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0. INTRODUCTION

Using the framework of Role and Reference Grammar (Foley and Van Valin 1984, Van Valin 1993), this paper claims that three structurally different topic NP constructions can be distinguished for Hausa. I will assume here and without much discussion that a topic NP constituent generally is the old information, or the thing or person about which a comment is made (see Van Valin 1990a and others cited there). In one of the three constructions, the topic NP can be shown to be altogether outside of the comment sentence. The construction is illustrated below in (1), where the nominal raagunàa 'rams' constitutes the topic NP:

(1) raagunàa? yâara sunàa kai sù rwàafii koowànè màrìicee.
    rams boys 3p-CONT take 3p pond every afternoon
    'The rams? The boys drive them to drink every afternoon.'

In the above sentence, the direct object raagunàa 'rams' is characterized by a question intonation and is hence separate from the remaining of the sentence (see section 2). In the other two topicalization constructions, the topic NP can be shown to be internal to the comment sentence. The two constructions are illustrated below in (2) and (3a-b) respectively:

(2) yâara sunàa kai raagunàa rwàafii koowànè màrìicee.
    boys 3p-CONT take rams pond every afternoon
    'The boys [they] drive the rams to drink every afternoon.'

(3) a. suu yâara sunàa kai raagunàa rwàafii koowànè màrìicee.
    3p boys 3p-CONT take rams pond every afternoon
    'As for the boys, they drive the rams to drink every afternoon.'

    b. suu raagunàa yâara sunàa kai sù rwàafii koowànè màrìicee.
    3p rams boys 3p-CONT take 3p pond every afternoon
    'As for the rams, the boys drive them to drink every afternoon.'

Example (2) is simply the regular Hausa SVO clause construction. Indeed I assume that yâara 'boys' in (2) is not the real grammatical subject, but it is an optional topic nominal. The grammatical subject is the preverbal pronoun su in su-nàa '3p-CONT'. Using the RRG clause structure representation, "subject" NPs such as yâara 'boys' in (2) are assigned to the (topical) Core-External Position (or CEP, see section 3). The nominals suu yâara '3p boys' in (3a) and suu raagunàa '3p rams' in (3b) are adjoined an agreeing independent pronoun to achieve a more prominent topicality. Again using the RRG clause structure representation, the topic nominals of (3) are assigned to the highly topical Left-Detached Position (or LDP, see section 4). Considering
four structural criteria, I show that topic nominals like those of (2) and (3a-b) are the sentence-
internal topicalized nouns. The topic nominal in (1) in reality heads a free constituent NP outside
the sentence.

The first section presents the clause structure assumed by the theory of Role and Reference
Grammar, the framework of investigation. Section 2 deals with the extra-sentential topic NP of
(1). Section 3 and section 4 focus on the sentence-internal topic nominals of (2) and (3)
respectively.

1. THE CLAUSE STRUCTURE IN RRG

The framework of Role and Reference Grammar (Foley and Van Valin 1984, Van Valin
1993) has among its components the theory of the Layered Structure of the Clause (LSC), the
component that handles the hierarchical organization of clauses and sentences (cf Van Valin
1993:3-7). According to Van Valin (1993:5), the RRG view of clause structure is based on the
contrast between predicate and arguments on the one hand, and the contrast between those NPs
and adpositional phrases that are arguments of the predicate and those that are not. All languages
have these two semantically-based distinctions: predicate vs. arguments and arguments vs. non-
arguments. The primary syntactic constituent units of the clause are the nucleus, the core, and the
periphery. The nucleus is a node and contains the predicate(s). The core contains the nucleus and
the arguments of the verb or verbs. The periphery contains the non-argument NPs and
adpositional phrases as well as adjuncts such as adverbs. The periphery modifies the core node.
Both core and periphery are subsumed under the clause node, as represented below (from Van
Valin 1993:5):

(4)
These hierarchical syntactic units are defined semantically (by the two contrasts predicate vs. arguments and arguments vs. non-arguments), and they obtain regardless of the word order type of a language. So, all the elements in the hierarchical units can occur in principle in any order. A single-clause sentence may also contain a pre-core slot (PCS) and a Left-Detached Position (LDP). The PCS is the structure which contains wh-words in languages where they do not occur in situ. PCS constituents are clause-internal. The LDP is the location of dislocated constituents that are set off from the clause by a pause such as 'John' in 'as for John, I haven't seen him for a while'. LDP constituents are sentence-internal but clause-external. The constituent structure is represented in RRG as follows (from Van Valin 1993:7, where one can also find the arguments for the various structures):

(5)  

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{SENTENCE} & \text{LDP} & \text{PCS} & \text{CLAUSE} \\
\text{CORE} & \text{ARG} & \text{NUC} & \text{ARG} \\
\text{PERIPHERY} & \text{PP} & \text{PP} \\
\text{ADV} & \text{NP} & \text{NP} & \text{V} \\
\text{yesterday} & \text{what} & \text{did} & \text{John} \\
\end{array}
\]

