２０２４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

（　夏期・一般選抜　）問題

専門科目　　英　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	

２０２４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

（夏期・一般選抜）問題

専門科目（　　英　語　学　　専攻分野）

[Ⅰ] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

This book is an extended reflection on the nature of morphosyntactic variation in natural language. **(i)**Probably one of the easiest things to observe about language is its variability: languages and dialects vary over time and across space. This variation is readily apparent even to the most casual observer. Moreover, all aspects of the structure of language seem to be open to variation: phonology, syntax, and morphology, as well as the lexicon. Linguistic variants are culturally sanctioned as languages in the everyday sense of the term, and so we speak of the English language, the French language, and so on. In the terminology of Chomsky (1986b), these cultural entities are forms of E-language, but individuals we identify as English speakers, French speakers, etc. have internalized variant I-languages. So variation is found at both the E-language and the I-language level.

(ii) At the same time, the search for language universals has been an abiding concern for linguists and linguistic theory. In recent decades, this has taken two principal forms. On the one hand, the field of language typology has sought to observe language universals of one kind or another by directly cataloguing common structural features across many languages. This approach was initiated by Greenberg (1963/2007), with a sample of thirty languages. At the time of writing (early 2018), *The World Atlas of Language Structures* (*WALS* henceforth) reports data from a total of 2,679 languages. Strikingly, while Greenberg cited 45 putative universals in his original paper, many working in this field now feel that the notion of universal may be chimerical. Nonetheless, many universals have been proposed: the Universals Archive at the University of Konstanz lists over 2,000.

The other form of investigation of language universals in recent decades has been directly inspired by the work of Noam Chomsky (see in particular Chomsky 1965; 1975; 1980; 1986b). Chomsky argues that there must be a biological predisposition to language. Again, the argument is based on two observations about language which are readily made: first, that language is an extremely complex phenomenon, and, second, that young children acquire their native language with apparent speed and ease. Together, these two observations lead to the conclusion that there must be some inbuilt cognitive bias which facilitates language acquisition by constraining the hypothesis space within which language learning can operate. The most direct—although certainly not the only—way to guarantee this is by constraining the form of a possible grammar of a human language, i.e. defining the class of possible I-languages. This amounts to constructing a theory of possible human grammars (taken to be a subset of the set of grammars, and therefore I-languages). Such a theory is universal by definition; hence the constraints on possible grammars/I-languages should manifest themselves as structural universals of language. This set of constraints is generally referred to as Universal Grammar (UG henceforth); UG is thus 'the general theory of I-languages' (Berwick & Chomsky 2016: 90). The notion of 'inbuilt cognitive bias' just alluded to is often thought to be genetically determined; if so, the possible form of grammars represents a modern version of the notion of 'innate ideas'. Put simply, UG is innate.

In what follows I will adopt a Chomskyan perspective, in that I accept the premise that some constraint on the possible form of natural-language grammars is required in order to account for the two observations just described. How directly such constraints need to be genetically coded is, however, a question which I will not decide in advance; this is an overarching issue which I will not directly address in what follows.

Adopting a Chomskyan perspective entails the postulation of universals, as we have seen: UG defines the general form of a possible grammar of a human language. In this context, the simple observation of massive structural variation, at all levels and in all observable times and places, raises a problem. How can we reconcile such easily observed, culturally sanctioned linguistic diversity with the fact that human linguistic competence appears to be a readily acquired cognitive capacity? Moreover, human linguistic competence appears to be *uniquely* human, and our species is known to be genetically rather homogeneous (see, e.g., Reed & Tishkoff 2006). Independently of whether one assumes some form of biological predisposition to language of the Chomskyan kind (but all the more so if one does), reconciling the attested linguistic diversity with the cognitive and genetic unity of the human species is a non-trivial matter. At its most general, this is the question this book tries to address.

Since the early 1980s, mainstream generative grammar has developed an approach which addresses this question by postulating that UG allows for variation: this is known as the principles and parameters approach, first articulated in detail by Chomsky (1981) (P&P henceforth). **(iii)**The principles of UG articulate the invariant constraints on grammatical form motivated by the twin observations of linguistic complexity and apparent ease of language acquisition. Allied to these principles, at least as was first thought, are parameters specifying a restricted range of variation. Hence both what varies and what is invariant were seen as part of the innate linguistic endowment.

It was almost immediately realized that the P&P approach could create a link between the Greenbergian and Chomskyan approaches to linguistic variation and diversity. The parameters of UG may underlie, directly or indirectly, the typological variation and diversity observed in the Greenbergian tradition. This central idea has led to a great deal of productive cross-linguistic research, and is what motivates the present work. In the remainder of this Introduction, I want to illustrate how the Greenbergian and Chomskyan traditions have interacted in one particular domain, that of cross-linguistic word-order variation, showing both the advantages and disadvantages of standard P&P.

