２０２５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

（　冬期・一般選抜　）問題

専門科目　　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。

受験記号番号	

成 績	

２０２５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

（冬期・一般選抜）問題

専門科目（　　言語学　　専攻分野）

問題 I. 次の文章を読んで以下の問いに答えなさい。

Languages differ not so much in what you *can* say as in what you *must* say. From the thousands of things we can attend to in the world around us, each language makes a different selection of what gets front-seat treatment as so-called (i) *grammatical categories*, which speakers and hearers need to keep constant track of. Using another of Ortega y Gasset's insights, each language is "exuberant" in some respects, going into loving detail about particular aspects of reality that you need to attend to and encode in most utterances, and "deficient" in others, allowing you to slack off and pay them no mind unless you feel like it.

More than anything else, this is what gives each language its own distinct psychological cast, because to speak it you have to attend constantly to facets of the world that other languages let you ignore. We will pursue this language-and-thought angle more in chapter 8, since to demonstrate it convincingly we will need to bring in psychological experiments as well as linguistic facts. For now, though, I would like to concentrate on developing a preliminary "audacious integration" of what the pooled expertise of the world's grammars has to tell us about one domain of reality: psychosocial cognition.

It is increasingly clear that our ability to construct and participate in a shared mental world, to coordinate our attention and our goals, and to keep track of who knows, feels and wants what, lies at the heart of being human. It is this intense sociality that powered our quantum leap out of the company of all other animal species by enabling us to build that constantly evolving shared world we call culture. This achievement rests on an ability to keep constant tabs on the social and psychological consequences of what happens around us. But, although this skill is universal at a generic level, different grammars bring very different aspects of social cognition to the fore. (ii)By integrating what the world's languages are collectively sensitive to, we can come up with a much richer picture of

human social cognition than any one language alone would give us.

It helps to start by imagining what a language would be like whose grammar makes NO reference to social context. This grammar would happily enable statements like "monkeys throw coconuts" or "all men are mortal," which imply nothing about the social context around. And it is exactly because of their stark social unanchoredness that sentences of this type crop up at the beginning of logic courses. But it doesn't take long for information about our social world to creep in. Once I say "a monkey threw my coconut," or "the prisoner must die," individual social agents have been drawn in, anchoring the event to the here-and-now of you and me communicating – what is generally known as the "speech act."

The "a" in "a monkey" marks its referent either as not previously known to you, and to be identified by me later ("and in fact, it was that monkey that escaped from the zoo"), or as something whose identity is unimportant or unknowable: "I don't know which monkey, though," I could go on to say. "The" in "the prisoner" shows I am confident you will be able to identify who I am talking about – a confidence that depends on me closely monitoring how far you are following my thoughts and previous statements. "My" in "my coconut" indicates not only that one of the participants happens to be the speaker or writer – me! – but also that I am aware of a particular relationship between that participant and the coconut, perhaps of ownership (I bought it this morning) or perhaps merely of interest (I have been looking at it greedily on the fruitstand). And "must" indicates a relation between the still-just-imagined event of the prisoner dying, and my wishes and powers to influence what other people around me do, by issuing an order or stipulation. If I shift to a question – "must the prisoner die?" – there is still a relationship of ordering or stipulation between the speech act and the described event of the prisoner dying, but now it is primarily you rather than me who is being linked "deontically" to the event. ("Deontic" modification is framing a statement with desires or moral requirements like "may," "must," or "ought.") Either I am inquiring about something you know but I do not – whether the prisoner's death is necessary – or I am seeking to influence you by asking a rhetorical question and implying that I do not want the event to happen.

Explorations like this, of the meaning of such categories as definiteness ("the" vs. "a"), possession ("my," "your"...) and "mood" ("can," "must," "may" etc.), have long been a staple for philosophers and linguists trying to work out how meaning can be represented and how inferences can be drawn. As such they underpin other enterprises like the representation of information in automatic translation systems, or reasoning algorithms in artificial intelligence. They are categories that are central in English and other European languages. But, once we look at other languages, we start to see the elaboration of rather different categories.

Take the phrase "my coconut." If you try to translate this into many Oceanic languages – say Paamese, a language of Vanuatu – you realize that English has not yet given enough information, that its grammar is deficient with regard to the general domain of possessive relations, whereas Paamese is exuberant in the sense of paying attention to much more detailed distinctions. What exactly are you trying to say, a Paamese speaker would insist? My coconut, whose flesh I am about to eat – OK, say *ani aak*. My coconut, whose juice I wish to drink? In that case, say *ani emak*. My coconut, that is growing on my land? In that case, say *ani esak*. My coconut, that I plan to use for some other purpose (perhaps sitting on it)? In that case, say *ani onak*. Between *ani* ("coconut") and the suffix -k ("my"), as you can see, we need to insert an element setting out the intended use the "possessor" will put the object to. Devices like these are generally called (iii)"possessive classifiers" by linguists, because they classify the type of possession relation. But another way of seeing them is that they signal a mix of socially recognized ownership types and intentions. Indeed, the late Terry Crowley, who wrote a fine grammar of Paamese, argues that the grammar is classifying types of social control, not just possession.

And by Oceanic standards Paamese is still at the kindergarten level when it comes to possessive classification. The New Caledonian language Tinrin distinguishes, for example, between "my (body part)," "my (burnable object)," "my (thing, to plant)," "my (fruit)," "my (meat)," "my (chewable or suckable object, like sugar cane)," "my (cannibalistically eaten human flesh)," and various others. It is impossible to say just "your X," or "my X" without deciding which of these types of possession is

受験記号番号	

involved.

Projection of intentions, in fact, is a key part of our ability for "social intelligence," as any good poker player or military strategist knows, and working out just how much intention-attribution goes on in our primate cousins is a hot topic in tracing the evolution of hominid social reasoning. At the most complex level, this ability allows us to invest just about any sign with a rich attribution of meaning, by enabling us to guess at the communicative intentions of our interlocutor. (以下省略)

(Nicholas Evans. (2010), *Dying Words: Endangered Languages and What They Have to Tell Us.* Wiley-Blackwell. pp.70-71 より一部改変)

問（1）下線部（ｉ）grammatical categories について、和訳したうえで日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

問（2）下線部（ii）について、本文に即して日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

問（3）下線部（iii）possessive classifiers について、和訳したうえで本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

問（4）日本語の classifiers について、具体例を挙げて説明しなさい。

問題 II. 「順番に船に乗る」を通常の速度で発話した場合の発音を国際音声記号（IPA）で表記しなさい。

問題 III. 次の１０語の中から５語を選び、和訳した上で日本語で説明しなさい。

1. affordance　2. complementary distribution　3. dative　4. dissimilation　5. ejective
6. etymon　7. finiteness　8. infix　9. neologism　10. vowel harmony

【 問題 I、問題 II、問題 III に対する解答は、次ページ以降にまとめて記すこと 】

受験記号番号	

受験記号番号	

受験記号番号	

受験記号番号	