

## 言語学

(1) 「足を洗う」という表現は、文字通りの意味で用いられる他に、「暴走族の世界から足を洗う（つまり、暴走族の一員であることをやめる）」のようにも用いられる。後者のように用いられる「足を洗う」は、慣用句（イディオム）と呼ばれるものの一つである。さて、慣用句をそうでないものから区別する方法を考えて、できるだけ詳しく論じなさい。例は、日本語でなくてもよいが、外国語の例を用いるときは、分かりやすい日本語訳をつけなさい。

(2) 下記の7語（アクセント符号、声調符号は省いてある）の中から2語を取り出し、それらと日本語(外来語)の「ジャパン」との間の音声上の相違点を述べなさい。

英語の 'Japan' ,  
ドイツ語の 'Japan' ,  
フランス語の 'Japon' ,  
スペイン語の 'Japon' ,  
ロシア語の 'Япония' ,  
中国語の 'riben' ,  
韓国語（朝鮮語）の '일본'

(3) 下記の文を検討して、この言語の語順の規則を述べなさい。

bama-lu gandu-nya jilwa-n

'Man kicked dog.'

warrngu-nya jamba-lu baja-n

'Snake bit woman.'

yuri-lu gamu-nya bija-n

'Kangaroo drank water.'

bama-lu jula-nya nyaga-n

'Man saw stick.'

galbi-nya barri-lu bambu-n

'Stone shot child.'

jamba-lu buri-nya nyaga-n

'Snake saw fire.'

bama-nya gandu-lu baja-n

'Dog bit man.'

warrngu-lu jamba-nya waju-n

'Woman cooked snake.'

bama-nya jula-lu balga-n

'Stick hit man.'

galbi-lu barri-nya guyba-n

‘Child threw stone.’

yuri-nya gamu-lu ganyji-n

‘Water washed away kangaroo.’

jamba-nya buri-lu waju-n

‘Fire cooked snake.’

参照：

-n 動詞の過去時勢の接辞

なおこの言語には冠詞がありませんので，英訳も冠詞を省いてあります。

(4) 以下の文を読んで下の問いに答えなさい。

The Comparative Method is often described as comprising two different tasks, the establishment of genetic relationship for a group of languages and then the reconstruction of features of the proto-language from which those related languages arose. In practice, this description is approximately correct: historical linguists first arrive at a hypothesis that two or more languages are genetically related and then try to reconstruct a common parent language from the proposed group of related languages. But when one looks at the criteria that are used to arrive at the initial hypothesis, the distinction between the two tasks breaks down. Hypotheses that rest solely on unsystematic sound / meaning correspondences in a modest-sized list of words do not meet with much favor among historical linguists, and in fact much more evidence is required before a hypothesis of relatedness will be generally accepted through the following kinds of evidence: not only (i) A the establishment of phonological correspondences in words of same or related meaning, including much basic vocabulary, but also (ii) the reconstruction of phonological systems, (iii) B the establishment of grammatical correspondences, and (iv) the reconstruction of grammatical systems, to whatever extent is possible. Where more than two languages are involved, a thorough exploitation of the Comparative Method also includes (v) construction of a subgrouping model for the languages and (vi) the elaboration of C a diversification model.

(a) 下線部 A について，具体例をあげて説明しなさい。

(b) 下線部 B について，具体例をあげて説明しなさい。

(c) 下線部 C でいう model の一つである“family tree diagram”について，その長所と限界を論じなさい。

(5) 次の文を読んで，以下の問いに答えなさい。

(a) implicational universal とは何か，簡潔に説明し，その具体例を本文中からできる限

り多く指摘しなさい。

(b) implicational universal の考え方の言語学的意義を、本文に即して簡潔に述べなさい。

The development of syntactic typology owes much to Joseph Greenberg, whose interest in language typology and language universals led him to take up the theory of *implicational universals* and to illustrate it by citing chiefly syntactic phenomena. In an article entitled “Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements,” Greenberg demonstrated that the presence of a certain syntactic feature often implies the presence of one or more other features. For example, he noted that languages with dominant VSO (Verb + Subject + Object) word order are almost always prepositional (i.e., they have prepositions rather than postpositions) and that there is a very strong tendency for SOV languages to be postpositional.

The foregoing observations cited from Greenberg's article illustrate the principle of implicational universal very well: given that a language has VSO as the basic word order we can automatically assume that such a language has prepositions instead of postpositions, and given the fact that a language has SOV as the basic word order we can reasonably expect (though not assume with total certainty) that this language will have postpositions instead of prepositions. Moreover, in SOV languages attributive adjectives and relative clauses precede the nouns they modify, whereas in SVO languages they usually follow.

Of course, the implicational chaining need not stop with just one implication. It is quite possible, for example, to find a whole chain of implications where the presence of feature X implies the presence of feature Y, which in turn implies the presence of feature Z, and so on. It should also be noted that such implicational relationships are not limited solely to the domain of syntax but can be found in other components of grammar as well.

The discovery of implicational universals is a very important development for linguistic typology for two reasons. First, it allows for a more economical typological schema: if we choose the basic classificatory categories on the basis of those features that by universal simplification entail the presence of a large number of other important features, we need only state that a given language has this feature to imply, by universal convention, a whole series of other features as well. For example, by classifying a language as having SOV as its basic word order we imply that it is also a postpositional language.

Second, the existence of implicational universals alerts us to many phenomena that require explanation; that is, linguistic theory must explain why there are such interrelationships between various grammatical features. In turn, our search for such explanations usually leads us to discover even more hidden facts and relationships in language. Thus, what starts as a “merely” typological, classificatory endeavor eventually leads to ever expanding understanding of the workings of language.