

On benefactive person agreement marker in Malagasy Sign Language (TTM)

マダガスカル手話 (TTM) の受益者人称一致標識に 関して

MINOURA Nobukatsu

箕浦 信勝

Institute of Global Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
東京外国語大学大学院総合国際学研究院

Introduction

1. Background information

- 1.1. Person agreement marker (PAM)
- 1.2. Sociolinguistics of TTM
- 1.3. BEN with sociolinguistic and other variations

2. Examination of the data

- 2.1. Clause-initial topicalized R (with or without BEN)
- 2.2. Non-clause-initial R or beneficiary without BEN
- 2.3. Non-clause-initial R with BEN
- 2.4. Beneficiary BEN with an overt object
- 2.5. BEN reduction
- 2.6. Malagasy-like HO preceding BEN

Summary

Keywords : Malagasy Sign Language (TTM), sign language linguistics, person agreement marker (PAM), benefactive, SAPTR, sociolinguistic variation

キーワード : マダガスカル手話 (TTM)、手話言語学、人称一致標識 (PAM)、受益者、SAPTR、社会言語学的変異

【Abstracts】

TTM has a BEN PAM (benefactive person agreement marker), which is used to mark beneficiary adjuncts and R arguments. The BEN can be pronominal or prepositional with an object. I treated them together in this paper. The BEN in question varies in its form. It can be followed by IX (indexing) and it can be preceded by a particle HO. The IX is obligatory when the



BEN is not followed by an object noun and when the IX marks plurality. When the IX is singular, the IX is optional. The BEN can be preceded by a particle HO and it shows that the clause is leaning more toward the Malagasy register. Moreover, usually two-handed BEN can be reduced to a one-handed sign.

When the clause-initial R argument is an overt noun, it does not require a BEN, but when the clause-initial R argument is pronominal, it is represented by a BEN. In a non-clause-initial position, R takes the form of IX when unambiguous, but it takes the form of BEN when ambiguous. Beneficiary BEN also sometimes takes an overt object.

マダガスカル手話 (TTM) は BEN PAM (受益者人称一致標識) を持っている。BEN は受益者付加語句および R 項を標示する役割を担っている。BEN は代名詞的だったり、目的語を採る前置詞的だったりする。本稿ではそれら 2 つを区別せずに扱った。BEN はその形式にバリエーションがある。BEN は、IX (人差し指によるポインティング) が後続することもあり、またマダガスカル語的であり、TTM 的ではない不変化詞 HO が先行することがある。その IX は、複数のときには必須であるが、単数のときには任意である。BEN に不変化詞 HO が先行することがあり、これは当該の節が TTM レジスターよりは、マダガスカル語レジスターに寄っていると示す。さらに、通常両手で表現される BEN は、利き手の片手表現に弱化することがある。

節頭の R 項が、明示された名詞である場合には、BEN は要求されない。他方、節頭の R 項が代名詞的である場合には BEN の形式を採る。節頭以外の位置においては、曖昧さがなければ、R 項は IX の形を採り、曖昧さが回避できないときには、R 項は BEN の形を採る。また受益者標示の BEN はときに明示的目的語を採る。

Introduction

In this paper, I will discuss how benefactive person agreement marker (BEN) is used in Malagasy Sign Language (Tenin'ny Tanana Malagasy, TTM), which is used among deaf people in Madagascar. The data is taken from my field note from my field work in Antananarivo, August 2016 with my language consultant M^{mce} Raobelina Nivo Haingo Holy Tiana Eva unless otherwise noted. M^{mce} Eva jotted down sentences on notebooks using Malagasy words. She was always aware that the sentences should be in TTM of the deaf people but not in written Malagasy. Although the sentences have been written using Malagasy words, many of the sentences are ungrammatical according to the written Malagasy grammar. After writing some pages, M^{mce} Eva would sign the sentences to my video camera, with which I would record her signing. Later I

went over the video recording while looking at the notebooks with M^{me} Eva's writing and made corrections. That is to say that I added words, erased words, and/or changed word orders since sometimes M^{me} Eva did not sign exactly in the same way as she had written in the notebooks.

