

On arguments and adjuncts in Malagasy

マダガスカル語の項と付加語句について

MINOURA Nobukatsu

Institute of Global Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

箕浦 信勝

東京外国語大学総合国際学研究院

Introduction

1. Arguments, complements, and adjuncts

- 1.1. Tallerman's classification
- 1.2. The problems of core arguments
- 1.3. Kôno's single-limb languages and double-limb languages

2. Examination of Malagasy data

- 2.1. Direct impact with a change in the patient
- 2.2. Direct impact without a change in the patient
- 2.3. Perception
- 2.4. Pursuit
- 2.5. Knowledge
- 2.6. Emotion
- 2.7. Relationship
- 2.8. Ability
- 2.9. Sectional summary

Conclusion

Keywords: Malagasy, argument, adjunct, complement, voice, split ergative, single-limb/double-limb languages

キーワード：マダガスカル語、項、付加語句、補語、ボイス、スプリット能格、単肢・両肢言語



本稿の著作権は著者が所持し、クリエイティブ・コモンズ表示4.0国際ライセンス(CC-BY)下に提供します。
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ja>

Abstract

Malagasy has a three-voice system: absolutive voice (AV), nominative voice (NV), and circumstantial voice (CV). The agent is genitive-marked, which functions as ergative. The patient is accusative-marked. Non-core nominals, i.e. any dependents of the predicates other than S/A/P/T are marked according to their function. But in the absolutive voice clauses, the P is subjective(=absolutive)-marked. In the nominative clauses, the A is subjective(=nominative)-marked. In the circumstantial clauses, one of the non-core nominals, i.e. any dependents of the predicates other than the S/A/P/T, is subjective marked. It means that the oblique- or adjunct-case marking is stripped when possible. Moreover, the Malagasy voice system can be related to split ergativity.

When it comes to Kôno's single-limb/double-limb languages, Malagasy is a double-limb language, but only a subject (P(S) in AV, A(S) in NV, and one of the non-core nominals in CV) is obligatory. The rest of the core nominals are not obligatory unlike in Western European languages. And a history of the Malagasy voice system is summarized in passing.

要旨

マダガスカル語は3つのボイス、即ち絶対格ボイス (AV)、主格ボイス (NV)、適用ボイス (CV) を持っている。A は属格標示を受け、それは能格の機能を持っている。P は対格標示を受ける。述語の付加語句的な従属部、即ち S, A, P, T でないものはその機能に応じて標示を受ける。絶対格ボイス節では、P(あるいはS)が(絶対格の役割を持つ)主語標示を受ける。主格ボイス節では、A(あるいはS)が(主格の役割を持つ)主語標示を受ける。適用ボイス節においては、述語の付加語句的な従属部、即ち S, A, P, T でないものの内の1つが、主語標示を受ける。言い換えると斜格的あるいは付加語句的な標示は可能であれば取り去られる。また、マダガスカル語のボイス体系は、スプリット能格に関連づけられる。

河野の単肢・両肢言語に関して、マダガスカル語は両肢言語であると言える。しかし、1つの主語(即ち AV における P(S)、NV における A(S)、CV における述語の付加語句的な従属部、即ち S, A, P, T でないものの内の1つ)のみが必須項である。西ヨーロッパ諸語とは違って、主語でない他のコア名詞句は必須ではない。またマダガスカル語のボイス体系の略史が触れられている。

Introduction

This paper's aim is to facilitate the description of Malagasy (and other languages?) grammar(s) by utilizing and adjusting general linguistic and cross-linguistic tools but not as much to promote any particular linguistic theories.

1. Arguments, complements, and adjuncts

We will take a look at the classification of arguments, complements, and adjuncts in section 1.1. from the general linguistic point of view although what we have here seems Eurocentric after all. In section 1.1., the core nominals are classified as the obligatory (core) arguments. On the other hand, the point that the core nominals can be optional is argued in sections 1.2. and 1.3. Section 1.3. further suggests that the obligatoriness of the core arguments may be an areal feature in Western Europe.

1. 1. Tallerman's classification

First, I take a look at Tallerman's (1998) classification. Although Tallerman is a Generative syntactician, her introductory textbook of syntax (Tallerman *ibid.*) tries to exclude linguistic terms mainly used in the Generative theory/theories as much as possible, but she tries to stick to technical terms and concepts which are more likely to be relatable in different grammatical theories and also in descriptions of individual languages.

<Table 1> Tallerman's classification of arguments, complements, and adjuncts

	Core nominals	Peripheral nominals ¹⁾
Obligatory	(Core) arguments	Complements
Optional	-	Adjuncts

According to Tallerman (*ibid.*), (core) arguments are obligatory subjects and objects. Monovalent (one-place²⁾) verbs have a subject. Divalent (bivalent, two-place) verbs have an agent subject and a patient object. Trivalent (three-place) verbs have an agent subject and two objects (which are typically a recipient (R) and a theme (T) if you employ terms from semantic role description in cross-linguistic studies). For the explanation of S, A, P, T, and R, refer to Haspelmath (2010)³⁾.

Complements and adjuncts are dependents of verbs or predicates which are not (core) argu-

1) The peripheral nominals here include not only noun phrases and adpositional phrases but also adverbials.

2) The terms, one-place predicates, two-place predicates, and three-place predicates, are Tsunoda's (1985, 1999 and elsewhere) terms. Predicates include verbs but also other parts of speech. He tries not to use big words when it is possible.

3) In the languages with the indirective pattern, both P and T are marked with the same case while R is marked with a different case. In the languages with the secundative pattern, both P and R are marked with the same case while T is marked with a different case. The indirect object (R) in the former and the secondary object (T) in the latter can be a peripheral complement/adjunct rather than a core nominal in some languages.

ments. Tallerman (1998) specifies that complements are obligatory, i.e. required by the predicate (verb), whereas adjuncts are optional.

In English and many other languages, (core) arguments are always present. They are represented by an overt noun phrase⁴⁾and/or by the agreement(s) on the predicate (verb). Tallerman (1998: 42) calls some English verbs (sing, cook, read, eat) ambitransitive. The ambitransitive verbs listed here seem to be S=A labile verbs, i.e. the relevant one-place (monovalent) verb's S appears as A when the verb of the same form is used as a two-place (divalent) verb.

- (1) a. Chris sings very well
S
b. Chris sings the song very well
A=S P

But there are also S=P labile verbs.

- (2) a. An eraser dropped
S
b. Chris dropped an eraser
A P=S

Here, the relevant one-place (monovalent) verb's S appears as P when the verb of the same form is used as a two-place (divalent) verb. Whether you call them ambitransitive verbs or labile verbs, the same characteristics shared by these verbs are that they do not change their forms when you turn a one-place verb into a two-place verb or the other way around.

When the same verb form can be used not only for one-place verb and two-place verb but also three-place verb, what do you call it or how do you treat it? The examples can be shown from a seemingly three-place verb *teach*.

- (3) a. What do you do for a living?
b. I teach English to children
c. I teach English
d. I teach children
e. I teach

For question (3a), any of the answers (3b-e) seem appropriate. (Although with the answer (3e), you may get the impression that (s)he is deliberately trying to hide what they teach and/or who they teach.) I am not going to coin a term and there may be already a term that I am not aware of at the moment to refer to a verb that can be one-, two-, or three-place verb without changing its form. These verbs and Tallerman's (1998: 42) ambitransitive verbs share the same traits that the

4) When I write "noun phrase," I am not excluding determiner phrase, adpositional phrase, etc. which contain a noun phrase inside.

valency of the verb can be changed without a morphological derivation.

Behind these arguments, there is also a common understanding that each argument slot needs to be filled by a noun phrase and/or marked with an agreement on the predicate verb, no matter what valency (one, two, or three) it has.

1. 2. The problems of core arguments

Tsunoda (2009 [1991]: 95-97) argues that core nominals and/or arguments cannot be readily defined in Japanese. He has the following examples.

- (4) a. Kono hon'=o yom-i-mas-i-ta ka⁵⁾?
 This book=ACC⁶⁾ read-LK⁷⁾-POLIT-LK-PST PQ
 'Have you read the book?' (Tsunoda 2009 [1991]: 96, ex. 6-6)
- b. Hai, yom-i-mas-i-ta
 Yes, read-LK-POLIT-LK-PST
 'Yes, I have read it' (Tsunoda *ibid.*)

These examples are followed by his argument (Tsunoda *ibid.*).

Usually, the verb *yomu* (read) is called a two-place verb. The reason is that a noun phrase referring to the reader and a noun phrase referring to something that is read are needed. But sentence (4a) only has one noun phrase. The sentence (4b) has no noun phrase. Does the verb *yomu* (read) really require two noun phrases? (Actually, an argument that there is no ellipsis taking place is also possible. In that line, the noun phrases are not required, but they are added to the clause when they are needed.) (Translation: NM)

This argument goes in line with Kôno's argument (cf. section 1.3.).