A typological structural contrast recognized in RRG involves the head-marking versus dependent-marking languages (see Nichols 1986). These two notions respectively correlate with the notions of endocentric versus exocentric relations between a verb or adposition and their NP arguments, or between a possessed head-noun and its possessor noun. English is an exocentric, dependent-marking language because the NP arguments of a verb must be realized. In an endocentric language, the NP arguments are cross-referenced on the predicate and they can be omitted. In this case, the predicate, with the cross-referencing affixes, can function on its own as a complete core. Van Valin (1985) gives Lakhota as an endocentric, head-marking language, as illustrated below (adapted from Van Valin 1985:403)

(6)  

a. lakhota ki thathaka ota wicha-Ø-kte.  
Indian the bison many 3pU-3sgA-kill  
(lit: 'the Indian bisons many they-killed-them')  
'The Indian killed many bison.'
In (6a), both the subject lakhota ki 'the Indian' and the direct object thathaka ota 'many bisons' are cross-referenced on the verb (the object nominal by a zero morpheme). (6b) shows that the two nominals can be omitted and yet the remaining head-verb is grammatical. Because normally real arguments are not so optional, the two nominals in (6a) are not considered as syntactic arguments in RRG clause structure representation. These two nominals are in a core-external but clause-internal position while the pronominal suffixes are the only (core-internal) syntactic arguments. In Abdoulaye (1992:8), the core-external-but-clause-internal position is referred to as the CEP (core-external position). The Lakhota sentence in (6a) is represented below:

\[
\text{(7)} \quad \text{SENTENCE} \\
\text{CLAUSE} \\
\text{CEP} \\
\text{CORE} \\
\text{ARG} \quad \text{ARG} \\
\text{NUC} \\
\text{PRED} \\
\text{Lakhota ki} \quad \text{thathaka ota} \quad \text{wicha-Ø-kte}
\]

According to Van Valin (1985:398, 1993:18), semantically, the function of the two nominals represented above in the CEP is to specify the reference of the pronominal arguments in the core. Syntactically, the two nominals are irrelevant for the statements of rules for grammatical phenomena because these phenomena can obtain even when the nominals are omitted. However, the CEP nominals are clause-internal and are within the scope of the illocutionary force (IF) operator; they can hence be questioned or asserted.

In conclusion the RRG Layered Structure of the Clause will allow us to characterize for Hausa two sentence-internal topicalization positions, the Core-External Position (CEP) and the Left-Detached Position (LDP).

2. THE EXTRA SENTENTIAL TOPIC NP

This section presents the previous studies of Hausa topicalization. It then brings up some evidence showing that the topic NP is not inside the main sentence.
1.1 Previous studies of topicalization in Hausa

Topicalization in Hausa has been dealt with mainly in Jaggar (1978), Tuller (1982, 1986, 1988), and Junaidu (1987, 1989). I am mentioning the previous works in this section because they all seem to focus their discussion on the sentence-external topic construction illustrated in (1) above. Indeed, although no study (but Abdoulaye 1992) specifically mentions the question intonation of the topic nominal of (1), all the above authors insist on a major intonational break that separates Hausa topic NPs from their comment sentence. Thus, Jaggar (1978:75, citing McConvell 1973:24) notes: "In the language, the structural division of an utterance into a topic and a comment seems to be a major constituent break in surface structure and results in unusual pitch perturbation." This pitch perturbation is also accompanied by a new tonal downdrift pattern starting after the topic NP. Tonal downdrift is the process where high and low tones progressively lower in absolute pitch value throughout an utterance. According to Jaggar then, this progressive tone lowering is stopped after the topic NP, and the comment intonationally restarts as a regular sentence. Jaggar concludes that in Hausa, the topic NP and the comment are two fully separate sentences. Similarly, Tuller (1982, 1986, 1988:135) analyzes Hausa topic NPs as being external to S-bar. She gives the following structural representation of the construction (adapted from Tuller 1982:n6):

(8) [ ... ] [ ... ]

Topic S'

For Tuller then, the topic nominal cannot have been moved in position transformationally. For her, it is a base-generated constituent. Beside other theory-internal arguments, she cites as support for her analysis the facts already observed that the topic nominal is followed by a pause, and that the sentence begins with a new intonation pattern. However, what one may point out is that the intonation pattern of the topic NP of (1) is similar to that of question sentences (see section 1.2.1 below). With some reservation (see for example the discussion of Jaggar 1978 in note #3 below), I will here assume that this question intonation is what the previous studies have characterized as a major intonational break. The question intonation, or something that can be called a major break, does not characterize the topic NPs of (2) and (3a-b), therefore, these topic NPs will be considered in this paper as integral parts of their comment sentences. They are thus in contrast with the external topic NP of (1). Previous studies generally note that the external topic (to the extent that they do indeed deal with this construction) can correspond to almost any constituent in the comment sentence, as it is illustrated below (with (9a-d) adapted from Junaidu 1989:63):

(9) a. yaarôn? yanàa cîn naamàa kullum.
     boy-DEF 3ms-CONT eat-DN-of meat every.day
     'The boy? He eats meat every day.'
b. naamàa? yaaròn yanàa cîi kullum.
meat boy-DEF 3ms-CONT eat-DN every.day
'The meat? The boy eats it every day.'

c. cîn naamàa? yaaròn yanàa yîi kullum.
et-DN-of meat boy-DEF 3ms-CONT do-DN every.day
'Eating meat? The boy does it every day.'

de. cîi? yaaròn yanàa yîi mà naamàa kullum.
et-DN boy-DEF 3ms-CONT do-VN MA meat every.day
*Eating? The boy does it to meat every day.'

e. Abdùu? Indoo taa aikàà mashì goorò jiyà.
Abdu Indo 3fs-PERF send MA-3ms kolanut yesterday
'Abdu? Indo send him some kolanuts yesterday.'
Abdu Indo 3fs-PERF see younger brother-of-3ms yesterday
'Abdu? Indo saw his brother yesterday.'