In this paper, the data are represented in five lines like in Minoura (2010: 184). Instead of trying to transform all of M^{me} Eva's writings into the lines of 'labels' just like I did in Minoura (2008), I am showing M^{me} Eva's writings and labels separately just like I did in Minoura (2010). This way, linguistically untrained Malagasy people, both deaf and hearing, can read the first line and can partially know what is talked about.

(1) hankany	Behoririka	izy ← what M ^{me} Eva has written
go.there.AV.FUT	place.name	(s)he ← the glosses of the written words
MANKANY	BEHORIRIKA	IX3 ← labels of TTM signs
go.there	place.name	(s)he ← the glosses of the TTM signs
'(s)he will go to Behoririka' (Minoura 2010:184)		

The line 1 represents what M^{me} Eva has written with the glosses in the line 2. The line 3 represents the labels to the signs¹⁾ and the line 4 being the glosses to the labels of the signs. I tried to make one-to-one correspondences between the labels and the signs, but this effort has not been completed, i.e. there are some many-to-one and one-to-many correspondences left. It is inevitable for now as spoken/written Malagasy and TTM have different categorization in their lexicons and in their grammars.

1. Background information

Padden (1980) Argued that American Sign Language verbs are classified into plain, agreement, and spatial verbs. Agreement verbs agree with persons. The persons involved are, in current typological terms, S in monovalent verbs (\rightleftharpoons intransitive verbs), A and P in divalent verbs (\rightleftharpoons (mono)transitive verbs), A and R in trivalent verbs (\rightleftharpoons ditransitive verbs)²⁾. Spatial verbs encode source, goal, manner, path, etc. It is generally and roughly the same in all the natural sign languages. (Artificially constructed sign languages like Manually Coded English does not have inflections which can be observed in agreement verbs and spatial verbs in other natural sign languages (Supalla 1991).

Malagasy Sign Language (Tenin'ny Tanana Malagasy, TTM) also has plain, agreement, and

spatial verbs.

1. 1. Person agreement marker (PAM)

Mathur and Rathmann (2002) started to use the term ‘person agreement marker (PAM).’ (Another term AUX, which stands for auxiliary, has been in use for similar categories even before that in Japan and elsewhere.) PAM marks agreement outside of the lexical verb. TTM, as far as I know for now, does not seem to have PAM to mark A and P/R agreement for plain verbs, but it has benefactive PAM, which I call BEN here. BEN marks beneficiary and optionally also the A argument. The manual expression, i.e. the signifier (Fr. signifiant) expressed by hands, of the BEN originates in lexical verb MANOME (give) and looks almost identical with it. The mouthing³⁾ is different between the lexical verb MANOME and the BEN if the deaf signer mouths. Mouthing, however, is not obligatory and the frequency of mouthing can differ quite considerably among signers⁹⁾.

BEN in TTM is used for the two following purposes: 1. to mark a beneficiary adjunct, 2. to mark optionally an R argument. BEN can sometimes take an object, which makes it look more like a preposition than a canonical BEN, but I treat the canonical BEN and the prepositional BEN together in this paper. When the status of the R argument is clear, i.e. when it cannot be mistaken for A or T, the canonical BEN is not used, but simple IX⁹⁾ is used instead (Minoura 2008, 2014). When the status of R argument is clear and there is a noun phrase for the R argument, the preposition BEN is not used.

That sometimes happens when the R argument comes after V and close to it.

1. 2. Sociolinguistics of TTM

Sociolinguistic divergence in TTM depends on several factors. First of all, there is regional divergence, i.e. TTM has regional dialects as reported by Lalaniaina Lucie Rasolonirina (p.c.). The regional divergence probably is not as great as in spoken Malagasy since TTM is a relatively young language.

