

論文の英文要旨

論文題目	Clitics in Degema: A Meeting Point of Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax
氏名	Kari, Ethelbert Emmanuel

This dissertation provides a detailed description of clitics in Degema, a Niger-Congo language of the Delta Edoid sub-family spoken in Nigeria, noting that cliticization in Degema brings together different levels of grammatical description, such as phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, including pragmatics.

Chapter One presents pieces of information which include a brief historical background of the Degema people, earlier descriptions of the language, and a brief discussion on clitics. It is pointed out that the name *Degema* does not refer exclusively to either Usokun-Degema or Degema Town but to both. Also noted is the fact that it is wrong to call the Degema language *Atala* or *Udekaama*. It is explained that *Atala* is the indigenous name of the dialect spoken by the Degema Town people, while *Udekaama* is the name of the clan comprising the two Degema-speaking communities – Usokun-Degema and Degema Town.

Chapter Two discusses aspects of the grammar of Degema, which have direct relevance to the discussion on clitics in Degema. The aspects of the grammar that are discussed include phonology, morphology, and syntax. In the section on phonology, vowels and vowel harmony, consonants, tone and syllable types are discussed. The section on morphology concentrates on nominal and verbal morphology. Among the things that are considered are noun class prefixes and genders, verbal extensions, and the morphology of modifying nominals derived from verbs. In the section on syntax, auxiliaries, pronouns, and adverbs are discussed.

The issues considered in Chapter Three include the typology of clitics, some of the practical and theoretical problems in isolating clitics (as clitics are neither clearly independent words nor

clearly affixes), and clitic phenomena, such as base-generation, copying, clitic climbing, and clitic doubling. This Chapter provides us with information that helps us to see which of these phenomena characterize Degema clitics. It also enables us to see in what respects Degema clitics are similar to or different from clitics in Romance and Slavic languages that have attracted the most attention.

Chapter Four examines the source of Degema clitics against the popular view that clitics developed from free lexical items or from syntactic categories that must appear without accent. It is shown that Degema clitics did not develop from free lexical items or from any syntactic category but from diachronic affixes at an earlier stage of the language. Following from this, it is argued that just as there is a possibility for some affixes to have developed from erstwhile independent words, passing through an intermediate clitic stage, there is also the possibility of some independent elements in language to have developed from erstwhile affixes, also passing through a clitic stage.

Chapter Five discusses two types of clitics that have featured in the literature on Degema linguistics. These are subject clitics (proclitics) and non-subject clitics (enclitics). Subject clitics are shown to attach to (main) verbs, auxiliaries, and preverbal adverbs, while non-subject clitics are shown to attach to verbs and transitive object pronouns that have a CVV(C) phonological structure. Also discussed is a surface endoclititic. Endoclititicization in Degema provides evidence against the assumption that clitic attachment is always external to affixes. The interaction between clitics and the categories of tense, aspect, and mood is discussed in some detail. It is noted that subject clitics change their forms to reflect the distinction between past and non-past, and affirmative and negative sentences. Specifically, it is noted that in most cases the **V** form of subject clitics features in past and negative sentences, whereas the **mV** form features in non-past and positive sentences. The discussion on Degema clitics and clitic doubling show that clitic doubling in Degema is not characterized by the presence of a preposition, as in Romance languages, or by topicality and specificity, as in Slavic languages, but by anaphoricity and emphasis and/or familiarity.

The distinctions between inflection and derivation, and clitic-affix-word are examined in Chapter Six. It is shown that despite grey areas between inflection and derivation in Degema, both phenomena are clearly distinguished by *syntax* and *productivity*. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that Degema clitics differ from words. They also differ from affixes, their common diachronic origin notwithstanding. One of the conclusions from Degema is that the distinction between the clitic and the affix may, in some languages, have to be made on the basis of language-internal facts (tone pattern, in the case of Degema) combined with cross-linguistic criteria, noting that any analysis of these elements, in a given language, based only on some cross-linguistic criteria may fail to distinguish them adequately.

Chapter Seven shows that Degema (subject) clitics do not copy an actual constituent but the grammatical features of the subject noun phrase when it moves from its underlying position in the verb phrase to the specifier position of agreement phrase – a position that places it in juxtaposition to the subject clitic to make it possible for the copying of its features. It is also shown that Degema subject clitics are placed in second position not by clitic movement but by subject noun phrase movement – a syntactic operation that places the subject noun phrase in

sentence initial position thus causing the subject clitic to occupy second position relative to the subject noun phrase.

In Chapter Eight, Degema clitics are examined against Klavan's five parameters, i.e. Clitic Identity (Parameter 1), Domain of Cliticization (Parameter 2), Initial/Final (Parameter 3), Before/After (Parameter 4), and Proclitic/Enclitic (Parameter 5), and found that these parameters, especially parameters 3 – 5 that appear to follow from a proper definition and establishment of the domain of cliticization, predict correctly for Degema. Clitic elements in Degema are marked with the lexical feature [+CL], i.e. they have a clitic feature, for the correct application of cliticization rules (Parameter 1). The domain of cliticization in Degema is established as AGR' (agreement-bar) where subject and non-subject clitics get attached to their hosts at surface structure (Parameter 2). Subject clitics attach to the initial word of the constituent, while non-subject clitics attach to the final word of the constituent under the domain of cliticization (Parameter 3). Subject clitics attach before their hosts, while non-subject clitics attach after their hosts under the domain of cliticization (Parameter 4). Subject clitics occur as proclitics and non-subject clitics as enclitics (Parameter 5).

Finally, it is shown in Chapter Nine that, in addition to morphological uniformity and identification, the pragmatic factor relating to given vs. new information also determines whether or not thematic subjects can be suppressed in Degema. It is found out that whereas thematic subjects that contain new information, i.e. focused, contrastive, and emphatic cannot be suppressed or dropped, those that contain given information, i.e. non-focused, non-contrastive, and non-emphatic, can be suppressed or dropped. This leads to the conclusion that syntax and pragmatics interact to suppress thematic subjects in Degema. Furthermore, the claim that free-inversion and having thematic null subject are independent of one another is supported by facts from Degema.