

2020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

( 春期・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。

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 成 |  |
| 績 |  |

2020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

(春期・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)に答えなさい。

### Syntactic structure is distinct from meaning

School grammar defines a noun as “the name of a person, place, or thing” and a verb as “an action or state of being.” According to these definitions, the units of syntactic structure are actually elements of meaning (or thought). And many people (some eminent psychologists and computer scientists included) think that syntactic analysis is nothing but a stripped-down description of meaning: if we characterize the meaning properly, there is nothing left to be said about syntactic structure.

It would indeed be nice if we didn’t have to posit a level of syntactic analysis in between phonological structure and meaning --- if the brain’s analysis were maximally simple. But the facts of language don’t let us off the hook so easily. Syntactic structure is closer to meaning than sound is --- it’s the last way-station enroute from sound to meaning --- so it strongly reflects certain aspects of meaning. But, as I want to show, there are other properties of syntactic structure that don’t have much to do with meaning. Rather, they have to do with organizing the elements of meaning into linear order so that they can be pronounced, and at the same time marking the relations among these elements so that they can be re-identified by the hearer.

To start with, let’s ask whether each part of speech really denotes a consistent kind of meaning. Some of the most common matchings of entities of meaning with parts of speech are shown in (1).

- (1) Object = Noun (*dog, skyscraper, ocean, molecule*)  
Action = Verb (*breathe, enter, provide, interpret*)  
Property = Adjective (*hot, jealous, quiet, insubstantial*)  
Location = Preposition (or prepositional phrase) (*in the house, on the ceiling, between NY and LA*)

Now it is true that any word that names an object will be a noun. But on the other hand, not every noun names an object. “Earthquake” names, if anything, an action, as does “concert”; “redness” and “size” name properties; “place” and “location” pretty obviously name locations. In fact, for just about any kind of entity we can think of, there exist nouns that name that kind of entity. So the grammatical notion of noun can’t be given a definition in terms of what kind of entity it names.

Similarly, prepositions can be used to name not only locations but also times (“**after** lunch,” “**through** the night”) and properties (“**out of** luck, “**in** a good mood”). So prepositions don’t correspond to any fixed sort of entity either.

---

These examples also show that a particular kind of entity need not correspond to a single part of speech either. Actions can be named by either verbs or nouns; properties can be named by adjectives, nouns, or prepositions. In fact, the very same property can be expressed by an adjective or an adverb, depending whether it modifies a noun or a verb:

- (2) a a **violent** earthquake, a **beautiful** concert  
b The earth shook **violently**; The orchestra played **beautifully**

(i) We conclude that parts of speech, the basic units of syntactic structure, are not definable in terms of meaning.

Here's another reason why syntactic structure isn't predictable from meaning. Meaning or thought is independent of the language that is being spoken. Otherwise it makes no sense to speak of translating from one language to another, conveying the same meaning. It follows, then, that any difference between the original and the translation isn't part of the meaning they share.

(ii) Of course, languages don't share the *phonology* that goes with the same thought. That's why we have to study vocabulary like crazy when we're learning foreign languages: what noise means the same thing in Portuguese that "umbrella" means in English? But in addition to learning phonology, we have to learn what order to put the words in, and that's a *syntactic* property of the languages in question.

For example, English adjectives normally precede the nouns they modify, but French adjectives (with some exceptions) normally follow the nouns they modify.

- (3) le chat noir = the cat black ("the black cat")

English verbs normally follow the subject and precede the object, but Japanese verbs always follow both subject and object.

- (4) Bill-ga hon-o utta = Bill book sold ("Bill sold the book")

In English, one can form a question by placing an "auxiliary verb" ("do," "will," "be," etc.) in front of the subject, but in German questions, the main verb can be placed before the subject.

- (5) Liebt Wozzeck Marie? = loves Wozzeck Marie?  
("Does Wozzeck love Marie?")

These patterns of word order depend on knowing the parts of speech of the words, so they have to do with syntactic structure. On the other hand, since they differ from language to language, they can't depend on the meaning. So again we see that syntactic structure has properties that are independent of meaning.

If parts of speech don't have to do with meaning, what *do* they have to do with? It should be evident by now that the classification of words into parts of speech determines their roles in patterns.

Let's briefly explore some syntactic patterns in English. As we go through them, it is important to bear in mind

---

---

that these patterns are part of mental grammar --- that we somehow have these patterns stored in our brains, and that we had to learn them.

A noun can appear with a plural ending: “dogs,” “bananas,” “earthquakes.” A verb, on the other hand, can appear with a past tense ending: “helped,” “believed,” “procrastinated.” Notice that (iii) our ability to use these endings is syntactic knowledge and doesn’t follow from the meanings of the words. In terms of meaning, it would make sense if nouns that name actions could appear with a past tense. But there are no words “earthquaked” or “concerted” which name an earthquake or a concert that occurred in the past. Likewise, in terms of meaning, it would make sense to be able to put a plural ending on a verb to mean that the action was performed more than once. But we can’t say “Bill will dances” to mean he will dance several times. (The “-s” ending in “Bill dances”, of course, indicates not plural, but that there is a third person-singular subject.) In other words, the availability of past tense and plural endings correlates with the syntactic distinction between verbs and nouns, not with the distinction in meaning between objects and actions.

(Ray Jackendoff. 1994. *Patterns in the Mind*. BasicBooks. より一部改変)

---

問（１） 下線部(i)の著者の主張にはどのような根拠があるか、本文に即して説明しなさい。

問（２） 下線部(ii)を和訳しなさい。

問（３） 下線部(iii)の主張にはどのような根拠があるか、本文に即して説明しなさい。

問（４） “Syntactic structure is distinct from meaning.”であることを示す日本語の具体例で、本文で言及されていないものを挙げて、100字程度で説明しなさい。

II. 次の10語の中から5語を選び、簡潔に説明しなさい。

1. affricate      2. complementary distribution      3. deixis      4. event-related potentials (ERP)
5. function word      6. Grimm’s Law      7. illocutionary force      8. morpheme
9. Pragmatics      10. Seediq language

【問題Ⅰと問題Ⅱに対する解答は次頁以降にまとめて記すこと】

---

受験記号番号

4 / 6

[illegible]

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 受験記号番号 |  |
|--------|--|

[illegible]

受験記号番号

6 / 6

[illegible]