(iv) Among the 45 universals observed in Greenberg's classic 1963/2007 paper, there were several which dealt with word order. Of these, as shown by Dryer (1992) in his reassessment of Greenberg's early observations in the light of improved language sampling (intended among other things to remove the Indo-European bias in Greenberg's sample) and a database of 625 languages, a number fail to stand up but, perhaps more interestingly, a good number still do hold. Consider as an illustration the correlation between VO order and prepositions and OV order and postpositions (Greenberg's Universals 3 and 4; Universal 3 was originally restricted to VSO languages, but this was later extended to SVO languages by W. Lehmann 1973; Vennemann 1974; and Hawkins 1983). The figures from the latest version of *WALS* are as follows (these figures exclude inpositions and cases of 'no dominant order' in the interests of exposition):

(1)

OV & Postpositions	472
OV & Prepositions	14
VO & Postpositions	41
VO & Prepositions	454

(Dryer 2013a; 2013b)

Here there is a total of 981 languages, and so the figures approximate closely to percentages. Hence more than 90% of the languages sampled show the correlation. In terms of standard P&P theory, this correlation is captured by the Head Parameter, which we can formulate as in (2):

(2) In X′, X {precedes/follows} its complement YP.

This parameter exploits the category-neutral nature of the X′-schema in order to state the cross-categorial generalization, a possibility first adumbrated by Lightfoot (1979) and developed in Hawkins (1983); see Roberts (2017a: 31-3). Here we see the P&P idea in action: the X′-theoretic notions of 'head', 'complement', and 'X″' are defined by UG, and are facets of invariant principles of phrase structure. The options 'precede' or 'follow' represent the parameter, also stated at the level of UG, and are also therefore taken to be part of the innate endowment.

But **(v)**we can also see a problem: a minority of languages appear to disobey the correlation. In this connection, there are several possibilities. We should, of course, check that the reported information is accurate. Assuming it is, then we need to look closely at the languages in question and see whether a plausible analysis which would bring them into line with (2) is possible. Since *WALS* is based on reported surface facts, it is in principle always possible that a generative analysis—referring to a deeper level of syntactic analysis—may be available, which will solve the problem. It is reasonable to think that this is possible in at least some cases, but it is also likely that some of these 55 languages will remain problematic. Of course, **(vi)**the non-surface-based analysis can lead to the opposite situation too. For example, German, Dutch, and Frisian are reported in *WALS* as combining 'no dominant order' for OV/VO with prepositions (no data on Afrikaans is reported for these features in *WALS*, but it well-known that Afrikaans is broadly very similar to Dutch in these respects: see Biberauer 2003). German is stated to be a language 'in which word order is primarily determined syntactically, but in which there are competing OV and VO constructions' (Dryer 2013a). In the generative tradition since Koster (1975) these languages have been analysed as underlyingly OV, with surface VO orders derived by verb-movement to the left of the object in the relevant contexts (main clauses where there is no auxiliary). Since these languages are prepositional (in fact there are also some postpositions, but I will leave this complication aside here), this analysis adds up to four further languages in the OV & Preposition group.

It is very likely, then, that we are faced with real counterexamples to the prevailing tendency, even if some of the 55 problematic languages could be shown either to have been misreported or to be amenable to a plausible 'deeper' analysis which assigns them to one of the other categories. Since parameters are taken as 'hard', UG-given constraints, we cannot simply replace (2) with a tendency, or attach some kind of weighting or preference to it (at least not in a direct way). The only option available, in that case, is to make (2) less general, and relativize it to categories. Let us then replace (2) with (3):

(3) a. In V′, V {precedes/follows} its complement.
b. In P′, P {precedes/follows} its complement.

We can now readily capture the data summarized in (1). The 14 OV, Prepositional languages set (3a) to 'follow' and (3b) to'precede' (as do Afrikaans, Dutch, German, and Frisian) and the 41 VO, Postpositional languages do the opposite.

(vii) It is clear, though, that such empirical adequacy has a heavy theoretical price. We now have no way to capture the overwhelming tendency towards harmonic orders in parametric terms (of course, we could introduce some other means, or appeal to psycholinguistic factors following proposals such as those in Hawkins 1983; 1994; 2004). The figures in (1) could just as easily have been the other way around, if the parameters regulating word order are those in (3). Moreover, this exercise can be repeated for all heads and complements, giving us as many head parameters as there are heads. This is clearly not a good situation.

[adapted from Ian Roberts, *Parameter Hierarchies and Universal Grammar*, Oxford University Press]

受験記号番号	

問1　下線部 **(i)** を日本語に訳しなさい。

問2　下線部 **(ii)** についてその内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問3　下線部 **(iii)** を日本語に訳しなさい。

受験記号番号	

問4　下線部（**iv**）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問5　下線部（**v**）についてその内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問6　下線部（**vi**）についてその内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問7　下線部（**vii**）についてその内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

受験記号番号	

［Ⅱ］以下の日本語の文を英語に訳しなさい。

語学の勉強は決して楽ではありません。学習機会や道具を手にいれるにはお金が必要です。勉強のための時間と道具はどこかで作り出さなくてはなりません。

アスリートは「サンマ」という戦略をよく使います。「時間」「空間」「仲間」の３つの「間」を利用して努力することです。具体的には、しっかりタイムマネジメントをして学習する時間を確保し、学習がはかどる空間を見つけ、くじけそうになった時に励まし合える仲間をもつ、ということです。

私の学生時代には、生の英語に接するための機会としては英語の説教が聞ける教会くらいで、仲間と英語を学び合う機会はそれほど多くありませんでした。しかし今ではラジオやテレビの語学講座のリスナーで作っているグループもいくつか存在します。独学ではなかなか続かなくとも、メンバー同士で学びあい、モチベーションを高めるのも現代の効果的学習法だと思います。

【杉田敏著『英語の新常識』（集英社インターナショナル新書）】