THE ONE-TERM PREDICATION FOR DEICTIC IDENTIFICATION IN HAUSA

Mahamane L. Abdoulaye & Salifou Barmou, & Saoudé Souley Bida
Abdou Moumouni University & EUCAP Sahel Niger

This article describes a type of non-verbal predication (NVP) with a single term called "deictic identification" (for example, *Abdù nee* 'it's Abdu') and which, in its basic function, is used to identify a referent present in the immediate spatial environment of the speaker. The paper shows that the one-term sentences must be distinguished from ordinary two-term specificational or equative sentences (for example, *ùban Muusaa Abdù nèe* 'Musa's father is Abdu' and *wannàn Abdù nee* 'this is Abdu'). Indeed, the paper in particular shows that when the two types of constructions are used in non-assertive contexts, they can select two different replacive copulas. The paper also shows how the basic one-term deictic constructions acquired extended, non-deictic uses, including uses in focus-fronting constructions, where the immediate external environment is not always relevant. The paper proposes that copula *nee/ cee* is the sentence predicate in one-term deictic identification and is hence comparable to other one-term non-verbal predicates in Hausa, such as the presentational *gàa* (for example, *gàa Abdù* 'here is Abdu').

Keywords: Non-verbal predications, Hausa, Deictic identification, Copula, Focus

1. Introduction

According to Payne (1997: 113) non-verbal predications (NVPs) are interesting for their own sake as a component of languages, but also because they are frequently recruited for the formation of larger syntactic constructions, such as the focus or *wh*-question constructions, or in the formation of tense and aspect markers. To these reasons, one can add the fact that NVPs (nominal, existential, possessive predications, etc.) are among the most common constructions in everyday usage and also the most useful for the child in acquisition (cf. Brown 1973: 274, cited by Steinberg 1982: 154). The main objective of this article is to provide an overview of NVPs in Hausa through a review of the linguistic literature. The article then focuses on one type of NVP that has been neglected in Hausa studies as well as in general linguistics and which has been suggested by Stassen (1997: 100) and taken up in Abdoulaye (2007: 245f) under the name "deictic identification". This type of predication has a single term in a construction "NP + Copula" (cf. *Abdù nee* 'it's Abdu') and must be clearly distinguished from the two-term nominal predication, specification, or identity statement (cf. *ùban Muusaa Abdù nèe* 'Musa's father is Abdu', *wannàn Abdù nee* 'this is Abdu'), even if on a first look both seem to use the same copula *nee/ cee*.

On the methodological level, it is of course not easy to define exactly what a NVP is. For example, Payne (1997: 112) proposes that NVPs have no semantically rich verb, i.e., a verb capable of conveying the semantics of the predication. For example, by comparing the copula *be* and the

verb *eat*, we have an idea of the action expressed by the verb *eat* but we need to look at the whole predication built around copula *be* to understand its meaning. In other words, with the same copula, *Abdu is the director* expresses an identification, while *Abdu is in the room* expresses a localization. In the traditional logical approach (see Creissels 2006: 343), in these examples, it is the nominal *the director* and the prepositional phrase *in the room* that are the non-verbal predicates, expressing a property verified by the referent of the nominal *Abdu* (see Wolff 1993: 494 for the opinion that the Hausa copula *nee/ cee* is "almost semantically empty"; see also Pustet 2003: 5 and the references she cites for a general definition of the copula as a semantically empty linguistic element). This approach, however, is rather restrictive, applying well to nominal and adjectival predications, but less so to other types of non-verbal predications. Thus, considering the criterion of the semantic poverty of the copula, Payne (1997: 113) notes that the different types of NVPs will not be classified in the same category (hence his using the expression "predicate nominals and related constructions", thus avoiding the all-encompassing expression "non-verbal predications" as used, say, in Creissels 2006). For Payne, NVPs can be expressed by more or less semantically rich copulas, in a continuous variation from "meaningless" copulas to copula-verbs with a clear semantic charge. Typical representatives of the first category are nominal and adjectival predications, which in many languages involve a predicate (a nominal or an adjective) and its subject bound by a "meaningless" copula. In these cases, the copula can be limited to a purely syntactic role, i.e., it serves as a link between the subject and the non-verbal predicate, a function which many languages can sometimes dispense with (see Payne 1997: 114, Pustet 2003: 3). Possessive predications may represent the second category, since they can have a regular verb in some languages and a defective copula in other languages. One of the consequences of Payne's approach is that NVP types with semantically rich copulas can be analyzed as having a logical predicate (the semantically rich copula) with its two logical arguments. Nonetheless, it should be noted that more specialized discussions nowadays make a distinction in English between nominal predications and equative or identity statements, even if both involve the structure "NP1 *be* NP2". Indeed, by definition, equative or identity statements do not have a property-attributing nominal predicate, rather, they have two referring expressions as logical arguments around the copula *be*, which in this case is the logical predicate with the meaning 'is equal to' (see Roy 2013: 8 and the references she cites, see also Declerck 1988: 1 on the many types of *be*'s in English). This proposal implies the existence of at least two copulas *be*. In Section 3, we will propose that the Hausa one-term deictic identification construction uses the same copula predicate *nee/ cee* one finds in equative predications, but with one logical argument. For this reason, in our overview of Hausa NVPs in the next section, we adopt the fined-grained typology of Declerck (1988) who distinguishes at least four major types of nominal "NP1 *be* NP2" predications (see Section 2.1). Unless otherwise indicated, the examples discussed in the paper come from our own grammatical judgments or from informants.

      The article is structured as follows. Section 2 presents an overview of Hausa NVPs through a review of the literature. Section 3 describes the characteristics and uses of the deictic identification construction.

2. Overview of non-verbal predications in Hausa

Hausa being a rather well-known language, the main types of NVPs are well described, particularly in recent works such as Abdoulaye (2006), Caron (1991), Green (1997, 2004), Green and Jaggar (2001), Jaggar (2001), Newman (2000), and Wolff (1993). The studies in Green (1997, 2004), Green and Jaggar (2003) in particular have focused on the *nee/ cee*-based copular sentences that have a "NP1 + NP2 + *nee/ cee*" structure, corresponding to the "NP1 + *be* + NP2" sentences in English. These types of sentences have generated a lot of controversies in the linguistic literature. Indeed, there are many typologies proposed, varying in the types distinguished, their number, and their relationship. For example, while Declerck (1988) distinguishes about six (major and minor) types of "NP1 + *be* + NP2" sentences in English, other researchers distinguish substantially more types (see the 14 semantic types proposed in Hengeveld 1992: 116; see also Mikkelsen 2005: 6 and the references she gives). Regarding the relationship between types, the case of the specificational sentences is illustrative. Indeed, depending on the investigator, specificational clauses can be an independent type, have affinity with equative clauses, or with the nominal predication clauses (see the discussions in Mikkelsen 2005: 2ff, 60ff, den Dikken 2006: 70ff, and particularly Declerck 1988: 2f, 110ff). Finally, another difficulty is that some works use different (sometimes idiosyncratic) names for the same types of constructions (see Higgins 1979, as cited in Mikkelsen 2005: 48). To simplify our presentation of the "NP1 + NP2 + *nee/ cee*" sentences in Hausa, we adopt Declerck's (1988) typology and definitions (see also Green 2004: 7, who similarly uses Declerck's typology in her study of copula *nee/ cee*).

> To provide a background as exhaustive as possible, this section also reviews the other non-verbal sentences in Hausa (localization, possession, etc.) built with copulas or predicates other than *nee/ cee,* particularly since they will be referred to from time to time in the rest of the paper. Regarding these NVPs, the section relies on the main types found in Hausa linguistic literature. The types of NVPs reviewed can be summarized as follows (we have retained only the first four major types of "NP1 + *be* + NP2" sentences found in Declerck's typology):

Table 1: Types of NVPs in Hausa
   - Sentences built around copula *nee/ cee*
        Nominal predication (or "nominal sentence", mainly for classification)
        Specification (identification by value assignment to a variable)
        Equative (Declerck's "descriptionally-identifying")
        Identity statements (alternate names of same referent)
        Adjectival predication
  - Non-verbal predications built with copulas or predicates other than *nee/ cee*
        Locative predication (copula -*nàa*)
        Existential predication (predicate *dà* or *àkwai*)
        Presentational predication (predicate *gàa*)
        Possessive predication (complex predicate -*nàa* + *dà*)

It may be noted that Table 1 refers to the use of the sentence types in assertive contexts (since in non-assertive contexts, as we will see in due course, almost all copulas and predicates are replaced with the non-assertive copula/ predicate *kèe/-kè*).

> The following subsections discuss first the "NP1 + NP2" sentences (nominal predications, specification sentences, equative sentences, and identity statements; see Section 2.1), then the

adjectival predications (Section 2.2), and finally each of the NVPs that are not based on the copula *nee/ cee* (Sections 2.3-2.6).

2.1. Copular "NP 1 + NP 2 + *nee/ cee*" sentences. This subsection presents the sentences in Hausa involving two NPs and the copula *nee/ cee*. These sentences express nominal predication (mostly classification), specification, equative predication, and identity statements. We also group them together because most languages have no formal distinction between them (see Declerck 1988: 4, Payne 1997: 114), which is the case in Hausa, where they are all expressed with the copula *nee/ cee* in a "NP1 + NP2 + *nee/ cee*" structure. We first present the nominal predication sentences. According to Declerck (1988: 55), in nominal predications a noun (the complement NP) predicates a property (characterization, role, function, class-membership) of the referent of the subject NP. When they express class-membership, nominal predications mark the relation of proper inclusion between the referent of the subject (NP1) and the category denoted by the nominal predicate, the NP2 (see for example Payne 1997: 114). Generally, the nominal subject is definite/ specific while the nominal predicate is indefinite/ generic. Some examples with simple assertion are given in the following (for similar examples and more detailed discussions, see also Caron 1991: 134f, Green 2004: 1, 17, Jaggar 2001: 458, Newman 2000: 160-161, 544-545 and Wolff 1993: 494): [1]

(1)   a.   Paarìs   bàbba-n   gàrii   nèe.
               Paris   big-of   town   COP
               'Paris is a big city.'

        b.   Abdù   manòomii   nèe.
               Abdu   farmer   COP
               'Abdu is a farmer.'

