.e. is not the case that it is possible)”. Similarly, in (52a), the deontic necessity case, the implication says that “there is some event/action X, such that the occurrence of X must be the case (i.e. it must occur)”. Whereas in (52b) such event/action in the complement is not the case (to be). That is it is permitted but it does not have to be necessary for it to happen. The propositional content here is affected by the information modality of the root CTE and this interrelationship between the two clauses has important consequences for the meaning and form of the complementation. In these negative forms, we can see that the scope of the negation is “narrow”, even though both the root clauses and the propositional complements are semantically affected. It is also a constituent negation of a sentence type as indicated earlier. The fact that something is not necessary is a consequence of saying that one may do it but it does not have to be the case that it is necessary. These readings can be summarized as follows (cf. this is based on Ransom 1986:170 system of negation using modal logic):

\[(53) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. \quad & \text{If “possible (X)”}, \rightarrow \text{implies “not necessary (X)”} \\
    b. \quad & \text{If “not possible (X)”}, \rightarrow \text{implies “necessary not (X)”}
\end{align*}\]

In other words if something is not possible, it is equivalent to saying that it is necessary for it not to be the case. A parallel definition can be used for deontic possibility:

\[(54) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. \quad & \text{If “allowed (X)”}, \rightarrow \text{implies “not obligatory (X)”} \\
    b. \quad & \text{If “not allowed (X)”}, \rightarrow \text{implies “obligatory not (X)”}
\end{align*}\]

Which implies that if something is not permitted or allowed, it is equivalent to saying that it is obligatory for it not to be the case (cf. Ransom 1986:170). In all these cases the scope
of the negation is narrow in the sense that it is only the root clause that is negated. The negative marker does not have a domain beyond the root clause. There are however cases where both the CTE clause and its complement may be affected by negation. These involve instances where the propositions are interpreted as true irrespective of the negative nature of the root CTE. In other words, there is a reverse of negation as explained earlier. In such instances there is usually a negative verb in the complement that is used or where the subjunctive negative operator kadá is used. In both cases, these negative elements co-occur together with the ba(a) ... ba negative operators in the same sentence. The following illustrate these points:

(55) a. [e]i yā kāmātā [Negp kadá [Ip [e] kā tāfi]]i.
   3ms.-perf. be fitting lest=neg. 2ms.-subj. go/leave

   'It is fitting/desirable that you should not go/leave'

   ---> b. [e]i bā-i kāmātā [Negp kadá [Ip [e] kā tāfi]]i ba*
   neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting lest=neg. 2ms.-subj. go neg.

   'It is not fitting/desirable that you should not go/leave' => meaning:
   'It is desirable that you should go/leave'

(56) a. [e]i yā zama dōlē nē à gārē ni [Cp (dá) ---
   3ms.-perf. be necessary cop. on/to me that

   [Negp kadá [Ip [e] nā kōmā gidā bana]]]
   lest=neg. 1s.-subj. return home this year

   'It had been necessary on me that I shouldn't return home this year'

b. [e]i bā-i zama dōlē nē à gārē ni ba* ---
   neg.-3ms.-perf. become necessary cop. on/to me neg.

   [Cp (dá) [Negp kadá [Ip [e] nā kōmā gidā bana]]]
   ba*
   that lest=neg. 1s.-subj. return home this year

   'It had not been necessary on me that I should not return home this year'
In (55a) and (56a) the root clauses are in the affirmative while their complements are negated with *kadá*. Here it is only the complements that are affected and the scope of negation (a narrow one), is restricted to the complements only. In (55b) and (56b) however, both the root clauses and their subjunctive propositional complements are affected. Here the scope of negation is “broad” in the sense that its domain is from the beginning of the sentence to the end of it (I use asterisks to indicate that NEG-2 may occur in either positions shown, see also earlier discussion in the section regarding its placement in various positions in a sentence). This same implication is possible where there is a lexical negative verb in the subjunctive propositional complement as illustrated in the following:

(57)  

a. \[e_i \ yâ \ kamátâ [\text{IP } e] \ kâ \ ki \ tâfiyà \ gidâ]\_i.  
\text{3ms.-perf. be fitting} \quad \text{2ms.-subj. refuse going home} \\
'It is fitting/desirable that you should refuse to go home' => meaning \\
'It is desirable/fitting that you should better stay'

b. \[e_i \ bâ-i \ kamátâ [\text{IP } e] \ kâ \ ki \ tâfiyà \ gidâ]\_i \ ba \\
\text{neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting} \quad \text{2ms.-subj. go going home neg.} \\
'It is not fitting/desirable that you should refuse to go home' => meaning \\
'It is desirable that you should go'

c. \[e_i \ yâ \ kamátâ [k\text{adá} [\text{IP } e] \ kâ \ ki \ tâfiyà \ gidâ]\_i. \\
\text{3ms.-perf. be fitting} \quad \text{2ms.-subj. refuse going home} \\
'It is fitting/desirable for you not to refuse to go home' => meaning \\
'It is desirable that you should go'

(58)  

a. \[e_i \ yâ \ zama \ dôlè \ nê \ à \ gârë \ ni \ \text{[CP (dá) ---]} \\
\text{3ms.-perf. become be necessary cop. on/to me that} \\
[\text{IP } e \ nâ \ ki \ kômâwà \ gidâ \ bana]]_i. \\
\text{1s.-subj. refuse returning home this year} \\
'It became necessary for me that I should refuse to return/go back home this year' => meaning \\
'It is necessary that I should not go back (I should stay)'
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b. [e]i yà zama dòlè nê à gàrë ni [çp (dà) --- 3ms.-perf. be necessary cop. on/to me that
[Negp kadà [IP [e] nà ki kômáwà gidà bana]]i.
lest=-neg. 1s.-subj. refuse returning home this year
'It became necessary on me not to refuse to return/go back home this year' => meaning 'It is necessary that I should go back home'

---

c. [e]i bà-i zama dòlè nê à gàrë ni [çp (dà) --- neg.-3ms.-perf. become necessary cop. on/to me that
[Negp kadà [IP [e] nà ki kômáwà gidà bana]]i ba.
lest=-neg. 1s.-subj. refuse returning home this year neg.
'It had not been necessary for me that I should not refuse to return/go back home this year' => meaning 'It is not necessary for me that I shouldn't go back home'


d. [e]i yà zama-n mi-n dòlè [çp (dà) --- 3ms.-perf. become-cl. dat-me necessary that
[Negp kadà [IP [e] nà ki kômáwà gidà bana]]i.
lest=-neg. 1s.-subj. refuse returning home this year
'It became necessary on me that I shouldn't refuse to return/go back home this year' => meaning 'It is necessary for me that I should go back home'

4.4 General Conclusions.

We have seen that several negative operators can be used in Hausa to negate different types of sentences. The discontinuous negative marker ba(a) ... ba or its variants can be used to negate simple or complex sentences. They cannot however be used to negate subjunctive clauses either simple or complex. In order for a subjunctive clause or complement to be negated a special subjunctive negative operator kadà ‘lest’ must be used. Where it cannot be used, special lexical negative verbs can be used to take the function of kadà. The negative operator kadà/kar may also introduce and negate a propositional complement in post-CTE position. It may also occur in pre-CTE position
only in some stylistic constructions, or when it heads and negates a simple imperative sentence.

Finally, we have also observed that when a root clause (i.e. a CTE-clause) is negated, the negation may either affect the root clause alone in which case we get a narrow-scope reading or it may also affects the complement clause where we get a broad-scope reading. In the former case the root clause is flanked by the negative markers \textit{ba(a)} ...\textit{ba} or its variants or the subjunctive negative marker \textit{kadà}. In the latter case it is the whole sentence (root clause and the complement that are flanked by the discontinuous negative markers (or where its variant is used which has the function of spreading its scope all the way to the end of the whole sentence), or where the subjunctive negative marker \textit{kadà} or a lexical negative verb is used in the subjunctive propositional complement. In this case it is also possible to get an instance where the entire construction is negated which contradicts the earlier presupposition or expectations and at the end resulting in no contradiction (see Ransom 1986:172 for similar cases in English).