Secondly, there is historically motivated and consciously manipulated divergence. The foundation of TTM was established at the first deaf school in Madagascar, namely at Fo.Fa.Ma in Antsirabe, which was established in 1960 by Norwegian and Malagasy Lutheran churches. Teachers at Aka.Ma school of the deaf in the capital of Antananarivo, on the other hand, try to introduce new signs into TTM for they think TTM does not have big enough vocabulary or for

some other reasons. Their neologisms include number signs⁶⁾ and separate signs for RENY (mother) and VEHIVAVY (woman), which used to be expressed by the same manual expression formerly. The neologisms do not instantly replace old signs, but instead, they give TTM signers variations to choose from when signing. They add riches to TTM, but probably not in the way the teachers at Aka.Ma have intended since both old signs and new signs remain and they are mixed together in usage.

Thirdly, there is influence from spoken/written Malagasy on TTM. One can talk about prototypical TTM register, which undergoes little influence from spoken/written Malagasy and Malagasy register of TTM, which undergoes considerable influence from spoken/written Malagasy. M^me Eva used to call the former *tenin'ny tanana marenina* (deaf sign language) and the latter *tenin'ny tanana mandre* (hearing sign language). But the dichotomy between the TTM register and the Malagasy register is not clearcut at all. They form a continuum with the two registers at each end instead. M^me Eva can go back and forth between TTM register and Malagasy register seamlessly and some little elements from Malagasy register can enter her TTM when she is predominantly using the TTM register. M^me Eva consciously tries to use the TTM register when I am consulting her, but sometimes she goes over to the Malagasy register probably without thinking much. M^me Eva tends to use Malagasy register after reading newspapers, after thinking about making a speech (*kabary*), and when telling preexisting stories. (When she is telling her own stories, she tends to lean more toward the TTM register. But in recent years, I notice that she puts bits of Malagasy influence into her signing after she has received some trainings for the deaf leaders of the country. Moreover, some bits of Malagasy influence get popular among deaf signers of TTM now and then for some reasons. For example, I see the Malagasy definite article NY a lot more often in recent years than before. It is not obligatory unlike in the standard spoken/written Malagasy yet, but it is ubiquitous. It coexists with the TTM deictic pointing IO, which sometimes marks non-obligatory definiteness. In fact, NY and IO are identical in manual expression, i.e. pointing at a neutral space with the index finger, but NY precedes the noun like in spoken/written Malagasy while IO mostly follows the noun⁷⁾, which does not coincide with anything in spoken/written Malagasy. The traits of Malagasy register can be seen in the use of NY (the) (16, 18), the use of a clause-initial verb (13, 14, 17, 18), demonstrative sandwiching of NP (17), and the use of HO in front of BEN (21).

1.3. BEN with sociolinguistic and other variations

In section 1.1, I wrote that BEN is manually identical with the lexical verb MANOME (give). But in actuality, this statement is oversimplified. The BEN which is manually identical with MANOME can be augmented by preceding and/or following signs and can undergo some formal reduction.

BEN can be followed by IX. Then it appears that the BEN is acting as a preposition (19, 20). The IX is obligatory when the beneficiary is pronominal and plural. Moreover, when TTM leans toward Malagasy register, pronominal and singular IX can follow BEN.

BEN can be preceded by a particle HO. This is utilized to materialize the *ho* part in spoken/written Malagasy for the benefactive expressions in TTM. It is totally unnecessary from the TTM's point of view. Let us compare a Malagasy (2) and a Malagasy-register TTM (3) examples:

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| (2) | ho | an-dRaso | (Malagasy) |
| | for | ACC-woman's.name | |
| | | 'for Raso' | |
| (3) | ho | an-dRaso | |
| | for | ACC-woman's name | |
| | HO | BEN-3 ⁸ RASOA | (Malagasy-register TTM) |
| | for | BEN-3 woman's name | |
| | | 'for Raso' | |

As for reduction, TTM BEN is made with two hands, but in a reduced form, it can be expressed by a single dominant hand.