-
- 5) The Romanization of Japanese follows the Hattori system (New Japanese System) in the examples and the Hepburn system elsewhere.
- 6) The abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: - (affix border), = (clitic border), + (compound border), & (reduplicated stem border), <, > (infix borders), A (agent), AV (absolute voice), ACC (accusative), CV (circumstantial voice), EXC (exclamation), EXCL (exclusive), FINIT (finite), FUT (future), IMP (imperative), INCL (inclusive), INDEF (indefinite), INST (instrumental), LAP (less affected patient), LIP (less individuated patient), LK (linker), LOC (locative), NEG (negative), NMZ (nominalizer), NOM (nominative), NONP (non-past), NV (nominative voice), OBL (oblique case), PN (personal/place name), POLIT (polite), P (patient), PQ (polar question), PRS (present), PST (past tense), R (recipient), RAV (root absolute voice), RECIP (reciprocal), RED (reduplication), S (sole argument/subject), SAE (standard average European (languages)), T (theme), TAM (tense, aspect, and mood), VM (valency marker) VOA (voa-absolute voice).
- 7) Tsunoda (2009 [1991]) glosses the vowel as the linking vowel (LK here). In the traditional Japanese grammar and also in Miyaoka's (2015) argument, the linking vowel belongs to the stem or the base to the left of it and the vowel alternation is handled as a manifestation of conjugation. The vowels can be called the thematic vowels in agglutinative languages. Kiyose (2013 among other publications starting in the 1970's) and his knowing and unknowing followers lump the linking vowel together with the suffix to the right of it and they argue that the stem conjugation by vowel alternation etc. in the traditional Japanese grammar can be discarded. As this is not the main topic of this paper, I gloss the linking vowel as LK and leave the argument unsettled for the time being.

Tsunoda (ibid.) also argues that the arguments and adjuncts form a continuum and there is really no definite line to break the two categories apart. He has the following example.

- (5) Kinoo heya=de Hanako=ga tegami=o pen=de ka-i-ta
Yesterday room=LOC PN=NOM letter=ACC pen=INST write-LK-PST
'Hanako wrote a letter with a pen in the room yesterday'

(Tsunoda 2009 [1991]: 96, ex. 6-7)

Tsunoda (ibid.) argues that taking only the writer (A) and something that has been written (P) as arguments is problematic. When you write something, the instrument is also necessary, therefore it can be possible to regard the verb in (5) as a three-place verb too.

When you think about it, it is not problematic with English. All the noun phrases⁸⁾ (excluding those which are sometimes labeled adverbs like *tomorrow* etc.) are arguments. All the prepositional phrases and adverbs are adjuncts.

- (6) a. Chris gave Pat a book
b. Chris gave a book to Pat

Strictly speaking, (6a) has a three-place verb whereas (6b) has a two-place verb because *to Pat* is a prepositional phrase⁹⁾. I am aware of the possibility of the description that treats (6b) as a clause with a three-place verb too.

Tsunoda (2009 [1991]: 97) writes "As for how many arguments a verb has, unfortunately, I follow the "number (= valency)" which is usually talked about. (Translation NM)"

1. 3. Kôno's single-limb languages and double-limb languages

Kôno¹⁰⁾ (Kamei et al. 1996c) suggests a classification of languages by his own typology. There are two types. They are called *tanshi gengo* (single-limb languages) and *ryôshi gengo*¹¹⁾ (double-limb languages). In a double-limb language, both the subject and the predicate are required. On the other hand, only the predicate is required in a single-limb language. A noun phrase, which may correspond to the subject in other languages, is only supplied when it is definitely needed.

The following Japanese conversation is nothing unusual.

8) Here the term noun phrase excludes adpositional phrase, etc. unlike elsewhere in this paper.

9) If this prepositional phrase is considered obligatory, it can be considered Tallerman's complement rather than adjunct (cf. Table 1).

10) In this volume of the *Great Dictionary of Linguistics* (Kamei et al. 1996a), the original author's name is not given for each article unlike in Kamei et al. (1989). It is because the articles have been thoroughly edited by the editors, but it is widely known that this typology is credited to Rokurô Kôno.

11) I tried not to use big words in translating Kôno's *tanshi gengo* (single-limb language) and *ryôshi gengo* (double-limb language) although Kôno's original terminology consists of Sino-Japanese roots, but in any case, they do not look too learned, i.e. these words can be readily understood by moderately educated Japanese speakers.

- (7) a. Asita iku¹²⁾?
 Tomorrow go.FINIT.NONP
 ‘Are you going tomorrow?’
 ‘On va(ira) demain?’ (Pseudo-French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘Does/will one go tomorrow?’ (English translation of the above)
- b. Un, iku
 Yes, go.FINIT.NONP
 ‘Yes, I am going’
 ‘Oui, on va(ira) demain’ (Pseudo-French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘Yes, one goes/will go tomorrow’ (English translation of the above)

In this conversation, no argument for the subject is required. There is no so-called zero anaphora. The second person singular in question (7a) and the first person singular in answer (7b) are not present in any way e.g. neither by a noun phrase nor by an agreement, in the linguistic context. They are understood from the non-linguistic context. If you want to call it a zero deixis, that may be it. But that is kind of awkward because there is no deictic marker of any kind either. So as to present that the subjects in the question and the answer (7) are understood from the non-linguistic context, I employ a pseudo-French translation because the French indefinite person pronoun comes in handy. The indefinite person pronoun does not refer to anybody in particular. What it refers to is understood from the context.

But when it is difficult to retrieve what the subject is from the context, Kôno (1989, Kamei et al. 1996c, d) argues that a subjective complement (or nominative complement) is supplied.

- (8) Watasi=ga iku
 I=NOM go.FINIT.NONP
 ‘‘I’’ am going or It is I that is going’

<Table 2>Kôno’s introduction of subjective complements

	Core nominals	Peripheral nominals
Obligatory		
Optional	Subjective complements (∈ Core complements)	Peripheral complements

According to Kôno (1989, Kamei et al. 1996c, d), subjective complements¹³⁾ are optional. Hence, Japanese is classified as a single-limb language because what seems to be the subject of a predicate is actually an optional subjective complement. Only the predicate is required in a

12) The *u* of *iku* is a conjugating thematic vowel according to the traditional Japanese grammars and Miyaoka (2015). In recent publications, the *u* is often separated as a suffix *-u*. This practice accords with what is done in Kiyose’s (cf. fn. 7) Derivational Grammar.

13) Kôno’s complements differ from Tallerman’s (1998) complements. Tallerman’s complements are obligatory complements which are peripheral nominals as opposed to the optional adjuncts. Kôno’s complements are optional and the term is used even for seeming core nominals (cf. subjective/nominative complements).

Japanese clause. Even seeming core nominals are optional and are supplied on demand. I am not aware if Kôno argued that the second core nominal (most likely an object) in seeming two-place verb construction and the second and the third core nominals (recipient and theme) in seeming three-place verb construction are also optional and are supplied on demand is not clear. But I suppose that is the only logical interpretation. Here, I argue that subjective complements are included in *core complements* in single-limb languages. But if you take a good look at Tsunoda's (2009 [1991]: 95-97) arguments, you will understand that the above-mentioned core complements and the peripheral complements form a continuum without a clear-cut division between the two categories.

The members of the Western European Sprachbund¹⁴⁾(linguistic area) (Kamei et al. 1996b), with French, Dutch, and English at its core, are double-limb languages. Kamei et al. (ibid.) write that the member languages have the following traits among others:

Predominance of the subjects in the syntax. English, German, French, Rhaeto-Romance, etc. require that every sentence to have one and only one subject. Therefore, double-subject constructions and subjectless sentences are not allowed and the expletive subjects like *it* (it is so good), *ce* (c'est si bon), and *es* (es ist so gut) appear. (Translation NM)

Kamei et al. (ibid.) only talk about the predominance of the subjects. I cannot talk about other languages in Kamei et al.'s linguistic area, but English seems to require not only the subjects but also the objects. In other words, a core nominal (= S) is obligatory in one-place verb construction. Two core nominals (= A and P) are obligatory in two-place verb constructions. And three core nominals (=A, T, and R) are obligatory in three-place verb constructions. When the number of the core nominals changes, one needs to talk about voice operation. Thus, Tallerman talks about ambitransitive verbs. These languages are very sensitive as to whether the clause in question has only one argument or two arguments. The derivation of the one-place (intransitive) *eat* from the two-place (transitive) *eat* is a non-morphological voice operation.

When a language is a single-limb language and the seeming core nominals are all optional core complements, it is more difficult to talk about non-morphological voice operation or ambitransitive (\in labile) verbs¹⁵⁾. Such a language is not as sensitive to non-morphological voice operation as the languages in which the core nominals need to be expressed by an overt noun phrase and/or by an agreement on the predicate verb.

14) Many of the readers should have thought about the Standard Average European (SAE) languages suggested by Benjamin Lee Whorf. The SAE languages are thoroughly examined by Haspelmath (2001). It appears that the SAE linguistic area encompasses a much wider area than Kamei et al.'s (1996b) Western European linguistic area. Comparisons of the two claims can be pursued, but it is beyond the scope of this paper.

15) There are so-called labile verbs in Japanese too, e.g. *to=ga hira-i-ta* (door=NOM open-LK-PST, the door opened) and *Miki=ga to=o hira-i-ta* (PN=NOM door=ACC open-LK-PST, Miki opened the door). It is easy to spot an S=P labile verb like *hiraku* (open), but pointing out an S=A labile verb like *taberu* (eat) is awkward because the object (on top of the subject) is not obligatory in single-limb languages where the seeming core nominals are not obligatory but optional in accordance with Tsunoda's (cf. 1.2.) and Kôno's (cf. 1.3.) arguments.

English ambitransitive *eat* can give a good idea.

- (9) a. Did you eat the fish? (transitive, two-place verb)
 b. Did you eat? (meaning: “did you have a meal?”, intransitive, one-place verb)

Take a look at Japanese examples.