In sentences (1), the copula is *nee*, with a polar tone tuned to the preceding tone. The copula also agrees in gender and number so that *nee* is used with masculine and plural predicate nouns and *cee* with feminine predicate nouns (see Newman 2000: 160 for more details). Given the fact that the two NPs in predicational sentences fulfill different functions, the examples in (1) do not allow for the transposition of the two nouns (while keeping the same semantic or pragmatic implications). Indeed, the two NPs are different in that the subject is referential (or can license a co-indexed referential expression later in the sentence), while the predicate NP cannot be referential or be co-indexed with a referential expression (see the discussion in Declerck 1988: 56ff and references cited there). For the classifying nominal sentences, it may be noted that some authors distinguish between class-membership (such as the examples in (1)) and class-inclusion (*whales are mammals*), though this never translates into distinctive formal expression (see Lyons 1968: 389, as cited in Declerck 1988: 1, n2; see Caron 1991: 123 on Hausa). We have indicated that examples (1), with copula *nee/ cee*, are used to express simple positive assertion. In non-assertive clauses (presupposed causal and consequent adverbial clauses, relative clauses, and out-of-focus clauses of sentences with a focused or *wh*-constituent), another copula *kèe/ -kè* is used, as seen in the following example with focalization:

---

1   It may be noted that in Hausa, in certain fixed expressions, proverbs and sayings, copula *nee/ cee* in nominal sentences can be omitted, as reported, amongst others, in Caron (1991: 123), Newman (2000: 164f), and Wolff (1993: 497f).

(2)   Abdù   (nee)   kèe   manòomii.
        Abdu   COP   COP   farmer
        'It's Abdu that is a farmer.'

In (2), the nominal *Abdù* is focus-fronted and optionally followed by a focus-associated copula *nee/ cee* (derived from copula *nee/ cee*; see the comments around Table 2), while the copula *kèe/-kè* appears in the out-of-focus clause. Syntactically, *kèe/-kè* differs from copula *nee/ cee* in coming before the NP2 in the predication, as shown in example (2). Besides nominal predications, virtually all other non-verbal predications use copula *kèe/-kè* in non-assertive contexts, in replacement for their specific copulas or predicates of assertive contexts (see the discussion in Section 3.1; see also the comments around Table 2). It should also be noted that examples (1-2) give only the basic structures and Hausa NVPs in general have a rather varied syntax that cannot all be discussed in this paper (see Caron 1991: 123-143, amongst others, for more detailed descriptions).

The rest of this subsection discusses three types of non-verbal sentences that in many general works are conflated under the label "equational", "equative", or "identificational" sentences (see for example Payne 1997: 114, Creissels 2006; for a summary discussion of this issue see Declerck 1988: 2-3). The same conflation is also made in virtually all Hausa studies except for Green (2004, 2007) and Green and Jaggar (2003). In this paper we adopt Declerck's typology and distinguish between specificational sentences, descriptionally-identifying sentences, and identity statements. According to Declerck (1988: 2), a specificational sentence specifies a value, expressed by one NP, for a variable (expressed by the other NP). This can be illustrated in the following child story where some children, out looking for "Ali the Leper", actually stumbled on him:

(3)   a.   Children: Maalàm,   Àali   Kuturuu   mu-kèe   neemaa.
                         Sir   Ali   Leper   1p-RI   looking.for
                         'Sir, we are looking for Ali the Leper.'

      b.   Ali the Leper: To,   Àalî-n   nii   nèe,   àmmaa   kuturû-n   ùba-n-kù   nee.
                           well   Ali-DF   1s   COP   but   leper-DF   father-of-2p   COP
                           'Well, I am Ali, but the leper is your father.'

According to Declerck (1988: 6f), specificational sentences most often answer a *wh*-question. In (3a) the underlying question from the children would be *wàanee nèe Àali Kuturuu?* 'who is Ali the Leper?', which Ali, of course, split distinctly into 'who is Ali?' and 'who is the leper?' In (3b) the answer to the question 'who is the leper?' restates the variable, *kuturûn* 'the leper', for which a value, *ùbankù* 'your father', is specified. According to Declerck (1988: 10f), a specificational sentence allows the speaker to pick out a valid referent (or a list of referents) from a set. Hence the variable is generally a definite (see Declerck 1988: 19) but non-referring NP. Most researchers also note that in specification (and also in descriptionally-identifying sentences and identity statements), the two NPs are typically reversible (see Declerck 1988: 40-47). So, the relevant part of sentence (3b) can be reversed as *àmmaa ùbankù kuturûn nee* 'but your father is the leper', which also answers the question 'who is the leper?'. It should be noted that answers to normal *wh*-questions in Hausa frequently take the form of focused sentences (see *wàanee nèe kuturûn?* 'who is the leper?', *ùbankù nèe kèe kuturûn* 'it's your father that is the leper', but non-focused sentences are acceptable as well (see Jaggar 2001: 496, Green and Jaggar 2003: 205 who consider such answers to express the in-situ focus). Further examples of specificational sentences are given in the following (for additional

examples that can be interpreted as specificational sentences, see also Caron 1991: 124, Green 2004: 19, Jaggar 2001: 458, Newman 2000: 160-161, and Wolff 1993: 494):

(4)   a.   Bàbban birni-n   Fàransà   Paarìs   nee. (= Paarìs bàbban birnin Fàransà nee)
           capital-of   France   Paris   COP
           'The capital city of France is Paris.' (= 'Paris is the capital city of France')

      b.   Uwa-r   Bàlki   Hàdiizà   cèe.
           mother-of Balki Hadiza   COP
           'Balki's mother is Hadiza.' (= Hadiza is Balki's mother)

In examples (4a-b), again a speaker picks out the correct referent for a variable NP, answering, respectively, the questions 'what is the capital city of France?' and 'who is Balki's mother?'. As seen in the translation, these questions can be answered with the NPs in either order. In Hausa however, the reversed sentences may not always answer the same question. For example, the reverse of sentence (4a), *Paarìs bàbban birnin Fàransà nee* 'Paris is the capital city of France'*,* would only answer the question *mìinee nèe Paarìs?* 'what is Paris?').

        According to Declerck (1988: 95) the vast majority of copular sentences are nominal predications or specificational sentences. Besides these two however, there are minor types, one of which is what he calls the "descriptionally identifying" sentences, which have elsewhere been called "identificational", "equational", or "equative" sentences. Declerck illustrates them with the following English sentences (in this paper, we will use the term "equative", following Green 2004):

(5)   a.   [Who's that man?] That man is John's brother.
      b.   [Mike? Who's Mike?] Mike is my brother.

According to Declerck, the sentences in (5), although they apparently answer wh-questions, do not in fact specify a value for a variable NP (i.e., the speaker is not picking out referents from a set). Indeed, contrary to a variable NP, the subject NPs *that man* in (5a) and *Mike* in (5b) are fully referring NPs. According to Declerck (1988: 100), equative (descriptionally identifying) sentences answer the request "tell me more about X" where "X" is already identified (visible in the immediate setting, as in most cases, or identified through a proper name). For Hausa, one can consider the following examples (sentence (6c) from Green 2004: 20; for further examples that can be interpreted as equative sentences see Caron 1991: 124, Jaggar 2001: 458, Newman 2000: 160-161 and Wolff 1993: 494):

(6) a.   Nii   Àali nèe.
         1s   Ali   COP
         'I am Ali.'

    b.   Wannàn   Àali nèe.
         this   Ali   COP
         'This is Ali.'

    c.   Mùtumì-n cân   likitàa-naa   nèe
         man-of   there doctor-of.1s   COP
         'That man over there is my doctor.'

Green (2004) considers that equative sentences in Hausa are not syntactically different from specificational sentences and uses the term "equative sentences" to refer to them. Sentences (6a-c),

respectively, answer the questions *wàa kakè?/ wàanee nèe kai?* 'who are you?' for (6a), *wàanee nèe wannàn?* 'who is this?' for (6b) and *wàanee nèe mùtumìn cân?* 'who is that man there?'. We will come back to this type of sentences in the next section.

The final type of nominal sentences we review is identity statement sentences. According to Declerck (1988: 110), in English "NP1 + *be* + NP2" identity statements can be paraphrased as "NP1 is the same (person/object) as NP2", which is not case with predicational, specificational, or equative sentences. Much cited examples of identity statements in English include *the morning star is the evening star, Clark Kent is Superman* (see also Mikkelsen 2005: 55f and references cited there, Declerck 1988: 40-43, 110ff). Examples of identity statements in Hausa can be as follows (for more examples see Caron 1991: 124):

(7)   Ìiro   Ìbraahìm   nèe. (= Ìbraahìm Ìiro nèe)
        Iro   Ibrahim   COP
        'Iro is Ibrahim.' (= 'Ibrahim is Iro')

Sentence (7) gives two alternate names (of the *William ~ Bill* type) so that anybody called *Iro* can also be called *Ibrahim* and vice versa. Identity statements are fully reversible, as indicated in (7).

