【発表 1】

# 日本語方言におけるノダ相当形式
## ―新形式の成立に注目して―

野間　純平（関西大学非常勤講師）

　現代日本語（標準語）には、以下のように準体助詞「ノ」とコピュラ「ダ」の組み合わせから成る「ノダ文」が存在する。
　　(1)　（仕事を頼まれて）ごめん、用事があるんだ。
方言にも同様の形式が存在し、やはり準体助詞とコピュラの組み合わせから成る。以下の（2）は大阪方言の例である。
　　(2)　（仕事を頼まれて）ごめん、用事あるンヤ。
　しかし、方言によっては、「準体助詞＋コピュラ」からさらに変化したノダ相当形式が存在する。大阪方言はその 1 つであり、上記の（2）は次のように「ネン」を使って表現できる。
　　(3)　（仕事を頼まれて）ごめん、用事あるネン。
　本発表では、この「ネン」のような新しいノダ相当形式を持つ方言として、上で例を挙げた大阪方言と、若年層を中心として「ゲン」「ガン」などの新形式が使用される石川方言を取り上げ、その体系や成立過程にどのような特徴があるかを明らかにする。具体的には、以下のことを述べる。
　　①　大阪方言と石川方言はどちらも対人的用法に特化した形式を発達させているが、体系のあり方には両方言で違いがある。大阪方言は平叙文の中で対人的用法に特化したネンなどを発達させているのに対して、石川方言では対人的用法の中で平叙文と疑問文を区別することに力点を置いている。
　　②　大阪方言と石川方言は、形式や機能が異なる複数のノダ相当形式を使用するという点で、他の日本語諸方言とは異なっており、他の方言に先駆けて最先端の変化を遂げた方言と位置づけられる。

【発表 2】

# ヒンディー語の名詞修飾構造の類型
## ―日本語の格助詞・準体助詞「の」との対照的視点を交えて―
### Types of Noun-Modifying Constructions: A Comparative Case Study of Genitival Constructions in Hindi and Japanese

西岡　美樹（大阪大学）

　ヒンディー語は一般的に日本語と同じ OV 言語で主要部終端型（head-final）とされ、

名詞を修飾する場合も形容詞による修飾ならば Adjective (modifier)＋Noun (head)、名詞ならば Noun (modifier)＋*kaa*＋Noun (head)という具合で基本は同じである。しかし、句あるいは節レベルのものが名詞を修飾する場合、ヒンディー語は日本語とは異なる様相を呈する。通常、動詞の連体形による修飾や準体助詞「の」を用いるのが日本語だが、ヒンディー語の場合、修飾節あるいは修飾句は①関係詞（主要名詞を後置修飾）、②分詞の形容詞的用法（日本語の連体修飾に相当）、③同格接続詞（関係詞と同じく後置修飾）、さらに、④*vaalaa*（接辞あるいは語として扱われる）と、最初にあげた⑤属格後置詞 *kaa* を用いたものの５つが存在する。

　非ヒンディー語母語話者にとって問題になるのが、④*vaalaa* と⑤*kaa* の使用法である。前者の *vaalaa* は Noun/Adjective/Verbal noun (modifier)＋*vaalaa*＋Noun (head)のように、名詞のみならず形容詞や動名詞（動詞の不定詞と同形）と主要部の名詞をつなぐことができるものであり、後者の *kaa* もまた日本語の格助詞「の」と違い、名詞のみならず動名詞（不定詞）も修飾句として使用される。さらに、この *kaa* はしばしば *vaalaa* と置き換え可能な場合もある。

　本発表では、ヒンディー語のこれら５つの名詞修飾構造を概観した上で、Kellogg (1876)が言及する属格後置詞 *kaa* に関する意味分類を参照にしつつ、Wrona (2012)の日本語の「の」の機能のうち、ヒンディー語の *kaa* と *vaalaa* が関わると考えられる 1. Copula (Adnominal), 2. Genitive, 3. Subjective marker, 4. Pronominal, 5. Complementizer を手掛かりに日本語の「の」を用いた名詞句とそのヒンディー語訳を照らし合わせながら、ヒンディー語の *kaa* と *vaalaa* がどのような機能分担がなされているか吟味する。