In (9a-b) a "subject" NP, yaaròn 'the boy', and a direct object, naamàa 'meat' are respectively the external topics. (9c) shows an external topic corresponding to a verb and its direct object, while in (9d) the verb is in the external topic position but without its direct object. (9e) illustrates an applied nominal topic while (9d) illustrates a possessor noun topic. Next we turn to the tests for the structural position of the external topic NP.

1.2 Evidence for the status of the external topic NP

This subsection reviews four types of evidence for the status of the external topic. We will in turn see that the nominal in reality has a question intonation, it cannot be placed at the end of the sentence, it can be recapitulated by a lexical NP, and finally, it can be followed by non-linguistic materials such as laughs, exclamations, swearings, and such.

1.2.1 Question intonation

We have seen above that previous studies of Hausa topicalization emphasize (in their discussion) an intonational break between the topic NP and the comment sentence. I have assumed that what is involved is specifically a question intonation break. This claim is substantiated by the fact that nominals normally ending in a short vowel have a long vowel in the external topic position. According to Newman and Newman (1981), lengthening is one of the features that characterize the last vowel of a question sentence. This is illustrated below:

(10) a. Abdù yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe.
Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
'Abdu is going to Maradi tomorrow.'
Abdü 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
'Abdu? He is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

c. wàaneenèe ya ga Abdùu?
who-cop.m-cop 3ms-RP see Abdu
'Who saw Abdu?'

In sentence (10a) the name Abdù has its normal short vowel. When Abdù is an external topic as it is in (10b), it takes a long final vowel: Abdùu. The vowel lengthening can also be seen in (10c) where Abdùu is at the end of a question sentence. Thus, the topic nominal Abdùu in (10b) is a free constituent. The utterer of (10b) would be rhetorically asking a question, or --more precisely-- would be echoing a name, as if to ensure that its referent is indeed the subject of the conversation. Sentence (10b) can be an answer to questions such as what about Abdù?, what will Abdù do? The topic nominal is actually indistinguishable from the (probing) vocative form, which is: Abdùu? 'Abdu? (are you in there?)', an obviously free constituent NP.

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the external topic NP is not really being questioned or else the comment sentence will not follow immediately. The external topic NP is indeed an already established topic in the discourse for all the participants. This topic construction in fact contrasts with the other two, which may introduce new referents into the discourse. I will assume then that the external topic construction is the most topical of the three Hausa topicalization constructions.

1.2.2 Right dislocation

Another possible evidence for the sentence-external topic construction is the fact that the topic nominal cannot appear right-dislocated sentence-finally with the same question intonation pattern. Thus, one has:

(11) a. *shii yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi. Abdùu?
3ms 3ms-CONT going Maradi Abdu
'*He is going to Maradi. Abdu?'

b. ?shii yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi Abdùu?
3ms 3ms-CONT going Maradi Abdu
'Is he going to Maradi Abdu?'

c. *shii yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi? Abdùu?
3ms 3ms-CONT going Maradi Abdu
'*Is he going to Maradi? Abdu?' (in the sense: I am asking you)

From (11a) we can see that one cannot make a statement and only then inquire about the suitability of the subject of the conversation. If the nominal Abdù appears sentence-finally with the question intonation (in a kind of afterthought structure), then it is simply part of a question
sentence, as it can be seen in (11b). It is similarly impossible to have the comment sentence in a question form followed by the external topic, as seen in (11c). We will see below that one of the other two topic nominals can be easily placed at the sentence-final position.

1.2.3 Recapitulation by a lexical NP

A third evidence for the external status of the topic nominals such as those in (9) is their ability to be recapitulated by a lexical NP beside a pronominal copy or a zero (for non-human referent nouns). This is illustrated below (with (12d) adapted from Jaggar 1978:79):

   Abdu Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
   'Abdu? Abdu is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

   b. iccèe? an saarèe (shi) jiyà.
   tree imp.PERF cut (3ms) yesterday
   'The tree? It was felled yesterday.'

   c. iccèe? an saarèe iccèe jiyà.
   tree imp.PERF cut tree yesterday
   'The tree? The tree was felled yesterday.'

   d. fitaa? ai mukàn fita wani lookàcii.
   going.out-DN indeed 1p-HAB go some time
   'Going out? We indeed do go out sometimes.'

In (12a), the external topic nominal Abdù is repeated immediately afterwards as the "subject" of the comment sentence. (12b-c) respectively show that the patient topic nominal iccèe 'tree' can be recapitulated by a pronoun or zero and by a lexical NP. In (12d) finally, the external topic fitaa 'going out' is a derived nominal and corresponds to a verb in the comment sentence. All the constructions in (12) being monoclausal, they are unlikely to allow two occurrences of the same lexical NP. Sentence (12a) is particularly telling in this regard, where the topic is immediately followed by its lexical copy. Movement transformations in GB-like frameworks leave traces or copy pronouns, and not full lexical NPs. Similarly, deletion rules under identity in GB-like frameworks, or more generally, the discourse reference-tracking mechanisms available to languages would exclude the lexical copies in (12) if the constructions were each a single sentence.

