２０２３年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（　秋期・一般選抜　）問題

専門科目Ⅰ　　　英　語　学　　　専攻分野

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

成

績

２０２３年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（秋期・一般選抜）問題

専門科目 I （　英　語　学　　専攻分野）

[I] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

　　　Let us consider data like (1).

(1)　a.　Dora published 'Henriette Potter' **chapter after chapter**.

　　b.　Anna piled **book upon book**.

　　c.　They looked **one by one**.

　　d.　Olivia climbed the mountain **metre by metre**.

　　e.　Olivia fell off **time after time**.

On the formal side, the sentences in (1) contain a reduplicative expression 'N Preposition N', for example 'book upon book' in (1b) (in bold face). On the content side, their interpretation intuitively involves iteration, for example in (1b) a repetition of placing one book on top of another. That is, the examples in (1) talk about multiple events of publishing, piling, looking, climbing, and falling. There is a formal similarity to data like (2) in that a central preposition is surrounded by two bare nouns which may be identical. But not all such examples are semantically parallel. In (2c) for example, there is no iteration of reading from one cover to another cover.

(2)　a.　She went **from door to door**.

　　b.　He was dressed in black **from head to toe**.

　　c.　I read the book (from) **cover to cover**.

　　d.　He repeated it **word for word**.

On the other hand, there are also semantically similar data like (3), which like (1) intuitively do involve iteration; for instance, (1a) and (3a) seem equivalent. But the adverbials in (3a-b) do not share the 'N Preposition N' form, and (3c-d) do not involve nouns.

(3)　a.　Dora published 'Henriette Potter' **one chapter after the other**.

　　b.　They looked **one at a time**.

　　c.　Olivia **climbed and climbed**.

　　d.　Olivia fell off **again and again**.

I focus on examples like (1), with some comments on non-iterative 'N Preposition N' structures like (2) on the one hand, and multiple event markers with a form other than 'N Preposition N' like (3) on the other. I refer to the core data like (1) as **pluractional 'N Preposition N'**.

　　　The questions raised by data like (1) are first, how to precisely capture the meaning of these sentences, and, second, the matter of how form relates to meaning. Regarding the first question, the strategy in the literature (e.g. Stockall, 2001; Zimmermann, 2002; Beck and von Stechow, 2007; Henderson, 2013) is to analyse (1) in terms of a plurality of events. The truth conditions of (1a), for example, entail (4). The overall event described by the sentence can be divided into multiple 'small' events.

(4)　There is a plurality of events of Dora publishing a chapter of 'Henriette Potter'.

That is, the intuition that these data involve repetition — like multiple events of publishing a chapter — is modelled by making use of event pluralization. This connects English data like (1) to the cross-linguistic phenomenon of pluractionality. Pluractionality is understood as event pluralization, see, e.g. Lasersohn (1995), Newman (2012).

Many languages mark event pluralization morphologically on the verb, cf. (5) and (6), though not English and related languages. The form of the pluractional marker, glossed PLA below, is often reduplication. The example in (5a) can have the interpretations in (5b) and (5c), both of which involve multiple events. In (6) there is a contrast between the simple verb in (6a) which has an interpretation as a single event, and the PLA-marked verb in (6b) which leads to a multiple event interpretation.

(5) a. čoy   sa   dedalčn'a   [Klamath; Lasersohn (1995: 259)]

        then   they   PLA-look

        'Then they looked.'

   b. The situation can be divided into relevant subevents each of which is an event of them looking.

   c. The situation and 'they' can be divided into parts so that in each subevent there is one part of them looking.

(6) a. kantooli-t   taanapu   i=toom-ay   [Konso; Beck (2011: 286)]

        kantooli-?   taanapu   3=hit.with.fist[SG]-PF[3SGM]

        'Kantoole (has) hit Taanapo with fist once.'

   b. kantooli-t   taanapu   i=tot-toom-ay

        kantooli-?   taanapu   3= PLA-hit.with.fist[SG]-PF[3SGM]

        'Kantoole (has) hit Taanapo with fist many times.'

The semantic analysis of pluractional data like (5) and (6) informs the analysis of (1): event pluralization as seen in (5), (6) is also involved in (1). To proceed with the analysis of (1), we thus need a semantic theory that answers the question in (7).

(7)   Multiple event semantics:

       What is responsible for event pluralization (in (1) as well as (5), (6))?

Turning to the second question raised by 'N Preposition N', the relation of syntax and semantics, we need to ask how the syntactic structure is mapped to the iterative, i.e. pluractional, meaning. In order to answer this question, we first need an understanding of the syntax of the construction, that is, we need to answer the question in (8).

(8)   Input to composition:

       What is the syntax of 'N Preposition N' in (1)?

Once we understand how event pluralization comes about and what the syntactic structure of our data is, we can turn to the analysis of pluractional 'N Preposition N' proper:

(9)   Compositional analysis of pluractional 'N Preposition N':

   a.   What is the role of the 'N Preposition N' expression relative to event pluralization?

   b.   How is its semantics composed internally from its components?

