## 2021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 言語学 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。

7 1

成績

## 2021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( 言語学 専攻分野)

## I. 次の文章を読んで、問(1)~(4)に日本語で答えなさい。

In English and in other languages, nouns may vary with respect to the property of **countability**. Nouns of high countability such as *woman, dog* and *pencil* denote objects which are conceptualized in terms of highly individuated units typically associated with a characteristic shape. In contrast, nouns of low countability such as *water, sand* and *smoke* denote objects which are conceptualized in terms of masses without unitary structure or characteristic shape.

Countability bears a number of grammatical consequences, one of which is the way in which nouns may occur in construction with numerals. Nouns of high countability generally occur in direct construction with numerals, for example *one woman, two dogs, three pencils*. In contrast, nouns of low countability typically do not occur in direct construction with numerals; instead, an additional item must be present, for example *one glass of water, two pounds of sand, three plumes of smoke*. Such additional items are sometimes referred to as **mensural numeral classifiers**, since (i) they provide nouns of low countability with a unit of measure by means of which they may then be counted.

However, in many other languages, nouns in construction with numerals may occur with an additional grammatical element even when such nouns are of high countability:

## (1) Minangkabau (Malayic, Austronesian; Indonesia; own knowledge)

sa <b>-ura</b> n	ıg	padusi
one-CLI	7	woman
'one wo	oman'	
duo	ikue	anjiang
two	CLF	dog
'two do	gs'	
tigo	batang	pituluik
three	CLF	pencil
'three p	encils'	
	sa-uran one-CLH 'one wo duo two 'two do <i>tigo</i> three 'three p	sa-urangone-CLF'one woman' $duo$ $ikue$ $duo$ $cLF$ 'two dogs' $tigo$ $batang$ three $CLF$ 'three pencils'

Such elements are typically referred to as **sortal numeral classifiers**. This term makes reference to one of the most salient functions of such forms, which is to divide the inventory of count nouns into semantic classes, each of which is associated with a different classifier. Thus, for example, in Minangkabau, as illustrated in (1) above, human nouns take the classifier *urang*, nonhuman animate nouns the classifier *ikue*, and elongated objects the classifier *batang*. In languages with sortal classifiers, the number of such classifiers may vary considerably, ranging from a mere handful to several dozen. Sortal numeral classifiers are referred to here as *numeral classifiers* or simply as *classifiers*, in contexts where the meaning is clear.

The world's languages can be divided up into (ii) three types, in accordance with whether, in the numeral-plus-noun construction, numeral classifiers are absent, optional or obligatory. In languages of the first type, there are no numeral classifiers; a numeral always occurs in direct construction with a noun without the additional presence of a classifier. One example of such a language is English. Another is Tagalog, in which the numeral-plus-noun construction is marked with the further presence of a ligature of morphophonemically variable form, in the following example the enclitic =*ng*:

(2) Tagalog (own knowledge)

dalawa=ng aso two=LIG dog 'two dogs'

Other examples of languages without numeral classifiers include Yoruba (Welmers 1973: 289), Hebrew (own knowledge), Tiwi (Osborne 1974), Maricopa (own field work) and Shipibo-Konibo (Pilar Valenzuela p.c.).

In languages of the second type, numeral classifiers are present, but their occurrence in the numeral-plus-noun construction is optional. One example of such a language is Minangkabau, in which classifiers such as those illustrated in (1) are sometimes present, but in other cases absent:

```
(3) Minangkabau (own knowledge)
duo (ikue) anjiang
two (CLF) dog
'two dogs'
```

Other examples of languages with optional numeral classifiers include Hungarian (Beckwith 1992), Chantyal (Noonan 2000), Hatam (Reesink 1999: 57-58), Tongan (own field work), and Haida (Swanton 1911b: 277-278).

In languages of the third type, numeral classifiers are obligatory in the numeral-plus-noun construction: a numeral cannot quantify a noun without such a classifier being present. One example of such a language is Vietnamese:

```
(4) Vietnamese (own fieldwork)
hai con chó
two CLF dog
'two dogs'
```

Other examples of languages with obligatory numeral classifiers include Boko (Jones 1998b: 128), Nivkh (Daniel Abondolo p.c.), Nyelâyu (Françoise Ozanne-Rivierre, Isabelle Bril p.c.), Coast Tsimshian (Boas 1911c: 396-398) and Warekena (Aikhenvald 1998: 298).