- (10) a. Sakana moo tabe-ta?
 Fish already eat-FINIT.PST
 ‘Did you eat a/the fish already?’
 b. Moo tabe-ta?
 Already Eat-FINIT.PST
 ‘Did you eat already?’
 (did you have a meal? or did you eat the thing we both have in mind?)

It is awkward to describe Japanese *taberu/tabeta* (eat/ate) as ambitransitive like Tallerman (1998) does for English. Even (10b) can be interpreted intransitively (did you have a meal?) and transitively (did you eat it?). It all depends on the context, both intralinguistic (anaphoric) and extralinguistic (deictic).

2. Examination of Malagasy data

Before the minute examination of the following sections, I have a general assumption that Malagasy has an obligatory subject. Keenan (1976) points out that Malagasy requires a subject, although not exactly like the English expletive *it*, as in the following example. The actual examples are from my field research in Tokyo¹⁶⁾.

- (11) M-afana&fana ny= andro
 NV-warm&RED DEF= day
 ‘It is a little bit warm’

A subject is expressed by a definite article and a noun. The subject noun phrase can be other words and phrases too.

- (12) a. M-afana&fana androany
 NV-warm&RED today
 ‘Today is a little bit warm’
 b. m-afana be izy izany
 NV- warm a.lot it that
 ‘it is somehow very hot’

16) The Malagasy examples have been elicited from M^{me} Raivo Toyoda, a Malagasy living in Japan who taught Malagasy back in 2003 at the summer school of the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa of the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies..

Ny andro (the day) in (11) can be replaced by *androany* (today, 12a). *Izy izany* in (12b) needs an explanation. *Izy* by itself can be interpreted as *he, she, it, or they*. And it can be used together with a demonstrative pronoun. *Izy ireo* (they those) is used for the most neutral *they* in modern Malagasy (Stark 1969, Moriyama 2003). *Izany* in *izy izany* is also a demonstrative pronoun. When a demonstrative pronoun has a *za-* prefix, it refers to something invisible but not *this* or *that* in sight. *Izany* qualifies *izy* and together they refer to an invisible *it*. Semantically speaking, *izy izany* acts like the expletive English *it*. When an utterance is more exclamatory, the expletive subject part can be omitted.

- (13) M-afana be e!
 NV-warm a.lot EXC
 ‘It is very hot, isn’t it?’

The exclamatory *e* is contemporarily in trend. It is placed at the end of an utterance and adds nuances which are something between *isn’t it* and *I tell you* or both at the same time.

I give some more examples before digging into the main argument.

- (14) M-a-lahelo aho
 NV-VM-sad I
 ‘I am sad’

Example (14) has an experiencer subject.

- (15) a. M-a-lahelo anao aho¹⁷⁾
 NV-VM-sad you.ACC I
 ‘I miss you lit. I am sad (for/because of) you’
 b. M-a-lahelo amin=ilay voina aho
 NV-VM-sad OBL=the disaster I
 ‘I am sad about the calamity’

The example (15a) has an object in the accusative case. Example (15b) has an oblique phrase. The predicate *malahelo* (be.sad) can be derived causatively.

- (16) M-amp-a-lahelo ilay voina
 NV-CAUS-VM-sad the disaster
 ‘The calamity saddens (me/us/etc.)’

The prefix *amp-* is usually described as a causative marker, but in this case, it helps replace the experiencer subject with the stimulus subject.

17) Zero-marked case which acts as the absolutive case patient in the absolutive voice clause, the nominative case agent in the nominative voice clause, and the caseless adjunct-meaning subject in the circumstantial voice is not glossed nominative/absolutive for case in this paper.

- (17) M-amp-a-lahelo ahy ilay voina
 NV-CAUS-VM-sad me.ACC the disaster
 ‘The calamity saddens me’

The experiencer object *ahy* (me) can be present (17) or absent (16). It is optional. The *mampalahelo* (sadden) in (16) has a causative prefix, so it can be expected that it adds an argument. But the experiencer object is optional. What I am saying is that even a causative prefix does not add to the number of obligatory argument(s). In examples (14-17), it can be said that only one argument is obligatory. With *malahelo* (be.sad), the experiencer subject is obligatory (14). The cause or the stimulus of sadness can be optionally added (15) in the accusative case (15a) or in the oblique case (15b). On the other hand with *mampalahelo* (sadden), the stimulus subject is obligatory (16). The experiencer object can be optionally added (17).

Malagasy has a three-voice system: nominative voice (NV), absolutive voice (AV), and circumstantial voice¹⁸⁾ (CV). With the predicate in the nominative voice, S or A is the subject and is the obligatory argument. With the predicate in the absolutive voice, S or P is the subject and is the obligatory argument. With the predicate in the circumstantial voice, anything other than S, A, P, or T can be subject like a beneficiary, a location, an instrument, etc. My assumption is that the above-mentioned subject is the only obligatory argument and anything other than the subject is basically optional.

By the way, there are some clues as to the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs. Solely intransitive verbs do not have corresponding absolutive voice forms. Intransitive verbs have imperative forms in the nominative voice. Transitive verbs use imperative forms in the absolutive voice when the object is definite, but they use imperative forms in the nominative voice when a seeming object is not marked definite or a definite object is absent.

- (18) M-i-sotro-a rano¹⁹⁾ ara+dalàna, sotro-y tsikelikely izany
 NV-VM-drink-IMP water according.to+rule, drink-AV.IMP little.by.little it
 ‘Drink water regularly, drink it little by little’

(Centre Médical Claym 2021)

This example (18) is from an entry in Facebook by a medical center in Madagascar. It has nominative voice imperative *misotroa* and absolutive voice imperative *sotroy* of the verb *misotro/sotroina* (drink). The initial *misotroa* is in the nominative voice because the object *rano* is indefinite. The initial *sotroy* in the second clause is in the absolutive voice because the object is a (definite) pronoun *izany* (it), which refers to the object introduced in the previous clause and is a topic (or antitopic) in the second clause.

18) My nominative voice, absolutive voice, and circumstantial voice are named active voice, passive voice, and relative voice in many of the literature (Stark 1969, Moriyama 2003).

19) A determinerless noun phrase in the object position of a nominative voice verb is not case marked. Stark (1969) and Moriyama 2003) state that a noun phrase with the definite article *ny* (the) is also caseless in the object position of a nominative voice verb.

The following subsections are classified roughly according to the hierarchy of two-place predicates shown in Tsunoda (2009 [1991]: 101).

2. 1. Direct impact with a change in the patient

Let us take a look at the examples from my field research in Tokyo. We start with the absolutive voice, continue with the nominative voice, and end with the circumstantial voice for each verbal root.

- (19) a. *Vàki=ko* *io* *kilalao* *io*
 Break.RAV=I.GEN that toy that
 ‘I broke that toy’
- b. (Ho) *vaki-0=ko* *io* *kilalao* *io*
 (FUT) break-AV=I.GEN that toy that
 ‘I will break that toy’

Some verbal roots are used in the absolutive voice form without any affixation. I gloss such a form RAV (root absolutive voice²⁰⁾). The initial word of the example (19a) *vàki=ko* is a RAV form and if you detach the genitive²¹⁾agent enclitic pronoun *=ko* (I.GEN), what is left is *vàky*. Example (19b), on the other hand, has an absolutive voice affix *-ina*, but it is not visible as such. The *a* of *-ina* is a paragogic vowel. A paragogic *a* is attached at the end of a word or an enclitic phrase to avoid the word or the enclitic phrase ending in a consonant since Malagasy syllables have the form ((N)C)V²²⁾ and a syllable, a word (without an enclitic), or an enclitic phrase cannot end in a consonant. Then the *n* in *-ina* drops before the enclitic pronoun *=ko* (I.GEN). Finally, the *i* in *-ina* is absorbed by the final *i* in the verbal root, but the fact that there is the *i* is manifested in the location of the word stress. Thus, *vàki=ko* in (19a) and *vaki-0=ko* in (19b) are differentiated only by the location of the stress.

For the suffixed *vaki-0=ko*, it is written everywhere in the literature (Stark 1969, Moriyama 2003) that its future tense counterpart is made by the prefix *ho-*. But my language consultant says *vaki-0=ko* can be used in the future sense without the prefix *ho-* and it can still have a future meaning. Probably the clause in the absolutive voice is perfective which happens to be interpreted as future perfective here. Thus, (19a) and (19b) without the prefix *ho-* are a minimal pair differen-

20) In the literature where they use the label passive for my absolutive voice, this is called root passive (Moriyama 2003).

21) Genitive enclitic pronouns and the genitive forms made from a noun are used as a possessor of a noun and an agent for the verbs in the absolutive voice forms and the circumstantial voice forms. You can say that the genitive case is used for the genitive proper and the ergative case. Such a form is generally named “genitive” in Austronesian linguistics. But other terms can be used like relative case in Eskimo/Inuktitut/Greenlandic grammars (cf. Fortescue 1984, Miyaoka 2012).

22) The N in ((N)C)V is a nasal consonant which is homorganic to the following C. In any case, Malagasy syllables are basically open syllables.

tiated only by the location of the stress. TAM-wise *vàki=ko* is perfective (19a) and *vaki-0=ko* is future (perhaps future perfective) (19b).

- (20) *Vàky io kilalao io*
 Be.broken that toy that
 ‘That toy is broken’

If you detach the agent enclitic *=ko* from the predicate verb in (19a), you get *vàky* in (20). Its sole argument is *io kilalao io* (that toy that) and you can see that the patient in (19a) and the sole argument or the subject in (20) is the only obligatory argument in the absolutive voice forms.