BEN complex can be described in the following formulae:

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|----------------------------|
| (4) | BEN | (IX) | (TTM-register TTM) |
| (5) | HO | BEN | IX (Malagasy-register TTM) |

HO is employed to make signs look more parallel to Malagasy although the benefactive meaning is already carried by BEN in TTM, while *ho* and ACC are both needed in spoken/written Malagasy to convey the benefactive meaning.

2. Examination of the data

I will examine actual data in the sections below.

2.1. Clause-initial topicalized R (with or without BEN)

I have a few examples with a clause-initial topicalized R.

(6)	olona	io	ianao	inona	manome?
	person	that	you	what	give.AV.PRES
	OLONA	IO ⁹⁾	IX2	INONA	MANOME-3?
	person	the	you	what	give-3?
	R		A	T	

‘what are you giving the person?’ (Minoura 2008:64)

(7)	ho	anao	fanomezana	aho	manome
	for	you.ACC	gift	I	give.AV.PRES
	BEN-2		FANOMEZANA	IX1	1-MANOME-2
	you(R)		gift	I	1-give-2
	R		T	A	

‘I give you a gift’ (ibid.)

(8)	olon+tia=ny	notolora=ny		voninkazo
	person+love=GEN3	present.TV ¹⁰⁾ .PST=GEN3		flower
	OLONA+TIA=IX3	MANOLOTRA-3=IX3		VONINKAZO
	Person+love=his/her	present-3=(s)he		flower
	R		A	T

‘(s)he presents his/her lover (a) flower(s)’

When the clause-initial R argument is an overt noun, it does not require a BEN (6, 8), but when the clause-initial R argument is pronominal, it is represented by a BEN (7).

2.2. Non-clause-initial R without BEN

Non-clause-initial R frequently does not require BEN, but there are exceptions.

(13) naharesy	izy;	notolorana	
win.AV.PST	(s)he;	present.TV.PST	
MAHARESY	IX3;	MANOLOTRA(DIR);	
win	(s)he;	present(DIR)-3;	
		R	
		medaly	
		medal	
MANOLOTRA(INV)-3(RS)		MEDALY	
present(INV)-3(RS)		medal	
	R	T	
'(s)he won; (somebody) presented him/her a medal; (s)he was presented a medal'			

This example (13) has three semantically connected clauses in TTM. The second clause consists only of a verb. The third clause has an overt T argument and the R argument is not expressed by an overt noun phrase. M^{me} Eva signed MANOLOTRA in the direct form and then signed again MANOLOTRA in the inverse form immediately after it. The MANOLOTRA in the inverse form in this case requires referential shifting (= role shifting), where the third person is physically aligned with the signer's space for non-shifted first person¹¹). The R arguments in the second and the third clauses are understood from the verbal inflection, i.e. the third person in the direct form of the verb and the referentially shifted third person (which physically coincides with the first person) in the inverse form of the verb.

2.3. Non-clause-initial R or beneficiary with BEN

(14) nanolotra	fisaorana	feno	ho	anao	izy
present.AV.PST	thanks	full	for	you.ACC	(s)he
MANOLOTRA-2	FISAORANA	FENO	BEN-2		IX3
present-2	thanks	full	you(R)		(s)he
	T		R		A
'(s)he gave you a lot of thanks'					

In the example (14), the R argument is not in the clause-initial position, but it is marked by BEN. If it were expressed by IX, it would be hard to decide whether the second person is the R or

the third person. Therefore, the second person R is marked by BEN. By the way, the BEN is not preceded by HO. The verb-initial word order suggests that it leans ore toward Malagasy register, but the lack of HO before BEN implies that it is not fully in the Malagasy register.

(15)	boky	io	novidia=ko	ho	ahy	
	book	the	buy.TV.PST=I	for	me.ACC	
	BOKY	IO ¹²⁰	MIVIDY	BEN(INV)-1		IX1
	book	the	buy	for.me		I
	P			beneficiary		A
	'I bought the book for myself'					

For the example (15), M^{me} Eva wrote an encliticized pronoun =ko following the theme-voice past-tense form novidia(na) in her notebook, but she did not sign IX1 there when I was filming her. She signed the IX1 at the end of the clause instead. I am not sure if it is idiosyncratic to M^{me} Eva or generally true for TTM, but she tends to sign pronominal index signs where necessary. Therefore, M^{me} Eva's TTM is not a so-called pro-drop language in that sense.