2.2. Adjectival predications. In adjectival predications, the predicate is a qualifying adjective, a numeral or a quantifier. According to Payne (1997: 120), in most languages adjectival predications generally have the same morphosyntax as nominal predications. This is explained by the fact that in many languages the morphosyntactic differences between the category of nouns and that of qualifying adjectives are not very important. In Hausa, the class of basic adjectives is restricted (see Schachter 1985: 15). But more recently, Newman (2000: 22-33) has shown that the adjective class is well-established, with several sub-classes and various processes for deriving adjectives from other lexical categories. Caron (1991: 143) suggests that adjectival predications answer questions containing the interrogative adverb *ƙàaƙàa* 'how'. Some examples are given in the following (for similar examples, see also Caron 1991: 140, Green 2004: 18, Jaggar 2001: 458, and Newman 2000: 160):

(8)   a.   Kàre-n   nàn   baƙii   nèe.
             dog-DF   here   black   COP
             'This dog is black.'

       b.   Paarìs   bàbba   cèe.
             Paris   big   COP
             'Paris is big.'

Thus, adjective predications use the copula *nee/ cee* in a basic structure "NP + AdjP + COP". Like nominal predications, adjective predications use the copula *kèe/ -kè* in non-assertive contexts.

2.3. Locative predications. A static location expression establishes a landmark or background where another element is located. In Hausa, the locative predication with simple assertion uses the copula *-nàa* that we will gloss as 'be.LOC', and which is usually completed by a preposition specifying the nature of the contact or the orientation between the landmark and the localized entity. The predication uses the basic structure "NP + (pronoun) + COP + NP / PP / AdvP". Some examples are given in the following (for similar examples, see also Abdoulaye 2006: 1150, Caron 1991: 126, Jaggar 2001: 172, 174, Newman 2000: 577 and Wolff 1993: 428):

(9)   a.   Abdù   ya-nàa   cikin   ɗaakìi.
             Abdu   3ms-COP   in   room
             'Abdu is in the room.'

       b.   Abdù   ya-nàa   ɗakà/   can.
             Abdu   3ms-COP   in.room/ there
             'Abdu is in the room/ over there.'

       c.   Abdù   ya-nàa   kàasuwaa.
             Abdu   3ms-COP   market
             'Abdou is at the market.'

As the examples show, the locative predicate can assume several forms: either a nominal (or a pronoun) with or without a preposition, as in (9a, 9c), or a derived adverb or demonstrative adverb, as seen in (9b). Locative predications are also sensitive to pragmatic and polarity contexts and use the copula *kèe/ -kè* 'be.LOC' in non-assertive clauses and the copula *bâa* 'be.LOC.NEG' in negation. Just like copula *kèe/-kè*, copula *bâa* is auxiliarized in verbal predications and used in most tense/ aspect categories as the general negative marker.

2.4. Existential predications. According to Payne (1997: 123), existential predications typically require a locative complement and that sentences that predicate for the existence of God, without a locative complement, are exceptional. In Hausa, however, the existential predication differs from the locative predication by the fact that it uses a different copula predicate and the fact that it does not require – but allows - a locative complement. Many authors have also noted that the nominal subject whose existence is predicated tends to be indefinite, while the subject of a locative predication tends to be definite (see Caron 1991: 132 for Hausa and Freeze 1992: 557, Hengeveld 1992: 119 and references cited there, and Payne 1997: 123 for a general discussion). In Hausa, existential predications use the predicates *àkwai, dà* (or their combination *dà àkwai* or *dàkwai*) and the negative predicates *bâa* and *baabù*, in a structure "PRED + NP", with a possible locative complement specified. Some examples are given in the following (for similar examples, see also Abdoulaye 2006: 1123-1127, Caron 1991: 126, Jaggar 2001: 464f, Newman 2000: 178 and Wolff 1993: 493f; data (10c-d) adapted from Moussa-Aghali 2000: 15, 39):

(10)   a.   Àkwai   Allàh!
             exist   God
             'God exists!'

       b.   Dà   wa-ni   kiɗâa   dà   su-kèe   yîi.
             exist one-3ms music   that 3p-RI   do
             'There is a kind of music they play.'

       c.   Kàajî-n   nan   kùwa, baabù   haalii   à   yankàa   su.
             chickens-DF   those as.for exist.NEG opportunity one.SBJ   slit   3p
             'As for those chickens, there is no way one could kill them.'

       d.   À   cikin duk   makarantâ-r, màalàmai ukkù kawài nee   kèe   àkwai.
             at   in   all   school-DF   teachers three only   COP   COP   exist
             'In the whole school, there are only three teachers.

Predicate *àkwai* is almost exclusively used in existential predications (see Abdoulaye 2006: 1139 for a possessive use), whereas the particle *dà* has many other uses. As with other NVPs, existential

predications are sensitive to pragmatic context, but combine the existential predicates with the non-assertive copula *kèe/-kè*, as illustrated in (10d) where the predicated NP (*màalàmai ukkù* 'three teachers') is focused. The existential predication can also be expressed with the locative copula *-nàa* augmented with the demonstrative adverb *nan* 'there' with the special sense of "be around, be available' (cf. French *il est là* 'he is around'; see also Abdoulaye 2006: 1153, Garba 1989: 126).

2.5. Presentational predications. Payne (1997: 123) does not seem to make a strong distinction between existential and presentational predications. Indeed, he does not discuss the presentational predications and even claims that existential predications typically have a "presentative" function and serve to introduce participants into the discourse stage. In Hausa, most authors agree that for the presentational function, there exists a special construction using the predicate *gàa* in a basic structure "*gàa* + NP". Also, most researchers think that the structure "*gàa* + NP" derives from the imperative statement with the verb *ga/ ganii* 'see', and is therefore comparable to French *voici/ voilà* 'here is'. Some examples are given next (for similar examples, see also Caron 1991: 131, Jaggar 2001: 468f, Newman 2000: 181 and Wolff 1993: 493; data (11b-c) adapted from Moussa-Aghali 2000: 47, 30):

(11)   a.   Gàa   Abdù   nan   tàhe.
            here.is   Abdu   there   coming
            'There is Abdu[,] coming.'

       b.   Sai gàa   mootàa   taa   zoo   ɗaukà-r-mù.
            then here.is   vehicle   3fs.CPL   come   taking-of-1p
            'Then here comes a vehicle that will take us.'

       c.   Baayan   hakà   kuma,   gidâ-n   gàa   shi   ràaɓe   dà   gida-n   kasòo.
            beside   this   also   house-DF here.is 3ms   leaning   with   prison-of prison
            'Beside this, there is also the fact that the house is right next to a prison.'

Sentence (11a) gives the typical usage of the presentational predication, where the subject NP directly refers to an entity in the immediate spatial environment of the speaker, usually implying a visual contact for both speaker and hearer. This ties in with Caron's (1991: 131) statement that the particle *gàa* "places [the referent of] a term within the speaker's sphere of influence" (by contrast, existential predications naturally do not have such a restriction). In narratives, the NP complement of *gàa* can refer to an entity, a fact or situation (or even an event) described in the narrative setting, as seen in (11b-c), respectively. This illustrates another case where a linguistic element with a basic deictic function can acquire extended, non-deicitc usages. As noted in Caron (1991: 131), presentational predications, unlike existential predications, do not have a negative form and cannot be focused or questioned (with the exception of echo questions such as *gàa mii*? 'here is what?' and their answers as *littaafìi na cèe gàa shi* 'it is (about) the book I just said here it is'). Presentational statements can also use other predicates such as the perception verbs *ji* 'feel', *dìibi* 'look', and *hîn* 'take', which all mean 'look at X/ here is X' when used in presentational context.

2.6. Possessive predications. Of all NVPs, the possessive predication is certainly the most complex, both globally and in individual languages. For example, Payne (1997: 126) shows that depending on the language, possessive predications can use either a verb (*have* in English, *avoir* in French, etc.), a nominal predication copula (Mandarin), a locative predication copula (Estonian), or an existential predicate (Turkish, Mandarin). However, for Heine (1997) most languages choose a few

schemas or constructions for their possessive predication from a set of eight universally available source schemas. Of the few schemas a language selects, one comes to dominate and becomes the most grammaticalized and hence expresses the most neutral, most general possessive sense (for the criteria of most grammatical possessive construction in a language see Heine 1997: 33). In Hausa the most grammaticalized positive possessive predication is based on the localization copula -*nàa* and the comitative particle *dà* 'with' in a basic structure "possessor-NP + Pro + -*nàa* + *dà* + possessed-NP", where -*nàa* is variously analyzed as the "imperfective" marker (Jaggar 2001: 470, Newman 2000: 222, 543), a locative "*be-(at-a-place)*" copula (Caron 1991: 136, Wolff 1993: 112), a type of *be* or *exist* predicate (Abraham 1959: 11). The particle *dà* is almost always taken to be the comitative 'with' (except in Abdoulaye 2006: 1145, where it is taken to be an existential predicate). The most general negative possessive construction uses the negative existential predicate *bâa* 'exist.NEG' combined with a comitative particle *dà* 'with' in a basic structure "possessor-NP + *bàa* + Pro + *dà* + possessed-NP" (lit. "NP + exist.NEG + with + NP"). Some examples are given next (for similar examples, see also Abdoulaye 2006: 1146ff, Caron 1991: 136, Jaggar 2001: 470f, Newman 2000: 543-544 and Wolff 1993: 495):

(12) a.   Mùtunè-n   ya-nàa   dà   bàbbar   goonaa.
            man-DF   3ms-COP   with   big   farm
            'The man has a big farm.'

      b.   Abdu bâa   shi   dà   kuɗii.
            Abdu exist.NEG 3ms   with   money
            'Abdu does not have money.'

