

## 言語学

(1)

- (a) 「厚い本」のように用いられる「厚い」の意味はどうか。このような「厚い」があらわしうる属性に共通な特徴を列挙することでその意味を記述しなさい。なお、「信頼が厚い」といった「厚い」は無視しなさい。
- (b) 「ひらく」と「あける」という2つの語の意味はどのように異なるか、説明しなさい。

(2) 次の英語文を読み、筆者の主張がどうかを日本語で述べなさい。その中には、結論としてどうすべきだといっているのかの推定も含むこと。

... whereas no one would ever dream of separating the components of the words in writing Latin, this has been done regularly in Tswana. The reason is obviously that the grammatical analysis of Tswana has been based mainly on that of English. It has been customary to write “*Ke rêka ...*”, “*Ke a rêka*”, “*Ke tla rêka*”, etc. on the analogy of English *I buy ...*, *I am buying*, *I shall buy*. Hence the subjectival concords *ke-*, *re-*, *lo-*, *ba-*, etc. have been termed “pronouns” on the analogy of *I*, *we*, *you*, *they*, etc. A little reflection shows that these two series of forms are definitely not parallel in function, though they may appear to be at first sight. In English the word order may be changed, e.g. *They will buy*, *Will they buy?*, *Buy, they will!*, *Buy, will they?*; one or both of the verbs in this sentence may be omitted, e.g. *They will*, *Will they ?*, *They ...* (of all people !); the pronoun is omitted when the noun subject is used, thus *The men will buy*. In Tswana on the other hand, the order of the components of *Batlarêka* is immutable; none of them can be omitted without making the word meaningless or completely changing its fundamental significance; and the subjectival concord must always be retained, irrespective of whether the substantival subject is expressed or not, thus *Banna batlarêka*. Obviously therefore, the three elements *ba-*, *-tla-*, and *-rêka*, in Tswana, do not correspond in function to *they*, *will*, and *buy*, in English, though they may be respectively similar in significance. Unlike English *they*, Tswana *ba-* cannot be classified as a pronoun; it is an integral part of the verb, and similar in function to the corresponding Latin verbal suffix.

(Desmond T. Cole: *An Introduction to Tswana Grammar*, 1975 よリ)

注：Tswana ツワナ語。南アフリカおよびボツワナで話されるバントゥ系の言語。

*banna* は「男（複数）」

(2) 次の文を参考にして，日本語において，抽象的な概念に metaphor によって具体的なイメージを与える表現の例をいくつかあげて論じなさい。

Humans behave like spiderlings who never venture outside their web. They create their own limited mental pictures of the world. The word *week* is often quoted. A week has no concrete reality in the external world. Yet most native speakers of English have a mental model of a sequence of seven days, which is divided into two chunks, five working days followed by two rest-days, the ‘weekend’ — or sometimes it’s six working days followed by one rest day. They have this idealized notion of a week, even though they may organize their own working life quite differently, and may know that technically the week begins on a Sunday. In contrast, an Inca week had nine days, eight working days followed by market day, on which the king changed wives.

These mental models can be handed down from generation to generation, and they can reinforce cultural norms. The word *mother* represents a cluster of at least three different ideas, as the linguist George Lakoff has pointed out: first, a birth idea, the mother gives birth to the child; second, a nurturing idea, the mother looks after the child; third, a marital idea, the mother is the wife of the father. This cluster of ideas has helped to give rise to a stereotype of a ‘proper mother’ as one who gives birth, stays at home and nurtures, and is married to the father. The stereotype persists, even though it is increasingly out of touch with modern society.

Powerful mental images may be preserved or even created by metaphors, it has been suggested. Expressions such as ‘Pauline was *rich* in ideas’, ‘Alan had a *wealth* of experience’ presuppose that accumulating money might be a praiseworthy aim.

Consider the emotion of anger. This is often envisaged as heated liquid in a container, as George Lakoff has pointed out. It is like a whistling kettle which builds up a head of steam: ‘Mark’s anger simmered’, ‘Helen seethed with rage’, ‘Neil’s blood boiled.’

Such metaphors reflect genuine mental images, according to psycholinguistic experiments. When asked about an idiom such as ‘hit the roof’, speakers envisaged containers bursting open and their contents spouting upwards. They did not imagine a person with springs on their heels hitting their head on the ceiling.

Arguably, the ‘liquid in a container’ image could lead people to assume that explosion is a natural consequence of overheating, and justify outbursts of rage. This is unlike the situation in some parts of India, where anger is still thought of as heat, but dry heat which requires lubrication. So universal tendencies may have different cultural manifestations.

Fear provides the reverse scenario. Physiologically, humans either freeze or flee. Yet almost all English metaphors stress freezing or empty containers, not fleeing: 'Peter froze with terror', 'Marigold was rooted to the spot', 'Peggy's limbs turned icy cold', 'Paul's courage drained away.' A terrified English speaker might stand still, rather than attempt to escape. It is a worrying possibility, though one which has not yet been checked out.