- (21) *Vaki-na io côcô io vao azo ho-han-ina*
 Break-AV that coconut that only.then can FUT-eat-AV
 ‘That coconut needs to be broken, only then it will be able to be eaten’

When you detach the agent enclitic *=ko* from *vaki-0=ko* in (19b), you get *vaki-na* in (21). There is no overt modal marker in (21), but it bears some modal nuances in the English translation.

Let us take a look at nominative voice forms of the same verbal root.

- (22) *H-am-àky an=io kilalao io aho*
 FUT.NV-VM-break ACC=that toy that I
 ‘I will break that toy’
- (23) *N-am-àky an=io kilalao io aho*
 PST.NV-VM-break ACC=that toy that I
 ‘I broke that toy’

The (22) is in the future tense and the (23) is in the past tense. My language consultant says that (22, 23) cannot be made into the present tense form as such. It needs some modifications.

- (24) a. *M-am-àky kilalao aho*
 NV-VM-break toy I
 ‘I break toys’
- b. *M-am-àky an=ity kilalao ity aho*
 NV-VM-break ACC=this toy this I
 ‘I am breaking this toy’

Medial²³⁾ demonstrative *io* in (22, 23) and the present tense in (24a, b) don’t belong together semantically. If you strip away the demonstrative *io*, also the accusative proclitic *an=* disappears

23) Medial means between distal and proximal although Malagasy demonstratives are classified not in three ways by distality/proximity but rather in six to seven ways (Cf. Adelaar 2010) and they are theoretically doubled by the choice of visible prefix *i-* and invisible prefixes *i-za-*. But only some of the *i-za-root* forms are used. The *izany* in (12b, 18) is one such form.

too. Then you get a customary reading of the present tense as in (24a). Otherwise, a proximal demonstrative *ity* can be used instead of the medial *io*, then you get a present (progressive) reading.

- (25) a. N-am-àky an=io kilalao io ve ianao?
 NV.PST-VM-break ACC=that toy that PQ you
 ‘Did you break that toy?’
- b. Een, n-am-àky aho
 Yes, NV.PST-VM-break I
 ‘Yes, I broke (it)’
- c. Een, n-am-àky an=io aho
 Yes, NV.PST-VM-break ACC=that I
 ‘Yes, I broke it’

For the polar question (25a), the answer can be either (25b) or (25c). In nominative voice clauses, the nominative argument is obligatory, but the accusative patient is optional. The accusative pronominal *an=io* (ACC=that) can be optionally stated (25c), but the clause also can be without the accusative phrase (25b).

Finally, I show you circumstantial clauses.

- (26) a. N-am-aki-a=ko côcô ilay vahiny
 PST-VM-break-CV=I.GEN coconut the guest
 ‘I broke a coconut for the guest’
- b. N-am-aki-ana côcô ilay vahiny
 PST-VM-break-CV coconut the guest
 ‘A coconut was broken for the guest’
 ‘On a ouvert une noix de coco pour l’invité(e)’ (French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘One opened a nut of coco for the guest’ (English translation of the above)

In the circumstantial clauses, the subject is anything other than S, A, P, and T. It can be semantically a beneficiary, a location, an instrument, etc. In (26a, b), the subject is taken as the beneficiary. The circumstantial construction is like the applicative construction. The difference is a beneficiary, a location, an instrument, etc. become the object in the applicative construction whereas they become the subject in the circumstantial construction. The semantic adjunct which becomes the subject in the circumstantial construction is the only obligatory argument. The genitive agent clitic *=ko* (I) in (26a) can be taken off as in (26b). For (26b), a passive translation can be used in English, but you can use the indefinite agent/subject *on* in French. As for the caseless indefinite *côcô*, the claim that it is an object as a core argument is problematic. Minoura (2021: 65) argues that a bare noun phrase can be an indefinite object, indefinite means of transportation or motion, indefinite core nominal in existential construction, and the second subject in the so-called double-subject construction (*Lava orona ilay/ny elefanta* (long nose the/the elephant, the elephant is nose-wise long). They are not the typical core nominals. They are more like oblique

objects in antipassive voice clauses in the languages which have the construction since they are less individuated patients (LAP). Moreover, the caseless indefinite object in (18) *rano* does not make the predicate to be in the absolutive voice imperative form *sotro-y* (drink-AV.IMP) but it is actually preceded by the nominative voice imperative form *m-i-sotro-a* (NV-VM-drink-IMP), which suggests that the clause is intransitive.

I have another verb root/stem (*a*)*fana* (warm).

- (27) N-afanà-ina ny vary.sosoa/kafe/ronono
 PST-AV-warm-AV the porridge/coffee/milk
 ‘The porridge/coffee/milk was warmed up’
 ‘On a réchauffé la bouillie/le café/le lait’ (French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘One warmed up the porridge/coffee/milk’ (English translation of the above)
- (28) N-afanà-i=ko ny vary.sosoa/kafe/ronono
 PST-AV-warm-AV=I.GEN the porridge/coffee/milk
 ‘I warmed up the porridge/coffee/milk’

In the absolutive voice clauses above, you can see that the patient subject is obligatory while the genitive agent is optional.

Let us take a look at nominative voice clauses with the same verb root.

- (29) a. N-an-afāna kafe ve ianao?
 NV.PST-VM-warm coffee PQ you
 ‘Did you heat coffee?’
- b. N-an-afāna vātana ve ianao?
 NV.PST-VM-warm body PQ you
 ‘Did you put on warm clothes lit. did you warm up your body?’
- c. Een, n-an-afāna (tsara) aho
 Yes, NV.PST-VM-warm (good) I
 ‘Yes, I heated some (well)/yes, I put on warm clothes (well)’

The (29a, b) are both polar questions and (29c) is an answer to both. The agent subject remains in the answer (29c) here.

Let us take a look at circumstantial examples.

- (30) N-an-afanà-0=ko ronono ianao
 PST-VM-warm-CV=I milk you
 ‘I warmed up milk for you’

In this example (30), *ianao* (you) is the subject and the beneficiary.

- (31) N-an-afanà-0=ko rano ianao mba ah-afah-a=nao m-andro
 PST-VM-warm-CV=I water you so.that VM-be.free-CV=you NV-bathe
 ‘I warmed up water for you so that you can shower with it’

The first half of (31) is almost the same as (30). The second half of it is a purposive clause. The circumstantial subject *iana* (you) turns into a genitive agent enclitic =*nao* (=you) in the second half. The circumstantial subject in the second half must be left unuttered (*ny rano* ((with the water))).

I have some examples with the verb root *vono* (kill).

- (32) Vonò-i=nay amin=ny famadihana ilay kisoa
 kill-AV=we.EXCL.GEN OBL=the famadihana the pig
 ‘we will kill the pig at the famadihana²⁴⁾’
- (33) N-am-òno kisoa izahay t-amin=ny famadihana
 NV.PST-VM-kill pig we.EXCL PST-OBL=the famadihana
 ‘We killed a pig at the famadihana’
- (34) a. N-am-onò-ana kisoa ilay famadihana/lanonana
 PST-VM-kill-CV pig the famadihana/lanonana
 ‘A pig was killed for the famadihana/lanonana’
 b. N-am-onò-a=nay kisoa ilay famadihana/lanonana
 PST-VM-kill-CV=we.EXCL pig the famadihana/lanonana
 ‘We killed a pig for the famadihana/lanonana’

Example (32) is in the absolutive voice, (33) is in the nominative voice, and (34) is in the circumstantial voice. The (32) has the patient subject *ilay kisoa* (the pig). The (33) has the agent subject *izahay* (we.EXCL). The (34) has the circumstantial subject *ilay famadihana/lanonana* (the famadihana/lanonana) with a causal/beneficiary(?) meaning. The genitive agent =*nay* (we.EXCL) in (34b) is unexpressed in (34a).

2. 2. Direct impact without a change in the patient

In place of the root *vaky* (break) in section 2.1., I have the root *daka* (kick) here.

- (35) Dakà-na io alika io fa masiaka/maditra
 Kick-AV that dog that for be.fierce/be.mischievous
 ‘That dog needs to be kicked for it is fierce/mischievous’

The dog (35) is the patient subject in this absolutive voice construction. If you add a genitive agent clitic =*ko* (=I), you get *dakà-0=ko* (kick-AV=I.GEN).

Let us take a look at nominative voice examples.

24) Famadihana is a funerary tradition of Malagasy people which is also called turning of the bones. They say that they change the silk cloths, which is called *lamba mena* (cloth red), covering the bones of the ancestors. They do not take off the old silk cloths, but the new silk cloths are used to wrap up the bones and the old cloths. The feast of abundant festive food, music, and dancing are parts of the famadihana. Lanonana is also a feast with music and dancing.

- (36) N-an-dàka an=io alika io aho
 PST-VM-kick ACC=that dog that I
 ‘I kicked that dog’
- (37) a. N-an-dàka an=io alika io ve ianao?
 PST-VM-kick ACC=that dog that PQ you
 ‘Did you kick that dog?’
- b. Aan, tsy n-an-dàka (aho)
 No, not PST-VM-kick (I)
 ‘No, (I) didn’t kick it’

The (37b) is an answer to the (37a). My language consultant says that even the agent subject can be unexpressed here unlike in (25b). Is it because it is a negative answer and the focus has shifted to the negation? That is only my wild guess.

As for the circumstantial examples with the verbal root *daka* (kick), I could not come up with an English or Japanese source sentence that makes any sense. But my language consultant came up with examples with the verbal root *kapoka* (hit/slap) for the three voice forms.