According to Caron (1991: 136), the nominal referring to the possessor is strongly determined, which is confirmed by the examples in (12). It should be noted that the possessive predication based on *nàa* + *dà* and its negative counterpart are pragmatically and semantically neutral and contrast with possessive predications using other schemas or using strong verbs. The alternative constructions are pragmatically or semantically marked (for example, a possessive verb such as *màllakàa* 'own, possess' implies a tangible positive possession, say, a car).

      To conclude this section, we have reviewed five major types of NVPs based on copula *nee/ cee* (nominal, specificational, equative, identity statements, and adjectival sentences) and four other NVPs based on other types of copulas/ predicates (locative, existential, presentational, and possessive predications).[2] To these predications, the next section adds another one, the one-term

---

2   Wolff (1993: 454, 493) analyzes the comparative construction with *gwàmmà* 'rather, much better' (and its variants) as a non-verbal predication. This construction is illustrated in the following:

(i)   a.   Gwàmmà jiyà   dà   yâu!
            better   yesterday with   today
            'Worse and worse! ' (lit: 'better yesterday than today')
      b.   Gwàmmà mù   tàfi   (dà   mù   zaunàa   nân).
            better   1p.SBJ   go   with   1p.SBJ   sit   here
            'Better we leave than stay here.'

In the examples, the particle *gwàmmà* can take as complement simple or modified nouns, as in (ia), or propositions, as in (ib). The particle (with its variants like *gwamma*, *gàarà/ gaara*, *gwàddà/ gwadda*, *ƙwàmmà/ ƙwamma* , etc.) introduces the preferred term, while the lesser option is introduced by *dà* 'with'. In all cases, the expression of the lesser option is optional. Our opinion is that *gwàmmà* (and its variants) is simply a preposition also functioning as a conjunction. We agree nonetheless that defining what is a full (non-verbal) predication in a way so as to exclude sentence fragments can be a complicated task (see an attempt in Creissels 2006: 344).

deictic identification, distinguishing it from the two-term "NP1 + NP2 + *nee/ cee*" sentences, in particular the two-term equative predication.

3. The one-term deictic identification predication in Hausa.

This section builds on an idea suggested in Stassen (1997) and taken up by Abdoulaye (2007) in his account of focus constructions in Hausa. Indeed, the section argues for the existence of a basic type of nominal sentences that have the structures "NP + *nee/ cee*", i.e., these sentences appear to have only one argument. We believe that these sentences, in their basic use, serve for the identification of referents visible in the immediate spatial environment of the speaker. In this basic use, the referent is unmediated by an NP in the sentence before the act of identification. For this reason, we refer to these constructions as "one-term deictic identification" sentences. Since figuring out the identity of a referent is the purpose of the construction, we use the term "identification", instead of "equation", "equative", or any of the terms used for the types of constructions presented in Section 2.

The section starts by illustrating the basic use of the sentences (Section 3.1). The section then reviews some arguments in support of the proposal (Section 3.2-3.4). The section also gives some extended uses of the deictic identification sentences beyond their basic deictic use (Section 3.5). The last subsection (Section 3.6) compares the deictic identification sentences with other NVPs taking only one NP argument and a predicate.

3.1 Basic use of the one-term deictic identification sentences. Stassen (1997: 100ff) distinguishes two fundamentally different types of nominal identification predications: a one-term predication, which he calls "presentation identification" and the ordinary two-term predication. Abdoulaye (2007: 245) adopted this distinction while discussing the Hausa focus construction, which he argued, uses the one-term identification construction to mark the focused phrase (see also Section 3.3 below). Abdoulaye (2007) refers to the one-term identification as the "deictic identification" construction, because it basically serves to directly identify non-discursive entities that are present in the immediate utterance context. Some examples are given in the following (for more examples that can be interpreted as one-term deictic identification sentences, see also Caron 1991: 124, 125; Jaggar 2001: 459, Newman 2000: 161, Wolff 1993: 494):

(13) a.   Abdù   nee.
            Abdu   COP
            'It's Abdu.'

      b.   Wàa-nee (nèe),   cân?
            who-COP   COP   there
            'Who is it, there?'

The basic one-term deictic identification predication is illustrated in (13a), an utterance that can be a reply to the question in (13b), which is also a deictic identification clause. In both cases, there is only one NP and the copula *nee/ cee* (which can be repeated in *wh*-questions; cf. Caron 1991: 75). Sentences like (13a) are not restricted to being answers to direct identification questions. Indeed, someone can enter or be found in some place (or somehow come to the attention of the interlocutors) and be identified or introduced using (13a), as one would do with the English equivalent. Indeed, as the glosses show, the Hausa one-term construction is the equivalent of English so-called "truncated cleft" construction, where the dummy pronoun *it* is considered to be the subject in a formally two-term equative construction (see Mikkelsen 2005: 120ff and the references she cites). Despite the

fact that in Hausa there is no such dummy pronoun, the constructions in (13) have nonetheless also been reduced to basic two-term constructions, with an understood recoverable subject term. This reductionist point of view is most clearly expressed in Wolff (1993: 494) for whom the structure "NP + *nee/cee*" is basically a two-term structure "NP1 + NP2 + *nee/cee*" (see also Jaggar 2001: 459). In the same vein, Caron (1991: 21, 125) states that the subject term (NP1) of the nominal predication "NP1 + NP2 + *nee/cee*" "may fail to appear when the situation itself is the subject of the predication or when it [the subject] is evident" (NB: our translation). Indeed, according to Caron (1991: 125), in (13a), the NP *Abdù* is the predicate while the subject is the context of the predication, even if the position is syntactically empty. He believes that this analysis is supported by the fact that the empty subject position can optionally be filled with a demonstrative pronoun or expression, as illustrated in the following:

(14) a. Wa-n-càn   Abdù   nee.
          one-DF-there   Abdu   COP
          'That is Abdu.'

      b. (Abû-n ga)   wa-ni   yaaròo   nee.
          thing-DF here   one-3ms   boy   COP
          'Once upon a time there was a young man.'

In (14a-b), the demonstrative pronoun and the demonstrative expression, by all accounts, are the subject of their predication (according to Caron 1991: 125, sentence (14b) is typically used to introduce the main participant at the beginning of a story). While we accept that sentences (13a) and (14a) are equivalent in their usage, we claim that they do not have the same structure, at the syntactic or logical levels. Sentence (13a) has only one term, while (14a) and similar sentences with two nouns, such as those in (4), are two-term equative predications.

As an anonymous reviewer noted, assuming a basic one-term deictic identification cannot however exclude the fact that deletion processes happen in NVPs, just as they happen in verbal predications. Here are some examples discussed by Green (2004: 19, 20, 25):

(15) a. Abdù   nee dàaraktàa.
          Abdu   COP director
          'ABDU is director.'

      b. Aa'àa,   ita cèe.
          No   3fs COP
          'No, SHE is.'

(16) a. Mùtumì-n   cân   likitàa-naa   nèe.
          man-of   there   doctor-of.1s   COP
          'That man over there is my doctor.'

      b. Mùtumì-n   cân nee.
          man-of there COP
          '(He) is that man over there.'

      c. Likitàa-naa   nèe.
          doctor-of.1s   COP
          '(He) is my doctor.'

Sentence (15a) illustrates a nominal predication where the subject, *Abdù*, is focus-fronted and marked with copula *nee/ cee* (glossed in the original as "FM", for "focus marker", by Green; see comments of Table 2). Sentence (15b), denying (15a), states that another person is director, but with ellipsis of the nominal predicate *dàaraktàa* 'director' (for other illustrative cases of ellipsis in NVPs see Jaggar 2001: 439, 505 and Tuller 1986: 187, 190). The case of data (16) is more complex. According to Green (2004: 20), given the full equative sentence in (16a), it is possible to omit one or the other NP, as seen in (16b-c). It may be noted though that sentences (16b-c) do not answer the same question. Sentence (16b) would be a good reply to the two-term specification question *wàanee nèe likitànkà?* 'who is your doctor?', in which case it would indeed be an elliptical structure (or a "pro drop" structure, in the generative terminology). Sentence (16c), on the other hand, can answer the one-term deictic identification question *wàanee nèe, cân?* 'who is it, there?', in which case it would be an instance of the one-term deictic identification. In sum, there are genuine cases of elliptical structures in NVPs that must be distinguished from the basic one-term deictic identification constructions.

In the remaining subsections, we provide more evidence in favor of establishing the one-term deictic identification as a basic NVP independent from the two-term non-verbal sentences.

3.2. Distinctive copulas for the two constructions. The clearest indication of the basic status of the one-term deictic identification relates to dialectal facts in Hausa. Indeed, while all dialects use the same copula *nee/ cee* (or its variant *naa/ taa* in western dialects) in assertive contexts, the situation is different when it comes to non-assertive contexts. Indeed, for non-assertive contexts, there is a split between central and eastern dialects, which use the same replacive copula for the deictic and the two-term specificational or equative constructions, and the western dialects which use two different copulas, one for the deictic identification and another for the two-term specification or equative constructions. This is illustrated in the following data, contrasting the two groups of dialects in non-assertive sentences (the central/ eastern dialects are illustrated in (17) and the western dialects in (18)):

(17) a. Paarìs   cee   kèe   bàbban birni-n   Fàransà.
          Paris   COP   COP   capital-of   France
          'It is Paris that is the capital city of France.'

      b. Paarìs   kèe   nan!
          Paris   COP   there
          'It is Paris!' (i.e., 'This is the Paris you've heard so much about.')