1.2.4 Insertion of paralinguistic materials

A final element in support of the free status of the external topic has to do with the possibility of inserting expressive materials after the topic nominal. One can indeed have laughs, expletives, and other swearing following the topic, as seen below:
3. THE CEP TOPIC NOMINALS

This section focuses on the CEP and the nominals that appear in it. We will see that the regular "subject" NP in Hausa occurs in this position (cf. (2) above). However, by a relatively little known process, it is also possible for the direct object nominal to be fronted into the CEP. The section also reviews the differences between the CEP nominals and the sentence-external topic nominal.

3.1 The CEP subject nominal

In Abdoulaye (1992:8) it was claimed that Hausa has an endocentric structure with respect to the subject noun. Indeed this nominal is cross-referenced by a preverbal pronoun (PVP) and can be freely omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence. This well-known fact of Hausa is again illustrated below:
In (15a), the nominal "subject" Abdù is optional, and this is represented in (15b) by the optionality of the CEP position. The real syntactic argument is the PVP ya '3ms', referring to the CEP nominal. As for the CEP subject nominal, it fulfills a topic function here. Note that the aspect marker naa realizes an aspectual operator and operators are represented in RRG in a separate projection which need not concern us here (cf. the unattached tense marker did in the figure under (5) from Van Valin 1993).

Because the lexical NP subject is never core-internal (except in copular clauses, see Abdoulaye 1992:124), one can say that it is always automatically "topicalized". This means that the nominal is structurally peripheral but still clause-internal, and the construction in (15a) is a single sentence, where the lexical NP subject is cross-referenced by a non-lexical element in its second occurrence. This CEP topic nominal is then different from the external topic nominal seen in section 1 above.

3.2 The CEP direct object

An unexpected fact for a language like Hausa --thought to have a familiar, exocentric clause structure-- is that it is possible for a patient nominal also to appear in the CEP, by an optional topicalization process. This is illustrated below:

(16) ruwaa sun jányee
water 3p.PERF draw
'The water has all receded.' (water is plural in Katsinanci)
'The water they drew [it] all.'

One reason for my considering the preposed patient ruwaa 'water' as a CEP nominal is the fact that it is not possible to distinguish it from a CEP subject argument. Indeed, there is no pause or any kind of prosody marked on the displaced patient nominal. This is why the sentence (16)
above has two interpretations. In the first interpretation, the PVP sun '3p.PERF' refers to ruwaa 'water', which is then the subject. In the second interpretation, the PVP refers to some other entity and ruwaa is just a topicalized patient nominal. It should be noted that the first interpretation is the default one, but that the linguistic or the real world context can cue the other interpretation as well. Whether subject or object, ruwaa 'water' in (16) above is a nominal in the CEP and it is marked as a topic. Note that the equivalent English translation the water they drew [it] all in (16) and the English sentences in (17b, 19a-b) below are more grammatical if the copy pronoun is omitted. They are not to be taken for contrastive focus constructions. They are topicalization structures like John I haven't seen for a while, when it is equivalent to (as for) John, I haven't seen him for a while, but not it is John that I haven't seen for a while (see the discussion in Van Valin 1990a:196-198, and Gundel 1974 cited there; also, these English examples are just the nearest Hausa equivalents, there is no claim here about their structure).

3.3 Differences between the CEP nominals and the external topic

CEP nominals, whether subject or direct object, are sentence-internal, contrary to the external topic NP seen in section 1. First, the CEP does not have a question intonation, as is evidenced by the fact that nominals ending normally with a short vowel cannot have a long vowel in the CEP. This is illustrated below:

Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
'Abdu is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

b. Abdù/ *Abdùu Indoo taa tuuràa shi makarantaa.
Abdu Indo 3fs.PERF push 3ms school
'Abdu Indo sent [him] to school.'

Secondly, the CEP nominals cannot be recapitulated by a lexical NP. The CEP subject is cross-referenced by the real syntactic subject (or pivot in RRG terms), the preverbal pronoun (PVP). In certain aspects such as the continuous, the PVP is optional, both for human or non-human referent nominals. This is illustrated below (for extensive accounts of the PVP optional drop see Tuller 1986 and Abdoulaye 1992):

(18) a. jirgii/ Abdù (ya)-nàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe.
train/ Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
'The train/ Abdu is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

b. jirgii/ Abdù zàa-*(ya) tàfiyàa MaraaDi gòobe.
train/ Abdu FUT-3ms going Maradi tomorrow
'The train/ Abdu will go to Maradi tomorrow.'
c. *Abdu Abdu (ya)nàa zuwàa MaraaDi göobe.
   Abdu Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
   'Abdu is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

The sentence (18a) is in the continuous, an aspect which belongs to the group of tenses/ aspects where the PVP drop is possible. The future on the other hand belongs to the group that does not allow the PVP drop, as seen in (18b). The PVP drop does not depend on animacy or humaness factors. Note that it is impossible to have the CEP nominal recapitulated by a lexical NP in the core, even if the PVP is dropped, as seen in sentence (18c). When the direct object is fronted in the CEP, a resumptive pronoun is obligatory for human referents, but optional for other referents. Still, no lexical NP copy is allowed. This is illustrated below:

(19) a. Abdù Indoo taa tuuràa *(shi) makarantaa.
    Abdu Indo 3fs.PERF push 3ms school
    'Abdu Indo sent [him] to school.'

b. littaafìi Indoo taa baadàa (shi) wàje.
   book Indo 3fs.PERF give (3ms) out
   'The book Indo gave [it] out.'

c. *littaafìi Indoo taa baadàa littaafìi wàje.
   book Indo 3fs.PERF give book out
   '*The book Indo gave the book out.'