Kellogg, Henry Samuel. (1938). *A Grammar of the Hindi Language : in which are treated the High Hindí, Braj, and the Eastern Hindí of the Rámáyan of Tulsí Dás, also the colloquial dialects of Rájputáná, Kumáon, Avadh, Ríwá, Bhojpúr, Magadha, Maithila, etc., with copious philological notes* (The 3rd edition). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co.

Wrona, Janick. (2012). "The Early History of no as a Nominaliser". Frellesvig, Bjarke, Kiaer, Jieun, Wrona, Janick (eds.), *Studies in Asian Linguistics (LSASL 78): Studies in Japanese and Korean Linguistics* (available from http://www.engl.polyu.edu.hk/research/nomz/pdf/WRONA_History_of_NO.pdf#search='The+Early+History+of+no+as+a+Nominaliser'). München: LINCOM.

【発表 3】
# Grammatical nominalizations in Akan and Gã

Akua A. Campbell

Rice University

The structures that have been referred to as relative clauses in Akan and Gã (both Niger Congo, Kwa) are re-examined in light of Shibatani (2009), which shows that these structures are actually nominalizations. Relativization is but one use of nominalization structures. It is shown that these facts are borne out in both Akan and Gã. Evidence adduced includes the occurrence of relative structures with determiners and internal syntactic changes such as the lack of an argument for Gã and inability to take full NPs in relevant argument positions for Akan. Forms traditionally construed as relativizers and typically glossed as REL are shown to be nominalizers or nominalization markers. The polysemous nature of these markers is seen in their occurrence with genitives and other types of subordinate constructions. These subordinate structures are also demonstrated to constitute nominalizations, but with different functions. The study highlights the value of separating form from function in syntactic analysis.

【発表 4】
## A nominalization account of possessive substantives in Formosan Languages

Haowen Jiang

Rice University

This talk discusses some terminological issues related to what is traditionally called attributive and predicative possession, two of the three broad syntactico-functional domains of possession (Herslund & Baron 2001:4; Mcgregor 2009: 2) and revises Ultan's (1978) typology of possessive substantives by empirically drawing data from Formosan languages and theoretically adopting a nominalization-based view of possession (Shibatani & Shigeno 2013).

Comrie & Thompson (2007: 379) discussed several crosslinguistic processes for forming nouns from nouns. Through various morphological means, a base noun can be turned into a derived noun with an abstract quality of the base noun's referent or with attributes that are either quantitatively (e.g. augmentative) or qualitatively (e.g. pejorative) different from those of the base noun's referent. These are all instances of nominal-based nominalization. However, there is yet another type of nominal-based nominalization that they did not take into consideration, one that may operate on units larger than the word level and is traditionally discussed under the rubric of (attributive) possession. Numerous studies have come to the conclusion that the range of semantics coded by so-called genitive/possessive constructions is so diverse, both within and across languages, that

"linguistic possession implies nothing more than the existence of some association or relationship between" the possessor (POR) and the possessum (PUM) (Langacker 2009: 81). And making reference to something through its association with something else is essentially a metonymical process, which plays an important role in the functional definition of nominalization (Shibatani 2009). Specifically, the input of this type of process can be any entity-denoting nominal, and the output is also a nominal, but with denotations anaphorically or contextually associated with referent of the base nominal. Accordingly, unlike prototypical nouns, the result nominal does not have constant time-stable denotations, and thus can be considered an ad hoc nominalization (Heyvaert 2003: 120).