(18) a. Paarìs   taa   ar   bàbban birni-n   Fàransà.
          Paris   COP   COP   capital-of   France
          'It is Paris that is the capital of France.'

      b. Paarìs   kèe   nan!   (=   Paarìs   kèe   ga)
          Paris   COP   there   Paris   COP   here
          'It is Paris!' (i.e., 'This is the Paris you've heard so much about.')

Sentences (17) show that the central/ eastern dialects use the same replacive copula *kèe* 'be' for the two-term specification sentence in (17a) and the deictic identification sentence in (17b). It may be recalled that copula *kèe* marks the part of an utterance that is presupposed (such as the presupposed causal and consequent adverbial clauses, the relative clauses, and the out-of-focus clauses of constituent focus and *wh*-questions). Thus, in (17a) the nominal *Paarìs* 'Paris' is focused, and the

rest of the sentence is out of assertion (see the pragmatically neutral version with copula *nee/* cee in data (4a) above). In (17b), although there is no focused element, the statement presents the city of Paris to an interlocutor who, to a certain extent, already knows Paris for having heard so much about it (cf. the pragmatically neutral, fully asserted *Paarìs cee* 'it is Paris'; but see Jaggar 2001: 463 and Newman 2000: 547 for two different views). Although sentences such (17b) are used to complete the identification of entities, they still have an element of presupposition in them (since the listener already knows about Paris, a situation that is precisely taken into account by the speaker). For this reason, we will refer to them as "non-assertive deictic identification" and align them with the other presupposition contexts (i.e., the causal or consequent adverbial clauses, the relative clauses, and the out-of-focus clauses of constituent focus and *wh*-questions). *Kèe* is originally a locative copula, which explains why it is accompanied with the demonstrative *nan* 'there' (see Jaggar 2001: 463 who refers to the whole *kèe nan* expression as a "copular phrase"). Example (18a) shows that in western dialects, the non-assertive two-terms sentence uses a special copula *aʁ* 'be' (an option that also exists for the central dialects). By contrast, example (18b) shows that western dialects use the same *kèe nan* copula as the central/ eastern dialects for the one-term deictic identification. Data (17-18) thus show that the one-term deictic identification cannot be reduced to a two-term specification or equative sentence whose subject would be understood or deleted (for a similar use of the existence of differential copulas as argument for distinguishing types of predications see also Hengeveld 1992: 81-83 and Roy 2013: 28ff). It may be noted that when the (to be) identified entity is referred to with the demonstrative pronoun *wancàn* 'that/ that one', as is illustrated in (14a), then the corresponding non-assertive sentence must use the copula *aʁ* in western dialects, as illustrated next using focalization:[3]

(19)   Wa-n-càn   naa   aʁ   Abdù!
         one-DF-there   COP   COP   ABdu
         'It's that one that is Abdu!'

Sentence (19) is the focused version of sentence (14a) (or, more precisely, of its western dialect version *wancàn Abdù naa* 'that is Abdu', using the western copula *naa/ taa*) and, as can be seen, it requires the copula *aʁ*. This shows that in sentence (14a) the demonstrative pronoun is not optional, and the sentence is a two-term equative predication. Even if the contrast observed in (17-18) is quite strong, it may nevertheless be noted that the copula *aʁ* can appear in one-term identification, but only with a meaning akin to 'it is finished', as illustrated next (we thank Mr Aminou Yawale for drawing our attention to example (20c)):

---

3 The western Hausa copula that we represent graphically as *aʁ* is phonetically [ʔáC], i.e., with an initial glottal stop and a final consonant that always assimilates to the next consonant. Given its dialectal and domain restriction, it is probably a new copula. Like copula *-nàa* or *kèe/-kè*, *aʁ* might have started in western dialects as a locative copula in non-assertive contexts when a subject is relativized, focus-fronted or questioned in non-verbal predications (cf. *Abdù naa aʁ cikin ɗaakìi* 'it is Abdu that is in the room'), thus displacing the pandialectal non-assertive copula *kèe/-kè* in these contexts. *Kèe/-kè* is still used in western dialects in presupposed reason and consequence adverbial clauses, in out-of-focus clauses of non-subject relative, non-subject focus, and non-subject wh-question constructions, and in one-term non-assertive deictic identification, as seen in (18b). Possible sources for *aʁ* may include the dismissive expression *(kài) aʁ!* 'blast you', also used as *aʁ!* or *as!* to chase animals away, specially the hens. In this case, it may well link up with the verb *yaʁ/ yas* 'throw away' (pronounced with a palatal approximant [j] or a laryngealized [j]), which itself is a short version of the causative *iyaʁ dà* [ʔíjár dà] 'finish off, do away with' based on the verb *yi/ i* ([jí]/ [ʔí]) 'do' (for a summary on the origin of copulas in languages see Pustet 2003: 54-61).

(20) a. Shii   kèe   nan!
         3ms   COP   there
         'It's over/ done; that is it!'

     b. Ita   ar   nan!
         3fs   COP   there
         'It's over/ done; that is it!'

     c. Làabàaru-n   duuniyàa   kèe   nan   ar   nan!
         news-of   world   COP   there   COP   there
         'That was the international news [you just listened to]!'

In the discussion of (17b), we said that the sentence expresses the non-assertive one-term deictic identification. However, the construction has also given rise to a fixed expression using the third person masculine pronoun *shii* with an impersonal sense, as seen in (20a), whereby a speaker acknowledges the end of an event, especially if the end is sudden or accidental (for example, any sports match quickly concluded; cf. French *ça y est!* 'it is good/ fine/ it is all over'). Sentence (20a) is pandialectal, but the western dialects also have an alternative form using the third person feminine pronoun *ita* with an impersonal sense and the copula *ar*, which is augmented with the demonstrative adverb *nan* 'there', certainly by analogy with *kèe nan*. The example in (20c) is a particular mannerism of a journalist from the Deutsche Welle Hausa section, who so concludes his international newscast, marking twice the meaning 'it's over' by combining the pan-dialectal copula *kèe nan* and the western Hausa copula *ar nan*. The examples (20b-c) clearly have a marginal status in the western dialects and one may note that copula *ar* cannot mark the true non-assertive deictic identification (and hence cannot replace *kèe nan* in example (18b) above). [4]

        The argument based on the existence of distinctive copulas for both types of predications can be extended to the locative copula *-nàa* 'be.LOC'. Indeed, locative *-nàa* can be recruited to express two-term non-verbal sentences; but apparently it cannot be recruited to express the one-term deictic identification. These points are illustrated in the following (for data similar to (21a-b) see also Jaggar 2001: 473, Wolff 1993: 428):

(21) a. Muusaa ya-nàa   soojà   a-kà   kaamàa   shi.
         Musa   3ms-COP   soldier   one-RP   arrest   3ms
         'Musa was a soldier when he was arrested.'

     b. Muusaa ya-nàa   ƙàramii   mu-kà   zoo   nân.
         Musa   3ms-COP   little   1p-RP   come   here
         'Musa was a child when we came here.'

     c. Ta-nàa   màata-r-kà   bà   zaa   kà   cêe   bâa   ruwa-n-kà   ba.
         3fs-COP   wife-of-2ms   NEG   FUT   2ms   say   exist.NEG   concern-of-2ms   NEG
         '[Since] she is your wife, you can't stay unconcerned.'

---

[4] Another sign of the marginal status of (20b) in western dialects is the fact that the utterance cannot be negated (cf. **bà ita ar nan ba* 'it is not over, it is not finished'). By contrast, sentence (20a), with copula *kèe/-kè*, can be negated in all dialects as *bàa shii kèe nan ba* 'it is not yet over, it is not yet finished'. Naturally, *ar* itself can be negated in non-assertive nominal predication as in *bàa Landàn ar bàbban birnin Fàransà ba* 'it is not London that is the capital city of France'.

d.	Sa'à-n-nan	Kantùu	ya-nàa	Kantù(-n-shì).
	time-DF-there	Kantu	3ms-COP	Kantu-of-3ms

'At that time Kantu was his real self.'

e.	*Ya-nàa		Muusaa. /	*Muusaa ya-nàa,
	3ms-COP		Musa/	Musa 3ms-COP

'It is Musa./ He is Musa.'

Sentences (21a-b) illustrates, respectively, a nominal and an adjectival predication. Sentences (21c-d) illustrates, respectively, a specificational sentence and an identity statement (Kantu was a famous Nigerien wrestler who eventually retired). As can be seen, copula *-nàa* is felicitous in all these sentences. However, sentence (21e) shows that it is not possible to use copula *nàa* in a one-term deictic identification, no matter the ordering of the copula and the single term. It should be noted that *-nàa* is basically a locative copula, which therefore has apparently begun encroaching on the domain of copula *nee/ cee,* but is limited, for the moment, to two-term non-verbal sentences. It may also be noted that the use of *-nàa* in nominal sentences usually describes past situations (though see (21c); see also Newman 2000: 578). The copula *nee/ cee* has no such restriction. Apart from Hausa, the specialization of the copulas for one-term or two-term predications is also verified in other African languages, such as Zarma, Fon (Gbe), Nupe, or Wolof (see the discussion in the next subsection).

3.3 Use of deictic identification construction in focus-fronting. Another reason for considering one-term deictic identification sentences as an independent type of predication is the fact that it alone seems to have a derivative use in focus constructions. Indeed, many authors, while adopting the reductionist approach, nonetheless note that in many languages it is the deictic identification structure that is used to mark a focus-fronted constituent. For example, Creissels (2006: 357) claims "In many languages, the constructions used to express the identification of the referent of a noun [i.e., the deictic identification], as illustrated in [(22)], are also the basis of constructions used to make explicit the utterance value of declarative sentences [...], as illustrated in [(23b)], or constructions used to focus a nominal or an adpositional constituent, as illustrated in [(24)]". [NB: our translation.] Creissels gives the following examples:

(22)	(Ce	garçon)	c'est	Jean.
	this	boy	it COP	Jean

'(This boy) it's Jean.'