Take a look at the example below (16):

(16)	mpiasa tia	miofana;		aho	manome
	worker like	get.trained.AV.PRES;		I	give.AV.PRES
	MPIASA TIA	MIOFANA;		IX1	1-MANOME-3
	worker like	get.trained;		I	1-give-3
				A	
	fahaizana	tsara	ho an'ny	mpiofana	
	skill	good	ho ACC-DEF	trainee	
	FAHAIZANA	TSARA	1-BEN-3	NY	MPIOFANA
	skill	good	1-BEN-3	DEF	trainee
	T			R	
	'workers like getting trained; I give the trainees good skills'				

In the example (16), the R argument is marked by BEN. It may be caused by the fact that there are two signs between the verb and the R argument, which means that the T argument

between the verb and the R argument is not light/short enough. Moreover, M^{mc} Eva signed a Malagasy-like definite article NY in front of MPIOFANA (trainee). When she wrote the example down in her notebook she did not write the NY, but she signed it spontaneously when I was filming her sign. The second clause in (16) starting with IX1 (I) is not a perfect Malagasy sentence, but the NY (the) is an influence from the Malagasy register.

2.4. Beneficiary BEN with an overt object

In the following examples, the BEN is used in order to mark beneficiary rather than R and takes an object. It probably is acting as a preposition, but I am reluctant to clearly state that the prepositional BEN is totally different from the PAM. For the time being, I treat them together with PAM. This treatment may be wrong when compared with other sign languages, but for TTM, it seems right.

(17) misokatra	ho an'ny	rehetra io toerana	io
be.open.AV.PRES	ho ACC-DEF	all that place	that
MISOKATRA	BEN-3	REHETRA IO TOERANA	IO ¹³
be.open	for	all that place	that
		beneficiary S	
‘that place is open to everybody’			

This example (17) has a couple of Malagasy-like traits, i.e. the clause-initial placement of the verb and the sandwiching of the noun phrase by demonstrative IOs. BEN-3 takes an object REHETRA (all) and acts like a preposition. It may be safe to state that the example (17) is completely in the Malagasy register except for the lack of HO unlike in (21) in the section 2.6.

(18) novaki=ko	ho an'ny	zandri=ko	ny boky
read.TV.PST=I	ho ACC-DEF	younger.sibling=	my the book
MAMAKY=IX1	1-BEN-3	ZANDRY=IX1	NY BOKY
read=I	for	younger.sibling=	my the book
A		beneficiary	P
‘I read the book for my younger sibling(s)’			

This example (18) also has a couple of Malagasy-like traits, i.e. the clause-initial placement of the verb and the use of the optional definite article NY¹⁴.

2.5. BEN reduction

Let us contrast some examples with or without reduction in the manual expression of BEN. The example (19) has two-handed BEN, i.e. BEN in full form:

(19) fianarana	vita;	mirary	soa
study	finish;	wish.AV.PRES	luck
FIANARANA	VITA;	MIRARY	SOA
study	finish;	wish	luck
			T
ho	azy	roa	
for	3PL.ACC	two	
BEN(2H)-3		IX3.DU	
for.them		them.two	
			R

‘Now that the study has finished, (I)¹⁵ wish them two a luck’

In the above example (19) with two semantically-related clauses, the BEN is expressed in a full form, i.e in two-handed form.

(20) mirary	soa	ho	azy	roa;
wish.AV.PRES	luck	for	3PL.ACC	two
MIRARY	SOA	1-BEN(1H)-3		IX3.DU
wish	luck	for them		two
		T	R	
vita	soa	fianarana		
finish	luck	study		
VITA	SOA	FIANARANA		
finish	luck	study		

‘(I) wish them two a luck, now that the study has finished with luck’

The example (20) has very similar constituents as (19) but with a different word order. Moreover, the BEN in (20) is expressed with one hand. That is a reduction in form or what Battison (1974) called weak drop (also cf. Nishio 2009). Weak-drop is a realization of canonically two-handed sign with one hand, which is usually the dominant hand.

