

The morphosyntax of peripheral marking in Hausa: phrasal affixation or edge inflection?

Peripheral marking, i.e., the expression of morphosyntactic properties of a phrase on a left or right-peripheral non-head word constitutes one of the most wide-spread cases of morphology–syntax interaction. Within morphological theory, there are at present two alternative views regarding peripheral marking: phrasal affixation (Anderson, 1992, 2005) and edge inflection (Miller, 1992; Nevis, 1985; Zwicky, 1987). While phrasal affixation postulates that rules of exponents can target syntactic phrases directly, this theory denies any interaction with morphological properties of the host word. Edge inflection, by contrast, invokes edge feature percolation to distribute morphosyntactic features which are realised by word level inflectional rules. In recent work, Anderson *et al.* (2006) recognise the necessity of edge inflection alongside phrasal affixation. In this paper I shall investigate two cases of peripheral marking in Hausa and conclude that both strongly support an analysis in terms of edge inflection.

Wrapping negative marking Negative marking of Hausa VPs is effected, in the great majority of TAM categories by a discontinuous marker *bà ... bá* that wraps around the entire VP. In the completive TAM, the initial marker triggers a suppletive form of the TAM markers, leading to systematic morphological neutralisation of the contrast between absolutive and relative paradigms (e.g., 2.f.sg *kín/kikà* → *bà kì*) and sporadic fusion (e.g., 1.sg *náá/ná* → *bàn*). If discontinuous negative markers take wide scope over a conjunction of completive VPs, only the TAM marker of the initial conjunct will appear in the neutralised negative TAM, whereas the distinction between absolute and relative will be preserved on all subsequent TAM markers. Similarly, the final marker *bá* will be suppressed on all conjuncts but the last. In sum, wide scope over coordinated VPs and the morphological interactions with the TAM system militate for an edge inflection rather than phrasal affixation analysis. Haplology of the final marker also favours an edge inflection analysis: at the right edge, exponents of matrix and embedded VP negation are folded into one. This process, however, only ever applies to the final marker of negation, rendering a purely phonological account entirely implausible.

TAM sequences In sequences (coordinations) of sentences featuring non-completive TAMs, markers in non-initial conjuncts are substituted by the “neutral” TAM marker (Jaggar, 2001; Newman, 2000). Nevertheless, interpretation of non-initial conjuncts is governed by the marker on the initial conjunct. The shape of the initial TAM marker cannot be derived from the neutral marker by concatenative phonological rules: alongside suprasegmental changes, we find suppletive forms (e.g., [*máà ...*] [*mù ...*]) as well as suffixation ([*tá-nàà ...*] [*tà ...*]). Conversely, the neutral form cannot be derived from the initial form on the basis of regular phonological processes either. Since TAM interpretation affects all conjuncts alike, we are confronted, again, with a phrasal property (of coordinated VPs) that is only fully marked on the first conjunct. Given the structural parallelism between the conjuncts (finite VPs) is clear that the exponent of TAM marking is properly contained within the first conjunct. Together with the fact that phonology is non-concatenative, phrasal affixation is clearly ruled out.

Thus, to conclude both initial and final marking of negation, as well as the morphology of TAM sequences show systematic interaction of peripheral marking strategies with morphological properties of the target words, including suppletion and haplology. As a result, we have to acknowledge that we need to add Hausa to the list of languages which resist a treatment in terms of phrasal affixation, underlining once more the role of morphology in the grammar of edge marking processes.

References

- Anderson, S., L. Brown, A. Gaby and J. Lecarme (2006), “Life on the edge: There’s morphology there after all,” *Lingue e Linguaggio* **5**, 33–48.
- Anderson, S. R. (1992), *A–Morphous Morphology*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Anderson, S. R. (2005), *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Jaggar, P. (2001), *Hausa*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Miller, P. (1992), *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase Structure Grammar*, Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics, Garland, New York.
- Nevis, J. A. (1985), “Finnish particle clitics and general clitic theory,” Ph.D. thesis, Ohio State University.
- Newman, P. (2000), *The Hausa Language. An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Zwicky, A. (1987), “Suppressing the Zs,” *Journal of Linguistics* **23**, 133–148.