Sentence (19a) illustrates the obligatory copy pronoun for the human referent CEP direct object Abdù. The copy is optional for non-human as seen in (19b) for littaafìi 'book'. Because the fronted CEP direct object is still inside the sentence, it cannot be recapitulated by a lexical NP, as (19c) shows (for the status of the English translations see discussion of (16) above). Thus, although the subject NP and the preposed direct object are both in the CEP, there is an asymmetry between the PVP and the direct object copy pronoun. This is not surprising because in RRG, there is only one syntactic function, the pivot. The PVP is the pivot, that is, the argument central to the construction, and which is referred to by the morphosyntactic processes (see Valin 1993; also, I have so far used the terms "subject" and "direct object" for ease of reference, otherwise these are not theoretical notions in RRG).

Finally, the CEP nominals differ from the external topic nominal in that they cannot be followed by paralinguistic material. This is illustrated in (14a) for a CEP subject nominal and in (14b) for the CEP direct object. In conclusion, it can be seen that Hausa has a topicalization construction in which NPs that should normally be in the core of the sentence are realized instead in the CEP. This topicalization is automatic for the subject NP, but it is optional for the direct object. The CEP is a "mild" topic position, specifying a topic with a comment in the same sentence. Beside the fronting, there is generally no pause or special prosodic or morphosyntactic
marking on the CEP content. The CEP nominals also contrast with the syntactically marked and more topical nominals treated in the next section.

4. THE TAGGED LDP NOMINALS

This section presents the construction already illustrated in (3) and which I think is the most frequent and most "natural" topicalization construction of Hausa. By natural it is meant that speakers will use it who are intent in establishing a prominent topic first and then commenting on it. The topic NP may or may not be already established in the discourse. The Hausa construction will be rendered in English with the '(as for) NP, ...' sentences. The English 'as for NP' constituent is argued to be in the LDP by Van Valin in various places (see Van Valin 1993 for example). The section first presents the basic data on the Hausa LDP, then the differences between the LDP nominals on the one hand and the external topic NPs and the CEP nominals on the other hand are explored in turn.

4.1 The form of the LDP topic

Compared to the CEP nominals, the LDP nominals can be characterized as highly topical. Their more prominent topicality is formally marked by an agreeing independent pronoun placed at the left of the topic nominal, or sometimes at the right. This is illustrated below (see also Jaggar 1978:74):

(20) a. shii Abdù Indoo taa tuuràa shi makarantaa.
   3ms Abdu Indo 3fs.PERF push 3ms school
   'As for Abdu, Indo sent him to school.'

   b. Abdù shii Indoo taa tuuràa shi makarantaa.
      Abdu 3ms Indo 3fs.PERF push 3ms school
      'As for Abdu, Indo sent him to school.'

In (20), the nominal Abdù is "tagged" with the pronoun shii '3ms', and the result is a higher topicality then it would be without the pronoun. The pronoun can precede or follow the nominal. As the case may be, one can get the other independent pronouns, nii '1s', kai/ kee '2ms/ 2fs', ita '3fs', muu '1p', kuu '2p', and suu '3p'. Note that an optional pause can intervene following shii Abdù or Abdù shii in (20). That pause one can represent as a comma, like in the English translations.

Beside the direct object, as illustrated in (20), nominals holding almost any other function in a sentence can be topicalized, as far as I am aware. Some examples are given below:

(21) a. shii Abdù yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe.
    3ms Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow
    'As for Abdu, he is going to Maradi tomorrow.'
b. suu fa yàara, Bàrai sun swaacèe masù kuDii.
   'As for the boys, the thieves stole their money.'

c. ita wannàn mootàaa an fiddà taayooyintà jiyà.
   'As for this car, its tires were taken off yesterday.'

d. suu su Bàlki ùbân yaa tàfi MaraaDi dà suu.
   'As for Balki and others, their father went to Maradi with them.'

e. shii wannàn àlmakàshii, Abdù yaa yankà faatuu dà shii.
   'As for these scissors, Abdu cut some skins with them.'

f. shii kaamùn/ kaamà kiifii, munàa yín shì koo dan shaawàa maa.
   'As for fishing [catching fish], we do it if only for pleasure.'

In (21), a variety of nominals are topicalized: a subject in (a), an applied nominal in (b), a possessor of the direct object in (c), a comitative in (d), and an instrumental in (e). In (21f) a verb and its direct object are topicalized. In the examples above, the function of the topicalized nominals is indicated by the underlined pronominal copies. For example, the fronted verb in (21f) is the direct object of the sentence's main verb, which is yi 'to do'. Note that in this paper, as in RRG theory in general, movement transformations are not allowed, so the sentences above are not taken as transforms of actual basic sentences. We will now compare the LDP nominals with the other topic NPs.

