

## 第二言語習得における母語の役割について

言語学と言語習得の諸相チーム（課題番号：157001）

研究期間：平成 27 年 7 月 28 日～平成 30 年 3 月 31 日

研究代表者：毛利史生 研究員：一瀬陽子

### 1. Introduction

In this paper, we present the current state of our research project. We have so far worked on English L2 learners' (Japanese L1 learners) acquisition of definiteness. As some of the most influential analyses of definiteness acquisition, we refer to Ionin (2003) and Ionin et.al (2004, 2005). These analyses have approached L2 learners' acquisition of definiteness on the basis of dichotomy of definiteness and specificity. On the other hand, Gillon (2015) notes that cross-linguistically, the semantics of articles are not necessarily dichotomous, because they do not necessarily encode either definiteness or specificity. It varies cross-linguistically: they encode definiteness (English and many other languages), deictic information (most Salish languages) and specificity (Samoan). Both analyses in common focused upon the semantics of articles. Particularly, Ionin et.al (2004, 2008) claim that L2 learners whose L1 lack an article system (L2 English learners of Russian and Korean) show more fluctuations over the usage of articles because they cannot transfer the linguistic source of their L1 to the L2 acquisition.

In our on-going analysis, on the other hand, we have been engaged in the definiteness acquisition from another perspective. It seems appropriate to assume that the English definite article encodes two semantic primitives: uniqueness and familiarity. These two semantic primitives are core components for definite articles, considering the fact that article-less languages show a principled distinction between uniqueness and familiarity. Investigating many article-

less languages, Jenks (2015, 2018) show that some languages, including Japanese and Mandarin, reflect the distinction in definiteness marking between uniqueness and familiarity: Unique definites are realized with a bare noun, and anaphoric definites are realized with a demonstrative, except in subject position (Jenks 2018 501). That anaphoric definites appear with a demonstrative has been reported in the studies of individual article-less languages such as Japanese (Kurafuji 2004) and Thai (Piriyawiboon 2010) .

With this cross-linguistic background of definiteness, we would like to shed light on Japanese English learners' definiteness marking patterns. Definiteness is one of the most intensively discussed issues in the second language acquisition study. However, to the best of my knowledge, there is no full-fledged analysis to investigate L2 learners' definiteness marking in terms of the distinction between those two semantic primitives. In Japanese, too, anaphoric definites are explicitly marked with a demonstrative, whereas unique definites are not explicitly marked. In other words, the latter has no linguistic clue from the learners' native language but the former has a realized linguistic clue, which can be a 'positive' transfer from their native language. Particularly, we need to pay special attention to the following questions: Does the presence of a demonstrative in L1 encourage learners to mark the appropriate definiteness marking? Or, otherwise, does it impede learners from acquiring the proper usage of definiteness? In this paper, we do not present the results of the experiment because we are still in the middle of collecting and analyzing data. Instead, this paper will only show English definite

environments and their Japanese counterparts, namely, definite nouns marked by a demonstrative and those without it.

## 2. Definiteness Environments

There is a longstanding debate going on in the literature: how definiteness can be characterized, i.e., uniqueness, or familiarity, and how it can be realized in classifier languages. It is true that the two semantic primitives for definiteness have been advocated by two theorists: Kadman (1990) and Hawkins (1991) for uniqueness approach, on one hand, and Kamp (1981), Heim 1982, and Chierchia (1995) for familiarity approach, on the other hand. More recently, the blended view that makes these primitives no longer distinguishable has been advocated in some analyses including Roberts (2003). Also, while maintaining the aspect of familiarity, Schwarz (2009) argues that uniqueness should be satisfied relative to a relevant minimalized context, that is, minimal situations in the sense of Kratzer (2007).

From recent cross-linguistic analyses, it turns out that English is a kind of language whose definite article has embodied both familiarity and uniqueness. For example, in German, the contrast between uniqueness and familiarity can be morphologically detected in whether the definite articles contract with prepositions. The former is described as a ‘strong’ definite article, and the latter, as a ‘weak’ definite article, respectively, in Schwarz (2009). Weak definite articles, which occur in unique definite contexts, must contract, while strong definite articles, which occur in familiar definite contexts, cannot be contracted.

