

当報告の内容は、それぞれの著者の著作物です。

Copyrighted materials of the authors.

-----  
研究会基本情報  
-----

タイトル：「バントゥ諸語のマイクロ・バリエーションの類型的研究（フェーズ1）」（平成28年度第1回研究会）

Title: Typological Study of Microvariation in Bantu (Phase 1)

日時：平成28年4月17日（日曜日）午前11時より午後17時

Date & Time: 17 April, 2016, AM11-PM5

場所：AA 研301室, Venue: Rm.301, ICLAA, TUFS

参加者：12名（1名スカイプ参加）

■全体討議（年度ごとの目標）

2016年度 研究枠組みの共有。19のパラメータに従ったデータの収集・統合とtypological correlation の検討。

2017年度 新たなパラメータの検討。

2018年度 新たなパラメータの提案とデータを含む成果発信。

■Some points raised in the meeting.

- Creating a pass-word protected project website.
- Collect a list of languages from each member
- Circulate a sample manuscript for collecting object marking parameters  
(Rationale: the creating of manuscripts will allow a fair acknowledgement to researchers who collect primary data).
- Create a dropbox folder to circulate references
- a possible time frame for the follow-up meeting: sometime in December

報告者（所属）：

1)阿部優子（AA 研共同研究員、東京外国語大学）

「マイクロバリエーション研究概説」

プロジェクトの概要、連携先について説明。3年間の計画および本年度の達成目標を共有。

2)品川大輔（AA 研所員）、コメンテーター：森本雪子（AA 研共同研究員、フンボルト大学）

「マイクロバリエーションの事例研究：いくつかの具体例」

## Microvariation研究概説(ベンデ語の場合)

「バントゥ諸語のマイクロ・バリエーションの  
類型的研究(フェーズ1)」第1回研究会

2016/4/17 阿部 優子

1

## バントゥのMicrovariation研究

*Transactions of the Philological Society* Volume 105:3 (2007) 253–338

### PARAMETERS OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC VARIATION IN BANTU<sup>1</sup>

1

By LUTZ MARTEN<sup>a</sup>, NANCY C. KULA<sup>b</sup> AND NHLANHLA THWALA<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Oriental and African Studies*, <sup>b</sup>*University of Essex*,

<sup>c</sup>*University of the Witwatersrand and School of Oriental  
and African Studies*

*Linguistic Variation* 14:2 (2014), 318–368. DOI 10.1075/lv.14.2.04mar

ISSN 2211-6834 / E-ISSN 2211-6842 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

### A typology of Bantu subject inversion

2

Lutz Marten & Jenneke van der Wal  
SOAS, University of London / University of Cambridge

2

## “Microvariation”という術語について

### • ヨーロッパ諸語方言の統語論研究から

- Barbiers, Sjef, Cornip, Leonie & Kleij, Susanne van der (eds.), 2002. *Syntactic Microvariation*. Electronische publicatie van Meertens Instituut en NIWI.

❖ ROMANCE TYPOLOGY

	WEST. ROMANCE			CENT. ROMANCE			EAST. ROMANCE
	<i>E. Port.</i>	<i>Galician</i>	<i>Spanish</i>	<i>Catalan</i>	<i>Italian</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>Romanian</i>
DOM	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
VOS	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
VSO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
NOM-SE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
OBlique CL.	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
LEÍSMO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
LAÍSMO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
PART. AGR.	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
AUX. SELEC.	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
CL. DOUBLING	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
CAUSEE + INF	--	--	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
POSS. "HAVE"	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO

Gallego 2013: 7]

似ていることが前提になっている言語群の差異(特に統語論)を研究

3

1

### で挙げられているパラメータ

Yes/Noで答えるバイナリー形式

MARTEN ET AL. – MORPHOSYNTACTIC VARIATION IN BANTU 259

Table 2. Parameters of the study

#### Object markers

- 1 OM – obj NP
  - 2 OM obligatory
  - 3 OM loc
  - 4a One OM
  - 4b Restr 2 OM
  - 4c Mult OM
  - 4d Free order
- Can the object marker and the lexical object NP co-occur?  
Is co-occurrence required in some contexts?  
Are there locative object markers?  
Is object marking restricted to one object marker per verb?  
Are two object markers possible in restricted contexts?  
Are two or more object markers freely available?  
Is the order of multiple object markers structurally free?

#### Double objects

- 5 Sym word-order
  - 6 Sym passive
  - 7 Sym OM
- Can either object be adjacent to the verb?  
Can either object become subject under passivisation?  
Can either object be expressed by an object marker?

#### Relatives

- 8 Agr Rel mark
  - 9a Res OM obl
  - 9b Res OM barred
  - 9c Res OM optional
- Does the relative marker agree with the head noun?  
Is an object marker required in object relatives?  
Is an object marker disallowed in object relatives?  
Is an object marker optional in object relatives?

#### Locative inversion

- 10 LI restr
  - 11 Full loc SM
- Is locative inversion thematically restricted to intransitives?  
Are there three different locative subject markers?

#### Conjunct agreement

- 12 Partial Agr
- Is partial agreement with conjoined NPs possible?

#### Conjoint/disjoint

- 13 Conj/disj
  - 14 Tone case
- Is there a (tonal) distinction between conjoint/disjoint forms?  
Is there a (tonal) distinction of nominal ‘cases’?

#### 【文法トピック】

- Object markers
- Double objects
- Relatives
- Locative inversion
- Conjunct agreement
- Conjoint/disjoint
- (どんどん増える)

4

## これまでの主な研究対象言語

言語	主な使用地域
Bemba (M42)	Zambia
Chaga (Kivunjo) (E62b)	Tanzania
Chichewa (N31)	Malawi
Ha (D66)	Tanzania
Herero (R31)	Namibia
Lozi (K21)	Zambia
Nsenga (N41)	Malawi/Zambia
SiSwati (S43)	Swaziland/SA
Swahili (G42)	Tanzania/Kenya
Tswana (S31)	Botswana/SA

東バントゥ諸語がメイン

5

## その結果…

Table 4. Comparison among five languages (only bold values counted)

	Swahili	Bemba	Chichewa	siSwati	Herero
<i>Object markers</i>					
1 OM – obj NP	yes	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
2 OM obligatory	yes	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
3 OM loc	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>no</b>	yes
4a One OM	yes	<b>no</b>	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes
4b Restr 2 OM	no	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
4c Mult OM	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
4d Free order	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
<i>Double objects</i>					
5 Sym order	<b>no</b>	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
6 Sym passive	<b>no</b>	<b>no</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	yes
7 Sym OM	<b>no</b>	<b>no</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	yes
<i>Relatives</i>					
8 Agr Rel mark	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>no</b>	yes
9a Res OM obl	no	<b>no</b>	yes	<b>yes</b>	no
9b Res OM bar	no	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>no</b>	yes
9c Res OM poss	yes	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no
<i>Locative inversion</i>					
10 LI restr	<b>yes</b>	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>yes</b>	no
11 Full loc SM	<b>yes</b>	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>no</b>	<b>yes</b>
<i>Conjunct agreement</i>					
12 Partial agr	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	no
<i>Conjoint/disjoint</i>					
13 Conj/disj	no	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	no
14 Tone case	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	<b>yes</b>

【ここから考えられること】

- ・Yes/Noの分布
- ・パラメータ間の相関関係

【本年度の目標】

- ・参加者の研究対象言語の値を並べる
- ・研究対象言語の例をアーカイブする

6

# 1 OM – obj NP (Object markers)

- Can the object marker and the lexical object NP co-occur?