- (38) No-kapòh-in=ny reni=ny ilay zaza satria tsy mianatra/maditra
 PST-slap-AV=the mother=her/his the child because NEG study/be.mischievous
 ‘Her/his mother slapped the child because (s)he does not study/(s)he is mischievous’
- (39) Kapòh-ina amin=ny karavasy ilay omby satria tsy mety mandroso
 Beat-AV OBL=the whip the cow because NEG willing move.forward
 ‘The cow is going to be beaten with a whip because it refuses to move forward’

The examples (38, 39) are in the absolutive voice. In both cases, the main clauses (the first half) in the absolutive voice and the reason clauses (the second half) in the nominative voice have a common subject each, i.e. *ilay zaza* (the child), *ilay omby* (the cow).

- (40) a. Voa-kàpoka ilay zaza satria tsy mianatra/maditra
 VOA-slap the child because NEG study/be.mischievous
 ‘The child was slapped because (s)he does not study/(s)he is mischievous’
- b. Voa-kàpoky ny reni=ny²⁵⁾ ilay zaza satria tsy mianatra/maditra
 VOA-slap the mother=3S the child because NEG study/be.mischievous
 ‘The child was slapped by her/his mother because (s)he does not study/(s)he is mischievous’
- (41) Voa-kàpoka t-amin=ny karavasy ilay omby satria tsy mety mandroso
 VOA-beat PST-OBL-the whip the cow because NEG willing move.forward
 ‘The cow was beaten with a whip because it refuses to move forward’

25) The noun phrase *ny reni=ny* (the mother=her/his) is a genitive agent and the definite article *ny* changes the paragogic vowel *a* of *voa-kàpoka* (VOA-slap) into *y* (40b) by regressive assimilation.

The passive forms with the *voa-* prefix are counted as absolutive voice forms, but they have different nuances from absolutive forms without an affix and with a different affix (*a-*, *-ina*, *-ana*). The *voa*-absolutive forms are perfective. When the genitive agent enclitic is present (40b), the agent is less volitional than in other absolutive voice forms.

- (42) N-i-kàpoka omby t-amin=ny karavasy izy
 V.PST-VM-beat cow PST-OBL=the whip (s)he
 ‘(S)he beat a cow with a whip’
- (43) N-i-kapòh-a=ko azy mba h-i-arov-a=ko anao
 PST-VM-slap-CV=I him/her so.that FUT-VM-protect-CV=I you.ACC
 ‘I slapped him/her so that I could protect you’

The (42) is in the nominative voice and the two clauses in (43) are both in the circumstantial voice. Unlike in (31) with the two circumstantial clauses, the first half of (43) does not have a personal noun phrase in the subject position. It seems that the second clause starting with *mba* (so. that) is the subject of the first clause with the purposive meaning and the circumstantial subject of the second clause must be the first clause (by my beating him/her). The two circumstantial voice clauses use each other as the circumstantial subjects. The second circumstantial voice clause acts as the purposive subject of the first clause. The first circumstantial voice clause acts as the means subject of the second clause.

- (44) Dòn-i=ko t-any Analakely ilay rafi+vavi=ko
 Bump.into-AV=I.GEN PST-there PN the rival+female=my
 ‘I bumped into my husband’s girlfriend in Analakely’
- (45) Voa-dòna t-any Analakely ny sandri=ko
 VOA-hit PST-there PN the shoulder=my
 ‘My shoulder got hit in Analakely’

The (44) is a regular absolutive voice clause and the (45) is a *voa*-absolutive voice clause. Both examples are not marked for tense in the verb²⁶⁾ but are marked for the past tense in the location phrase *t-any Analakely* (PST-there PN). The two examples do not seem to differ much in volitionality. (They are both low in volitionality.) The agent in (44) is not in control of the event. In (45), the patient subject is *ny sandri=ko* (the shoulder=my). The owner of the shoulder (I) is not a participant in the sentence itself.

- (46) N-if-an-dòna t-aman=olona t-any Analakely aho
 NV.PST-RECIP-VM-hit PST-OBL=person PST-there PN I
 ‘I bumped into a person in Analakely’

26)) *Dòn-i=ko* (44) could be marked with a past prefix as in *no-dòn-i=ko* (PST-bump.into-AV=I.GEN) according to prescriptive grammars (cf. Stark 1969, Moriyama 2003), but my language consultant did not use the past-tense prefix here unlike in (38), which has the *no-* (PST).

- (47) An-dòn-ana vera ny fahafaha=nao
 VM-hit-CV glass the success=your
 ‘(We) clink glasses for your success’

The (46) is in the nominative voice with a reciprocal prefix and the (47) is in the circumstantial voice. The circumstantial subject of (47) is *ny fahafaha=nao* (the success=your). It is a purposive subject.

2. 3. Perception

Let us take a look at perception verbs. We take verbs of sight and hearing. Malagasy has a different volitional verb root for sight and a non-volitional verb root for sight, i.e. *hita* (see), *jery* (look.at). But *heno/haino* (hear/listen to) is used for both volitional hearing and non-volitional hearing. (There is also non-volitional hearing verb root *re/renes* (hear, touch, taste, smell), but I do not deal with it in this paper since my language consultant did not come up with examples with the root spontaneously.)

Let us first take a look at the examples with *hita* (see) in the root absolutive voice.

- (48) a. Hita avy lavitra ilay tendrombohitra
 See.RAV from (a)far the mountain
 ‘The mountain is visible from afar’
 b. Hita=ko avy lavitra ilay tendrombohitra
 See.RAV=I.GEN from (a)far the mountain
 ‘I see the mountain from afar’

In these examples above, the difference is only the existence of the genitive agent enclitic =*ko* (=I) in (48b). The English translations look quite different, but for Malagasy speakers, they are not different as much. In any case, it is fairly easy to see that the only obligatory argument is the patient subject *ilay tendrombohitra* (the mountain) while the genitive agent enclitic =*ko* (=I.GEN) is optional. Let us look at the nominative voice form and the circumstantial voice form.

- (49) N-a-hita an=ilay tendrombohitra avy lavitra aho
 NV.PST-VM-see ACC=the mountain from afar I
 ‘I saw the mountain from afar’
 (50) A-hità-0=ko an=ilay tendrombohitra ity fahita+lavitra ity
 VM-see-CV=I.GEN ACC=the mountain this seer+far this
 ‘I see the mountain with this telescope’

In (50), the telescope, with which the person sees the mountain, is not marked for case. Instead, the circumstantial voice marking in the verb shows that the subject *ity fahita+lavitra ity* (this seer+far this, this telescope) is a tool. If this tool was to be used with AV verbs and NV verbs, it would be marked with an oblique case marker *amin=ity fahita lavitra ity* (OBL=this seer far this, with this telescope).

The root *heno/haino* (hear) can be used for both volitional and non-volitional hearing.

- (51) *Hèno=ko avy lavitra ny dia+tongotr=ao*
 Hear.RAV=I.GEN from afar the step+foot=your
 ‘I hear your foot steps from afar’

The root absolutive voice form (51) seems non-volitional. The suffixed absolutive voice form (52) seems somewhat more volitional.

- (52) *Henò-i=ko amin=nyzoki²⁷=ko ny momba anao*
 Hear-AV=I.GEN OBL=the older.sibling=my the about you
 ‘I hear from my older sister the whatnot about you OR
 I listen to what my older sister talks about whatnot about you’

My language consultant said that the “I” is listening to what the older sister talks about “you” volitionally or with intention. Thus, the absolutive voice *hèno=ko* (hear.RAV=I.GEN) and the suffixed absolutive voice *henò-i=ko* (hear-AV=I.GEN) are different in volitionality in these examples.

The same root is used for intentional listening in the nominative and circumstantial voice forms.

- (53) *M-i-haino radiô/vaovao izy/aho*
 NV-VM-hear radio/news (s)he/I
 ‘(S)he/I listen(s) to the radio/news’
- (54) *H-i-haino-a=ny hira ilay oridinatera*
 FUT-VM-hear-CV=(s)he.GEN song the computer
 ‘(S)he listens to the songs with the computer’

The (54) has the instrumental subject *ilay oridinatera* (the computer) and it is not case-marked, but the circumstantial voice marking in the verb shows that it is a tool.

- (55) *Jerè-na avy lavitra fotsiny izy*
 Look-AV from afar only her/him/it
 ‘(S)he/it can be just spotted from afar’
- (56) *M-i-jèry avy lavitra fotsiny izy*
 NV-VM-look from afar only (s)he
 ‘(S)he is looking from afar in vain’

27)) Malagasy has two sibling name systems. One is *zoky* (older sibling) and *zandry* (younger sibling). The other system consists of the following items: *rahavavy* (same-sex sister), *rahalahy* (same-sex brother), *anabavy* (opposite-sex sister), *anadahy* (opposite-sex brother).

The examples (55, 56) differ from each other only in the predicate verb. (55) has the verb in the absolutive voice and (56) has the verb in the nominative voice. The common subject *izy* ((s)he/it) is the patient subject in (55) and the agent subject in (56).

The same root is put in the circumstantial voice in (57).

- (57) (H-)i-*jerèv-ana* sary m-i-hetsika ilay televiziônina
 (FUT-)VM-look-CV picture NV-VM-move the television
 ‘(I) am watching/will watch a movie on the television’
 ‘On regarde/regardera le film à la télévision’ (French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘One watches/will watch the movie on the television’ (English translation of the above)

In (57), the agent is not specified, but it can be understood to be the first person singular from the situation. But it also can be taken as the first person plural.EXCL/INCL, third person singular/plural although the agent is not specified.