Before we proceed with the formal analysis, let me point out some of the specific properties of the data in (1) that will be addressed.

A first observation is that the preposition in 'N Preposition N' plays an interesting semantic role. The multiple events that (1a) talks about are ordered temporally, one occurring *after* the other. The multiple eventualities that (10) talks about are not ordered temporally. Instead, the order comes from the preposition *within*: one puzzle is contained inside another puzzle. Thus in (1a) and (10), the multiple 'small' events form a sequence which, taken together, gives us the 'big' event described by the sentence, and the ordering for the sequence relates to the preposition.

(10)   This mystery offers **puzzle within puzzle**.

Second, the noun in 'N Preposition N' provides a description of parts of a plural or internally complex object. In (1a), a chapter is a part of a book, 'Henriette Potter' in the example. The multiple 'small' events are characterized by these parts of the plural or complex object being involved. (1a) differs from (the pragmatically less plausible) (11) in that in each relevant 'small' event in (11), a page rather than a chapter gets published. Thus the noun in 'N Preposition N' needs to denote an appropriate part of a plural or complex object in the sentence, and this part goes into the identification of the multiple events. The plural or complex object in (1a-c) is an entity (a book, a set of books, a group of people), but it is a path in (1d) and an event in (1e).

(11)   Dora published 'Henriette Potter' **page after page**.

The three claims derived for pluractional 'N Preposition N' so far are summarized in (12).

(12)   a.   Pluractionality:

'N Preposition N' expressions characterize pluralities of events.

b.   Ordered sequence:

The preposition in 'N Preposition N' may induce a sequence of events.

c.   Part-whole structure:

The N in 'N Preposition N' provides the units by which a complex object participates in the multiple events.

These generalizations allow us to understand some empirical limitations of the construction (cf. the ungrammatical examples in (13)). In (13a) the verb *outnumber* precludes a pluractional interpretation. In (13b), the preposition *after* indicates a temporal sequence, but the predicate is not compatible with a step by step temporal unfolding ((13b) gets better if you imagine somebody leafing through a book of animal species; in that case, a derived temporal order may become available). In (13c), *chapter* is not a unit into which any complex object involved in the approaching event is plausibly divided. The data in (13) indicate that the verbal predicate, the N and the preposition all have to combine sensibly for a meaningful 'N Preposition N' structure.

(13)   a.   # The Smiths outnumber the Johnsons **person by person**.

b.   #Whales are extinct **species after species**.

c.   #Dora approached the walrus **chapter after chapter**.

There are some further interesting aspects of these constructions that we will come back to. The 'N Preposition N' constituent can be an adverbial or an argument, compare (1a) vs (1b). While the core data in (1) involve the same noun, note that this is not always the case in the non-pluractional (or not necessarily pluractional) (2), cf. (2b). Finally, there is some interaction with Aktionsart, as seen in (14a), where the activity *wave* doesn't seem to take an 'N by N' modifier. The contrast to (14b) indicates possible cross-linguistic variation in this domain, which to my knowledge has not been systematically explored.

(14) a. *The graduating seniors waved **student by student**. (Henderson, 2013: 476)

b. Die Absolventen winkten **Student für Student**. (German)

the graduating students waved student for student

'The graduates waved one after the other/individually.'

Literally: 'The graduating students waved student by student.'

We will be better equipped to examine such facts when the formal theory is in place, to which we now turn.

[adapted from Sigrid Beck, "Multiple Events and 'N Preposition N,'" in *The Oxford Handbook of Grammatical Number*, Oxford University Press]

問1　例文 (1), (2), (3) の共通点と相違点について、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問2　例文 (1), (5a), (6b) の共通点と相違点について、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問3　例文 (1) を分析する際の重要な二つの問題について、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問4　例文 (1a) と (10) の共通点と相違点について、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問5　例文 (13) が不適格である理由について、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問6　例文 (14a) と (14b) の対比について、本文に即して説明しなさい。

[II] 以下の日本語の文を英語に訳しなさい。

　言語学は言語についての経験科学です。言語哲学は言語についての哲学です。科学と哲学というのは複雑にからみあって関連していますので、一般的に想像されるよりも、言語学者が行っていることと言語哲学者が行っていることは似かよっており、ときに区別しようがありません。

　しかし、言語のダークサイドに立ち向かう際に、哲学が必ず役に立ちます。それは、歴史的に、哲学がものごとの善悪について語るための道具を提供し続けてきたからです。言語学を通じて、「こうなっている」「そうなっている」という事実関係を明らかにすることはできるかもしれませんが、哲学をプラスすることによってはじめて、「これはよくない、やめよう」「そうすべきだ」というような、価値についての判断にまで、到達することができます。

【和泉悠著『悪い言語哲学入門』（ちくま新書)】