Yes	Object and OM can co-occur	Bemba, Ha, Lozi, Swahili, (Ruwund)
No	Object and OM cannot co-occur	Chaga, Chichewa, Herero, siSwati, Tswana

<i>naamwíhághá</i>	<i>yasíni</i>
N-aN- <b>mu-jíhag-a</b>	Ø- <i>yasini</i>
<b>SP.1SG-PAST-OP.3SG-kill-IND</b>	<b>NP.1a-PN</b>
「私はヤシニを殺した」	

- (2) n-álì-mú-món-à Chìsángá (Bemba)  
     SMLSG-PAST-OM1-see-FV 1.*Chisanga*  
     'I saw Chisanga'

(3) \*mb-é       vé       múnù       òvá-nátjè (Herero)  
     SMLSG-PAST OM2    *see*       2-*children*  
     Intd.: 'I saw (the) children'

参考例文アリ

## 2 OM obligatory (Object markers)

- Is co-occurrence required in some contexts?

Yes	Required in some contexts	Chaga, Swahili, Makhuwa, Sambaa
No	Never required	Bemba, Chichewa, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Tswana

<i>naamwíhághá</i>	<i>yasíni</i>
N-aN-mu-jíhag-a	Ø- <i>yasini</i>
<b>SP.1SG-PAST-OP.3SG-kill-IND</b>	<b>NP.1a-PN</b>
「私はヤシニを殺した」	

### 3 OM loc (Object markers)

- Are there locative object markers?

Yes	Locative object markers	Bemba, Chaga, Chichewa, Ha, Herero, Nsenga, Swahili, Tswana
No	No locative object markers	Lozi, siSwati, Yeyi

*ndíkúkumanya*  
N-liku-ku-many-a  
**SP.1SG-PRS-OP.17-know-IND**  
「私はンパンダ(地名)を知っている」

*nanjako*  
N-an-j-a=ko  
**SP.1SG-PST-go-IND=ENC.17**  
「私はンパンダへ行く」

*kúMpanda*  
ku-Mpanda  
**17-PN**

only possible/  
alternative?

9

### 4a One OM (Object markers)

- Is object marking restricted to **one object marker per verb**?

Yes	Only one OM	Chewa, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Swahili
No	More than one OM	Chaga, Ha, Tswana, Bemba

*bhalíkúkandímila*  
bha-liku-ka-N-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.1SG-farm-APP-IND**  
「彼らはそれ(12)を私のために耕してくれている」

10

## 4b Restr 2 OM (Object markers)

- Are two object markers possible in restricted contexts? (4aでNoが前提)

Yes	Two OM possible in certain contexts	Bemba, Ruwund, Sambaa
No	Two OM either not possible, or possible freely	Chaga, Chichewa, Ha, Herero, Lozi, SiSwati, Swahili, Tswana

*bhalíkúkandímila*  
 bha-liku-ka-N-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.1SG-farm-APP-IND**  
 「彼らはそれ(12)を私のために耕してくれている」  
*bhalíkúkamulímila*  
 bha-liku-ka-mu-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.3SG-farm-APP-IND**  
 「彼らはそれ(12)を彼のために耕してくれている」  
  
 \**bhalíkúkakulímila*  
 bha-liku-ka-ku-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.2SG-farm-APP-IND**

Bembaに類似の例アリ

11

## 4c Mult OM (Object markers)

- Are two or more object markers freely available? (4aでNoが前提)

Yes	More than one OM possible freely	Chaga, Ha, Tswana
No	Two OM either not possible, or possible only in certain contexts	Bemba, Chichewa, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Swahili

*bhalíkúkandímila*  
 bha-liku-ka-N-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.1SG-farm-APP-IND**  
 「彼らはそれ(12)を私のために耕してくれている」  
*bhalíkúkamulímila*  
 bha-liku-ka-mu-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.3SG-farm-APP-IND**  
 「彼らはそれ(12)を彼のために耕してくれている」  
  
 \**bhalíkúkakulímila*  
 bha-liku-ka-ku-lim-il-a  
**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.2SG-farm-APP-IND**

**【ベンデ語2-OMの出現条件】**  
 (1) IANIM(DO)-ANIM(IO)  
 (2) 2番目のOMに鼻音が含まれる

12

## 4d Free order (Object markers)

- Is the order of multiple object markers structurally free? (4aでNoが前提)

Yes	Order is free	Tswana
No	Order is structurally fixed	Bemba, Chaga, Chichewa, Ha, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Swahili

*bhalíkúkandímila*  
bha-liku-ka-N-lim-il-a

**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.1SG-farm-APP-IND**

「彼らはそれ(12)を私のために耕してくれている」

*bhalíkúkamulímila*

bha-liku-ka-mu-lim-il-a

**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.3SG-farm-APP-IND**

「彼らはそれ(12)を彼のために耕してくれている」

\**bhalíkúkakulímila*

bha-liku-ka-ku-lim-il-a

**SP.3PL-PRS-OP.12-OP.2SG-farm-APP-IND**

【ベンデ語2-OMの出現条件】  
(1) IANIM(DO)-ANIM(IO)  
(2) 2番目のOMに鼻音が含まれる

13

## 5 Sym word-order (Double objects)

- Can either object be adjacent to the verb?

Yes	Either object can be adjacent to the verb	Ha, Tswana
No	Only one object can be adjacent to the verb	Bemba, Chaga, Chichewa, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Swahili

*naamwíhághílá*  
N-a-mu-jíhag-id-a

**SP.1SG-PAST-OP.3SG-kill-APP-IND**

「私はヤシニのためにライオンを殺した」

*yasíni*  
Ø-yasini

**NP.1a-PN**

*nsimbá*  
N-simba

**9-lion**

✓ 要チェック



14

## 6 Sym passive (Double objects)

- Can either object become subject under passivisation?

Yes	Either object can become subject	Chaga, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Tswana
No	Only one object can become subject	Bemba, Chichewa, Swahili

*naamwíhághílá*                            *yasíni*                    *nsimbá*  
 N-a-mu-jíhag-id-a                            Ø-yasini                    N-simba  
**SP.1SG-PAST-OP.3SG-kill-APP-IND**    **NP.1a-PN**                    **9-lion**  
 「私はヤシニのためにライオンを殺した」

*yasíni*    *ghaajíhághílwá*                            *nsimbá*    *nóone*  
 Ø-yasini    ga-a-jíhag-id-u-a                            N-simbá    ná#úune  
**1a-PN**    **SP.3SG-PAST-kill-APP-PASS-IND**    **9-lion**    **PREP#PRN.1SG**  
 「ヤシニは私にライオンを殺してもらった」

\* *nsimbá*    *jaamwíhághílwá*                            *yasíni*                    *nóone*  
 N-simbá    ji-a-mu-jíhag-id-u-a                            Ø-yasini                    ná#úune  
**9-lion**    **SP.3SG-PST-OP.3SG-kill-AP-PAS-IND**    **1a-PN**    **PRER#PRN.1SG**

15

## 7 Sym OM (Double objects)

- Can either object be expressed by an object marker?

Yes	Either object can be OM	Chaga, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Tswana
No	Only one object can be OM	Bemba, Chichewa, Swahili

*naamwíhághílá*                            *yasíni*                    *nsimbá*  
 N-a-mu-jíhag-id-a                            Ø-yasini                    N-simba  
**SP.1SG-PAST-OP.3SG-kill-APP-IND**    **NP.1a-PN**                    **9-lion**  
 「私はヤシニのためにライオンを殺した」

IOのみ

16

## 8 Agr Rel mark (Relatives)

- Does the relative marker agree with the head noun?