2. 4. Pursuit

Now we take a look at pursuit verbs.

- (58) *Andràs-a=ko* eto ianao
 Wait-AV=I.GEN here you
 ‘I wait for you here’
- (59) *M-i-àndry* anao aho
 NV-VM-wait you.ACC I
 ‘I wait for you’
- (60) *I-andràs-a=ko* anao ny vali=n=ilay fanontaniana
 VM=wait-CV=I.GEN you.ACC the answer=LK²⁸⁾=the question
 ‘I am waiting for you for the answer to the question’

In the above examples (58-60), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (58) and in the circumstantial voice (60). The patient is accusative-marked in the nominative voice (59) and in the circumstantial voice (60). The circumstantial voice clause (60) also has a caseless subject with an adjunct-like meaning *ny vali=n=ilay fanontaniana* ((for) the answer to the question).

We take a look at examples with the root/stem *tady/tadiav* (look.for).

- (61) *Tadiàv-i=ko* ny pôketra=nao
 Look.for-AV=I.GEN the wallet/handbag=your
 ‘I am looking for your wallet/handbag’

28) The linker (LK) has nothing to do with the LK in Japanese. In Malagasy the LK is used in a possessive construction in the form *possessum=LK=possessor* in a simplified formula. The possessum and the possessor can be preceded by a determiner each.

- (62) M-i-tàdy trano/vady aho/izy
 NV-VM-look.for house/spouse I/(s)he
 ‘I am/(s)he is looking for a house/spouse.’
- (63) a. I-tadiàv-ana vady izy
 VM-look.for-CV spouse (s)he
 ‘A spouse is sought for her/him’
 ‘On cherche un(e) époux(se) pour elle/lui’ (French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘One is looking for a spouse for her/him’ (English translation of the above)
- b. I-tadiav-a=ko vady izy
 VM-look.for-CV=I.GEN spouse (s)he
 ‘I am looking for a spouse for her/him’

In the above examples (61, 62, 63b), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (61) and the circumstantial voice (63b). The patient is not case marked because it is indefinite in the nominative voice (62) and the circumstantial voice (63a, b). The circumstantial voice clauses (63a, b) also have a case-wise unmarked subject with a beneficiary meaning *izy* ((s)he). In example (63a), the agent is not specified and the clause can be translated with a passive in English and with an indefinite-subject construction in French.

2. 5. Knowledge

We take a look at examples with the root *fantatra* (know).

- (64) a. Fàntatr=o ianao fa japoney
 Know.RAV=I.GEN you that Japanese
 ‘I know you are Japanese lit. I know you that you are Japanese’
- b. Fàntatr=o ianao fa efa m-a-hay
 Know.RAV=I.GEN you that already NV-VM-be.able
 ‘I know you are able lit. I know you that you are already able’
- (65) M-aha-fàntatra anao aho
 NV-VM-know you.ACC I
 ‘I know you’
- (66) Aha-fantàr-a=ko anao ny bika=nao
 VM-know-CV=I.GEN you.ACC the figure=your
 ‘I recognize you by your body figure’

In the above examples (64a, b, 65, 66), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (64a, b) and in the circumstantial voice (66). The patient is accusative-marked in the nominative voice (65) and in the circumstantial voice (66). The circumstantial voice clause (66) also has a caseless subject with a meaning of the reason (=the clue) *ny bika=nao* ((by) your body figure).

We take a look at the examples with the root *hadino* (forget).

- (67) Hadino=*n=ilay zaza* ny leso=*ny*
 Forget.RAV=LK=the child the lesson=*her/his*
 ‘The child forgot her/his lesson’
- (68) M-an-adino lesona ilay zaza
 NV-VM-forget lesson the child
 ‘The child forgets her/his lesson’
- (69) a. An-adinò-ana ilay fahoriana ny m-i-sotro (toaka)
 VM-forget-CV the suffering the NV-VM-drink (rum)
 ‘The suffering gets forgotten by drinking (rum)’
 ‘On oublie la souffrance en buvant (du rhum)’ (French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘One forgets the suffering by drinking (rum)’ (English translation of French)
- b. An-adinò-ana ilay fahoriana ny f-i-sotro (toaka)
 VM-forget-CV the sorrow the NMZ-VM-drink (rum)
 ‘The sorrow gets forgotten by drinking (rum)’
 ‘On oublie la souffrance en buvant (du rhum)’ (French translation with an INDEF A)
 ‘One forgets the suffering by drinking (rum)’ (English translation of French)

In the above examples (67, 68), both the agent and the patient are specified. In (69a, b), the agent is not specified. The agent is genitive-marked²⁹⁾ in the absolutive voice (67). The patient is caseless because they are indefinite in the nominative voice (68). In (69a, b), the patient also is not case-marked although it is definite. If it was accusative-marked, it would be *an=ilay fahoriana* (ACC=the sorrow). The circumstantial voice clauses also have a caseless subject with an instrumental meaning (69a, b). In *ny m-i-sotro (toaka)* (the NV-VM-drink (rum)) in (69a), the verb is not morphologically nominalized, but it is made into a noun phrase by the placement of the definite article *ny* (the) in front of the verb in the nominative voice. In (69b), the verb is nominalized by the prefix *f-*.

Finally in this subsection, we take a look at the examples with *(ha)zava* (explain).

- (70) Hazavà-i=ko ami=nao ny heritreritr=o
 Explain-AV=I.GEN OBL=you the thought=my
 ‘I am going to explain my thoughts to you’
- (71) a. Hazavà-o ami=ko izany fa tsy hai=ko
 Explain-AV.IMP OBL=me that for NEG understand.RAV=I.GEN
 ‘Explain that to me for I do not get it’
- b. Hazavà-o ami=ko ny heritreritr=ao
 Explain-AV.IMP OBL=me the thought=your
 ‘Explain your thoughts to me’
- (72) a. M-an-azàva lesona izy
 NV-VM-explain lesson (s)he
 ‘(S)he explains a lesson’

29) The phrase *=n=ilay zaza* is not a morphological genitive, but it is in the same form as the possessor in the possessive construction: *ny reni=n=ilay zaza* (the mother=LK=the child, the child’s mother).

- b. M-an-azàva ny heritreri=ny ami=ko izy
 V-VM-explain the thought=her/his OBL=me (s)he
 ‘(S)he explains her/his thoughts to me’
- c. M-an-azàva ny heritreritr-o ami=ny aho
 NV-VM-explain the thought=my OBL=her/him I
 ‘I explain my thoughts to her/him’
- (73) An-azavà=0=ko ny heritreritr=o ianao
 VM-explain-CV=I.GEN the thought=my you
 ‘I will explain my thoughts to you’

The clauses with the predicate verb with *(ha)zava* (explain) are typically three-place (trivalent) clauses³⁰. They typically have an agent (the one who explains), a theme (what is explained), and a recipient (the one to whom things are explained). The agent is expressed by a genitive enclitic in the absolutive voice clause (70) and in the circumstantial voice clause (73). The agent is expressed as the subject in the nominative voice clauses (72a, b, c). The agent is not expressed in the absolutive imperative clauses (71a, b). The theme is a caseless non-subject in the nominative clauses (72a, b, c) and in the circumstantial clause (73). The theme is the subject in the absolutive clause (70) and in the absolutive imperative clauses (71a, b). The recipient takes an oblique form in the absolutive clause (70), in the absolutive imperative clauses (71a, b), and in the nominative clauses (72b, c). The nominative clause (72a) does not have a recipient. Finally, the recipient is the subject in the circumstantial clause (73).

Unlike what is written in the literature (cf. Stark 1969, Moriyama 2003), when the patient is definite, my language consultant prefers to use the absolutive voice forms rather than the nominative forms, but with the three-place clauses, she seems to be comfortable with a definite and caseless theme in the nominative clauses (72b, c).

2. 6. Emotion

In this subsection, we look at examples with the root *tia* (love). Moriyama (2003) among others states that the nominative voice form is not used for this root. Stark (1969) states that the root form *tia* without a prefix complex starting with an *m-* (in the form *m-(VM-)*) is used as the nominative voice form³¹. A dictionary (Andro Vaovao 1973) states that the form *mitia* (love) is

30) With the three-place (trivalent) clauses with the root *ome* (give), the recipient in the absolutive voice clause and in the nominative voice clause would be marked accusative in place of the oblique preposition in the above examples.

31) A protestant hymn for children, *Tia Zaza*, which is made using the melody of Swedish or Scandinavian songs, *Björnen Sover* (The Bear is Sleeping) and *Gubben Noak* (The Old Man Noah), actually uses the root nominative *tia* (love). It starts with *Tia zaza, tia zaza ny Jesosi=nay* (love child, love child the Jesus=our, our Jesus loves children, loves children). The definite article in front of a person’s name is usually *i* instead of *ny*. My guess is that the more unmarked *ny* is used to converge to the children’s speech level.

obsolete, but can be found in certain expressions. But my language consultant says that the form *mitia* (love) is back in regular use.