Numeral classifiers have captured the imagination of linguists and others interested in language for a variety of reasons. Most obviously, linguists, psychologists, anthropologists and other scholars have been interested in the classificatory function of numeral classifiers and what insights it might provide into how speakers view the world (Haas

1942; Burling 1965; Craig 1986). Whereas in some languages each noun is associated with exactly one classifier, in other languages there is a degree of flexibility with regard to the choice of classifier, permitting the differentiation of subtle shades of meaning. For example, in Mandarin, when *sān* 'three' occurs in construction with *huā* 'flower', *sān zhī huā*, with classifier *zhī* for elongated objects, conjures up an image of three flowers on their stalks, whereas *sān duŏ huā*, with classifier *duŏ* for round objects, focuses in on the actual florescences, to the exclusion of the stalks.

Other interesting issues pertain to the grammar of numeral classifiers. One question is that of constituency: does the classifier form a constituent with the numeral or with the noun? There is at least some reason to believe that the answer may vary across languages, and also across different kinds of classifiers. A second question is that of headedness: given a particular constituency, which of the elements is the head and which is the modifier? Again, different scholars have proposed different answers to this question, which may be due to differences between languages, differences between theoretical approaches, or perhaps other reasons.

Why do languages have numeral classifiers? Most commonly, classifier languages are ones in which an NP consisting entirely of a bare noun may be understood as either mass or count, and as either singular or plural (Gil 1987). For example, in Mandarin, the noun-phrase *pingguo* 'apple' may be understood as 'apple' (mass), 'an apple' (singular), or 'some apples' (plural). This cross-linguistic generalization has led to a widespread belief that in such languages, the classifier is needed in order to individuate the noun and provide the necessary units to facilitate quantification (Thompson 1965; Quine 1969; Stein 1981; Link 1991). Thus, according to this view, the Mandarin \*sān pingguð 'three apple(s)' is semantically ill-formed for the same reason that the English \*three water(s) is: just as English water requires an explicit mensural classifier before it can be quantified, as in three glasses/ounces/drops of water, so Mandarin píngguð requires a sortal classifier before it can be successfully enumerated, as in sān gè píngguð. However, this explanation for the occurrence of classifiers is belied by a variety of additional facts (Gil 1996). Unlike English water, the Mandarin noun pingguo does indeed come with a conventional unit of enumeration, namely the individual round fruit that one can hold in one's hand, and therefore does not need a classifier in order to be counted. Evidence for this is provided by size and shape adjectives: whereas in English, constructions such as big water are bizarre, in Mandarin, constructions such as dà píngguð 'big apple' are syntactically well-formed, and understood in the same way as their English counterparts. A further argument against (iii) this explanation is provided by the existence of languages in which, as in Mandarin and other classifier languages, an NP consisting entirely of a bare noun may be understood as either mass or count, and as either singular or plural, but in which there are no numeral classifiers. For example, in Tagalog, the noun phrase mansana 'apple' may be understood as 'apple' (mass), 'an apple' (singular), or 'some apples' (plural); however, it does not require a classifier in order to occur with a numeral, as in *tatlong mansana* 'three apples'. Thus, the occurrence of classifiers in classifier languages has no straightforward semantic explanation; in the absence of any better-motivated account, it must accordingly be viewed as just another arbitrary conventionalized fact about the grammars of individual languages.

(David Gil. 2013. Numeral classifiers. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (http://wals.info/chapter/55, 2020 年 8 月 8 日閲覧) より一部改変)

受験記号番号	
--------	--

- 問(1) 下線部(i)を、theyが何か分かるように補って和訳しなさい。
- 問(2) 下線部(ii) three types とはどのようなものか、本文に即して説明しなさい。
- 問(3) 下線部(iii) this explanation とは何か、本文に即して説明しなさい。
- 問(4) 日本語の numeral classifiers を本文の観点から分析しなさい。
- II. 次の10語の中から5語を選び、和訳して日本語で簡潔に説明しなさい。
- 1. articulatory phonetics2. Austronesian languages3. c-command4. ergative5. Maxim of Quality6. palatalization7. polysemy
- 8. relative clause 9. stem (of a word) 10. truth condition

【問題Iと問題IIに対する解答は以下にまとめて記すこと】

受験記号番号	
--------	--

5 / 7

6 / 7


7 / 7