Yes	Relative markers agree	Bemba, Chichewa, Ha, Herero, Lozi, Nsenga, Swahili, Tswana
No	Relative markers do not agree	siSwati

*mwenda*                    *ghôntehílé*  
*mu-ènda*                *ghó-N'-tèh-ídé*  
**NP3-clothes**            **REL3-PP.1SG-love-ANT**  
「私が好きな服」

17

## 9a Res OM obl (Relatives)

- Is an object marker **required** in object relatives?

Yes	OM required	Chichewa, siSwati, Tswana
No	OM not required	Bemba, Ha, Herero, Lozi, Nsenga, Swahili

\**mwenda*                    *ghôngutehílé*  
*mu-ènda*                *ghó-N'-gu-tèh-ídé*  
**NP3-clothes**            **REL3-PP.1SG-OP.3-love-ANT**  
「私が好きな服」

18

## 9b Res OM barred (Relatives)

- Is an object marker **disallowed** in object relatives?

Yes	OM prohibited	Bemba, Herero, Lozi
No	OM allowed or required	Chichewa, Ha, Nsenga, siSwati, Swahili, Tswana

\*mwenda            *ghōngutehílé*  
mu-ènda            ghó-N'-gu-téh-ídé  
**NP3-clothes**      **REL3-PP.1SG-OP.3-love-ANT**  
「私が好きな服」

19

## 9c Res OM optional (Relatives)

- Is an object marker **optional** in object relatives?

Yes	OM optional (possible but not required)	Ha, Nsenga, Swahili
No	OM required or <b>not possible</b>	Bemba, Chichewa, Herero, Lozi, siSwati, Tswana

\*mwenda            *ghōngutehílé*  
mu-ènda            ghó-N'-gu-téh-ídé  
**NP3-clothes**      **REL3-PP.1SG-OP.3-love-ANT**  
「私が好きな服」

20

## 10 LI restr (Locative inversion)

- Is locative inversion thematically restricted to intransitives?

Yes	Locative inversion only with intransitives	Bemba, Chaga, Chichewa, Lozi, siSwati, Swahili, Tswana
No	Locative inversion with other predicates	Herero, Nsenga



*hákátúmá*      *hakáfwié*      *múntú*  
 ha-[ka-túma]    ha-ká-fù-ídé    mu-ntú  
**NP16-[NP12-PN] SP16-DIS-die-ANT**      **NP1-person**  
 「ここカトウマ村で人が死んだ」

✓ 要チェック

*kúkijiíji*      *kwafumá*      *bhántú*  
 ku-[Ø-kijiíji]    ku-a-fùm-a    ba-ntú  
**NP17-[NP9-village]**      **SP17-PAST-leave-IND**      **NPx-person**  
 「村は人に去られた(いくらかの人に見捨てられた)」

21

## 11 Full loc SM (Locative inversion)

- Are there three different locative subject markers?

Yes	Class 16-18 locative SM	Bemba, Chichewa, Herero, Nsenga, Swahili
No	Only one or two SM	Chaga, Ha, Lozi, siSwati, Tswana

*hákátúmá*      *hakáfwié*      *múntú*  
 ha-[katúma]    ha-ká-fù-ídé    mu-ntú  
**NP16-PN**      **SP16-DIS-die-ANT**      **NP1-person**  
 「ここカトウマ村で人が死んだ」

*kúkijiíji*      *kwafumá*      *bhántú*  
 ku-[Ø-kijiíji]    ku-a-fùm-a    ba-ntú  
**NP17-[NP9-village]**      **SP17-PAST-leave-IND**      **NP2-person**  
 「村は人に去られた(いくらかの人に見捨てられた)」

*múnyumba*      *mulí*      *bhántú*  
 mu-ny-umba    mu-li    bha-ntú  
**NP18-[NP9-house]**      **SP18-be**      **NP2-person**  
 「家の中に人がいる」

22

## 12 Partial Agr (Conjunct agreement)

- Is partial agreement with conjoined NPs possible?

Yes	Partial agreement possible	Luguru, Nsenga, Swahili, Swati
No	Only/mainly default agreement	Bemba, Chewa, Ha, Herero

*múkélé*    *nó*    *sukaáli*                      *fyasánsíkáná*  
 mu-kéde    ná    Ø-sukaadi                      fi-a-sáns-ik-an-a  
**NP3-salt PREP NP9-sugar**                      **SP8-PAST-mix-STAT-REC-IND**  
 「塩と砂糖が混ざった」

*múghóosí*    *nê*    *mbusí*    *bhalikúlyátá*                      *hámwí*  
 mu-góosi    ná    N-bùsi    ba-díku-dyát-a                      há-mwì  
**NP1-male PREP NP9-goat SP.3PL-PRS-stroll-IND EP16-one**  
 「男とヒツジが一緒に歩いている」

モノ+モノ=8  
ヒト+動物=2

23

## 13 Conj / disj (Conjoint / disjoint)

- Is there a (tonal) distinction between conjoint/disjoint forms?

Yes	Conjoint-disjoint distinction	Bemba, Ha, Swati, Tswana
No	No conjoint-disjoint distinction	Chaga, Chewa, Herero, Swahili

24

## 14 Tone case (Conjoint/disjoint)

- Is there a (tonal) distinction of nominal ‘cases’?

Yes	Tone cases	Herero
No	No tone cases	Bemba, Chaga, Chewa, Ha, Nsenga, Sotho, Swahili, Swati, Tswana,

25

## ベンデ語のYes/Noの値は…

Table 4. Comparison among five languages (only bold values counted)

	Swahili	Bemba	Chichewa	siSwati	Herero	Bende
<i>Object markers</i>						
1 OM – obj NP	yes	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	yes
2 OM obligatory	yes	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	yes
3 OM loc	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>no</b>	yes	no
4a One OM	yes	<b>no</b>	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	yes
4b Restr 2 OM	no	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	no
4c Mult OM	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	no
4d Free order	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	no
<i>Double objects</i>						
5 Sym order	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	no
6 Sym passive	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	yes	no
7 Sym OM	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	yes	no
<i>Relatives</i>						
8 Agr Rel mark	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>no</b>	yes	yes
9a Res OM obl	no	<b>no</b>	yes	<b>yes</b>	no	no
9b Res OM bar	no	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>no</b>	yes	yes
9c Res OM poss	yes	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	no	no?
<i>Locative inversion</i>						
10 LI restr	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>yes</b>	no	yes
11 Full loc SM	yes	<b>yes</b>	yes	<b>no</b>	yes	yes
<i>Conjunct agreement</i>						
12 Partial agr	yes	<b>no</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	no	no
<i>Conjoint/disjoint</i>						
13 Conj/disj	no	<b>yes</b>	no	<b>yes</b>	no	no
14 Tone case	no	<b>no</b>	no	<b>no</b>	yes	no

26

## 本年度の目標

- 既存のパラメータについて、自分の研究対象言語のYes/Noを調べて…
- 使える例文をアーカイブする(→HPで公開)

### 課題:

- フォーマット(エクセル?)を用意する
- グロスの(ある程度)統一
- 追加情報(備考)をどう記載していくか

## マイクロバリエーションの事例研究：いくつかの具体例

品川大輔

### 1. はじめに

#### 1.1 研究枠組みと背景

Cf. Marten et al (2007) “Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu”

- 形式上の差異を体系的・網羅的に把握できるようなパラメータを用いて、バントゥ諸語における形態統語レベルの類型的多様性に接近する試み
  - ✧ “**Systematic approach to the study of morphosyntactic variation** in Bantu by developing ... parameters which serve as the basis for cross-linguistic comparison ...”
  - ✧ “While variation within Bantu has been discussed in a number of studies, it is not usually addressed systematically, and our aim in this paper is to introduce and **discuss a number of parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu along which variation can be more systematically assessed.**”
  
