平成２９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

（　秋期・一般選抜　）問題

専門科目Ⅰ　英　語　学

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。

受験番号	

成績	

平成２９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

(秋期・~~一般選抜~~) 問題

専門科目Ⅰ(　　英語学　　)

[Ⅰ] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

(A) A fundamental question that needs to be resolved at the outset concerns what kind of approach to adopt in studying grammar. There are two diametrically opposed answers to this question found in work on grammar. One sees the role of grammar as being essentially prescriptive (i.e. prescribing norms for grammatical correctness, linguistic purity and literary excellence); the other sees the role of grammar as being inherently descriptive (i.e. describing the way people speak or write their native language). We can illustrate the differences between these two approaches in relation to the following dialogue between the fictional Oxford detective Morse and his assistant Lewis, as they are looking at a dead body (where capital letters in the dialogue mark emphatic stress, and italics mark items of grammatical interest):

(1) MORSE: I think he was murdered, Lewis

LEWIS: *Who by*, sir?

MORSE: *By whom*, Lewis, *by whom*. Didn't they teach grammar at that COMPREHENSIVE school of yours?

Morse was educated at a *grammar* school – i.e. an elitist school which sought to give pupils a 'proper education' and taught them grammar, so that they could learn to speak and write 'properly' (i.e. in a prestigious form of Standard English). Lewis, by contrast, was educated at a *comprehensive* school – i.e. a more socially inclusive type of school which admitted pupils from a much broader social spectrum and didn't force-feed them with grammar. (B) The linguistic skirmish between Lewis and Morse in (1) revolves round the grammar of an italicised phrase which comprises the preposition *by* and the pronoun *who(m)*. The differences between what the two men say relates to (i) the form of the pronoun (*who* or *whom*?), and (ii) the position of the pronoun (before or after the preposition *by*?). Lewis uses the pronoun form *who*, and positions the pronoun before the preposition when he asks 'Who by?' Morse corrects Lewis and instead uses the pronoun form *whom* and positions the pronoun after the preposition when he says 'By whom?' But why does Morse correct Lewis? The answer is that Morse was taught traditional prescriptive grammatical rules at his grammar school, including two which can be outlined informally as follows:

(2) (i) The form *who* is used as a subject of a finite verb, and *whom* as the object of a verb or preposition.

(ii) Never end a phrase, clause or sentence with a preposition.

When Lewis asks 'Who by?' he violates both rules. This is because the pronoun *who(m)* is the object of the preposition *by* and rule (2i) stipulates that *whom* must therefore be used, and rule (2ii) specifies that the preposition should not be positioned at the end of a phrase. The corrected form 'By whom?' produced by Morse obeys both rules, in that *whom* is used in conformity with rule (2i), and *by* is positioned in front of its object *whom* in conformity with rule (2ii).

受験番号	

The more general question raised by the dialogue in (1) is the following. When studying grammar, should we adopt a descriptive approach and *describe* what ordinary people like Lewis actually say, or should we adopt a prescriptive approach and *prescribe* what people like Morse think they ought to say? (C) There are several reasons for rejecting the prescriptive approach. For one thing, it is elitist and socially divisive, in that a privileged elite attempts to lay down grammatical norms and impose them on everyone else in society. Secondly, the grammatical norms which prescriptivists seek to impose are often derived from structures found in 'dead' languages like Latin, which is somehow regarded as a model of grammatical precision and linguistic purity: and so, because Latin made a distinction between subject and object forms of pronouns, English must do so as well; and because Latin (generally) positioned prepositions before their objects, English must do so as well. Such an approach fails to recognise typological diversity in languages – i.e. that there are many different types of structure found in the world's 8,000 or so known languages. Thirdly, the prescriptive approach fails to recognise sociolinguistic variation i.e. that different types of structure are found in different styles and varieties of English (e.g. *Who by?* is used in colloquial English, and *By whom?* in formal styles of English). And fourthly, the prescriptive approach also fails to recognise linguistic change – i.e. that languages are constantly evolving, and that structures used centuries ago may no longer be in use today (e.g. *whom* is an archaic form which has largely dropped out of use and is no longer part of the grammar of teenagers today). For reasons such as these, the approach taken to grammar in work over the past seventy years or so has been descriptive.

What this means is that in attempting to devise a grammar of (e.g.) English, we aim to describe the range of grammatical structures found in present-day English. But how do we determine what is or isn't grammatical in present-day English? One approach is to study usage (i.e. the range of structures used by people when they speak or write). Linguists who adopt this kind of approach rely on data from a corpus (e.g. a computerised database such as the British National Corpus) containing authentic examples of spoken or written English. Such corpora offer the advantage that they contain millions of sentences, and the sentences have usually been codified/tagged by a team of researchers, so simplifying the task of searching for examples of a particular construction. Some linguists treat the Web as a form of corpus, and use a search engine to find examples from the Internet of the kinds of structures they are interested in.

The usefulness of corpora can be illustrated as follows. One of the ways I collect data on spoken English is by listening to live, unscripted radio and TV broadcasts, and noting down unusual structures (often using them as exercise material in my syntax books). An interesting sentence which I heard one day (reported in Radford 2004: 429; 8a) is the following:

(3) What is thought has happened to him? (Interviewer, BBC Radio 5 Live)

When I first heard the sentence in (3), I wasn't sure what to make of it. (D) One possibility that occurred to me is that it might be an accidental speech error (perhaps induced by the pressure of live broadcasting), representing a blend of the two different structures in (4), formed by combining the italicised part of (4a) with the italicised part of (4b):

(4) (a) *What is thought* to have happened to him?