4.2 LDP nominals versus external topic nominals

Contrary to the external topic, the tagged LDP nominals are sentence-internal, although they are not in the clause itself. This is well represented in the figure under (12) above. The tagged nominal maximally differs from the external topic in all the tests set up in section 1. Thus, the LDP nominal cannot have a question intonation while the remaining sentence is a simple comment. This is seen below:

(22)  *shii Abdùu? yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe.
   'As for Abdu? he is going to Maradi tomorrow.'
It can be seen that the vowel lengthening and the question intonation on the topic nominal are ungrammatical. An isolated shii Abdu? can occur, but it would have the meaning of a real question, 'did you say Abdu?', which would necessarily require an answer from the interlocutor before any comment is made.

LDP tagged nominals can be shifted to the right of the sentence, in the right equivalent of the LDP, the Right-Detached Position (RDP). All the sentences in (20-21), but not (20b), can thus have their topic nominal at the end of the sentence. An example is given below:

(23) a. ita Bàłki maalàm yaa ài kee tà.  
   3fs Balki teacher 3ms.PERF send 3fs  
   'The teacher sent Balki (somewhere).'</n
b. maalàm yaa ài kee tà, ita Bàłki.  
   teacher 3ms.PERF send 3fs 3fs Balki  
   'The teacher sent her (somewhere), Balki.'

Sentence (23b) above shows the direct object nominal tagged with a pronoun, and set off the clause, at end of the sentence in the RDP.

Like the CEP nominals, LDP nominals cannot be recapitulated by a lexical NP in the clause. Instead, topicalized LDP nominals take only a copy pronoun. This point is illustrated below:

   3ms Abdu Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow  
   'As for Abdu, he is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

b. *suu fa yàara, Bàrai sun swaacèe mà yàara kuDii.  
   3p MOD boys thieves 3p.PERF steal MA boys money  
   'As for the boys, the thieves stole their money.'

As it can be seen, the lexical NPs copies (underlined) are ungrammatical. Only pronouns are acceptable, as shown in the corresponding grammatical sentences in (21a-b).

Finally, it is not possible to insert paralinguistic material following the tagged LDP nominal. This is exemplified below:

   3ms Abdu (laughs) 3ms-CONT going Maradi tomorrow  
   '*As for Abdu, ha! ha! ha! he is going to Maradi tomorrow.'

b. *shii wànnan iccèe, kài habbàa inaa! ai an saarëe shi jiyà.  
   3ms that tree EXPL come come in.fact imp.PERF cut 3ms  
   yesterday  
   '*As for that tree, no come on! somebody felled it yesterday.'
Thus, by the four tests reviewed in section 1, the LDP topic nominals clearly contrast with the sentence-external, free constituent topic NPs. The LDP topics are sentence-internal and this is why they cannot be recapitulated by a lexical NP or be followed by paralinguistic material among other properties. Next the LDP and CEP nominals are compared.

4.3 LDP nominals versus CEP nominals

It may be recognized that the contrast is stronger between the external topic nominals on the one hand and the LDP and CEP nominals on the other hand. LDP and CEP nominals are both sentence-internal and they have many properties in common, as seen above. Still, they are nonetheless different. The first fact pointing to a difference between the LDP and CEP nominals is that both types of nominal can cooccur. Moreover, when they occur, the tagged LDP nominal always precedes the CEP nominal. This is illustrated below:

(26) a. suu yâara, kuDii Bàrai sun swaacèe (masù).
   3p boys money thieves 3p.PERF steal (MA-3p)
   'As for the boys, the thieves stole their money.'

   b. *kuDii suu yâara, Bàrai sun swaacèe (masù).
      money 3p boys thieves 3p.PERF steal (MA-3p)
      'As for the boys, the thieves stole their money.'

(27) a. shii Abdù, jàkkai yaa sayar dà suu jiyà.
   3ms Abdu donkeys 3ms.PERF buy DA 3p yesterday
   'As for Abdu, he sold the donkeys yesterday.'

   b. *Abdù suu jàkkai yaa sayar dà suu jiyà.
      Abdu 3p donkeys 3ms.PERF buy DA 3p yesterday
      'As for the donkeys, Abdu sold them yesterday.'

   c. ?jàkkai shii Abdù, yaa sayar dà suu jiyà.
      donkeys 3ms Abdu 3ms.PERF buy DA 3p yesterday
      'As for Abdu, he sold the donkeys yesterday.'