- 類型論全体の趨勢としての「大きな類型論」から、構造的に類似性の高い言語間の「小さな／詳細な類型論」へ ⇒ micro-variation そして micro-parameters
  - ✧ “**While most research on parameters was initially concerned with broad cross-linguistic variation**, building on typological work, for example on the difference between languages requiring an overt subject NP and those which do not (the ‘pro-drop parameter’), **more recently emphasis has shifted to the investigation of variation in much smaller, and structurally more similar, language groups.**”

#### 1.2 この枠組みの目指すところ

Cf. Leverhulme-funded research project ‘Morphosyntactic variation in Bantu: Typology, contact and change’ based in SOAS (<https://bantuvariation.wordpress.com/>)

- (typology, contact and change のうちの) typology に焦点
  - ✧ It aims to demonstrate how the structures of different Bantu languages have been shaped by the interaction of processes of **historical innovation, language contact, and universal functions of human language.**
  
- Cf. contact and change の部分について : Although based on a small sample, the results [Marten et al (2007) で得られた] suggest that language contact and structural convergence play a role in the development of structural similarity in the centre of the

## 「バントゥ諸語のマイクロ・バリエーションの類型的研究（フェーズ1）」

Bantu area, where contact is between structurally similar languages, while at the periphery of the Bantu area, contact with non-Bantu languages leads to divergence.

- ❖ The specific aim of the project is the development of comprehensive typology of Bantu morphosyntax ... with the objectives of 1) **developing a set of descriptive parameters** to systematically study morphosyntactic variation in Bantu; 2) charting the extent of variation based on selected data from the literature and collected through fieldwork; and 3) **developing analyses and explanations of variation in terms of typological correlations**, language change and language contact.

⇒ 本研究課題においては、次の諸点を重点的なテーマとする。

- i) すでに提案されている micro-parameters に基づいたデータの収集・統合
- ii) micro-parameters 自体の検討 (+提案)
- iii) パラメータ間の運動関係 (typological correlations/ co-variation) に関する知見の深化

## 2. 具体例-1：目的語標示

### 2.1 概観

- 同じ語群 (Kilimanjaro Bantu, KB/ Chaga E.60) 内部での micro-variation
- Marten et al. (2007) の提案する 19 のパラメータの一部
- binary なパラメータ

### 2.2 パラメータ

- Marten et al. (2007) による目的語標示に関する 4 つの (部分的に論理的排他関係を含む<sup>1</sup>) パラメータ (同論文におけるパラメータ番号 4a-d)
- (1)
- a. One OM: Is object marking restricted to one object marker per verb?
  - b. Restr 2 OM: Are two object markers possible in restricted contexts?
  - c. Mult OM: Are two or more object markers freely available?
  - d. Free order: Is the order of multiple object markers structurally free?

Fig. 1: Attested patterns of object marking variation

Type	(1a)	(1b)	(1c)	(1d)
I	yes	no	no	no
II	no	no	yes	no
III	no	yes	no	no
IV	no	no	yes	yes

<sup>1</sup> If (1a) is ‘yes,’ then all the rest should be ‘no’ because (1b-d) are only relevant to the languages that allow (more than) two object markers. Hence, from scratch, the total number of logically possible patterns cannot be 16 ( $2^4$ ); it is reduced to 5 because the value of (1b) and (1c) must not be identical, i.e., four patterns in Fig. 1 plus unattested ‘no-yes-no-yes.’

### 2.3 データ

- たとえばスワヒリ語の場合、目的語一致標識（OM）は構造的に1つしか許容しないので、(1a)がyesで残りはすべてno（正確には「適用できない」）。したがって、上の表で言えばType-Iにカテゴライズされることになる。

(2) Type-I [Swahili (G42)]

- a. *ni-li-m-p-a*  
SM1sg-PST-OM1-give-F  
'I gave him (it).'
- b. *\*ni-li-i-m-p-a*  
SM1sg-PST-OM9-OM1-give-F
- c. *\*ni-li-m-i-p-a*  
SM1sg-PST-OM1-OM9-give-F (Marten et al. ibid.)

- KB のヴンジョ語の場合、構造的には2つ（以上）のOMが許容される（1a=yes）。そして、それらの辞順については規則的に決定されるらしいので（1d=no），no-no-yes-noのType-IIにカテゴライズされることになる。

(3) Type-II [Vunjo (CK)]

- mangí n-á-lé-i-kú-m-n-zrúm-a*  
chief FOC-SM1-PST-OM9-OM16-OM1-send-F  
'The chief sent him there with it.' (Moshi 1998, quoted in Marten et al. ibid.)

- 一方で、同じKBのルワ語とロンボ語の場合、OMの辞順は構造的に決定されていないので（1d=yes），no-no-yes-yesのType-IVに属することになる。

(4) Type-IV [Rwa (WK)]

- a. *ni=ŋ-reíyo va-a-m-n-u-ti-séríis-í-a*  
FOC=3-trap SM2-PST-PERF-OM3-OM1pl-send-AP-F  
'(It is) the trap that they (had) sent to us.'
- b. *ni=ŋ-reíyo va-a-m-n-ti-u-séríis-í-a*  
FOC=3-trap SM2-PST-PERF-OM1pl-OM3-send-AP-F  
'(It is) the trap that they (had) sent to us.'

(5) Type-IV [Mkuu (Rombo)]

- a. *kisali é-le-ka-i-andik-i-a* (*bárúá ka-kálamu*)  
Kisali SM1-PST-OM12-OM9-write-AP-F (9.letter 12(dim)-pen)  
'Kisali wrote a letter with a small/useless pen.'
- b. *kisali é-le-i-ka-andik-i-a* (*bárúá ka-kálamu*)  
Kisali SM1-PST-OM9-OM12-write-AP-F (9.letter 12(dim)-pen)

'Kisali wrote a letter with a small/useless pen.'

- つまり、同じ語群の中ですらミクロな類型的多様性が認められる。あるいは、micro-parameters を適用することで、同じ語群の中でのミクロな（しかし類型的に有意な）差異を明示的な形で捉えることができる。

### 3. 具体例-2：適用形

#### 3.1 概観

- 同じ語群 (Kilimanjaro Bantu, KB/ Chaga E.60) 内部での micro-variation
- ~~Marten et al. (2007) の提案する19のパラメータの一部~~ ではない試案的なパラメータ
- binary なパラメータ

#### 3.2 適用形 (applicative constructions) についての概観

- KB は、動詞語基 (base verb) が語彙的に有する基本目的語 (Base Object, BO) のみならず、適用項として導入された名詞項 (Applied Object, AO) にも第一目的語<sup>2</sup> (Primary Object, PO) の資格を与える、いわゆる目的語対照型言語 (Object symmetric language) .
- しかしながら、KB のなかのいくつかの言語では、AO が道具項 (Instrumental)<sup>3</sup>の場合に異なる振る舞いをする言語が認められる。

#### 3.3 道具項適用形制約 (Restricted Instrumental Applicative)

- 例えばロンボ語は、適用項の典型的な意味役割である、受益 (beneficiary), 道具 (instrumental), 場所 (locative) のいずれを AO とする適用形も可能である<sup>4</sup>.

(6)

[Mkuu (Rombo)]

a.	<i>kisali</i>	<i>é-le-ka-andik-i-a</i>	<i>bárua</i>
	Kisali	SM1-PST-OM12-write-AP-F	9.letter (BO)
'Kisali wrote a letter with it (Cl.12).'			