- (74) *Tia=ny ny voninkazo*
 Love.RAV=(s)he.GEN the flower
 ‘(S)he loves the flowers’
- (75) *M-i-tia voninkazo izy*
 NV-VM-love flower (s)he
 ‘(S)he loves flowers’
- (76) *I-tiäv-a=ny ny voninkazo ny fofo=ny*
 VM-love-CV=(s)he.GEN the flower the smell=its
 ‘(S)he loves the flowers because of their smell’

In the above examples (74-76), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (74) and in the circumstantial voice (76). The patients are not case marked in the nominative voice (75) and in the circumstantial voice (76), but the patient is indefinite in the nominative voice (75) and definite in the circumstantial voice (76). The circumstantial voice clause (76) also has a caseless subject with the meaning of the reason *ny fofo=ny* ((because of) its/their smell).

I am not sure if the predicate verbs with the root *ila* (need) are emotional verbs, but the examples below truly express emotions or feelings.

- (77) *Ilà-i=ko ianao*
 Need-AV=I.GEN you
 ‘I need you’
- (78) *M-ila anao aho*
 NV-need you.ACC I
 ‘I need you’
- (79) *Ilà-0=ko anao ity asa ity*
 Need-CV=I.GEN you.ACC this work this
 ‘I need you for (because of) this work’

In the above examples (77-79), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (77) and in the circumstantial voice (79). The patient is accusative marked in the nominative voice (78) and in the circumstantial voice (79). The circumstantial voice clause (79) also has a caseless subject with the meaning of the reason *ity asa ity* ((for/ because of) this work this).

2. 7. Relationship

I have examples with the root *anana* (have).

- (80) Anàn-a=ko ny vola
 Have-AV=I.GEN the money
 ‘I have the money’
- (81) M-ànana vola aho
 NV-have money I
 ‘I have money’
- (82) M-ànana vola roa arivo ariary any ami=nao aho
 NV-have money two thousand ariary there OBL=you I
 ‘You owe me 2,000 ariary lit. I have money of 2,000 ariary at you’
- (83) Anàn-a=ko vola roa arivo ariary ianao
 Have-CV=I.GEN money two thousand ariary you
 ‘You owe me 2,000 ariary lit. I have money of 2,000 ariary at you’

In the above examples (80-83), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (80) and in the circumstantial voice (83). Note that the forms *anàn-a=ko* (have-AV/CV=I.GEN) are identical for both the absolutive voice and the circumstantial voice. The patient is indefinite and is not marked for case both in the nominative voice (80) and in the circumstantial voice (83). The circumstantial voice clause (83) also has a caseless subject with the meaning of the location *iana* ((at) you). Note that *at you* is expressed *any ami=nao* (there OBL=you) in (82) when it is a non-subject.

2. 8. Ability

I have examples with the root *hay* (be.able).

- (84) Hài=ko ny m-a-handro
 Be.able.RAV=I.GEN the NV-VM-cook
 ‘I can cook’
- (85) M-a-hày m-a-handro aho
 NV-VM-be.able NV-VM-cook I
 ‘I can cook’
- (86) A-haiz-a=ko m-a-handro ianao
 VM-be.able-CV=I.GEN NV-VM-cook you
 ‘I am able to cook thanks to you’
- (87) A-haiz-a=ko m-i-teny malagasy
 VM-be.able-CV=I.GEN NV-VM-speak Malagasy
 ny m-i-araka ami=nao
 the NV-VM-be.together OBL=you
 ‘I can speak Malagasy because I am with you’

In the above examples (84-87), both the agent and the patient are specified. The agent is genitive-marked in the absolutive voice (84) and in the circumstantial voice (86, 87). The patient is the verb *m-a-handro* (NV-VM-cook). Note that the verb is handled like a regular noun. The verb takes the definite article when it is the patient subject in the absolutive-voice clause (84), but it does not take the definite article in the absolutive voice clause (85) and in the circumstantial voice clause (86). The verb *m-i-teny* (NV-VM-speak) is also caseless in the circumstantial voice clause (86). The circumstantial voice clauses (86, 87) also have a caseless subject each with the meaning of the gratitude *iana* ((thanks to) you, 86) and with the meaning of the reason *ny m-i-araka ami=nao* (the NV-VM-be.together OBL=you, (because) I am with you)

2. 9. Sectional summary

2. 9. 1. Clarification of the voice system

As for the case-marking patterns, Malagasy does not seem to enjoy a diverse case-marking system according to the hierarchy of two-place predicates unlike Japanese and English (Tsunoda 1985, 2009 [1991]: 97-100) and unlike Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993). The agent and the patient take an appropriate case marking according to the voice of the predicate as shown in the table below:

<Table 3>Case assignments according to the voice of the predicate^{32/33)}

	Agent	Patient	Anything other than S/A/P/T	
			One of the above	The rest
AV	genitive	subjective ³²⁾	an appropriate adjunct form for each	
NV	subjective	accusative ³³⁾ or caseless	an appropriate adjunct form for each	
CV	genitive	accusative or caseless	subjective	an appropriate adjunct form for each

It is the same pattern all the way through from “direct impact” (2.1., 2.2.) to “ability” (2.8.) to take Tsunoda’s (2009 [1991]: 101) hierarchy of two-place predicates. According to Tsunoda (ibid.), the “direct impact” (2.1., 2.2.) is the most typically transitive predicate and the “ability”

32) What is named subjective case acts as the absolutive case in the absolutive voice clauses and as the nominative case in the nominative voice clauses. The subjective case in the circumstantial voice clauses have various semantic roles other than S, A, P, and T, but it has the same form as the above-mentioned absolutive case and the nominative case.

33) The patient is caseless instead of being marked accusative if it is indefinite in the nominative voice and in the circumstantial voice clauses. The nominative voice clause with an indefinite object is sort of between transitive and intransitive. It looks transitive because it has an (indefinite) patient. But when a nominative voice with an indefinite and caseless object is made into an imperative form, it uses the nominative voice imperative form like intransitive nominative clauses (cf. 18) instead of the absolutive voice imperative form like the regular transitive nominative voice clauses with a definite patient. Whether to call such a clause intransitive or semitransitive or antipassive or something else is up to the integrity and systematicity of the descriptive grammar of the language as a whole.

the non-perfective clauses. Melikishvili (2008) states that Georgian is an active/ergative split language. For the imperfective series of verb forms³⁵, the core arguments are marked in the active pattern (rather than the widely believed nominative pattern) while the agents are marked ergative for the aorist series, which consist of aorist and optative, and the agents are marked dative for the perfective series, which consist of perfect, pluperfect, and perfect subjunctive.

It seems that the TAM comes first in Hindi/Urdu and Georgian ergative split patterns and voice (absolutive voice vs. nominative voice) comes first in Malagasy, but the absolutive voice and the nominative voice in Malagasy differ from the TAM perspective too. Minoura (2014: 86-87) has the following examples.

- (91) a. N-am-òno lalitra izy
 NV.PST-VM-kill fly (s)he
 ‘(S)he killed a fly’
- b. No-vonò-i=ny ilay lalitra
 PST-kill-AV=(s)he.GEN the fly
 ‘(S)he killed a fly intentionally’
- c. Voa-vòno=ny ilay lalitra
 VOA-kill=(s)he.GEN the fly
 ‘(S)he killed a fly unintentionally’

Minoura (ibid.) states that the absolutive voice clause (91b) is [+ control, + volitional] and the voa-absolutive voice clause (91c) is [-control, -volitional]. He also states that the nominative voice clauses are [± control, ± volitional], but this case (91a) is to be read [+ control, + volitional]. My present view differs from what Minoura (2014: 106) states, but another dimension can be added, i.e. the nominative voice clause (91a) is [-telic], the absolutive voice clause (91b) is [+telic], and the voa-absolutive voice clause (91c) is [+telic]. If you use Tsunoda’s (1999) volitionality and affectedness, the nominative voice clause (91a) is [+volitional, -affected], the absolutive voice clause (91b) is [+volitional, +affected], and the voa-absolutive voice clause (91c) is [-volitional, +affected]. The nominative voice form *n-am-ono* (NV.PST-VM-kill) (91a) can mean *hit with a fist*. Then the speaker is not concerned with the patient of the verb to be actually dead or not as a result. The patient in the nominative voice clause is a less affected patient. Malagasy is a language in which you can say “I killed him, but he didn’t die.” The caseless and indefinite patient in the nominative voice clause (and in the circumstantial voice clause) goes in line with the Vigus’ (2018) less affected patient (LAP) and less individuated patient (LIP) describing the case-wise demoted patient in the antipassive constructions in languages which have the constructions. On the other hand, Miyaoka’s (2012, 2015) description of the antipassive constructions in Central Alaskan Yupik includes unintentionality. The unintentionality is not borne by the nominative voice clauses in Malagasy but rather by the voa-absolutive voice clauses (cf. [-volitional] ⇔ [-intentional]). In

35) The imperfective series of verbal forms include the following TAM: present, imperfect, present subjunctive, future, conditional, and future subjunctive.

an interpretation, the Malagasy nominative voice can be considered a kind of antipassive to the absolutive voice counterpart and the Malagasy absolutive voice can be considered passive to the nominative voice counterpart. To go back to the TAM perspective, the absolutive voice and the voa-absolutive voice are perfective while the nominative voice is imperfective. In this way, the voice opposition in Malagasy has some resemblance to the TAM-related split ergativity. Moreover, perfectivity is more salient in Malagasy absolutive voice clauses than the tense (cf. 19-20). On the other hand, the threefold tense (PST, PRS, FUT) is regularly marked in the nominative voice clauses (cf. 22-24).