### (1) Weak vs. strong articles in German

- a. In her Kabinettsitzung heute wird ein neuer  
In the cabinet.meeting today is a new proposal  
Vorschlag vom Kanzler erwartet.  
by.the<sub>weak</sub> chancellor expected  
‘In today’s cabinet meeting, a new proposal by  
the chancellor is expected.’
- b. In der Kabinettsitzung heute wird ein neuer  
In the cabinet.meeting today is a new proposal  
Vorschlag #vom/ von dem Minister  
by.the<sub>weak</sub>/by the<sub>strong</sub> minister erwartet.  
expected  
‘In today’s cabinet meeting, new proposal by the  
minister is expected.’

(Schwarz 2009: 41)

It is not only German that shows morphosyntactic distinctions between uniqueness and familiarity. According to Schwarz (2013), some languages including Creole and Akan explicitly mark definiteness with articles when their nouns occur in anaphoric definite environments.

Also, it seems plausible to say that classifier languages, including Japanese, show analogous morphosyntactic patterns in definiteness marking. As mentioned above, in Mandarin and Japanese, unique definites are realized with a bare noun, and anaphoric definites are realized with a demonstrative, except in subject position (Jenks 2018: 501).

### 2.1 Definiteness in Japanese

Let us look over several definite environments to see whether demonstrative descriptions in Japanese hold true of anaphoric environments, and uniqueness definites require nouns to appear bare. Based on the observations by Schwarz (2009, 2013) and Jenks (2015, 2018), we present three ‘unique’ environments in which definiteness is not licensed by a prior-mentioned discourse antecedent: large-situation definites, immediate-situation definites, and part-whole bridging. These environments require weak definites in German, and bare nouns in classifier languages.

#### [A] Large-situation definites

A first definite environment is the one called large-situation definites. The use of the definite determiner in English is due to culturally or socially unique entities. This uniqueness is not licensed by a specific context, but judged based on general world knowledge.

- (2) **The prime** minister made a speech.  
(3) **The sun** sets at 6:00 PM.  
(4) Taiyoo-wa gogo 6-ji-ni sizumu.  
sun-Top PM 6-time-Dat set  
‘The sun sets at 6:00 PM.’

This type of definiteness does not have an explicit prior-mentioned antecedent, so it is expected that nouns in Japanese appear bare. In fact they appear without a demonstrative.

**[B] Immediate-situation definites**

The next definite environment is the case in which definites are licensed on the knowledge shared commonly by speaker and hearer, as shown below:

- (5) A: I am dead tired.  
B: I'll prepare the meal.

Let us say that this conversation goes on between wife and husband, and the first remark is made by the husband who has come back from a long day's work. Then, his wife kindly offers cooking for their meal. The meal she refers to is obviously the one the two are going to eat for dinner. Thus, the uniqueness is licensed in a specific small situation shared 'immediately' by speaker and hearer. Under the same situation, the Japanese counterpart to the remark by B is translated with the bare noun, as follows:

- (6) Watasi-ga shokuji-o tukuru-yo.  
I-Nom meal-Acc prepare-Part  
'I will prepare the meal.'

This definite environment, too, shows that bare nouns are unique definites. In other words, demonstratives cannot be used to express immediate-situation definites.

**[C] Association/Inference definites**

A third definite environment is an instance in which definites are licensed in association with some other entity mentioned in the discourse.

- (7) I was invited to a wedding last Saturday. The bride was very beautiful.

The bride is identified as a definite referent, despite the lack of its prior-mentioned antecedent. In this environment, definiteness is licensed as uniqueness because the bride is usually a uniquely identified referent in the wedding context. This type of definiteness, however, is more precisely segmented into two subcategories (Schwartz 2009, 2013) : part-whole bridging as in (8) and producer-product bridging as in (9).

- (8) I was called into John's office. **The ceiling** was very high.  
(9) I was inspired by the novel. **The author** must be

talented.

These two kinds of bridging definites, though apparently difficult to distinguish, reflect the choices of articles in German. The former is expressed with the weak article, and the latter, with the strong article. Analogously, the investigations by Jenks (2018) have revealed that Mandarin native speakers prefer bare descriptions in the case of part-whole bridging, and also prefer demonstrative descriptions in the case of producer-producing bridging. It thus follows that the part-whole bridging definites are identified as unique referents, and the producer-product bridging definites are treated as anaphoric definites. As noted in Schwartz (2009, 2013) and Jenks (2018), part-whole bridging is associated with uniqueness because the antecedent of the bridged definite is presupposed by virtue of a 'containment' relation. That is, an office contains the existence of its ceiling under a normal common knowledge. On the other hand, no such containment relationship holds in the case of producer-product bridging. Jenks claims that the producer-product bridging is a case of anaphoric definite, with an analysis of appealing to its 'concealed' antecedent --- due to lack of space, we will not touch upon the technical details.