(b) What is it thought *has happened to him*?

受験番号	

However, an alternative possibility is that the kind of structure in (3) is not a speech error but rather a productive structure – albeit not one described in standard grammars of English. To check on whether (3) is a productive structure or not, I searched for similar structures on the Internet, and found hundreds of them. For example, I came across 116 examples of sentences containing the string (i.e. sequence of words) *is/are thought may*, like those below:

(5) (a) The toxicology issue is thought may have arisen because of a pre-existing health issue in the animals
(b) Police are investigating the cause of the blazes, which is thought may be arson
(c) Curiously, about one-third of adults 60 and over are thought may have antibodies that may help protect against the virus
(d) The user enters one or more search words which are thought may exist in the definition of the word sought

(E) The fact that I was able to locate thousands of similar examples of the structure in (3) makes it more likely that (3) is a (hitherto unreported) grammatical structure in English, and not a one-off 'slip of the tongue'.

What the discussion here illustrates is that usage data (from corpora or from the Web) provide a very useful source of information about the productivity of a given type of structure (i.e. how often it is used). However, there are also downsides to the usage-based approach. For one thing, a corpus may contain relatively few examples of low-frequency structures. Secondly, it is generally not possible to ask the speakers who produced them questions about the sentences in the corpus (e.g. 'How would you negate this sentence?'). Thirdly, a corpus may contain examples of production errors (slips of the tongue, or pen, or keyboard) which would probably be judged as unacceptable even by the people who produced them. And (in the case of internet examples), it is sometimes unclear whether someone producing a given sentence (who may use an identity-concealing pseudonym like *CutiePie* or *MasterBlaster* as their name) is a native speaker of English or not, and if so what variety/dialect of English they speak.

A very different approach to studying grammar has been adopted by Noam Chomsky and his followers in work over the past sixty years. For Chomsky, the goal of studying the grammar of a language is to determine what it is that native speakers *know* about the grammar of their native language which enables them to speak and understand the language: hence, in studying language, we are studying a specific kind of cognition (i.e. human knowledge). In a fairly obvious sense, any native speaker of a language can be said to *know* the grammar of his or her native language. (F) For example, any native speaker of English can tell you that the negative counterpart of *I like syntax* is *I don't like syntax*, and not, e.g., **I no like syntax*. (Note that a prefixed star/asterisk in front of a phrase or sentence indicates that it is ungrammatical.) In other words, native speakers know how to form phrases and sentences in their native language. Likewise, any native speaker of English can tell you that a sentence like *She loves me more than you* is ambiguous and has two interpretations which can be paraphrased as 'She loves me more than she loves you' and 'She loves me more than you love me': in other words, native speakers also know how to interpret (i.e. assign meaning to) expressions in their language. However, it is important to emphasise that this grammatical knowledge of how to form and interpret expressions in your native language is tacit (i.e. subconscious) rather than explicit (i.e. conscious): so, (G) it's no good asking a native speaker of English a question such as 'How do you form negative sentences in English?' since human beings have no conscious awareness of the processes involved in speaking and understanding their native language. To introduce a technical term devised by Chomsky, we can say that native speakers have grammatical competence in their native language: by this, we mean that they have tacit knowledge of the grammar of their language – i.e. of how to form and interpret words, phrases and sentences in the language.

受験番号	

In work in the 1960s, Chomsky drew a distinction between competence (the native speaker's tacit knowledge of his or her language) and performance (what people actually say or understand by what someone else says on a given occasion). Competence is 'the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language', while performance is 'the actual use of language in concrete situations' (Chomsky 1965: 4). Very often, performance is an imperfect reflection of competence: we all make occasional slips of the tongue, or occasionally misinterpret something which someone else says to us. However, this doesn't mean that we don't know our native language or that we don't have *competence* in it. Misproductions and misinterpretations are performance errors, attributable to a variety of performance factors like tiredness, boredom, drunkenness, drugs, external distractions and so forth. A grammar of a language tells you what you need to know in order to have native-like competence in the language (i.e. to be able to speak the language like a fluent native speaker): hence, (H) it is clear that grammar is concerned with competence rather than performance. This is not to deny the interest of performance as a field of study, but merely to assert that perfomance is more properly studied within the different – though related – discipline of psycholinguistics, which studies the psychological processes underlying speech production and comprehension.

[From Andrew Radford, *Analysing English Sentences (Second Edition)*, Cambridge University Press]

問1　下線部（A）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問2　下線部（B）について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

受験番号	

問3　下線部（C）について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問4　下線部（D）について、著者がそのように考えた理由について *What* の移動操作の観点から説明しなさい。

問5　下線部（E）を日本語に訳しなさい。

受験番号	

問6　下線部（F）について、*I don't like syntax* が文法的であり、また、*I no like syntax* が非文法的である理由を樹形図を書いて説明しなさい。

問7　下線部（G）を日本語に訳しなさい。

受験番号	

問8　下線部（H）について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

［II］以下の日本語の文を英語に訳しなさい。

自分が話す英語を相手に分かってもらうために必要なことはいくつかありますが、まず大切なのは、英語の音の出し方の基本を知ることです。きれいな発音でなくても構いませんし、ネイティブのような英語でなくても良いのですが、英語の音の基本を守らないと通じません。「英語の音の基本」とは、具体的には、母音と子音、そして強弱のリズムです。

【鳥飼玖美子『本物の英語力』（講談社現代新書）より】