Areal diffusion in the Chadic-Kanuri contact zone

Presented at WOCAL8, Kyoto 2015

Georg Ziegelmeyer
University of Vienna
Contact linguistics in the Lake Chad region

• Focus on the linguistic impact of Kanuri on neighbouring languages, e.g.:
  – on **Chadic languages** such as Bade, Buduma, Malgwa, Ngizim, and on **Shuwa Arabic** and on **Adamawa Fulfulde** (e.g. Awagana 2001; Cyffer 2006; Löhr 1998; Mohammadou 1997; Owens 1998; Schuh 2003, 2011; Ziegelmeyer 2009a, 2009c, 2010, 2014).

• **Kanuri imprint** on neighbouring languages is **without controversy**

• Becomes **manifest** especially in the **lexicons**, e.g. borrowing of **content words**, and **function words**, and to a lesser degree in the transfer of **derivational morphology**
Contact linguistics in the Lake Chad region

• Against an exclusively unidirectional line of “Kanuricisation” of Chadic languages

• Kanuri itself owes a fair degree of its typological structures to interference with Chadic languages

• Recognized e.g. by Cyffer (1998): the Kanuri TAM system departs from a much less elaborate system still found in Teda-Daza and Beria

• Also recognized by Wolff & Löhr (2005): changes in the Kanuri TAM system, especially with respect to coding information structure, result from interference by Chadic substratum languages
Kanuri and its neighbours

- Historically rather recent invasion of Kanuri speakers into Lake Chad region
- Kanuri speakers have been in contact with speakers of Chadic languages, at the least since the expansion of the Kanem-Borno empire into regions west of Lake Chad
- Before its advent in the Lake Chad region Kanuri probably was part of a different linguistic alliance in the East
- Heine’s (1976) typology of African languages points out a convergence zone of Nilosaharan and Afroasiatic languages in north-eastern Africa
Kanuri and its neighbours

- By the same token Amha & Dimmendaal (2006) discuss typological convergence between Nilosaharan languages (Saharan and Nubian) and Afroasiatic languages of Ethiopia (Omotic, Cushitic and Semitic)

- As shared typological properties they propose:
  - converses
  - verb-final syntax
  - extensive case marking

- Today Saharan and Nubian languages exhibiting this set of typological features do not form a contiguous geographic zone, however, there is some paleo-climatic evidence pointing to an ancient contact zone in north-eastern Africa
Contact in the Lake Chad region

- We can show that Kanuri and Chadic languages have been in mutual contact, e.g. Schuh (2003) argues, that Chadic loanwords entered Kanuri particularly in the domains of native flora and fauna.

- On the other hand, there has been strong impact of Kanuri on the lexicons of several neighbouring languages, e.g. Bade, Buduma, Malgwa, Ngizim (cf. Schuh 2003, Ziegelmeyer 2009c).

- The phonetic realization of Kanuri loanwords in neighbouring languages suggests that its influence has been particularly strong during the expansion of Kanem-Borno Empire.
Language contact in the Lake Chad region

• Proposed **periods of influence** and **directions of transfer** in the wider Lake Chad region (Ziegelmeyer 2009c):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language</th>
<th>Target Language</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadic</td>
<td>Kanuri</td>
<td>early history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanuri</td>
<td>Chadic</td>
<td>16th to 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanuri</td>
<td>Adamawa Fulfulde</td>
<td>16th to 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfulde</td>
<td>Chadic (in Adamawa)</td>
<td>19th and 20th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>Fulfulde, Kanuri, Chadic</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact-induced changes in the Lake Chad region

- The **results of mutual language contact** in the wider Lake Chad region are evident in **different linguistic domains**, e.g.:

1. **Borrowing of content words** (cf. Schuh 2003)
2. **Extensive borrowing of function words**, e.g. coordinators, subordinators, discourse markers (cf. Schuh 2011, Ziegelmeyer 2009a, 2009c, 2009d)
3. **Transfer of derivational morphology**, e.g. derivation of agentive nouns in Bade (cf. Ziegelmeyer 2014)
4. **Semantic calquing**, e.g. semantics of the verbs “eating” and “drinking”
5. **Diffusion of structural features** (cf. Ziegelmeyer 2009c)
Diffusion of structural features

- Typological features which are thought to be relevant for establishing the convergence zone at issue will be discussed.