(23)	a.	Les	enfants	sont	bien	en	retard.
		DET.p	children	COP	well	in	late

'The children are very late.'

	b.	(Ce	qui se passe)	c'est	qu'ils	ont	manqué	le	bus.
		that	thathappen	it COP	that 3p	CPL	miss	DET.s	bus

'What happened/ it is that they missed the bus.'

(24)	C'est	de	Marie	que	Jean	est	amoureux.
	it COP	of	Marie	that	Jean	COP	in.love

'It is Marie that Jean loves.'

Creissels apparently assumes that sentence (22) is a two-term equative predication, with an optional explicit subject (*ce garçon*), the dummy subject *ce* 'it', the copula *être* 'be', and the complement

noun (*Jean*). The same dummy subject and its copula are used to mark sentences, such as (23b), that provide an emphatic explanation (to a previously stated or observed situation, such as in (23a)) and which are the equivalent of English *wh*-cleft constructions. Clearly, the presentation of the example suggests a structural parallel with the presumed equative sentence (22), with an optional explicit subject referring to a situation (*ce qui se passe*), the dummy *ce*, the copula, and a propositional complement. Finally, according to Creissels, in (24) the same dummy *ce* and the copula *être* 'be' are used to mark a focus-fronted constituent, which is followed by an out-of-focus clause containing an empty constituent co-indexed with the displaced phrase. Here however, an optional explicit subject is not possible and only the dummy *ce* appears with the copula. For languages like French or English that use dummy pronouns, one may still fairly establish – if only formally - an equation between the dummy subject and the fronted phrase. But many languages do not use a dummy pronoun in their focus constructions. Hausa is one such language, as illustrated in the following:

(25)   a.   Abdù   nee   a-kà   ganii __   kàasuwaa.
             Abdu   COP   one-RP   see   market
             'It was Abdu that was seen at the market.'

       b.   An   ga   Abdù   kàasuwaa.
             one.CPL   see   Abdu   market
             'Someone saw Abdu at the market.'

In (25a), the nominal *Abdù* is fronted out of the direct object position and marked with the copula *nee/ cee* (cf. the non-focused version in (25b)). Although there is no dummy pronoun in (25a), Caron (1991) nonetheless proposes an equation analysis for similar sentences, giving two alternative solutions. First, the equation can be established between the fronted nominal *Abdù* and its empty direct object position in the out-of-focus clause (see Caron 1991: 21). Secondly, the equation can be established between the focused nominal *Abdù* and the entire situation described by the out-of-focus clause, which would be the subject term of the equative sentence (see Caron 1991: 22).

       In this subsection, we naturally agree with the proposal that the deictic identification construction is recruited to mark focus-fronted constituents. However, according to Abdoulaye (2007: 246), the clearest indication of the involvement of the deictic identification construction is to be found in examples where the out-of-focus proposition has no empty or understood argument that could be co-indexed with the focused phrase. This is illustrated in the following data:

(26)   a.   *Hàukaa*   *nèe*   ((,) dà)   ka-kèe   bugar   ma-nì   ɗaa?
             madness   COP   that   2ms-RI   hit   to-1s   son
             'Are you crazy, to hit my child?'

       b.   *Shùugàban kasaa*   *nèe*   ((,) dà)   mu-kèe   jîn   jiiniyàa   ɗàazu.
             president   COP   that   1p-RI   hear   siren   a.while.ago
             'It was the president (who was passing) when we heard a siren earlier.'

(27)   Dà   ka-kèe   bugar   ma-nì   ɗaa,   *hàukaa*   *nèe?*
          that   2ms-RI   hit   to-1s   son   madness   COP
        'Are you crazy, to hit my child?'

According to Abdoulaye (2007), in examples (26-27), the italicized constituents are focalized (with emphasis) against background subordinate adverbial clauses that carry presupposed information and are marked as such by the non-assertive copula *kèe/-kè* (functioning here as an imperfective

auxiliary). As may be seen in (26), the out-of-focus proposition can optionally be introduced by the subordinating conjunction *dà,* which may or may not be preceded by a pause. When the conjunction (and the pause it licenses) is omitted, then one formally obtains nearly typical Hausa focus-fronting constructions. In the alternative (and in fact more basic) construction illustrated in (27), the out-of-focus proposition can precede the focused constituent, but in this case the subordinating conjunction *dà* is required and a pause must separate off the focused constituent. It should be noted that if the adverbial clauses in (26-27) are omitted, one then obtains simple deictic identification clauses. All these facts point to the relative syntactic independence of the deictic identification "NP + *nee/ cee*" predication proper in example (26-27). Also, it is probably not possible to establish in sentences (26-27) a coreference between the focused constituents and anything in the out-of-focus adverbial clauses. Indeed, none of the out-of-focus clauses contains an empty position that can be equated with the focused constituent. Similarly, there certainly can be no equation between, say, the referent of *shùugàban ƙasaa* 'president' in (26b) and the event of hearing the sirens. Rather, the president is emphasized as the cause for hearing the sirens (i.e., one explains the other).

Apart from Hausa, in other African languages where one-term deictic identification and two-term non-verbal predictions use distinctive copulas, it is the deictic identification copula that is used in focus-fronting constructions, not the copula of the two-term constructions. As noted in Abdoulaye (2007: 247n4), Zarma (Songhay) has two copulas *ti* 'be' and *nôo* 'be'. In positive deictic identification and in focus constructions only *nôo* appears (see Sibomana 1995: 39), whereas in the negative versions of these constructions the two copulas *ti* and *nôo* are required (see Sibomana 1995: 39, 44). However, in two-term positive nominal and equative predications, copula *ti* is preferred but *noo* is also possible (see Sibomana 1995: 52n1). On the other hand, in two-term negative nominal and equative predications, only copula *ti* is possible. In spite of the multiple overlaps, it is clear that in Zarma copulas are sensitive to the type of predication involved. Similarly, in Fon (Gbe) the same copula is used for deictic identification and in focus-fronting (see Ndayiragije 1992: 64 and Lefebvre 1992: 54n2), whereas a different copula is used in two-term nominal predication (see Ndayiragije 1992: 67). Creissels (1978: 137f) also points to a link between a focus marker and a deictic identification copula in Nupe and Wolof. It can be concluded that the deictic identification construction is fundamentally different from the two-term nominal predication and on this basis many languages select it to mark focus-fronted constituents.

3.4 Syntactic contrast between focus or *wh*-constructions with and without copula *nee/ cee.* In Hausa, as in many other languages (see Schachter 1973), *wh*-questions typically share some formal characteristics with focus (and with relative) constructions. Indeed, like the focused constituents seen in Section 3.2, *wh*-words in Hausa are fronted and followed by the copula *nee/ cee,* and then by the out-of-focus clause. Although we have nearly consistently illustrated the focus constructions in Section 3.2 with the copula *nee/ cee*, in fact the copula is optional, for both focus and *wh*-question constructions. This subsection shows that in both constructions, when the fronted constituent is followed by the copula, the two seem to form a one-term predication, and the so-formed predication is syntactically freer from the following out-of-focus clause, then would be an unmarked fronted constituent. But first, let us illustrate next the two constructions, with and without the copula:

(28) a. Abdù   a-kà   ganii __ kàasuwaa.
          Abdu   one-RP see   market
          'ABDU was seen at the market.'

   b. Abdù   nee   a-kà   ganii __kàasuwaa.
       Abdu   COP   one-RP   see   market
       'It was Abdu that was seen at the market.'

(29) a. Wàa   a-kà   ganii __ kàasuwaa?
          who   one-RP   see   market
          'Who was seen at the market?'

      b. Wàa-nee nèe a-kà   ganii __ kàasuwaa?
          who-COP COP one-RP   see   market
          'Who was it who was seen at the market?'

As shown in Abdoulaye (2007), there are many different pragmatic implications between presence and absence of the copula in fronting constructions. For example, sentence (28a), without the copula, implies a strong contrast between Abdu and another person that was incorrectly held (by the listener) to validate the predication. Sentence (28b), with the copula, has no contrast but emphatically identifies Abdu as the person seen at the market (say, after people long wondered who was seen at the market and the speaker found out the information). In sentence (29a), without the copula, the speaker does not rule out that the *wh*-pronoun refer to a null set (i.e., nobody relevant was seen at the market). By contrast, in sentence (29b) the speaker assumes someone relevant must exist that was seen at the market (see Abdoulaye 2007 for more details on these contrasts; see Dryer 1996: 486ff for the interpretation of English *wh*-words with or without a copula; see also the comments around Table 2). Besides these pragmatic differences, the fronted constructions in (28b) and (29b), with copula *nee/ cee*, show more syntactic flexibility than the corresponding constructions in (28a) and (29a), without the copula. This is illustrated next with an insertion test:

(30) a. *Abdù, har   dà   ya-kè   bâ   ni   dà   tabbàt,   a-kà
          Abdu   even   that 3ms-COP   NEG   1s   have certainty one-RP

          cêe   yaa   gudù
          say   3ms.CPL   run
          '??ABDU, although I have no confirmation, was said to have fled.'

      b. Abdù   nee, har   dà   ya-kè   bâ   ni   dà   tabbàt,   a-kà   cêe   yaa   gudù.
          Abdu   COP   even   that 3ms-COP   NEG   1s   have certainty one-RP say   3ms.CPL   run
          'It's Abdu who, although I have no confirmation, was said to have fled.'