Aside from whether Jenks's technical details are on the right track, the presence of an anaphoric link satisfies the producer-product bridging. The following examples are the Japanese counterparts to (8) and (9):

- (10) Watasi-wa John-no heya-ni yobareta. Tenjoo-ga I-Top John-Gen office-Sat was.called ceiling-Nom totemo takakatta.  
very was.high  
'I was called into John's office. The ceiling was very high.'
- (11) Watasi-wa sono shoosetu-ni kandoo-sita. I-Top that novel-Dat inspiration-did  
(Sono) sakka-wa tensai-ni tiginai.  
(That) author-Top genius-Dat talented  
'I was inspired by the novel. The author must be a genius.'

The informants I consulted were in fact divided for their preference for the presence of the demonstrative. It is certainly true that more informants preferred the demonstrative description in (11), but the bare noun does not seem to degrade the acceptability. On

the other hand, in the example below, the producer-product definite appears in the non-subject position, where the demonstrative description is more preferable.

- (12) Watasi-wa # (sono) sakka-ni zehi aitai.  
 I-Top (that) author-Dat for.sure want.to.see  
 'I want to see the author.'

I dared to attach the # mark to the bracket, but the judgement was not clear to all the informants. The demonstrative description seems more felicitous and the presence of the demonstrative may have made the relation between a producer and her product clearer. Obviously, it is necessary to investigate whether the marginal difference observed in Japanese is reflected in the other classifier languages including Mandarin. However, here I will not delve into this marginal issue and the inter-linguistic differences.

#### [D] Anaphoric Definites

Finally, we would like to touch upon anaphoric or familiar definites, which have explicit linguistic antecedents. It has already been reported in Jenks (2015, 2018) that in Mandarin anaphoric definites must include a demonstrative determiner. This section devotes to whether Japanese goes hand in hand with Mandarin. The most orthodox case of anaphoric definite is the one in which the definite noun appears in narrative sequences, as exemplified below:

- (13) a. Kyositu-ni kyojyu-to koosi-ga haittekita.  
 classrrom-Dat professor-Con lecturer-Nom entered  
 'A professor and a lecturer entered the classroom.'  
 b. Watashi-wa # (sono) koosi-ni kinoo aimasita.  
 I-Top that lecturer-Dat yesterday met  
 'I met the lecturer yesterday.'  
 c. Watashi-wa # (sono) kyojyu-ni gengogaku-o naratta.  
 I-Top that professor-Dat linguistics-Acc was. taught  
 'I was taught linguistics by the professor.'

In these narrative sequences bare nouns appear infelicitous and instead, the demonstrative descriptions occur as definite expressions. This corroborates the fact that bare nouns are prohibited in anaphoric definite environments. Interestingly, though not

exemplified here, in both Mandarin and Japanese, their anaphoric bare nouns are only allowed in 'subject' positions. Jenks (2018) claims that the definite noun in subject position is associated with 'topic', which can help the description without a demonstrative identified with its explicit antecedent. I will not pursue this issue any longer, leaving the technical details to a future research.

In addition to these narrative sequences, it has been reported that in donkey sentences, demonstrative descriptions are mandatory in Mandarin. Cheng and Huang (1996) observe that in two types of donkey sentences, namely, bare conditionals and *ruguo-* and *dou-* conditionals, what serve as donkey anaphora are demonstrative descriptions. Analogously, what serves as Japanese donkey anaphora is a demonstrative descriptions, as shown below:

- (14) Noofu-ga roba-o katteire-ba, noohu-ha  
 farmer-Nom donkey-Acc beat-Con, farmer-Top  
 # (sono) roba-o tataku.  
 that donkey-Acc beat  
 'If a farmer has a donkey, he beats the donkey.'

### 3. Summary and a Future Outlook

In the previous section, we have overviewed the observations by Schwarz (2009, 2013) and Jenks (2015, 2018), while referring to definite nouns in Japanese and Mandarin. As a result, it has turned out that Japanese goes hand in hand with Mandarin with respect to definite descriptions, reflecting Jenks's observation of definiteness in classifier languages, as follows:

- (15) a. Unique definites are realized as bare nouns.  
 b. Familiar definites are realized as demonstratives or overt pronouns.