- The methodology has been to survey the presence and absence of a certain candidate feature esp. in Chadic and Saharan languages.

- Strong evidence for the “Chadicisation” of Kanuri comes from features which are shared between Kanuri and Chadic languages, but which are absent in the Saharan languages Teda-Daza and Beria.
## Summary of features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Knb</th>
<th>T-D</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATR harmony</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed comparatives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM coding information structure</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative possession: conjunctual</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluractionals with reduplication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP conjunction: “with”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague future</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichotomy in standard negation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special prohibitive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal predication possible</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed order of adverbial subordinator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar question particle</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic reflexives with „head“</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H = Hausa, Ch = Chadic except for Hausa, K = Kanuri, Knb = Kanembu, T-D = Teda-Daza, B = Beria, R = rare, F = frequent
Areal feature 1: Lack of ATR vowel harmony

• According to Jakobi & Crass (2004) **ATR vowel harmony** plays an important role in the morphophonology in Beria

• They further state that: “*Le système vocalique du teda, equissé par Mark Ortman (comm.pers., 30.10.2001), est identique à celui du beria.*” Jakobi & Crass (2004: 38).

• **Dazaga exhibits vowel harmony** based on the feature [ATR], cf. Walters 2015

• **ATR vowel harmony** is also attested in Kanembu varieties, e.g. Kanembu of Ngaldoukou (Jouannet 1982: 74), pers. comm. Bondarev & Löhr

• **Kanuri** is the only Saharan language **without ATR vowel harmony**, therefore, **loss through contact with Chadic languages** is a plausible explanation
Areal feature 2: Exceed comparatives

- Stassen (2013a) identifies two types of comparative constructions in African languages, i.e. **exceed comparatives**, e.g. in Hausa and Margi and **locational comparatives**, e.g. in Kanuri and Teda-Daza. Including Beria **locational comparatives seem to be the typical pattern in all Saharan languages**, where a locative postposition or suffix follows the standard NP.
Locational comparatives

**Kanuri**
Musa Kano-rö lejîn Musà Alì-rò kurà wò
Musa Kano-DIR go.3SG.IMPF Musa Alì-DIR big COP
*Musa is travelling to Kano* (Cyffer 1991: 33) *Musa is bigger than Ali* (Cyffer 1991: 86)

**Teda-Daza**
kasúgu du adé-num nta du addé-yo
market LOC wife-POSS2SG 2SG LOC small-if/when
*at the market* (Lukas 1953: 158) *when your wife is smaller than you* (Lukas 1953: 159)

**Dazaga:** The dative case enclitic can be used for comparative constructions
áì áì = rù kóré
this this=DAT short
*this (is) short(er) than this* (Walters 2015: 142)

**Beria**
bègidiní biègi-ré áā-ré jî
Tree house-ADV2 mouth-ADV2 COP
*there is a tree in front of the house* (Jakobi & Crass 2004: 162)
àbéjè ànjàménà-ré mìnna-î
Abeche N’Djamena-ADV2 very.small-COP
*Abeche is smaller than N’Djamena* (Jakobi & Crass 2004: 162)
Areal feature 2: Exceed comparatives

**Hausa**

Audù yaa fi Muusaa vàayoo
Audù 3M.PF exceed Musa cleverness

*Audu is cleverer than Musa* (Jaggar 2001: 474)

**Margi**

nàjà gà mdíadà dá dzègàm/dzègàmkùr
3SG NARR surpass.1sg. with tall/tallness

*he is taller than I* (Hoffmann 1963: 71)

**Miya**

mà ra-tlá ma(a) aa mban-uw
you.PF exceed-her NEG for beauty-NEG

*you are not more beautiful than her* (Schuh 1998: 315)

