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（春期・社会人特別選抜）問題

筆記試験　言語学専攻分野

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。
The intuition behind the notion of markedness in linguistics is that, where we have an opposition with two or more members (e.g. perfective versus imperfective), it is often the case that one member of the opposition is felt to be more usual, more normal, less specific than the other (in markedness terminology, it is unmarked, the others are marked). It is clearly insufficient to rely solely on an intuitive concept of markedness, and in this chapter a number of criteria that give more content to these intuitions are presented. The criteria are of varying nature (semantic, morphological, statistical), and are logically independent of one another. In many cases all criteria, or the clear majority of the criteria, point in the same direction, and here one can be reasonably certain of the appropriate assignment of markedness values. Often, however, the criteria conflict, and here one has to decide what weight must be attached to each criterion. Examples of such conflicts are cited below; in general, the morphological criteria are the least telling, since the morphology often reflects systematic correspondences of an earlier period in the history of a language. It is not, at least not necessarily, the case that all oppositions will have an unmarked member and a marked member or members; in some oppositions, all members may be equally marked. Finally, markedness is apparently not an all-or-none choice (marked versus unmarked), since there are oppositions where the markedness difference between the members is very great, and oppositions where the difference is much less, i.e. there can be degrees of markedness. All of these possibilities are illustrated below.

One of the most decisive criteria is that, in many cases, the meaning of the unmarked category can encompass that of its marked counterpart. The clearest example of this situation is where overt expression of the meaning of the marked category is always optional, i.e. where the unmarked category can always be used, even in a situation where the marked category would also be appropriate. Thus Italian and Spanish have Progressives very similar in meaning to that of English: Italian sto scrivendo, Spanish estoy escribiendo, English I am writing. However, in Spanish and Italian these forms can always, without excluding progressive meaning, be replaced by the non-Progressive forms scrivo, escribe, whereas in English changing I am writing to I write necessarily involves a shift to nonprogressive meaning. Compare also the following Italian example, where the Progressive and the Imperfect are used in parallel: Il Pizzi era in cucina e stava rimestando (Progressive) la polenta. La moglie preparava (Imperfect) la tavola e il ragazzo ... metteva (Imperfect) legna sul fuoco `Pizzi was in the kitchen and was mixing (Progressive) the polenta. His wife was laying (Imperfect) the table and the boy ... was putting (Imperfect) wood on the fire’. In such cases, we may say quite strictly that the marked category signals the presence of some feature, while the unmarked category simply says nothing about its presence or absence.

1. 下線部を日本語に訳しなさい。
2. 第二段落冒頭の文を日本語に訳した上で、その趣旨にそってイタリア語・スペイン語の進行形と英語の進行形の違いを簡潔に説明しなさい。
3. 第二段落冒頭の文の例になっていると考えられる言語現象を任意の言語から挙げ、なぜそのように考えられるか、説明しなさい。

Ⅱ. 次の術語のうちから5つ選び、それぞれ簡潔に説明しなさい。
1. クレオール
2. 対格
3. モグリティ
4. 情報
5. 声調
6. 危機言語
7. コード切り替え
8. 相補分布
9. 基本色彩語
10. 基本母音

以下、解答欄