2. 9. 4. Kôno's single-limb languages and double-limb languages revisited

When it comes to Kôno's (1989, Kamei et al. 1996c, d) single-limb languages/double-limb languages dichotomy, Malagasy seems to be a double-limb language. Malagasy requires at least a predicate and a subject. But the subject is not always an agent. The subject is the patient in the absolutive voice clauses, the agent in the nominative voice clauses, and something or somebody other than the agent or the patient/theme in the circumstantial voice clauses.

<Table 4>Malagasy core nominals and peripheral nominals

	Core nominals	Peripheral nominals
Obligatory	A subject (which is • P/T/S in AV • A/S in NV • Anything other than A/S/P/T in CV)	
Optional	Non-subject core nominal(s)	Adjunct(s)

Malagasy clauses require a predicate and just one subject. Other seemingly core nominals, i.e. A in the absolutive voice clauses, P/T in the nominative voice clauses, and A/S/P/T in circumstantial voice clauses, are optional. Adjuncts and R, which are not the subject in the circumstantial clauses, are optional.

The optionality of A in absolutive voice clauses can be seen in (19a, 20), (19b, 21), (27, 28), (35), (39), (40a, b), (41), (48a, b), and (55). The optionality of P/T in the nominative voice clauses can be seen in (14, 15), (16, 17), (25a, b), and (56). The optionality of S/A in the circumstantial voice clauses can be seen in (26a, b), (34a, b), (47), and (69a, b). I do not have examples of the optionality of P/T in the circumstantial voice clauses. However, when you have the P/T manifested in the caseless indefinite form, it is not a full object but rather like a demoted oblique object in the languages which have antipassive construction.

2. 9. 5. A little bit of the history of Malagasy voice system

Adelaar (2010: 5) states that the voice affixes in Proto-Austronesian have the corresponding forms

in Malagasy, but the non-actor voice affixes have merged into a general passive (my absolutive voice).

<Table 5>The correspondence between Proto-Austronesian and Malagasy voice affixes (Adelaar ibid.)

	Proto-Austronesian	Malagasy	
Actor Voice	*m-, *<um>	m-	Nominative Voice
Undergoer Voice	*-ən	-ina	Absolutive Voice (The affixes are almost allo-morphs.)
Locative Voice	*-an	-ana	
Instr./Recip. Voice	*Si-	a-	

Adelaar (ibid.) further states that the new voice category, the circumstantial voice was made in Malagasy by formally taking the actor voice prefix (my nominative voice prefix *m-* (NV) plus the valency marker³⁶⁾ (VM)) and the locative voice suffix *-ana* and taking the *m* off of the actor voice prefix. Adelaar (2011) on another occasion pointed out that the new circumstantial voice came about with the stimuli from Bantu languages' applicative forms, which promote various non-core nominals to the object position. Malagasy circumstantial voice, on the other hand, promotes various non-core nominals to the subject position.

Conclusion

Malagasy has a three-voice system: absolutive voice (AV), nominative voice (NV), and circumstantial voice (CV) (2.9.1.). The agent is genitive-marked, which functions as ergative. The patient is accusative-marked. Non-core nominals, i.e. any dependents of the predicates other than S/A/P/T are marked according to their function. But in the absolutive voice clauses, the P (or S) is subjective(=absolutive)-marked. In the nominative clauses, the A (or S) is subjective(=nominative)-marked. In the circumstantial clauses, one of the non-core nominals, i.e. any dependents of the predicates other than the S/A/P/T, is subjective marked. It means that the oblique and/or adjunct-case marking is stripped when possible.

Malagasy voice system can be related to split ergativity (2.9.3.).

When it comes to Kôno's single-limb/double-limb languages, Malagasy is a double-limb language, but only a subject (P(S) in AV, A(S) in NV, and one of the non-core nominals in CV) is obligatory. The rest of the core nominals are not obligatory unlike in Western European languages. And a history of Malagasy voice system is summarized in passing in 2.9.5.

36) Adelaar (ibid.) thinks that the *m-* is part of the actor voice prefix together with my VM, which interpretation is comparative-Austronesian-wise more appropriate than my analyses. Furthermore, the Proto-Austronesian actor voice infix *<um> is vestigially present in Malagasy, but it is obsolete. It can be found in set expressions like *m-a-zoto-a h<om>ana* (NV-VM-be.diligent-IMP eat<om>eat, bon appétit! lit. diligently eat!). The *h<om>ana* can be found for example in older editions of the Bible, but in contemporary speech, it is replaced by *m-i-h<in>ana* (NV-VM-eat<in>eat) with one of the regular NV prefix compound *m-i-* (NV-VM-) and another non-productive infix <in> (undergoer voice??).

References

- Adelaar, Sander. (2010). "The story of Malagasy," the handout for a lecture at La Trobe University, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, September 30, 2010.
- (2011). "Bantu-Austronesian contact phenomena in coastal East Africa," a paper given at the Institute of Language Researches, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, November 30, 2011.
- Andro Vaovao. (1973). *Diksonera Malagasy-Anglisy (Malagasy-English Dictionary)*. Trano Printy Loterana.
- Centre Médical Claym. (2021). "Mitandrema hatrany (Always be careful)," an entry in Facebook, December 7, 2021. <https://www.facebook.com/Centre-Médical-Claym-768071060036077/photos/2039146326261871/> (retrieved on September 23, 2022).
- Fortescue, Michael D. (1984). *West Greenlandic (Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars)*. Routledge Keegan & Paul.
- Haspelmath, Martin. (1993). *A Grammar of Lezgian (Mouton Grammar Library)*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2001). "The European linguistic area: Standard Average European," Haspelmath, Martin, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals*, pp. 1492-1510. Walter de Gruyter.
- (2010). On S, A, P, T, and R as comparative concepts for alignment typology https://www.eva.mpg.de/fileadmin/content_files/staff/haspelmt/pdf/OnSAPTR.pdf (retrieved on September 23, 2022).
- Keenan, Edward L. (1976). "Remarkable Subjects in Malagasy," Li, Charles (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, pp. 247-301. Academic Press.
- Kiyose, Gisaburô Norikura. (2013) (清瀬義三郎則府) . *Nihongo Bumpô Taikai Shinron – Hasei Bumpô no Genri to Dôshi Taikai no Rekishi (A New Argument for the System of Japanese Grammar – The Principles of Derivational Grammar and the History of the Verbal System)*. Hitsuji Shobô.
- Kamei, Takashi, Rokurô Kôno, & Eiichi Chino (eds.) (1989) (亀井孝、河野六郎、千野榮一) . *Gengogaku Daijiten, Dai-2-kan, Sekai Gengohen, Chû (The Great Dictionary of Linguistics, Volume 2, Languages of the World, Middle Volume)*. Sanseidô.
- (eds.) (1996a). *Gengogaku Daijiten, Dai-6-kan, Jutsugohen (The Great Dictionary of Linguistics, Volume 6, Linguistic Terms)*. Sanseidô.
- (1996b). "Gengo Rengô (Sprachbund)," Kamei et al., pp. 500-503.
- (1996c). "Hogo (Complements)," Kamei et al., p. 1304.
- (1996d). "Tanshi gengo to ryôshi gengo (Single-limb languages and double-limb languages)," Kamei et al., p. 896.
- Kôno, Rokurô. (1989). "Nihongo no tokushitsu (The characteristics of the Japanese language)," Kamei et al., pp. 1574-1588.
- Melikishvili, Irine (2008). "Georgian as an active/ergative split language," *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Science, vol. 2, no. 2*, pp. 138-147.
- Minoura, Nobukatsu (2013) (箕浦信勝) . "Event integration pattern in Malagasy," *Area and Culture Studies, no. 86*, pp. 63-86. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- (2014). "Madagasakarugo no tadôsei ni kanshite (On the transitivity in Malagasy)," *Gogaku Kenkyûsho Ronshû (Transaction of the Institute for Language Studies), no. 19*, pp. 85-108. Institute for Language Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- (2021). "On and around "double-subject sentences" in Malagasy and Malagasy Sign Language (TTM)," *Area and Culture Studies, no. 102*, pp. 49-76. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Mirdehghan, Mahinnaz & Nader Jahangiri (2005). "Split-Ergative Morphology in Hindi/Urdu, Pashto & Balochi languages," *International Journal of Humanities, vol. 12 (3)*, pp. 93-122. Tarbiat Modares University.
- Miyaoka, Osahito. (2012) (宮岡伯人) . *A Grammar of Central Alaskan Yupik (CAY) (Mouton Grammar Library)*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2015). "Go 'to wa Nani ka – Saikô: Nihongo Bumpô to 'Moji no Otoshiana' (What is the 'Word' – Revisited: Japanese Grammar and 'The Pitfall of Written Language). Sanseidô.

- Moriyama, Takumi (森山工). (2003). *Madagasukarugo Kaki Gengo Kenshū Tekisuto Bumpōhen (The Textbook for the Summer Language School, Malagasy, Grammar)*. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Stark, Elsie. (1969). *Malagasy Without Moans*. Trano Prinity Loterana.
- Tallerman, Maggie. (1998). *Understanding Syntax, fourth edition*. Routledge.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. (1985) (角田太作). "Remarks on transitivity," *Journal of Linguistics* 21, pp. 385-396.
- (1999). "Transitivity and Intransitivity," *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, no. 57, 9 pages. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- (2009 [1991]). *Sekai no Gengo to Nihongo, Gengo Ruikeiron kara Mita Nihongo, Kaiteiban (The Languages of the World and Japanese, the Japanese Language Examined from the Point of View of Linguistic Typology, Revised)*. Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Vigus, Meagan (2018). "Antipassive constructions: Correlations of form and function across languages," *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 339-384.