**Bade**

Bàłaa kòda Mammàn ii tâgwda
Bala surpass.PF Mamman in money

*Bala is richer than Mamman* (field notes 2008)
Areal feature 2: Exceed comparatives

*Kanuri*

Modù Fatì nàmkurà-n kozənà
Modu Fati bigness-LOC surpass.3SG.PF

*Modu is bigger than Fati* (Cyffer 1991: 142)

Màidùgùri Kanò nàmcintè-n kozənà
Maiduguri Kano distance-LOC surpass.3SG.PF

*Maiduguri is farther than Kano* (Cyffer 1991: 142)

*Shuwa Arabic*

káano ba’iid b-ufúut jós
Kano far it-passes Jos

*Kano is farther than Jos* (Owens 1993: 195)
Areal feature 3: T/A for information structure

- Tense/aspect as coding means for information structure is known from several West African languages, among them Hausa, Fulfulde and many others (cf. Frajzyngier 2004).

- This feature is not restricted to the Chadic-Kanuri contact zone

- This phenomenon typically concerns focus constructions, e.g. in Hausa there are two morphologically different paradigms for the perfective and the imperfective

- In addition to their tense/aspect functions such multiple systems also carry pragmatic functions

- Kanuri converged insofar as it operates a similar system in the completive aspect
T/A as coding means for information structure

Hausa

Audù yaa tàfi kàasuwaa neutral
Audu 3m.PF go market

*Audu went to the market* (Newman 2000: 188)

Audù (nee) ya tàfi kàasuwaa focus
Audu (FSEM) 3m.FOC_PF go market

*It is Audu who went to the market* (Newman 2000: 188)

yanàa baayan bishiyàa neutral
3m.IMPF behind tree

*he is behind the tree* (Newman 2000: 188)

baayan bishiyàa yakè focus
behind tree 3m.FOC_IMPF

*it’s behind the tree he is* (Newman 2000: 188)
T/A as coding means for information structure

Kanuri

Musà  Kanòrò  lèwonò  neutral
Musa  Kano. DIR  go.3SG.PAST

*Musa went to Kano* (Cyffer 2000: 169)

Musà-ma  Kanòrò  lèzô  focus
Musa-FOC  Kano.DIR  go.3SG.NEP

*it was Musa, who went to Kano* (Cyffer 2000: 169)

Musà  sawànzǝ  curò  neutral
Musa  friend-POSS3SG  3SG.see.PAST

*Musa saw his friend* (Cyffer 2000: 169)

sawà-nzǝ-ma-gà  Musà-yè  surò  focus
friend-POSS3SG-FOC-DO  Musa-AG  3SG.see.NEP

*it’s his friend who Musa saw* (Cyffer 2000: 169)
T/A as coding means for information structure

- Note that neither Beria nor Teda-Daza exhibit a special tense or aspect form which is used with focus constructions. E.g. in Dazaga focus is indicated by case markers and/or preverbal position, (cf. Walters 2015)

- According to Walters (2015: 185): “Other focus constructions, which do not involve case markers or the preverbal position, are reported in Kanuri” (Wolff & Löhr 2006; Ziegelmeyer 2011). These focus constructions do not appear to have parallels in Dazaga.”

Use of “Focus”-TAMs in Hausa, Fulfulde and Kanuri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kanuri</th>
<th>Hausa</th>
<th>Fulfulde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areal feature 4: Predicative possession = conjunctional

- Stassen (2013b) proposes a typology of predicative possession. Among the strategies he distinguishes between **transitive constructions**, i.e. Have-Possessive, where the possessor NP and the possessed NP function as the subject and the direct object of a ‘have’-verb, and syntactically **intransitive constructions** the possessive construction has the basic form of an **existential sentence**.
Areal feature 4: Predicative possession = conjunctival

- It appears that Beria and Teda-Daza exhibit a ‘have’-verb (e.g. TD ta (2)). “Locative existential predicates are not used to express possession in Dazaga ... Rather, like many Nilo-Saharan languages ..., possession is expressed by a transitive verb meaning ‘have’ “ (Walters 2015: 164)