In (26a), the tagged LDP nominal suu yâara 'them the boys' is an applied nominal, and it can be followed by the direct object kuDii 'money' in the CEP. Their order cannot be reversed as seen in (26b). (27a) shows a tagged LDP nominal subject shii Abdù 'him Abdu' which is followed by the CEP direct object jàkkai 'donkeys'. (27b) shows that the direct object cannot be tagged (suu jàkkai 'them the donkeys') and follow the bare subject NP Abdù. In (27c), when the bare direct object nominal jàkkai 'donkeys' is followed by the tagged subject NP shii Abdù 'him Abdu', the result is at least odd. In general then, the order LDP+CEP nominal is confirmed and this is in fact what one should expect given the representation of the LDP as clause-external in the figure under (5), and the representation of the CEP as clause-internal in the figure under (7).
A second difference between a tagged LDP nominal and the CEP subject at least is the fact that a CEP subject NP can follow a focused nominal with or without the copula nee/cee. However, an LDP nominal can follow a focused noun only when the latter is marked with the copula. This is exemplified below:

(28) a. teebùr [+FOC] (nee) Abdù yakèe yii.
    table (cop.m) Abdu 3ms-RC do-DN
    'It is a table that Abdu is making.'

b. teebùr [+FOC] *(nee) shii Abdù yakèe yii.
    table (cop.m) 3ms Abdu 3ms-RC do-DN
    'As for Abdu, it is a table that he is making.'

The sentence (28a) shows the CEP subject nominal Abdù following the focused material teebùr 'table' with or without the copula nee. In (28b) on the other hand, the tagged LDP nominal shii Abdù 'him Abdu' cannot appear after the focused material teebùr 'table' unless the copula nee is present.

With respect to resumptive pronouns, the LDP nominals slightly differ from the CEP nominals in that the omission of the copy pronoun is marginal even for non-human referent nouns (for human referents, a copy is obligatory in all types of topicalization). This is illustrated below:

(29) a. shii littaafìn Indoo taa baadàa ?(shi) wàje.
    3ms book-DEF Indo 3fs.PERF give (3ms) out
    'As for the book, Indo gave it out.'

b. littaafii Indoo taa baadàa (shi) wàje.
    book Indo 3fs.PERF give (3ms) out
    'The book Indo gave [it] out.'

Sentence (29a) shows that a pronominal copy is almost required with the tagged LDP direct object shii littaafìn 'it the book'. This contrasts with the CEP direct object littaafii 'book' in (29b) which, straightforwardly, takes an optional copy pronoun.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper showed that Hausa has three types of NP topic constructions which have different degree of topicality. The more highly topical construction (see section 2) involves a sentence-external, free constituent NP with a question intonation, and which is followed by an independent comment sentence. An example of this structure is: Abdùu? yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi göobe 'Abdu? He is going to Maradi tomorrow'. The next construction highest in topicality involves the tagging of the topic nominals with corresponding independent pronouns (see section 4). These tagged nominals were argued here to be in the LDP, and thus sentence-internal according to the RRG clause structure representation. An example of this construction would be: shii Abdù yanàa zuwàa
MaraaDi gòobe 'as for Abdu, he is going to Maradi tomorrow'. Finally, Hausa also has an unmarked (or "mild") topic construction usually involving the subject and the direct object in the CEP position (see section 3). An instance of the CEP topicalization is simply the Hausa regular SVO clause such as: Abdu vanàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe 'Abdu is going to Maradi tomorrow'.

Primary data in this paper is from the Katsinanci dialect, as spoken in Maradi area (Niger). Katsinanci is classed among the Western dialects. The transcription follows the orthography with some changes. I represent long vowels as double letters, low tone as /à(a)/, falling tone /â(a)/. High tone is unmarked. Capitals represent glottal consonants. The abbreviations are: 1, 2, 3 '1st, 2nd, 3rd person'; A 'actor'; ADV 'adverb'; ARG 'argument'; CEP 'core-external position'; CONT 'continuous'; cop 'copula'; DEF 'definite'; DN 'derived nominal'; f 'feminine'; FOC 'focus'; FUT 'future'; HAB 'habitual'; IF 'illocutionary force operator'; imp 'impersonal'; LDP 'left-detached position'; LSC 'Layered Structure of the Clause'; m 'masculine'; MOD 'modal particle'; NUC 'nucleus'; p 'plural'; PCS 'pre-core slot'; PER 'periphery'; PERF 'perfective'; POT 'potential'; PRED 'predicate'; PVP 'preverbal pronoun'; RC 'relative continuous'; RDP 'right-detached position'; RP 'relative perfective'; RRG 'Role and Reference Grammar'; s, sg 'singular'; U 'undergoer'; V 'verb'; VN 'verbal noun'; XP 'X phrase'. I thank Paul Newman for constructive comments on this paper.

Notes:

1. The LDP has been represented in two ways in RRG. In previous works it is represented as a sort of modifier to the CLAUSE node on the LSC. This representation is shown below: (adapted from Van Valin 1990b:197)

```
(i) SENTENCE
   | CLAUSE
   |   | PCS
   |   | ARG (ARG)
   |   |   | NUC
   |   |   | PRED
   |   |   |   | V
   |   |   | XP
   |   |   | XP
   |   |   | XP
   |   |   | (XP)
   | LDP
```

The horizontal arrow above means that the LDP is optional (in principle it can be taken away and the sentence will be grammatical as is; this also applies to the PER and the CEP, as seen in (7), but not to the PCS). In the second representation, the LDP is a daughter of the SENTENCE node, as seen in (5) above. This representation ensures that the LDP will not be embedded in a sentence but will appear only at the beginning or at the end (RDP) of the sentence. In these positions it will be out of the scope of the illocutionary force operator applying at the CLAUSE node, so that it would not be questioned, asserted or denied (see Van Valin 1993:13). It also ensures that one will have only one LDP per sentence. There however are instances of highly topical material inside complex sentences and embedded LDPs may be needed. This is illustrated below (with sentence (iia) represented in (iii)):
(ii) a. an cèe shii Abdù Bàlki taa baa shì riigaa.  
    'As for Abdu, it was said that Balki gave him a gown.'  
    Lit.: '(impersonal) said as for Abdu, Balki gave him a gown.'

b. inàa tàmmaanìn gòobe sùu tàfi MaraaDi.  
    'I think that tomorrow they will go to Maradi.'