(31) a. *Wàa,   duk   dà   bâ-i   sô,   ya   tàfi   kàasuwaa?
          who   all   that NEG-3ms.IPF   want   3m.RP   go   market
          '*Who, although he didn't like it, went to the market?'

      b. Wàa-nee   nèe,   duk   dà   bâ-i   sô,   ya   tàfi kàasuwaa?
          who-COP   COP   all   that NEG-3ms.IPF   want   3m.RP   go   market
          'Who is it who, although he didn't like it, went to the market?'

It may be noted that in all four sentences in (30-31), the fronted constituent is co-indexed with the subject pronoun (*yaa* '3ms.CPL' in (30) and *ya* '3ms.RP' in (31)) in the (main) out-of-focus clause. Nonetheless, it is only when the fronted constituent has an accompanying copula that parenthetical material can be felicitously inserted, as seen in (30b) and (31b) (dialectal evidence suggests that when the *wh*-word has two copulas, as is the case in (31b), the first one is the oldest and likely fused with the pronoun, with the second copula probably being a reinforcement; see Caron 1991: 75 for

the relevant dialectal data). We believe that these facts are more consistent with an analysis of sentences (30b) and (31b) as having incorporated a one-term identification predication. In other words, sentences (30a) and (31b) are structurally different and the copula in (30b) is more than an appendage marking the fronted constituent (see more on this in the comments around Table 2). The reductionist approach would probably not have much to say about the contrast between these sentences. The next subsection focuses on other derived uses of the deictic identification predication.

3.5 Other uses of the one-term deictic identification predication. As can be expected with a basic structure, the deictic identification construction, apart from its use in focalization, has other extended or derived uses, where sometimes the external utterance context is not directly referred to. Here are some examples (example (32a) adapted from Beik 1987: 194 and (32b-d) from Moussa-Aghali 2000: 42, 34, 28):

(32)   a.   Naa   azà   ki-nàa   jî-n   Zabarmancii   nèe.
              1s.CPL think   2fs.IPF   understanding-of   zarma language   COP
              '[It is that] I thought you understood Zarma.'
              (Cf. French: '[C'est que] j'ai pensé que vous compreniez le zarma.')

        b.   Bà-n   san   ba   koo   raanaa   ta   ɓaacì   gàree nì   nee,
              NEG-1s.CPL know   NEG whether day   3fs.RP spoil   on   1s   COP

              koo   kuma   ya-nàa   dai   jî-n   haushiinaa   nèe.
              whether   indeed 3ms-IPF simply feeling-of   resentment.of.1s   COP

              Tôo,   bà-n   san   koo   bà-n fàɗi   kalmà-r
              well NEG-1s.CPL   know   whether NEG-1s.CPL   say   word-DF

              dàidai ba   nèe? Koo   mìi   nee?
              right NEG   COP whether   what   COP
              'I wonder whether it was bad luck for me, or whether it was him simply resenting me. Well, I wonder whether it was that I did not repeat the word correctly. Or whatever it was.'

        c.   Tôo, shii   kèe   nan.
              well, 3ms   COP   there
              'Well, that's all / it's over / we're set / etc.'

        d.   In lookàci-n   aduwàa   dà   magaryaa   nèe kuma, sai   mù
              if time-of   aduwa.fruit and   magarya.fruit COP indeed, then 1p.SBJ

              jee kaaɗà-r   y̌aay̌â-n.
              go harvesting-of   fruits-DF
              'When it is desert date and jujube fruits season, we would then go harvest them.'

        e.   Màalàmai   nèe,   Kiristàa   nee,   'yan bòorii   nèe,   koowaa
              Muslims   COP   Christians   COP Bori followers COP   everybody

              ya-nàa   tàfiyàa wuri-n   ròoƙo-n   ruwaa.
              3ms-IPF go   place-of   prayer-of rain
              'Whether Muslims, Christians or *Bori* followers, everybody attends the rain prayers.'
              (Cf. French: 'Que ce soit les musulmans, que ce soit les chrétiens,,,')

Examples (32a-b) illustrate the emphatic explanation sentences already presented for French in (23b) and which clarify a previously stated or observed situation (see also Wolff 1993: 495). So, in (32a)

the speaker is trying to explain why he rushed speaking Zarma to the interlocutor. In (32b) the narrator weighs several explanations for the behavior of a narrative participant (a teacher that punished the narrator). Sentence (32c) illustrates a derived use of the deictic identification constructions with the non-assertive copula *kèe nan*, whereby it expresses the completeness, the completion, or the end of an event, as indicated by the possible translations (see also the discussion of (20a-b) above). In (32d) the single term of the predication is a complex NP and the whole predication is introduced by the conditional conjunction *in/ ìdan* 'if'. Finally, sentence (32e) presents a series of one-term identification predications enumerating the elements of a category of people (the involved religious groups).

3.6 Logical structure and syntax of deictic identification. In the previous subsection, we have tried to show that one-term deictic identification and two-term specification or equative sentences are two fundamentally different constructions, based on their morphosyntactic properties. Assuming a distinction between a syntactic level and a logical level for NVPs (see, amongst others, Creissels 2006: 343, den Dikken 2006: 8, 25), this subsection tries to address the issue of the syntactic and logical/ semantic statuses of the single term of a deictic identification construction, compared to the statuses of the two NPs in a two-term specification or equative construction. First, regarding the surface syntax, one may wonder whether the single NP of a one-term deictic identification is the subject or the complement of the predication. In this respect, it may be noted that the single NP of a "NP + COP" deictic identification shares at least one syntactic property with the NP2 of a two-term "NP1 + NP2 + COP" specification or equative construction. Indeed, the NP closest to the copula (whether single NP or an NP2) can shift some of its material to the right of the copula, in an extraposition-like process. This is illustrated in the following:

(33) a. Abdù   [ùba-n   Muusaa   na   gàske]   nèe.
          Abdu   father-of   Musa   one.of   truth   COP
          'Abdu is Musa's real father.'
          = Abdù ùba-n Muusaa nèe na gàske.

      b. [Ɗaalìbâ-r   dà   mu-kèe   jiràa]   cee.
          student-DF   that   1p-RI   wait   COP
          'It is the student we have been waiting for [while introducing a person].'
          = Ɗaalìbâr cee dà mu-kèe jiràa.

(34) a. Naa   zoo   à   baa   nì   maagànii   nèe.
          1s.CPL   come   one.SBJ   give   1s   medicine   COP
          'I came to take a medicine.'
          = Naa zoo nèe à baa nì maagànii.

      b. [Yâara   maràs laafiyàa]   nèe   [a-kà   kaawoo __].
          children   sick   COP   one-RP   bring
          'It is the sick children that were brought.'
          = Yâara nèe maràs laafiyàa akà kaawoo.

Sentences (33a-b) show, respectively, that the NP2 of an equative sentence and the single NP of a deictic identification can shift a sub-constituent after the copula *nee/ cee* (see also the discussion in Jaggar 2001: 460, Newman 2000: 167). The same material shifting is also possible for some of the derived uses of the one-term deictic identification, as seen in data (34a-b) illustrating, respectively, a sentence expressing an emphatic explanation and a sentence with a focus-fronted constituent. These may seem to weaken our analysis which would assume that the single NP of the deictic

identification predication would be the subject. Yet it behaves like the complement of a two-term specification or equative construction. Conversely, the facts of (33-34) would seem to support the reductionist claim that the single term of the deictic identification is a complement, with an understood subject elsewhere. Nonetheless, our analysis can be maintained if one considers that copula *nee/ cee* would simply allow any NP that is next to it to shift materials to the right, regardless of its function, subject or complement. Also, according to Payne (1997: 114) even in two-term equative and identity statements, it is not easy to determine what is the subject and what is the complement, given the equivalence between the two terms, which often results in their interchangeability.

Secondly, regarding the logical semantic level, one may wonder whether the single NP of a deictic identification predication is the logical predicate or the logical argument. We propose that the one-term analysis of deictic identification predications also extends to the logical level. In this case, the single NP would necessarily be a logical argument, with the copula assuming a predicate function. In this respect, it may be noted that many authors (cf. Roy 2013: 8f, Rothstein 2001: 240–241, see also Heycock and Kroch 1999 and the other references cited in Mikkelsen 2005: 43f) do not consider that the two terms of ordinary specificational and equative clauses are in a logical subject/ predicate relationship. Instead, they argue that the two terms of an equation have the same syntactic category, the same semantics, and none of them refers to a property that would make it a predicate (see the discussion in Hengeveld 1992: 54 on the semantics of nominal predicates). Consequently, many researchers consider equative constructions to have the structure of ordinary transitive clauses, with a copula-verb (if the language uses one) and its two arguments, where the copula provides the "semantic glue" (see Mikkelsen 2005: 49f; for a contrary view, see den Dikken 2006: 76). Assuming these proposals, we consider that the logical structure of a deictic identification predication in Hausa is simply "BE (x)", where the predicate "BE" is the assertive copula *nee / cee* or the non-assertive copula *kèe/-kè* and the "x" the single NP that references a real world entity. This structure would be similar to other non-verbal predications with a single subject term and a copular predicate, such as the existential predication ("EXIST (x)"; as in *àkwai Abdu* 'Abdou exists'/ *bâa Abdù* lit. 'Abdu does not exist', i.e., 'Abdu is dead') and, particularly, the presentational predication ("HERE IS (x)"; as in *gàa Abdù* 'here is Abdou'). Given their substantial, specific semantics, the existential and presentational predicates can easily be conceived as logical predicates. By contrast, one must assume some flexibility with the status of copula *nee/ cee* or *kèe/-kè*. In nominal or adjectival predications with two terms, one term is subject, and the other is the logical predicate, linked together by semantically weak *nee/ cee* or *kèe/-kè* copulas. But in equative and deictic identification sentences, the copulas *nee/ cee* and *kèe/-kè* would automatically become logical predicates, each with a special pragmatic (assertion vs. presupposition) marking function. In any case, one must assume that the minimal semantics of *nee/ cee* and *kèe/-kè* in one-term predication is enough to contrast it to the existential and presentational predicates, which also have one term. Considering that copulas *nee/ cee* and *kèe/-kè* have some minimal semantics would also be more compatible with the derived uses of the deictic identification seen in Sections 3.3 and 3.5, or the auxiliarization of the copulas into tense/ aspect markers (for a plethora of secondary uses of the copula *kèe nan* see Jaggar 2001: 463f: see also Pustet 2003: 45-53, 59-61 for the wide range of semantic and functional distinctions marked by copulas in languages).