- In Kanuri no verb for ‘have’ exists, instead predicative possession has to be expressed either by a locational strategy, or by the prominent option within the conjunctival possessive, i.e. by the use of the comitative marker ‘with’ on the possessed NP (often referred in the literature to as the with-possessive), e.g.

  a) nányîn redìyò mbǝjì b) kǝrì adǝ sǝmǝ kùruwù-à
  place.my radio EXIST dog this ear long-com

  I have a radio (Cyffer 1991: 39) this dog has long ears (Cyffer 1991: 97)

- Conjunctival possessives are prominent in Chadic languages, and the with-type is found e.g. in Hausa, Western Bade, Ngizim, Malgwa.
Areal feature 5: Pluractionals with reduplication
Areal feature 5: Pluractionals with reduplication

- According to (Newman 1990: 134) “pluractional verb formation which is and was an extremely common and productive Chadic feature”

- E.g. in Hausa and languages of the Bade-Ngizim group pluractionals are typically formed by reduplication of a root consonant, i.e. pluractional verbs differ from the simple root by addition of a CV(V) syllable.

- Reduplication is also found in Fulfulde. (Klingenheben 1963: 212) “Die Reduplikationsstämme haben intensiv-iterative Bedeutung. Sie können in der Reduplikation der ganzen Wurzel [...] oder in der des letzten Radikals der Wurzel [...] bestehen.”, e.g. hathad- “prevent repeatedly” < had- “prevent”, torr- “molest” > tor- “beg”.
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Areal feature 5: Pluractionals with reduplication

• According to Khidir (2005) Beria forms pluractionals by either a different verb base or by addition or change of vowels, e.g.

  tɛn     kui     put     ɪr     ɪrar     break
  ti      bɛ     place, put     kɛdɛ     kɔdɔ     bring
  dɔ      tɛ     carry

• Jakobi & Crass (2004: 84-87) report suppletive verb roots differing in number of subject, and number of object. In Teda-Daza, suppletion seems to be related to number of objects only (cf. Lukas 1953: 61, Walters 2015: 115).

• In Teda-Daza pluractionals are often formed by vowel change (cf. Lukas 1953), e.g.

  dil      dal      dye
  lu       la       dig
  lus      las      hang up
  yit      yet      kill
Areal feature 5: Pluractionals with reduplication

- Although Kanuri has some cognate verbs with Teda-Daza, i.e. pluractional verbs dal ‘dye’, la ‘dig’, they have no pluractional meaning in present-day Kanuri. Instead pluractionals are usually formed by reduplication of the first syllable(s), e.g.:

  - mangin mamangin I am looking for repeatedly
  - saladin salasaladin they keep on selling
  - fiwono fifiwono he/she kept on pouring
  - baksana babaksana they have battered
Areal feature 6: “With” NP conjunction

• “… most of the languages of Africa in and below the Sahara … have with-status.”

Stassen 2013c. For instance, in most Chadic languages the markers for noun phrase conjunction and comitative phrases are the same, e.g. in Hausa NPs are conjoined with the conjunction dà ‘and’ which is identical with the comitative preposition dà ‘with’.
Areal feature 6: “With” NP conjunction

• In Kanuri NPs are conjoined by the correlative use of a suffix -(C)a which is also employed in associative/comitative construction, e.g.

  kâm kamu-à fé-à fâr-à  
  man woman-com cow-com horse-com  
  a man with his wife a cow and a horse (Cyffer 1998: 70)

• According to Lukas (1953) Teda-Daza uses different strategies for NP conjunction and comitative constructions, e.g.

  dána du tûrku ye molofûr ye  
  force com jackal coo hyena coo  
  with force (Lukas 1953: 159) the jackal and the hyena (Lukas 1953: 166)

• In Beria the situation seems to be more complex. On the one hand the adverbializer1 -du/-tu/-ru (which according to Jakobi & Crass (2004: 157) corresponds in form and function to Kanuri -ro and Teda-Daza -du) can have interpretations of NP conjunction as well as comitative construction. On the other hand Beria also employs a comitative copula, which cannot be related to NP conjunction.
Areal feature 7: Existence of “vague future”

- Vague future or potential (future) refers to a TAM form which expresses a range of attitudes like uncertainty, doubt, indefiniteness, probability, vagueness, etc. as to the future realization of an action or event.