<sup>2</sup> An object which fulfills the following criteria; (a) word order ("immediately after the verb" position), (b) subjectivization (through passivization), and (c) cliticization (marked by an object marker within the verb complex). See Hyman and Duranti (1982).

<sup>3</sup> バントゥにおける道具項が、そもそも他の意味役割に比べて「目的語性 (objecthood)」が低いという議論は、Hyman & Duranti (1982) に認められる：目的語性階層 semantic roles: Benefactive > Recipient > Patient > Instrumental

<sup>4</sup> 同様に、Bresnan & Moshi (1993) によれば、ヴンジョ語も道具項が自由にとれるようである。ただし、Emanatian (1991) は、基本的にヴンジョ語には道具項適用形は認められないという立場をとり、それについての認知意味論的な説明も試みている。また“方言差”さらには“個人差”のレベルで許容度が変わるのでないかとの指摘もある：“It should be noted that the Chagga Applicative apparently exhibits dialect variation, and even considerable speaker-to-speaker variation within a dialect.” (Emanatian 1991: 256)

b.	<i>kisali</i>	<i>é-le-i-andik-i-a</i>	<i>ká-kalámu</i>
	Kisali	SM1-PST-OM9-write-AP-F	12-9.pen (AO)
‘Kisali wrote it(Cl.9) with a small/useless pen.’			
c.	<i>kisali</i>	<i>é-le-ka-í-andik-i-a</i>	
	Kiasli	SM1-PST-OM12-OM9-write-AP-F	
‘Kisali wrote it(Cl.9/12) with it(Cl.12/9).’			
d.	<i>kisali</i>	<i>é-le-i-ka-andik-i-a</i>	
	Kiasli	SM1-PST-OM9-OM12-write-AP-F	
‘Kisali wrote it(Cl.9/12) with it(Cl.12/9).’			
e.	<i>ka-kalamu</i>	<i>ká-le-andik-i-w-a</i>	<i>bárúá</i>
	12-9.pen (AO)	SM12-PST-write-AP-PASS-F	9.letter (BO)
‘A small/useless pen was used to write a letter by Kisali.’			
f.	<i>barua</i>	<i>t-le-andik-i-w-a</i>	<i>ká-kálámú</i>
	9.letter (BO)	SM9-PST-write-AP-PASS-F	12-9.pen (AO)
‘A letter was written with a small/useless pen by Kisali.’			
g.	* <i>kisali</i>	<i>é-le-i-andik-ir-a</i>	<i>ká-kalámu</i>
	Kisali	SM1-PST-write-CAUS-F	12-9.pen (AO)
Intd. ‘Kisali wrote it(Cl9) with a useless/small pen.’			
h.	<i>kisali</i>	<i>é-le-kamád-is-a</i>	<i>mw-aná</i>
	Kisali	SM1-PST-send-CAUS-F	1-child
‘Kisali had a child send a gift.’			

- 一方ルワ語では、道具項に相当する *m-biíri* 「棒」を AO にとる構造が許容されないことが確認される。つまりこの言語では、適用形構文において、道具項に関して（のみ）構造的な制約がかかっているということになる。

(7) [Rwa (WK)]

a.	* <i>tareto</i>	<i>a-a-kab-í-a</i>	<i>m-biíri</i>
	Tareto	SM1-PST1-hit-AP-F	9-stick (BO)
Intd. ‘Tareto hit with a stick.’			
b.	? <i>tareto</i>	<i>a-a-ń'-kab-í-a</i>	<i>m-biíri</i>
	Tareto	SM1-PST1-OM1(AO)-hit-AP-F	9-stick (BO)
‘Tareto hit him/her because of/for? a stick.’			
but not possible to interpret as ‘Tareto hit him/her with a stick.’			
c.	<i>tareto</i>	<i>a-a-ń'-kab-ís-a</i>	<i>m-biíri</i>
	Tareto	SM1-PST1-OM1-hit-CAUS-F	9-stick
‘Tareto hit him/her with a stick.’			

- そして、適用形構文で表現できない道具項は使役形によって表現されている (7c) . このような、「使役形による道具項適用形のブロック ("blocked by the existence of causative")」は、Harford (1993: Larry Hyman p.c.) などに言及があり、ショナ語やケレウェ語などにも同様の現象が確認される (cf. 品川&米田 2008) .
- 「道具項適用形制約」(アリ/ナシ)のような binary なパラメータを立てることで、連動的に影響を受けうる他の類型的特徴 (typological correlation/ co-variation) にシステムティックに言及することが可能になり、それをパラメータ間の原理として整理することで類型論一般への貢献も期待される.

#### 4. 具体例-3：未来時制標示

##### 4.1 概観

- 同じ語群 (Kilimanjaro Bantu, KB/ Chaga E.60) 内部での micro-variation
- Marten et al. (2007) の提案する 19 のパラメータの一部 ではない試案的なパラメータ
- binary なパラメータ ではない gradient な(?)パラメータ

##### 4.2 KBにおける \*-ag と未来時制標示についての概観

- Philippson and Montlahuc (2003: 495): "There is a major dividing line cutting across KB between WK and the rest: WK has an imperfective suffix -aa (Common Bantu \*-aga) marking Habitual and Future, e.g. in M[ashami] (perhaps also progressive in K[ibosho]); CK and R[ombo] have no such forms."
- Nurse (2003: 75): "CK and Rombo alone have two clear and discrete futures, that is, forms which are distinct in form from each other and from the present-used-as-future. ... While the WK data leaves much to be desired, most dialects there have one or no discrete future forms..."

##### 4.3 -aa と未来時制の形式的区分

- (8)-(10) に挙げる WK の諸言語は -aa をマーカーとして有し、未来時制の形式的区分は 1 つないし未来時制 (に特化した) 標識を欠く (以下 mono-F と言及) .

(8)

[Mashami (WK)]

*n-lú-mány-aa*

FOC-SM1pl-know-F

'We will know.'

(Rugemalira and Phanuel 2009)

(9)

[Rwa (WK)]

*ti-lóli-á-a*

SM1pl-see-FUT-F

'We will see.'

(10)

*n-lu-u-som-aa*

FOC-SM1pl-(?)-read-F

'We are reading.'

(Kagaya 1989)

❖ -aa を有する言語が mono-F タイプになるという（一見したところの）オーバーラップが、「なぜ」起こるのかを説明する確かな理由は不明だが、可能な説明としては、動詞構造におけるスロットの性質の差異に注目する方法があるかもしれない。-aa が充填される Prefinal 位置は限られた接辞しか入りえない「閉じた」スロットであり、この位置で複数の形式的区分を表示することが構造的にかなわないということと関わりがあるかもしれない。

➤ 一方、CK とロンボは概ね 2 つ（以上）の形式的区分が認められる（以下 pluri-F と言及）。

(11)

[Vunjo (CK)]

*lw-eci-kap-a*vs. *lw-e-kap-a*

SM1pl-FUT1-hit-F

SM1pl-FUT2-hit-F

'We will hit.' [Near Future]

'We will hit.' [Far Future]

(Nurse 2003)

(12)

[Uru (CK)]

*lú-i-káp-a*vs. *lú-tfi-káp-a*

SM1pl-FUT.N-hit-F

SM1pl-FUT.R-hit-F

'We will hit this tree.' [Near Future]

'We will hit this tree.' [Far Future]

(13)

[Mkuu (Rombo)]

*dú-í-m-kab-a*vs. *dú-e-m-kab-a*

SM1pl-FUT.N-OM3sg-hit-F

SM1pl-FUT.R-OM3sg-hit-F

'We will hit him/her.' [Near Future]

'We will hit him/her.' [Far Future]

❖ -aa を有する言語との対比で言えば、これらの言語は TAM 位置で未来時制を表示しており、文法化によって新たに生み出されたマーカーによって形式的区分を比較的容易に表示できると説明することができるかもしれない。

➤ Tentative correlation (local): [language without -aa] x [pluri-Future])

Fig. 2: List of future markers across KB (Shinagawa 2014)

Subgroup	Language	Tense	Form	Source
WK	Rwa	FUT	-áa	*-ag <imperfective>
	Siha	FUT	-áa	*-ag <imperfective>
CK	Uru	FUT.N	<i>i</i> -	* <i>li</i> - 'be'
		FUT.R	<i>tfi</i> -	* <i>ci</i> 'know'
Wunjo	Wunjo	FUT.N	<i>ci</i> -	* <i>ci</i> 'know'
		FUT.R	<i>e</i> -	(cf. * <i>eci</i> -?)