2. 6. Malagasy-like HO preceding BEN

In the following example (21), I will show that HO precedes the BEN in some clauses that M^{me} Eva signed.

(21) mirary	soa	ho	anao
wish.AV.PRES	luck	for	you(ACC)
MIRARY	SOA	HO	1-BEN(1H)-2
wish	luck	for	for.you
			beneficiary
ho	tonga+soa	any	an-tanàna
FUT	come+well	there	ACC-town
	TONGA+SOA	ANY	TANÀNA
	come+luck	there	town

“(I) wish you that you will arrive safely in your home town”

In this example (21), the BEN is preceded by HO, which is redundant in TTM, but it just popped in so as to correspond with the *ho* in spoken/written Malagasy. On the other hand, the future marker *ho* and the accusative marker *an-* in spoken/written Malagasy were not manually realized. In fact, I have not seen the accusative marker *an-* anywhere in my TTM data that I have gathered since 2004. The future marker *ho*, which is homophonous with the *ho* (for), can possibly be realized by the same sign as the HO before the BEN in this example.

Summary

I will sum up important points in the previous sections. TTM has a BEN PAM (1.1), which is used to mark beneficiary adjuncts and R arguments. The BEN can be pronominal or prepositional with an object. The BEN in question varies in its form. It can be followed by IX (19, 20) and it can be preceded by HO (21). The IX is obligatory when the BEN is not followed by an

object noun and when the IX marks plurality or duality (19, 20). When the IX is singular, the IX is optional. The BEN can be preceded by HO (21) and it shows that the clause is leaning more toward the Malagasy register (2.6). Moreover, usually two-handed BEN can be reduced to a one-handed sign (20, 21).

When the clause-initial R argument is an overt noun, it does not require a BEN (6), but when the clause-initial R argument is pronominal, it is represented by a BEN (7). In a non-clause-initial position, R takes the form of IX when unambiguous, but it takes the form of BEN when ambiguous. Beneficiary BEN also sometimes takes an overt object. Then it may not be a canonical PAM but rather a preposition, but I treated the pronominal and the prepositional PAMs together in this paper.

Notes

- 1) The labels are written with all capitals.
- 2) For S, A, P, T, and R terms, see Haspelmath (2011).
- 3) Mouthing related to sign language production is the movement of the signer's mouth as if (s)he is pronouncing the corresponding word in a spoken language of the area. The speech sound can be audible or inaudible. The spoken language of choice for TTM signers, if they mouthe, is spoken Malagasy. But you also encounter spoken French and spoken Norwegian mouthing on very rare occasions. When mouth gesture is used, it blocks the mouthing.
- 4) M^{me} Eva mouthes a lot, while her husband mouthes considerably less.
- 5) IX is indexing made usually with a handshape with only index finger extended.
- 6) Traditional number signs use two hands where necessary, but Aka.Ma's new number signs use only the dominant hand.
- 7) The NY used to have another manual form, namely the U-handshape of the dominant hand touching the palm of the B-handshape of the non-dominant hand, but the form identical with IO seems to have survived the competition.
- 8) BEN-3 is inflected for the third-person beneficiary or R argument.
- 9) This IO marks optional definiteness and/or topicality in the TTM register.
- 10) The three voice forms in spoken/written Malagasy are actor voice (AV), theme voice (TV), and circumstantial voice (CV), which are not transferred to TTM in one-to-one correspondence. Theme voice is thus named because S argument and P argument are unmarked in TV and it follows the absolutive-ergative pattern. But the unmarked argument includes also actor-like S argument. In the traditional description of the Malagasy grammar, the three voices are named in the following fashion: active voice, passive voice, relative voice (Rajemisa Raolison 1969, Andro Vaovao 1973). TTM rather has a voice system of its own consisting of direct voice (DIR) and inverse voice (INV).
- 11) In TTM, first person uses the space right in front of the signer. The second person uses the direction of the actual or imagined interlocutor. The third person uses the space to the right, the space to the left, and idiosyncratically to TTM, the space over the left shoulder, or more precisely, over the shoulder of the non-dominant-hand side. When referential shifting sets in, this configuration changes. Typically, the third person is made in the space of the physical first person. It probably has something to do with the topi-

cality of the third-person argument. See Mandel (1977) for more information on referential shifting (role shifting).