- The vague future is typically found after conditional clauses, indicating that something might happen if the condition is fulfilled.

- Such special TAM forms are found in Hausa, Fulfulde (eastern varieties only), Kanuri and possibly in Miya and Kwami.

- The areal character of this feature has already been mentioned by Schubert (1971-73), Ziegelmeyer (1999) and Cyffer (2000). The following examples illustrate the semantics and functions of this specialized TAM form.
Areal feature 7: Existence of “vague future”

Hausa
bà mà kaamà bàraawòn ba
NEG 1PL.V_FUT catch thief.DET NEG
*we will probably not catch the thief* (Newman 2000: 587)

Kanuri
dulinam maarantirò yikkamiyà kərà-à ... calò
children.your school.to give.1SG.DEP_FUT reading-COO ... learn.3PL.V_FUT
*if you put your children to school, they’ll probably learn reading ...* (Cyffer 1991: 149)

Fulfulde (Nigeria)
mi yahay luumo yalla/koo mi fott-uma e maako
1SG go.FUT market on.chance 1SG meet-V_FUT with him
*I’ll go to the market on the chance that I may meet with him* (Arnott 1970: 275)
Areal feature 8: Dichotomy in standard negation

- Standard negation can be defined as the basic way a language has for **negating** declarative verbal main clauses.

- By dichotomy in standard negation I simply mean that **negation of the perfective differs from negation of the imperfective** (cf. Ziegelmeyer 2009b)

- The differences typically concern **form and/or position of the negative markers**.

- For instance, in **Hausa** negation of the **imperfective** employs a **clause-initial negative marker** *baa*, whereas in negation of all **other indicative TAMs** the finite clause subject-agreement pronoun and the predicate are **surrounded by the discontinuous negative markers** *bà(a) ... ba*, e.g.:
Areal feature 8: Dichotomy in standard negation

Hausa

**baa** tàa sooyà kàazaa

*NEG 3F.IMPF fry chicken*

*she is not frying chicken* (Newman 2000: 360)

**bà** sù daawoo **ba**

*NEG 3PL.PF return NEG*

*they didn’t return* (Newman 2000: 357)

Kanuri

kărma kulɔlàn cìdàjìn-bâ

*now farm.at work.3SG.-NEG_IMPF*

*now she is not working on the farm* (Cyffer 1998: 39)

biskà Musà Kanòrò lèzê-nyi

*yesterday Musa Kanotoro go.3sg.-NEG_COMP*

*yesterday Musa did not travel to Kano* (Cyffer 1998: 40)
Areal feature 8: Dichotomy in standard negation

• Apart from Hausa **dichotomy in standard negation** is also **found in some Chadic languages**, e.g. Western Bade, Miya, Guruntum (cf. examples below).

• According to Walters (2015) **in Dazaga standard negation is expressed by suffixation of -ní or its allomorphs -mí, -dí to the verb**. The same strategy is also used with negative imperatives. It is only in non-verbal clauses that other negation markers are used.

• **Beria shows no dichotomy in standard negation.** The **Negative Perfective** and the **Negative Imperfective** take the suffix -ɔ which replaces the suffix -ɪ for the affirmative (Jakobi & Crass 2004: 93).
Areal feature 9: Special negation in the prohibitive

• Special negation of non-indicative mood is found in many languages of northern Nigeria. The following criteria have been used for the classification of a special negative:

1. Negation markers of non-indicative mood are morphologically different from those engaged in indicative mood and/or,

2. Negation markers used in non-indicative mood take different positions in the sentence compared to those used in the indicative mood.