Ultan (1978: 27) refers to "non-attributive, independent possessive pronouns or nouns" as possessive substantives, and his typology of possessive substantives (based on a pool of 75 languages) recognizes two basic types, both characterizable by how they differ from attributive possessive NPs. Possessive substantives are formed by omitting PUM from a typical POR-PUM syntagm in Type 1 (e.g. *John's* in English; cf. *John's book*), and by replacing PUM with a "determination marker" in Type 2 (e.g. *mein-er* 'mine' in Germany; cf. *mein Bleistift* 'my pencil'). On the basis of 15 Formosan languages/dialects, I expand this two-way typology to include a third type, where possessive substantives are neither elliptical nor substitutional versions of attributive possessive NPs, suggesting the former is not syntactic derivatives of the latter, as is commonly held to be the case. The results thus argue for possessive substantives best seen as denoting nominals on their own right rather than as "headless" or "elliptic genitive constructions" (Rosenbach 2002: 32). It is also found that while so-called genitive markers in attributive possessive NPs are rather homogeneous across Formosan languages and often involve cognate forms, the way possessive substantives are formed varies considerably from one language to another. Finally, I show alienability splits in Formosan languages are in fact more pervasive than previously believed once possessive substantives are given the attention they deserve.

## References

Comrie, Bernard & Sandra Thompson. 2007. Lexical nominalization. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 334–381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herslund, Michael & Irène Baron. 2001. Introduction: Dimensions of possession. Typological Studies in Language 47. In Irène Baron, Michael Herslund & Finn Sørensen (eds.), *Dimensions of possession*, 1–25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heyvaert, Liesbet. 2003. *A Cognitive-Functional approach to nominalization in English*. Cognitive Linguistic Research. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2009. *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*. Cognitive Linguistics Research 42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mcgregor, William B. 2009. Typology of ergativity. *Linguistics and Language Compass* 3(1). 480–508. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00118.x.

Rosenbach, Anette. 2002. *Genitive variation in English: conceptual factors in synchronic and diachronic studies*. Topics in English Linguistics 42. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2009. Elements of complex structures, where recursion isn't: the case of relativization. In Talmy Givón & Masayoshi Shibatani (eds.), *Syntactic Complexity: Diachrony, Acquisition, Neuro-cognition, Evolution*, 163–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shibatani, Masayoshi & Hiromi Shigeno. 2013. Amami nominalizations. *International Journal of Okinawan Studies: Speccial Issue on Ryukyuan Languages* 4(1). 107.

Ultan, Russell. 1978. Toward a typology of substantival possession. In Joseph Harold Greenberg, Charles Albert Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of human language. Vol. 4: Syntax*, 221–248. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

【発表 5】
# (Numeral) Classifiers and Nominalization

Masayoshi Shibatani
Rice University

Noun classifiers occur all over the world with various functions ranging from number/quantifier marking (numeral classifiers) to the discourse marking of specific/definite references and of register/style levels. Other functions include formation of what are known as "deictic anaphoric" and "numeral anaphoric" expressions, possessive marking, relative clause marking, and nominal derivation. However, the current understandings of classifiers such as "numeral classifiers … may categorize the

referent of a noun in terms of its animacy, shape, and other inherent properties"
(Aikhenvald 2006) do not readily explain why classifiers have these various functions
and even a simple fact that numeral classifiers across languages always occur directly
next to numerals rather than the head nouns that they are said to classify. Alternatively,
Greenberg (1974 and, Chierchia (1998), based on the observation that numeral classifier
languages do not have obligatory plural marking, advance a view that numeral classifiers
make nouns countable in non-number marking languages, where nouns are all collectives
(Greenberg) or mass nouns (Chierchia). In this talk I will demonstrate that languages like
Japanese and Chinese, where nouns are claimed to be inherently collectives or mass nouns,
do in fact make count-mass-collective distinctions in the noun lexicon apart from the use
of numeral classifiers. Of the various functions of classifiers enumerated above, we take
nominalization to be the basic function of classifiers, including numeral classifiers. It will
be shown that the other "functions" of classifiers follow from the nominalization analysis.
　(当日の講演は日本語で行われる。)