(iii) SENTENCE  
    CLAUSE  
    CORE  
    ARG NUC ARG  
    PRED LDP CLAUSE  
    CEP CORE  
    ARG NUC ARG ARG  
    PRED

It can be seen in (iii) that the LDP modifies the lower subordinate CLAUSE node of the complex sentence (iia). In RRG, preposed adverbs are in the LDP. This LDP would also be embedded if the preposed adverb modifies only the subordinate clause, as is the case in (iib).

It may actually be possible to have more than one LDP per sentence if the data below is considered:

(iv) a. *ita Indoo shii Abdù taa tuuràa shi makarantaa.  
    'as for Indo, as for Abdu, she sent him to school.'

b. *ita Bàlki taa cèe shii Aali yaa tàfi MaraaDi.  
    'As for Balki, she said, as for Ali, he went to Maradi.'

c. ita Bàlki taa cèe gòobe Aali yâa jee MaraaDi.  
    'As for Balki, she said that tomorrow Ali will go to Maradi.'

Sentences (iva-b) show that on the whole, two NPs cannot be equally highly topicalized and placed in the same LDP (as it would be the case in sentence (a)) or in two different LDPS (for sentence (b)). However, sentence (ivc) and its English equivalent seem fine. Apparently then one
may have two different LDPs if their contents are different (such as if one contains an NP and the other an adverb, as it is the case in sentence (ivc)).

2 The representation of the CEP in (7) makes it an optional core modifier just like the PERIPHERY, as seen in (4). But then it must be stipulated that the CEP is distinct from the PERIPHERY although they have the same core modification function. The difference can still rest on the fact that the CEP holds a content that is topical. Material in the PERIPHERY is not necessarily topical. Another potential difference is the fact that the CEP holds nominals that are usually cross-referenced in the core. Again this is not the case for the material in the PERIPHERY.

3 Topic NPs in the LDP do not always have a pronoun tag. There are indeed certain LDP constructions where the pronominal tag is optional. Four cases are illustrated below:

(i) a. (shii) Abdù àbin wàasaa yakèe yîi.
   3ms Abdu thing-of play 3ms-RC do-DN
   'As for Abdu, it is a toy that he is making.'

   b. (shii) Abdù an cèe yanàa sôn Bàlki.
   3ms Abdu imp.PERF say 3ms-CONT want-DN-OF Balki
   'As for Abdu, it was said that he loves Balki.'

   c. (shii) Abdù gòobe yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi.
   3ms Abdu tomorrow 3ms-CONT going Maradi
   'As for Abdu, tomorrow he is going to Maradi.'

   d. (shii) Abdù , yanàa zuwàa MaraaDi.
   3ms Abdu 3ms-CONT going Maradi
   'As for Abdu, tomorrow he is going to Maradi.'

In sentences (ia-c) the nominal Abdù is set off to the LDP by a focused material (àbin wàasaa 'toy'), a main clause (an cèe 'it was said'), and a preposed adverb (gòobe 'tomorrow') respectively. In (id) on the other hand, it is a slight pause that sets the nominal off into the LDP. Jaggar (1978:74, 79) gives examples similar to sentence (id). The problem is that in general, he characterizes the pause in Hausa topicalization as a major intonational break. I rather think that one can compare the pause in sentence (id) with the one that occurs in normal English 'as for NP' sentences.

In each sentence of (i) above the pronoun tag shii '3ms' is optional, as indicated. However, whether or not the tag is present, the fronted nominal Abdù can be considered to always be in the LDP for the reason given below. First, let us recall that a tagged LDP subject nominal does not allow the preverbal pronoun (PVP) to drop (see Abdoulaye 1992:115-118). Thus one has shii Abdù *(ya)nàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe 'As for Abdu, he is going to Maradi tomorrow'. In such simple clause, the pronoun tag is the element marking Abdu as being in the LDP. Indeed without the tag, the nominal Abdu will be in the CEP and PVP drop will become possible, as in: Abdù *(ya)nàa zuwàa MaraaDi gòobe 'Abdu [he] is going to Maradi tomorrow'. Now, in each sentence of (i) above, whether or not the tag is present, the preverbal pronoun drop is impossible, as seen in (shii) Abdù an cèe *(ya)nàa sôn Bàlki 'As for Abdu, it was said that he loves Balki'. Therefore, the intervening focused NP, main clause, adverb, and the pause of sentences (ia-d) respectively,
are the elements marking off the nominal Abdù into the LDP, and the pronominal tag can be optional.

Another optional pronoun tag is that found in the RDP, thus (23b) can also be maalàm yaa àikee tà, (ita) Bàlki 'the teacher sent her (somewhere), Balki'. Whether or not the tag is present I assume that the nominal is highly topical and hence always in the RDP, set off by a preceding slight pause.
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