- 12) The demonstrative IO is sometimes used where a definite article would be required in spoken/written Malagasy. It is more TTM-like and not Malagasy-like in that it does not sandwich the noun phrase here. In spoken/written standard Malagasy, the sandwiching of a noun phrase by the demonstratives is obligatory.
- 13) A noun phrase sandwiched by demonstratives is certainly a Malagasy thing away from TTM register. M^{me} Eva uses this sandwiching more and more recently than before, but not always.
- 14) The definite article NY is not used as frequently as in spoken/written standard Malagasy.
- 15) In the examples (19) and (20), the actor “I” or IX1 does not appear. This contradicts my statement in the section 2.3 that TTM is not a pro-drop language. My explanation to this situation is that the expression MIRARY SOA (wish luck) is an idiomatic expression used without the actor just like in English “thank you” or in TTM MISAOTRA (thank you).

Abbreviations

1 (first person), 1H (one-handed), 2 (second person), 2H (two-handed), 3 (third person), AV (actor voice), BEN (benefactive PAM), DIR (direct), DU (dual), FUT (future), INCL (inclusive), INV (inverse), PAM (person agreement marker), PL (plural), PRES (present), PST (past), RS (referential/role shifting), TTM (Malagasy Sign Language, Tenin'ny Tanana Malagasy), TV (theme voice).

References

- Andro Vaovao 1973
Diksonera Malagasy Anglisy (Malagasy-English Dictionary), Antananarivo: Andro Vaovao sy Trano Printy Loterana
- Battison, Robbin 1974
 “Phonological deletion in American Sign Language”, *Sign Language Studies* 3:5, 1-19
- Haspelmath, Martin 2011
 “On S, A, P, T, and R as comparative concepts for alignment typology”, *Linguistic Typology*, 15-3: 535-568.
- Mandel, Mark 1977
 “Iconic devices in American Sign Language”, Friedman, Lynn (ed.), *On the Other Hand: New Perspectives on American Sign Language Research*, Academic, 57-107
- Mathur, Gaurav and Christian Rathmann 2002
 “Is verb agreement the same cross-modally?”, Meier, Richard et al. (eds.), *Modality and Structure in Signed Languages and Spoken Languages*, Cambridge University Press, 370-404
- Minoura, Nobukatsu 2008
 “Word Order in Malagasy Sign Language (TTM)”, *Area and Culture Studies*, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 77:47-69
- 2010
 “Relativization or Nominalization in Malagasy Sign Language (TTM)”, *Area and Culture Studies*, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 81:183-228
- 2014
 “On S, A, P, T, and R in Malagasy Sign Language (TTM)”, *Journal of Institute of Language Research*, Institute of Language, Research, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 19:1-20
- Nishio, Rie 2009
 “Corpus-based analysis of Weak Drop and Weak Prop in German Sign Language (DGS)”, slides of a

paper presented at the workshop “Sign Language Corpora: Linguistic Issues” held at University College London on 24-25, July, 2009

Padden, Carol 1980

A Basic Course in American Sign Language, TJ Publishers

Rajemisa Raolison, Régis 1969

Grammaire Malgache, 6ème Édition, Fianarantsoa: Centre de Formation Pédagogique,

Supalla, Samuel 1991

“Manually Coded English: The Modality Question in Signed Language Development”, Siple, Patricia and Susan Fischer (eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research, Volume 2: Psychology*, University of Chicago Press, 85-109