To summarize, one can distinguish for Hausa (and probably for other languages as well) a deictic identification predication with one NP term from the equative predication with two NP terms. We have shown that this distinction is supported by a certain number of facts, in particular the existence sometimes of different copulas for the two constructions and the derived uses for which

only the deictic identification predication is recruited. The NVPs in Hausa and their copulas and predicates can be summarized as in the Table 2.

Table 2: Copulas in Hausa (central and east dialects)

	Assertion	presupposition	Negation
Deictic identification	nee / cee	kèe nan	
Nominal predication	nee / cee, (-nàa)	kèe / - kè	
Specification	nee / cee, (-nàa)	kèe / - kè	
Adjectival predication	nee / cee, (-nàa)	kèe / - kè	
Localization	-nàa	kèe / - kè	bâa
Possession	-nàa dà	kèe dà	bâa ... dà
Existence	dà, àkwai, dàkwai	kèe (d)àkwai	bâa / baabù
Presentation	gàa		

In Table 2 the "assertion" domain refers to all NVP sentences conveying "neutral", new information (naturally, negative sentences, too, are asserted; but the table sets them off to show their distinctive predicates). As can be seen, *nee/ cee* spans the range of all "NP1+NP2"-based sentences and adjectival sentences. According to Abdoulaye (2006: 1162, n5, 2007), the deictic identification function of *nee/ cee* carries over into the grammatical focus constructions, where, depending on the context, *nee/ cee* can mark the basic deictic identification (see *mootàa cee sukèe wankèewaa cân* 'it is a/the car that they are washing over there', which can be said when the interlocutors are watching the event, vs. *mootàa sukèe wankèewaa cân* 'They are washing CARS/THE CAR over there', which excludes a direct observation of the event. In focus constructions, copula *nee/ cee* can also mark functions derived from deictic identification, such as the exhaustive listing function (see *muu nèe mukà san Bàmàko* 'we are the ones who know Bamako' vs. *muu mukà san Bàmàko* 'we indeed know Bamako'). For this reason, and following Abdoulaye (2007), *nee/ cee* is glossed as "COP" in all of its occurrences (in this perspective, the semantic components of "focus", i.e., emphasis and contrast, are marked by the fronting alone). Copula *nee/ cee* is probably the most problematic copula in Hausa, as seen in the many different labels it has received in Hausa descriptions: "copula" (in most sources, e.g., Wolff 1993: 494), "actualizer" (Caron 1991: 134), and "stabilizer" (Newman 2000: 160). In one particular proposal (Green 1997, 2004, Green and Jaggar 2003), *nee/ cee* is labeled as a focus marker and glossed "FM" through all of its occurrences on the ground that it marks focus in copular clauses in the same way it does in grammatical focus constructions (in this perspective, "focus" bundles the semantic components of "new information", "exhaustive listing", and "contrast"). Also, most people note the connection between copula *nee/ cee*, the pronouns *na* (masculine singular or plural)/ *ta* (feminine), and the adverbs *nân* 'here'/ *cân* 'there' (see Newman 2000: 36, 300, 545). Abdoulaye (2007: 243) specifically proposes that copula *nee/ cee* derives from former emphasis and contrast markers, which themselves may have derived from pronouns or adverbs (see Stassen 1997: 66f, 80 and Frajzyngier 1985: 66ff on the general idea that copulas can develop from discourse markers). Copula *-nàa* essentially spans the localization and possessive predications. It also auxiliarized to mark the "general", assertive imperfective in verbal clauses and has a host of other functions that can be derived from its localization function. Nearly all assertive-context copulas and predicates are replaced by *kèe/-kè* in non-assertive clauses (except for *gàa*, the subject of which cannot be focused, and *àkwai*, which combines with *kèe/-kè*).). Copula *kèe/-kè* has

also auxiliarized to mark the "relative" imperfective *-kèe* in non-assertive verbal clauses (it may be noted that for the sake of simplicity, all copulas and predicates are glossed "COP" in the examples, except for *kèe/-kè* and *-nàa* when they occur as auxiliaries, in which case they are glossed as tense/ aspect markers; for a full account of tense/ aspects categories in Hausa see, amongst others, Newman 2000: 564-596).

4. Conclusion

General works (Payne 1997, Creissels 2006, Declerck 1988, Pustet 2003, etc.) have explored the many facets of non-verbal predication in languages and their importance in language description. This article shows that the NVPs types can be enriched with a new basic type: the deictic identification predication. This type of NVP stems from the distinction made between an ordinary equative sentence and a one-term identification predication. The article has shown that the two types of clauses select different copulas in non-assertive contexts in the western dialects of Hausa. The article has also shown that the deictic identification has derived uses for which the two-term equative predication is not recruited.

List of Abbreviations

1/2/3	1st/2nd/3rd person
COP	copula
CPL	Completive
DET	determiner
DF	definiteness marker
f	feminine;
FUT	Future
IPF	Imperfective
LOC	locative
m	masculine
NEG	negative
NP	noun phrase
NVP	non-verbal predication
p	plural
RI	Relative Imperfective
RP	Relative Perfective
s	singular
SB	subjunctive.

References

Abdoulaye, Mahamane L. 2006. Existential and possessive predications in Hausa. *Linguistics* 44, 1121–1164.

Abdoulaye, Mahamane L. 2007. Profiling and identification in Hausa. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 232–269.

Abraham, Roy C. 1959. *The language of the Hausa people*. London: University of London Press.

Beik, Janet. 1987. *Hausa theater in Niger: A comtemporary oral art*. New York/ London: Garland.

Brown, Roger. 1973. *A first language: The early stages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caron, Bernard B. 1991. *Le haoussa de l'Ader*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Creissels, Denis. 1978. Réflexions au sujet de l'article de Maurice Coyaud: '"Emphase, nominalisations relatives"' (La Linguistique, vol.11, fasc. 2/1975). *La Linguistique* 14, 117–141.

Creissels, Denis. 2006. *Syntaxe générale: Une introduction typologique*. Paris: Hermes.

Declerck, Renaat. 1988. *Studies on copular sentences, clefts and pseudo-clefts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1996. Focus, pragmatic presupposition, and activated propositions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 475–523.

Freeze, Ray. 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68, 553–595.

Garba, Mohammed M., 1989. A new look at the NP+nàà+NP constructions, in: Frajzyngier, Z. (Ed.), *Current Progress in Chadic Linguistics*. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Chadic Linguistics, Boulder, Colorado, 1-2 May, 1987, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 121–129.

Green, Melanie. 2004. Predication, Equation and Information Structure: Evidence from Hausa Copular Sentences. Ms, University of Sussex, UK

Green, Melanie. 1997. Focus and Copular Constructions in Hausa. PhD dissertation. School of Oriental and African Studies, London.

Green, Melanie and Philip J. Jaggar. 2003. 'Ex-situ and In-situ Focus in Hausa: Syntax, Semantics and Discourse', in J. Lecarme (ed.), *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar*, pp. 187-213. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication: Theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Heycock, Caroline and Anthony Kroch. 1999. Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF interface level. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 365–397.

Higgins, Francis R. 1979. *The pseudo-cleft construction in English*. New York: Garland.

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

Lefebvre, Claire. 1992. Towards a typology of predicate cleft languages. *Journal of West African Languages* 22, 53–61.

Lyons, John. 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McConvell, Patrick. 1973. Cleft sentences in Hausa? A syntactic study of focus. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, SOAS

Mikkelsen, Line. 2005. *Copular clauses: Specification, predication and equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Moussa-Aghali, F. 2000. *Yarintata* [My childhood]. Niamey: Editions Albasa.

Ndayiragije, Juvénal 1992. Structures syntaxiques des clivées en fon. *Journal of West African Languages* 22, 63–95.

Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa language: An encyclopedic reference grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pustet, Regina, 2003. *Copulas: Universals in the categorization of the lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rothstein, Susan. 2001. *Predicates and their subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roy, Isabelle A., 2003. *Non-verbal predication: Copular sentences at the syntax-semantics interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schachter, Paul. 1973. Focus and relativization. *Language* 49, 19–46.

Schachter, Paul. 1985. Parts-of-speech systems, in: Shopen, T. (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description Vol. 1: Clause Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 3–61.

Sibomana, Leo. 1995. La focalisation en zarma. *Afrika und Übersee* 78, 39–54.

Stassen, Leon. 1997. *Intransitive predication*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Steinberg, Danny D. 1982. *Psycholinguistics: Language, mind, and world*. London: Longman.

Wolff, H.E., 1993. *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa*. Münster/ Hamburg: LIT.

Mahamane L. ABDOULAYE < mlabdoulaye@gmail.com>
Abdou Moumouni University,
Niamey.
.
Salifou BARMOU < sbarmou@yahoo.fr>
Abdou Moumouni University,
Niamey.

Saoudé SOULEY BIDA < saoudebida@gmail.com>
EUCAP Sahel Niger,
Niamey