Rombo	Mkuu	FUT.N	<i>i-</i>	* <i>li-</i> ‘be’
		FUT.R	<i>e-</i>	(cf. * <i>eci-?</i> )

## 4.4 COM/GOM

- これに関連して、mono-F型／pluri-F型という（parametricに計りうる）対立が、文法化に関するパラメータと連動している可能性を指摘できるかもしれない。KBの多くの言語で、'come'や'go'に相当する語彙形式が文法化したものが、未来時制ないし「確信性（certainty）」に関するモダリティー概念を表すことが確認されている（Nurse 2003等）。今のところ把握しているタイプは、'come'が文法化したマーカー（COM）と'go'が文法化したマーカー（GOM）の両方を持つタイプの言語と、COMのみが文法化している言語という対立である。
  - mono-F型の言語は、COM, GOMともに十分に文法化している傾向がある。

- (14) [Rwa (WK)]

- a. *va-shé-shi-kab-ís-’á-a* *m-bííri*  
           SM3pl-COM-OM1sg-hit-CAUS-FUT-F 9-stick  
      ‘(Perhaps) they will hit me with a stick.’

b. *va-ndé-shi-kab-ís-’á-a* *m-bííri*  
           SM3pl-GOM-OM1sg-hit-CAUS-FUT-F 9-stick  
      ‘They will (definitely) hit me with a stick.’

- (15) [Rwa (WK)]

- |                            |                      |     |                             |                      |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>fuá</i>                 | <i>y-a-ndé-nis-á</i> | vs. | <i>fuá</i>                  | <i>y-a-shé-nis-á</i> |
| 9.rain                     | SM9-PST-GOM-rain-F   |     | 9.rain                      | SM9-PST-GOM-rain-F   |
| ‘It rained (as expected).’ |                      |     | ‘It rained (unexpectedly).’ |                      |

- ◆ ちなみにルワ語では、GOM が「強い確信性 ((strong) certainty)」、COM が「不確実性 (uncertainty)」のような概念を表すようである。

- 一方で pluri-F 型の言語では、COM のみが文法化する（あるいは GOM の文法化が不十分である）傾向がみられる。

- [16] [Uru (CK)]

- a. *ndzí-i-tfá-orôk-a*  
SM1sg-FUT.N-COM-stand up-F  
'I will stand up.' [Near Future]
  - b. *ndzí-tfí-tfá-orôk-a*  
SM1sg-FUT.R-COM-stand up-F  
'I will stand up.' [Far Future]
  - c. *\*ndzí-i-endá-orôk-a*  
SM1sg-FUT.N-GOM-stand up-F  
Intd. 'I will (go to) stand up' [Near Future]

- (17) d. *?ndʒí-tʃí-endá-orôk-a*  
 SM1sg-FUT.R-GOM-stand up-F  
 lit. 'I will go somewhere to stand up' [Far Future]  
 (17) [Mkuu (Rombo)]
- a. *ngí-le-shé-m'-loli-a*  
 SM1sg-PST1-COM-OM3sg≠see-F  
 'Surely I met him/her' (Sw. 'Nilimwonaga')  
 b. \* *ngi-le-nde-m'≠loli-a*  
 SM1sg-PST1-GOM-OM3sg≠see-F
- ❖ ウル語もロンボ語も pluri-F 型の言語であるが、いずれも GOM は TAM マーカーとして限定された環境にしか現れることができず、構造的な制約を受けているようである。ちなみに双方の言語においては、COM の方が「強い確信性」と結びついているようである。
- 以上の傾向はかなり大まかな観察によるものだが、パラメータ的に把握するとすれば、「未来時制の形式的区分」に関するパラメータと、「COM/GOM の文法化」パラメータ（これは gradient になりうる?）との間に連動関係が認められる可能性がある。

## 5. 具体例のまとめ

- 本発表で扱った、試案的なパラメータ間の correlation/ co-variation のリスト（作業仮説として）
  - ❖ [Restricted Instrumental Applicative] x [Inanimate Causative] (3.3)
  - ❖ [language without -aa] x [Pluri-Future] (local in KB?, 4.3)
  - ❖ [Pluri-Future] x [Restricted GOM](4.4)

## 6. プロジェクトの方向性

- 重点を置く部分は、typology の部分。とくに micro-parameters の検討と提案、そしてパラメータ間の typological correlation の探求。
  - ❖ the parameters are concerned with many major topics in Bantu grammar such as object relations, double objects, and agreement, and are thus likely to be included in any future, further-developed list of Bantu parameters (Marten et al. 2007: 257)
  - ❖ Of course, there are many other aspects of Bantu grammar which would lend themselves easily to inclusion in this list [19 のパラメータのリスト], and for which appropriate literature is available.: difference in noun-class system, **order and function of verbal suffixes, tense-aspect marking** or question formation are only a few possible topics (ibid.: 259-260).
  - ❖ The project aims to develop some 100 parameters of variation (Lutz Marten p.c.)

➤ 今後のスケジュール

2016 年度 <研究枠組みの共有>

19 のパラメータに従ったデータの収集・統合と typological correlation の検討

2017 年度 <新たなパラメータの検討>

2018 年度 <新たなパラメータの提案とデータを含む成果発信>

### Abbreviations

1, 2, 3,... (= number only): noun class, 1sg, 2pl... (= number + sg/pl): person + singular/plural, AP: applicative, CAUS: causative, COM: grammaticalized marker from ‘come,’ dim: diminutive, FOC: focus, FUT: future, F: final vowel, GOM: grammaticalized marker from ‘go,’ IMPF: imperfective, N: near, OM: object marker, PERF: perfective , PST: past, R: remote, SM: subject marker, - (hyphen): morpheme boundary, = (equals sign): clitic boundary, . (period): boundary of grammatical categories fused in a single morpheme