It is well known in the literature that L2 learners can rely on three sources of linguistic knowledges: L2-input, L1-transfer and UG-based knowledge. The existence of L2-input is almost self-evident, because it is nearly impossible to acquire a target language without L2 exposure. Also, L2 acquisition is mediated by both positive and negative L1-transfers. For instance, it has been reported that English learners whose L1 have no articles show more patters of article misuses than those with articles in their L1 (cf. Ionin

2003 and Ionin et al. 2008) . The former case can be treated as a typical one induced by ‘positive’ L1-transfer, and the latter, the case induced by ‘negative’ L1-transfer. In contrast, what has been highly contentious is the issue of UG-based knowledge: To what extent L2 acquisition can proceed with the help of UG-based knowledge, and can L2 learners access to UG in the process of acquisition? However, the UG relevant issues are beyond the scope of my paper to pursue. In our research, rather, we will focalize on the effect of L1-transfer, and analyze negative and positive L1-transfer observed in the definiteness marking.

So far, we have looked into the definite environments in terms of the two semantic primitives, anaphoricity/familiarity and uniqueness. As a consequence, it has turned out that only the former requires an explicit description with a demonstrative. This ‘explicitness’ may be expected to prompt learners to the proper article usage. The unexpected case could possibly be attained. As we pointed our earlier in this report, we need to pay special attention to the following questions: Does the presence of a demonstrative in L1 encourage learners to mark the appropriate definiteness marking? Or, otherwise, does it impede learners from acquiring the proper usage of definiteness? With these questions as our focalized points, we are going to implement our research in our tests.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by funds (No.: 157001) from the Central Research Institute of Fukuoka University.

## References

- Cheng, L. and C.-T. Huang (1996) Two Types of Donkey Sentences. *Natural Language Semantics* 4, 121-163.
- Chierchia, G. (1995) *Dynamics of Meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawkins J. (1991) On (In) definite Articles: Implicatures and (Un) grammaticality Prediction. *Journal of Linguistics* 27, 405-442.
- Ionin, C. (2003) Article Semantics in Second Language Acquisition. Ph.D. Thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ionin, T., Ko, H., Wexler, K. (2004) Article Semantics in L2-acquisition: the Role of Specificity. *Language of Acquisition* 12, 3-69.
- Ionin, T., Zubizarreta, L.M., Maldonado, B. S. (2008) Sources of Linguistic Knowledge in the Second Language Acquisition of English Articles. *Lingua* 118, 554-576.
- Gillon, C. (2015) Investing D in Languages With and Without Articles. In *Methodologies in Semantic Fieldwork*, ed. by M. R. Bochnan and L. Matthewson, 175-206, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jenks, P. (2015) Two Kinds of Definites in Numeral Classifier Languages. In *Proceedings of SALT 25*, ed. by S. D’ Antonio, M. Moroney, and C. Little, 103-124.
- Jenks, P. (2018) Articulated Definiteness without Articles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49 (3) , 501-536.
- Kadmon, N. (1990) Uniqueness. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13, 273-324.
- Kanmp, H. (1981) A Theory of Truth and Semantic Representation. In *Formal Methods in the study of Language*, ed. by J.A.G. Groenedijk, T.M.V. Jansen, and M.J.B. Stokhof, 277-322. Amsterdam: Mathematisch Centrum.
- Kratzer, A. (2007) Situations in Natural Language Semantics. In *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. by E. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/situations-semantics/>.
- Kurafuji, T. (2004) Plural Morphemes, Definiteness, and the Notion of Semantic Parameter. *Language and Linguistics* 4, 211-242.
- Piriyawiboon, N. (2010) Classifiers and Determiner-less Languages: The case of Thai. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Schwarz, F. (2009) Two Types of Definites in Natural Language. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Schwarz, F. (2013) Two Kinds of Definites Cross-linguistically. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 7, 534-559.

## 研究業績

### 【論文】

1. Fumio Mohri, The Particle *Mo* in Japanese and its Roles in Numeral Indeterminate Phrases, *The Proceedings of PLC* (Pennsylvania Linguistic Conference) 40 平成29年3月
2. Fumio Mohri, Rai Tei, Degree Nominals in Japanese and Chinese Comparatives, *GLOW in Asia MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 平成29年12月

3. 一瀬陽子、大学教育におけるPBLの試み『比較文学研究』No122 平成29年

**【学会発表】**

1. Fumio Mohri, The Particle Mo in Japanese and its Roles in Numeral Indeterminate Phrases, The 40th Pennsylvania Linguistics Conference (ペンシルバニア州立大学) 平成28年2月
2. Fumio Mohri, Rai Tei, Degree Nominals in Japanese and Chinese Comparatives, GLOW in Asia IX 平成29年2月