• Non-indicative mood is usually labelled as imperative and subjunctive typically expressing commands, exhortations, obligations, etc. In this case negation results in a prohibitive. In both cases negation of non-indicative mood differs from negation of indicative mood.
Areal feature 9: Special negation in the prohibitive

Hausa

tàashi!
get.up.IMP
get up! (2sg.c.)

kadà kà taashì!
PROH 2m.SUB get.up
don’t get up! (2m.) (Newman 2000: 262-63)

Kanuri

luy-e!
go.out-IMP.2sg.
go out!

wànde luwù-mi!
PROH go.out-NEG_COMP.2SG
don’t go out! (Cyffer 1991: 123)

Fulfulde

war(u)!
come.IMP.2SG
come!

taa war(u)!
PROH come.IMP.2SG
don’t come! (Arnott 1970: 249 and 251)
Areal feature 9: Special negation in the prohibitive

Note that the value “special imperative + special negative” cannot be corroborated for Dazaga. According to Walters (2015: 169) the suffix -ni is used to form “negative imperatives”, in addition to negating indicative clauses. “Negative imperatives” are identical in form to negated second person perfective indicative verb forms.
Areal feature 10: Non-verbal predications and copulas

• “Non-verbal predications are commonly encountered in clauses expressing identification, existence, location, or attribution of qualities ... Uncontroversial examples of non-verbal predications are those involving mere juxtaposition of non-verbal words or constituents devoid of any predicative marking (noun phrases, adposition phrases, adverbs) ...” Creissels et al. (2008:130), e.g. in Kanuri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bintù</th>
<th>ferò</th>
<th>Musà</th>
<th>Kanò-làn</th>
<th>nyi</th>
<th>kurà</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bintu</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>Musa</td>
<td>Kano-LOC</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bintu is a girl</td>
<td>Musa is in Kano</td>
<td>you are big</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• “This type exists also, for example, in equational clauses of some Chadic languages, [e.g. Bade, Margi G.Z.], but on the whole, it is not particularly frequent in Africa.” Creissels et al (2008: 131).
Areal feature 10: Non-verbal predications and copulas

- Although this type exists also in Teda-Daza (cf. Lukas 1953, Stassen 2013d, Walters 2015) it seems to be absent in Beria. **Beria exhibits a set of copulas**, e.g. copula of identification, copula of location, a locative-existential copula with future sense, and a comitative copula. Note that Beria copulas show **inflectional values**, e.g. person (except for 3rd persons) and negation.
Areal feature 11:
Order of adverbial subordinator and clause

• As an effect of mutual borrowing of function words, in this case adverbial subordinators, Kanuri and some Chadic languages converge with respect to the order of adverbial subordinator and clause, exhibiting what Dryer (2013a) calls a mixed type. The mixed type cannot be corroborated for Dazaga: (Walters 2015: 231) “As is typical for SOV languages, subordinating morphemes in Dazaga are postpositional”
Areal feature 12: Polar Questions

• According to Creissels et al. (2008) in African languages, verbal systems including special interrogative forms are not common, while **interrogative particles are particularly common**. Most **Chadic languages**, e.g. Hausa, Bade, Mupun, Tera, **have question particles**. Dryer (2013b) discusses different strategies for forming polar questions; the important features here are **question particles** vs. **interrogative verb morphology**.
Areal feature 12: Polar Questions

• In Kanuri polar questions take the particle *wa*, e.g.

   Ali isənà wa? manà gùlzənàdə jirè wa?
   Ali come.3SG.PF Q talk say.3SG.PF.DET truth Q

   *did Ali come?* is it the truth what he said?

• In Beria polar questions are formed by a suffix *-a*, which attaches to the finite verb in final position. Tone of the suffix *-a* is conditioned by the aspect (low in the imperfective and falling in the perfective), i.e. the suffix *-a* combines with inflectional values of the verb, cf. Jakobi & Crass (2004)
Areal feature 12: Polar Questions

• According to Lukas (1953) in Teda-Daza polar questions put the adverb *da* at the end of the sentence, e.g.

  gənna  jenəm  ma?  (ma < da)

  everything  prepare.2sg.pf  Q

  did you prepare everything?