### References

- Bresnan, J. and L. Moshi, 1993. Object Asymmetries in Comparative Bantu Syntax, In: Mchombo, S. (ed.), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu Grammar*, Cambridge University Press pp. 47-91
- Emanatian, M. 1991. *Grammatical Polysemy: The Systematicity of Multiple Meanings in Grammar*, PhD Dissertation, eScholarship [accessed on 1/AUG/2015]
- Harford, C. 1993. The applicative in Chishona and Lexical Mapping Theory, In: Mchombo, S. (ed.), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu Grammar*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 93-111
- Hyman, L. M. and A. Duranti, 1982. On the object relationship in Bantu, In: Hopper, P. J. and S. A. Thompson (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 15, Studies in Transitivity*, Academia Press, pp. 217-239
- Kagaya, R. 1989. Chaga-go [Chaga languages], In: Kamei, T., Kōno, R. and E. Chino (eds.) *Gengogaku hyakkajiten [The Sanseido Encyclopedia of Linguistics] Vol. 2*, Sanseido, pp. 826-831 [in Japanese]
- Leverhulme-funded research project ‘Morphosyntactic variation in Bantu: Typology, contact and change’ (ウェブサイト <https://bantuvariation.wordpress.com/> [2016年4月14日閲覧] および Lutz Marten 教授によるプロジェクト概要を参照)
- Maho, J. F. 2009. *NUGL Online: The online version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a referential classification of the Bantu languages*, URL <http://goto.glocalnet.net/mahopapers/nuglonline.pdf>
- Marten, L. 2012. Morphosyntactic variation, structural convergence and language contact in Bantu, paper presented at the International Workshop on Bantu Languages, Osaka
- Marten, L. and N. C. Kula, 2007. Morphosyntactic co-variation in Bantu: two case studies, In: *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics Vol. 15*, pp. 227-238
- Marten, L., N. C. Kula and T. Nhlanhla, 2007. Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in Bantu, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105, pp. 253-358

- Meeussen, A. E. 1967. Bantu grammatical reconstructions, In: *Africana Linguistica III*, pp. 79-122, Royal Museum for Central Africa
- Nurse, D. 2003. Tense and aspect in Chaga, *APAL 1*, pp. 69-90
- 2008. Tense and Aspect in Bantu, OUP
- Nurse, D. and G. Philippson 1977. Tones in Old Moshi (Chaga), *Studies in African Linguistics 8(1)*, pp. 49-80
- (eds.) 2003. *The Bantu Languages*, Routledge
- Nurse, D. and G. Philippson (eds.) 2003. *The Bantu Languages*, Routledge
- Philippson, G. and M-L. Montlahuc, 2003. Kilimanjaro Bantu (E60 and E74), In: Nurse and Philippson (eds.), pp. 475-500
- Rugemalira, J. and B. Phanel, 2009. A Grammatical Sketch of Kimashami, unpublished MS
- Shinagawa, D. 2013. Vowel coalescence and morphological micro-variations in Kilimanjaro Bantu, paper presented at the International Workshop on Bantu Languages: Studies in East African Bantu and Microvariation, SOAS
- 2014a. Vowel length and TMA micro-variation in Kilimanjaro Bantu, In: *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics, No. 9*, pp. 5-21, ILCAA
- 2014b. *A grammatical sketch of Chaga-Rombo (Bantu E623)*, ILCAA, pp. 142 [in Japanese]
- Shinagawa, D. and Yoneda N. 2008. Object asymmetry/symmetry of applicative verbs in Bantu languages, paper presented at the 137<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan [in Japanese]
- Yukawa, Y. 1989. A tonological study of Machame verbs, In: Yukawa, Y. (ed.) *Studies in Tanzanian Languages*, pp. 223-338, ILCAA

# **A typological study of micro-variation in Bantu**

## **Commentary on the theoretical perspective, planned/potential case studies**

Yukiko Morimoto  
Humboldt University, Berlin

### **1. Theoretical perspective**

#### **Binary parameters vs. Gradient scales?**

- In theoretical linguistics, typically and overwhelmingly, parameters have been binary features (cf. Chomskyan Principles & Parameters approach, other approaches on generative syntax such as Lexical-Functional Grammar, Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, non-OT phonological/morphological theories, etc.).
- In typology, however, generalizations about various linguistic phenomena are often stated in terms of markedness (cf. Greenberg 1966).
- Optimality Theory (both in phonology and syntax) is a generative framework which attempts to incorporate typological generalizations in terms of markedness into the generative study, and takes into consideration markedness hierarchies and combinations of markedness to account for degrees of acceptability (cf. Morimoto 2000 and references cited therein).
- A recent linguistic trend is to state linguistic generalizations by way of quantification in addition to qualitative analysis.
- Given such developments both in theoretical and descriptive/typological work, stating recent (especially quantificational) results in terms of binary parameters will be a challenge. Gradient scales might therefore be more useful, at least in some empirical domains.
- Gradient scales seem to be able to more naturally relate synchrony and diachrony in terms of grammaticalization from one end of a scale to the other.
- In the last decade (since Marten et. al 2007), more empirical domains from many more Bantu languages have been explored, and we have a much better understanding of the macro-variation that exists in Bantu languages. These results need to be incorporated into the first phase of our study.

本研究課題の重点的テーマ

- i) すでに提案されている micro-parameters に基づいたデータの収集・統合
- ii) micro-parameters 自体の検討 (+提案)
- iii) パラメータ間の連動関係 (typological correlations/ co-variation) に関する知見の深化

Question: What (grammatical) level of micro-variation should be in focus in the present project?

## 2. Comments on the potential case studies

### Case study 1 (object marking)

同じ語群の中ですらミクロな類型的多様性が認められる。あるいは、micro-parametersを適用することで、同じ語群の中でのミクロな（しかし類型的に有意な）差異を明示的な形で捉えることができる。

- Micro-variation not only across Bantu languages but also within a particular language group or dialectal (or speaker) variation seems to be commonly observed (discussed below).
- The parameters in (1): binary or gradient? – cf. Marten et. al (2007: 268). Is the “free order” of the relevant object markers conditioned by some semantic (e.g. animacy) or discourse (e.g. topicality) factors?
- The role of animacy and topicality has already been discussed in the literature on differential object marking (Morimoto 2002, Downing 2014), and applicative constructions (Demuth et. al 2003, 2005). There might be potential interaction with phenomena such as object marking and these semantic/discourse “parameters”.

### Case study 2 (Restricted instrumental applicative)

- (ルツ語においては)適用形構文で表現できない道具項は使役形によって表現されている (7c)。
- 「道具項適用形制約」(アリ／ナシ)のような binary なパラメータを立てることで、運動的に影響を受けうる他の類型的特徴 (typological correlation/ co-variation) にシステムティックに言及することが可能になり、それをパラメータ間の原理として整理することで類型論一般への貢献も期待される。
- Survey of languages with instrumental applicative vs. causativization

### Case study 3 (Future marking)

Correlation/co-variation of potential (new) parameters??

- Mono-F and Pluri-F type languages with respect to future marking
- mono-F 型の言語は、COM, GOM ともに十分に文法化している傾向がある。
- 一方で pluri-F 型の言語では、COM のみが文法化する（あるいは GOM の文法化が不十分である）傾向がみられる。

## 3. Other empirical domains: verb doubling vs. the conjoint/disjoint alternation

- A subset of Bantu languages (e.g., languages of zones A, B, E, F, H & K) display ‘verb doubling’ – [infinitive verb + identical finite verb] with or without a focus marker (e.g., de Kind et. al 2014).
- Another subset of Bantu languages (e.g., languages of zones J, M, N, P & S) display the conjoint/disjoint morphology, widely studied in recent Bantu research (van der Wal & Hyman 2015).

Preliminary work (e.g., Güldemann et. al 2014, Morimoto 2015) suggests that these seemingly unrelated grammatical forms appearing in different Bantu zones are, in fact, interrelated on the information-structural basis.

### **Conjoint/disjoint alternation**

The conjoint form is the ‘out-of-focus form’, where the predicate is out of focus and the term, in-focus. The disjoint form is the ‘in-focus’ form, where the predicate (typically the only element in the utterance) is in-focus.

- (1) Makhuwa (P31, van der Wal 2009: 218 (679))

- a. ni-n-thípá nlittí. CJ  
1.PL-PRS:CJ-dig 5:hole  
‘We dig a hole.’
- b. ni-náá-thípá. DJ  
1.PL-PRS:DJ-dig  
‘We are digging.’