\textbf{NOTES TO CHAPTER 4}

1 Note that in the descriptions of this morpheme \textit{kar}, it is usually cited as having a falling tone. Apart from this regular \textit{kár} there is also \textit{kàr} with a high tone which results due to a simple phonological process (the usual tonal simplification HL # L ->H L) whereby \textit{kár} + Pronoun [+Low Tone] --> \textit{kár}. However, when \textit{kár} is followed by a noun, then the tone does not simplify. These two forms are illustrated in the following:

(i) \textit{[e] yà kàmàt à \neg p kàr [i [p [e] kà tafi gidà yàu] \textit{kar}]} 3ms.-perf. be fitting lest 2ms.-subj. go home today
   'It is better that you should not go home today'

(ii) \textit{[e] yà kàmàt à \neg p kàr [i [p Audù yà tafi gidà yàu] \textit{kar}]} 3ms.-perf. be fitting lest Audù 3ms.-subj. go home today
   'It is better that you should not go home today'

2 Monosyllabic verbs on the other hand are of a mixed nature with respect to imperative forms. Some have two alternatives, where one form has a high tone and the other has a low tone. Others have only one form with either high or low tone (see Yalwa 1983 unpublished, Newman in preparation, and also Jaggar 1992, and Jaggar in preparation for discussion of these forms of the imperative verbs).
3 Some speakers consulted didn't like the sentences in (27). One such speaker is my wife who offered the following sentences instead:

(i) [e] bâ-i kâmâtâ [e] a cê [e] kadâ [e] kù biyâ hârájî bâl.  
    neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting Imp.-subj. say neg. 2pl.-subj. pay tax neg.  
    'It is not desirable/appropriate that it should be the case that you shouldn't pay the taxes'

(ii) [e] bâ-i kâmâtâ ba [e] kù ri biyâ-n hârájî bâl.  
    neg.-3ms.-perf. be fitting neg. 2pl.-subj. refuse paying-of tax neg.  
    'It is not desirable/appropriate that you should refuse to pay the taxes'

It appears that for this speaker there should not be a double negation of the postposed complement if it is immediately embedded to the root clause, hence the rejection of the sentences in (27). As for the example in (i) the second bâ is allowed to occur at the end of the whole sentence because there is an intervening clause between the CTE clause and the postposed complement. I must however mention then that there is no one clear-cut solution to this issue of NEG-2 occurring at the end of the whole sentence, even though it is clear that the complement is in the scope of negation in which case the position of NEG-2 should not affect the grammaticality of the sentences, see other examples below where the sentences are grammatical with NEG-2 at the end. I will take up the issue of the presence of a subjunctive clause before the kadâ clause and the presence of a an auxiliary verb in the postposed complement in the next subsection.

4 A way to salvage this problem of ungrammaticality (especially with the CTEs of the possibility, probability, and likely group) is to use other TAMs like future and perfective in the propositional complement rather than the subjunctive, or to use an adverbial clause (see chapter 2 for such discussions). The following are a few examples of such uses:

(i) [e] yâ yiwu [e] bâ zâ-i zama sâkî bâl.  
    3ms.-2fut. be possible/likely neg. 1fut.-3ms. become emir neg.  
    'It may be possible that he will not become Emir'

(ii) [e] yâ yiwu [e] bâ-i zama sâkî bâl.  
    3ms.-2fut. be possible/likely neg.-3ms.-perf. become emir neg.  
    'It may be possible that he did not become Emir'

(iii) [e] yâ yiwu [e] bâ-i zama sâkî bâl.  
    3ms.-perf. be possible/likely neg.-3ms.-perf. become emir neg.  
    'It was be possible/likely that he did not become Emir'

In these sentences, the embedded clause is negated using the ba(a) ... ba discontinuous negative markers. The interesting thing here is the use of sequence of tenses. In (i) and (ii) it is not necessary to have tense matching between the root CTE and that of the complement. In (iii) however, the tenses must match. Hence, one cannot use the future TAM in the complement because this root CTE has indicated that the action has already taken place. This is in contrast with a CTE like yâ kâmâtâ which must take a complement in subjunctive even though the CTE indicates a completed action (see chapter 2 for details on tensed complements that follow the CTEs under study).

5 Note that when the TAM is in the first future for instance, the negative marker in the adverbial clause may either be the long vowel bâ or the short vowel one bã. But if the TAM is in the perfective, it can only be the low tone bã.