• In Dazaga (cf. Walters 2015) polar questions are marked by the clause-final enclitic =ɾà and its allomorphs. The enclitic =ɾà always occurs clause-finally, cliticizing to the final word whether it is a verb or a word from another grammatical category. The yes/no question enclitic has an allomorph [mà] which occurs following a clause final [m].
Areal feature 13: Emphatic reflexives with the noun “head”

• A common feature of Saharan languages is a verbal extension with the morpheme -t-. This derivation is used to produce verb forms that lend themselves to translation as intransitive, passive, reflexive, or reciprocal verb forms in other languages, e.g. Kanuri rúkin “I see” > túrúkin “I see myself”.

• Other reflexive expressions seem to be absent in Beria and Teda-Daza, e.g. Walters (2015: 109) writes: “There are no reflexive pronouns, and derived reflexive verbs are the only means of forming reflexive constructions”.
Areal feature 13: Emphatic reflexives with the noun “head”

• Kanuri, however, also has emphatic reflexives constructions which use the noun ƙəlâ “head” (rô “life, soul”, or nósku “life, soul”) with possessive suffixes, e.g. wú ƙəlânyí cída áḍə cidéko “I myself did this work”.

• The Kanuri construction with “head” probably comes from Chadic languages which frequently use the noun “head” for both, basic, as well as emphatic reflexives, e.g. Hausa, Bade, Miya, Malgwa, Margi.

• Cf. Hausa: taa cùuci kântà “she harmed herself”; Hàliimà ita kântà zaa tà zoo “Halima herself will come”
The Chadic-Kanuri contact zone and the Sudanic belt

• The structural features presented together with borrowing of content and function words, transfer of derivational morphology, and semantic calquing clearly point out a convergence zone in the Lake Chad region, and may corroborate historical findings in the one or other way.

• It has been proposed that Chadic (Nilotic, and Narrow Bantu) does not really belong to the Macro-Sudan belt (Güldemann 2008), as features are mostly untypical for them, but occur recurrently in member languages which border on the area and which thus could be viewed as participating in it.
The Chadic-Kanuri contact zone and the Sudanic belt

Nevertheless, the further we go north towards the wider Lake Chad region it becomes obvious that a different linguistic alliance comes into effect which cannot be brought in line with neither Güldemann’s Macro-Sudan belt nor with Clements & Rialland’s (2008) Sudanic belt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macro-Sudan belt</th>
<th>Sudanic belt</th>
<th>Chadic</th>
<th>Hausa</th>
<th>Kanuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logophoricity</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labio-velar stops</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR harmony</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-(AUX)-O-V-X</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-O-NEG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labial flaps</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absence of P-sounds</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implosives</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal vowels</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ tone levels</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“lax” question markers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chadic-Kanuri contact zone and the Sudanic belt

• It becomes apparent that the linguistic alliance of the wider Lake Chad region cuts into a wider convergence zone, if we define the Sudanic belt or Macro-Sudan belt in its widest sense as a broad sub-Saharan belt from the western end of the continent to the escarpment of the Ethiopian Plateau.

• I would like to put forward the hypothesis that speakers of Chadic languages spread into a part of the Sudanic belt, i.e. the wider Lake Chad region, from the north or northeast at a rather early point in history.
The Chadic-Kanuri contact zone and the Sudanic belt

- Being in early contact with, or replacing Niger-Congo languages, Chadic languages probably took over features which are rather untypical for Afroasiatic, e.g. exceed comparatives, tone.

- Some Chadic languages on the southern fringes continued, and still continue to take over features of neighbouring languages of the Sudanic belt, e.g. logophoricity in Mupun, ATR harmony in Tangale, labio-velar stops in some languages of the Bole-Tangale group.
The Chadic-Kanuri contact zone and the Sudanic belt

• Much later, but latest in the 9th century, Kanuri speakers came from the east, and began to play an important role in the Lake Chad region.

• Although Kanuri also had some impact on neighbouring Chadic languages, the features presented here show that Kanuri departs in several respects from other Saharan languages.

• I hope my presentation helps to expand our understanding of areal phenomena in the Lake Chad region, and how those phenomena can contribute to a better understanding of the diachronic mechanisms in the macro-zone of the Sudanic belt.
Thanks for your attention
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