- (2) Swati (S43, Ziervogel and Mabuza 1976:97, 98)

- a. ngi-natsa... CJ  
1.SG-drink  
‘I drink ...’
- b. ngi-ya-natsa. DJ  
1.SG-PRS.DJ-drink  
‘I am drinking.’

- (3) Ha (JD66, Harjula 2004:167)

- a. ba-rima ibiharagi. CJ  
2.SM-cultivate beans  
‘They cultivate beans.’
- b. ba-ra-rima (ibiharagi). DJ  
2.SM-PRS.DJ-cultivate beans  
‘They cultivate/are cultivating (beans).’

## Verb doubling

Verb doubling is used to express predicate-centered focus, much like the disjoint form does.

(4) Kikuyu

{The woman hit Peter.}

- a. *n̄i kū-mu-igat-á a-mu-igát-ír-e.*  
FOC INF-1OM-chase-FV 1-1OM-chase-PFV-FV  
'She CHASED him.'
- b. *#n̄i amuigátire.* [not contrastive]

(5) Kītharaka (Abels & Muriungi 2008: 704)

- a. *i-kū-gúra Maria a-gur-ire nyondo.*  
FOC-INF-buy 1.Maria 1 -buy-PERF 9.hammer  
'Maria BOUGHT the hammer.' (she did not borrow it.)
- b. *i-ku-noga Maria a-rí mû-nog-u.*  
FOC-INF-tire 1.Maria 1-be 1-tired-ADJ  
'Maria is really tired. (she is not kidding!)'

(6) Kuria (Landman & Ranero 2015: 6)

{Did they really eat fruits?}

- e, n-oko-ria ama-ako ba-a-rey-e.*  
yes FOC-14-eat 6-fruit 2-PST-eat.PERF-FV  
'Yes, they DID eat fruits.'

(7) Civili (West Kikongo variety; Ndouli 2012: 5)

- {*n-cétù ù-á-búl-à piele*  
1-woman 1-PERF-beat-FV Pierre  
*ko kú-tél-à n-cétù ù-à-ń-tél-à*  
no 15-call-FV 1-woman 1-PERF-1OM-call-FV  
{Did the woman beat Pierre?} 'No, the woman (only) CALLED him.'

Similar constructions with verb doubling have also been reported in the Southern-Cameroon language Tuki (A 601, Biola 1995), the South-Western Bantu language Mbukushu (K333, Güldemann 2003: 336), and spread over to the East Bantu languages such as fwe (K402, Gunnink 2014), in addition to Kikuyu (see also Morimoto 2016) and other zone E languages (e.g., Kitharaka: E54, Abels and Muriungi 2008).

- Verb doubling is often used to express predicate-centered focus – focus on the lexical content of the verb ('state-of-affairs focus') or the verb's operators such as polarity and tense/aspect/modality ('operator focus') (e.g., Morimoto 2016).
- In the conjoint/disjoint alternation, the disjoint form is generally used to express predicate-centered focus, while the conjoint form is the out-of-focus form (e.g., Güldemann

2003, Morimoto 2016).

- Preliminary work suggests that verb doubling and the conjoint/disjoint alternation are in complementary distribution: in the languages of zones A, B, E, F, H & K that display verb doubling, the conjoint/disjoint alternation is not attested; conversely, in the languages of zones J, M, N, P & S, for example, that display the conjoint/disjoint alternation, verb doubling is not observed. This is not surprising if they indeed fulfill a similar discourse function.
- Another potentially related phenomenon is inversion. While those languages that display the conjoint/disjoint alternation certainly vary in terms of what type of inversion is allowed in the language (cf. Marten et. al. 2007), Kikuyu (E51), for example, does not allow even the most wide-spread type of inversion with locative. In the languages of zone A as well, inversion is apparently not attested, suggesting a potential correlation between verb doubling and apparent absence of inversion constructions.
  - **Parameter 13:** presence/absence of conjoint/disjoint alternation – correlates with the presence/absence of verb doubling.
  - Conjoint/disjoint vs. verb doubling potentially correlates with the presence/absence of inversion constructions

#### Other potential empirical domains

- Types of inversion constructions: restrictions and their co-variation (e.g. with agreement)
- Noun modifying constructions (Yoneda 2016)

## 4. Prospect

- Parameters: binary or gradient?
- Cases of micro-variation within language groups
- Proposing new parameters and co-variation
- Exploring new empirical domains
- Methodological challenges: developing systematic questionnaires for data collection in order to obtain comparable data

## References

- Abels, Klaus and Peter Murungi. 2008. The focus marker in Kîtharaka. *Lingua* 118, 687-731.
- Biloa, Edmond. 1995. Functional categories and the syntax of focus in Tuki. LINCOM Studies in African Linguistics 2. München/ Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. *Language Universals*. The Hague. Mouton.
- De Kind, Jasper, Sebastian Dom, Gilles-Maurice de Schryver, and Koen Bostoen. 2014. Event-centrality and the pragmatics-semantics interface in Kikongo: From predication focus to progressive aspect and vice versa. Unpublished ms. March 13, 2014.
- Demuth, Katherine, 'Malillo Machobane and Francina Moloi. 2003. Rules and construction effects in learning the argument structure of verbs. *Journal of Child Language*. 30, 1-25.
- Demuth, Katherine and 'Malillo Machobane. 2005. Learning animacy hierarchy effects in Sesotho double object applicatives. *Language* 81(2). 421-447.
- Downing, Laura. 2014. Differential object marking in Chichewa. Ms.
- Gunnink, H. 2014. The fronted infinitive construction in Fwe. Unpublished manuscript.

- Güldemann 2003: Present progressive vis-à-vis predication focus in Bantu: A verbal category between semantics and pragmatics. In (ed.), *Studies in Language*, 323-360.
- Güldemann, T, I. Fiedler, and Y. Morimoto. 2014. The verb in the preverbal domain across Bantu : infinitive “fronting” and predicate-centered focus. Paper presented at the Workshop on Preverbal Domains. ZAS, Berlin.
- Landman, Meredith and Rodrigo Ranero. 2015. Focus Marking in Kuria. The Selected Proceedings of ACAL 45.
- Marten, Lutz, Nancy C. Kula and Nhlanhla Thwala. 2007. Parameters of morpho-syntactic variation in Bantu. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105 (3), 253-338.
- Morimoto, Yukiko. 2000. *Discourse Configurationality in Bantu Morphosyntax*. Ph.D Thesis, Stanford University.
- Morimoto, Yukiko. 2002. Prominence mismatches and differential object marking. In Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *The Proceedings of LFG-02*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Morimoto, Yukiko. 2016. The Kikuyu focus marker *n̄i*: formal and functional similarities to the conjoint/disjoint system. In Van der Wal, Jenneke and Larry Hyman (eds.), *The Conjoint/Disjoint Alternation in Bantu*. De Gruyter. In Press.
- Ndouli, Guy. 2012. Focalisation et ordre des mots en kikongo véhiculaire (H10A) de Pointe-Noire et en civil (H12). Paper presented at the 42nd Colloquium of African Languages and Linguistics, Leiden University.
- Van der Wal, J. and L. Hyman (eds.). 2016. *The Conjoint/Disjoint Alternation in Bantu*. De Gruyter. In Press.
- Yoneda, N. 2016. Noun modifying constructions in Swahili and Japanese. In Pardeshi, P and T. Kageyama (eds.), *Handbook of Japanese Contrastive Linguistics*. De Gruyter Mouton.