

2020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

(春期・一般選抜) 問題

専門科目Ⅰ 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。

成

績

2020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

(春期・一般選抜) 問題

専門科目 I (英 語 学 専攻分野)

[I] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

Notions of observational, descriptive and explanatory adequacy can be usefully transposed to comparative syntax.

Observational adequacy in the context of comparative syntax is achieved when one has gotten the facts of comparative syntax right. Facts in comparative syntax necessarily involve more than one language or dialect. (I will use the term 'language' to cover dialects, too.) They typically have the form 'Language A differs syntactically from Language B in the following way' or 'Language A and Language B are identical in the following respect'. A well-known example of the first sort would be 'French and English differ in that unstressed object pronouns precede the verb in French (apart from positive imperatives), but follow it in English', as in:

(1) Vous les voyez souvent. ('you them see often')

(2) You see them often.

A banal example of the second sort would be 'French and English are alike in that definite articles precede the associated nouns in both languages'. In a very large number of cases, such observations are completely straightforward, in particular when the languages in question are both well-studied.

I have here used examples involving just two languages, but comparative syntax sets no limit in principle on the number of languages to be compared. In practice, one limit is set by the number of languages/dialects currently spoken (plus those that are extinct yet to some extent accessible). A smaller limit than that is set in practice by our ability to discover and to manipulate data in very large quantities.

(I) The two French-English comparisons just mentioned may give the impression that achieving observational adequacy in comparative syntax is easy. It is and it is not. In the case of French and English syntax, there are innumerable solid facts that have been accumulated over the years and decades, reaching back to pre-generative syntax work. What is specific to comparative syntax is the collating of those facts and observations. In the case of gross word order differences and similarities such as those just given for French and English, the observational task does seem easy. But other comparative facts are less well-known. For example, French has no exact counterpart of:

(3) John has written three articles but Mary has written four.

French needs to add a pronominal clitic to the second half. This is shown by the impossibility of the French word-for-word counterpart of (3):

(4) *Jean a écrit trois articles mais Marie a écrit quatre.

as opposed to the well-formed:

(5) Jean a écrit trois articles mais Marie en a écrit quatre.

which contains the pronominal clitic *en* (that can be thought of as approximately equivalent to English *of them*).

Less well-known still, French has no exact counterpart of:

- (6) At the age of seven, Mary could speak three languages.

French would need to express years (=ans) overtly:

- (7) A l'âge de sept ans, Marie. . .

Contrary to English, omitting *ans* is not possible in French:

- (8) *A l'âge de sept, Marie. . .

Even to a syntactician bilingual in French and English (or in whatever pair of languages is at issue), observational adequacy would not be automatic. Consider what is in practice usually the most interesting starting point for comparative syntax work, namely the observation of differences, often of differences that are 'surprising' (against the background of what is known about syntax in general). The (somewhat) difficult part of the observational task is simply to notice those differences in the first place. (II) But we can make the reasonable assumption that with sufficient hard work done by a sufficient number of syntacticians over a sufficient period of time a very substantial set of syntactic differences between Languages A and B will be unearthed, for an arbitrarily large number of choices of A and B.

Descriptive adequacy in the case of comparative syntax involves discovering generalizations over the comparative observations that have been made. Assume that Languages A and B differ with respect to properties P and Q, such that A has both P and Q and B has neither. Assume further that in examining Languages C, D, and E, one discovers that each one either has both P and Q or has neither P nor Q. Then there appears to be a generalization to the effect that a language will have P if and only if it has Q.

Put another way, in thus studying Languages A through E we will have discovered a (bidirectional) correlation across those languages between properties P and Q. (III) There may also (in practice, more frequently) be partial (unidirectional) correlations, in the sense that we may find cases in which having property P implies without exception having Q, but in which Q does not imply P.

As an example of a unidirectional comparative syntax correlation, let us take P to be the property of having a transitive verb corresponding to English *need* and Q to be the property of having a transitive verb corresponding to English *have*. Harves and Kayne (2012) discovered that P appears to imply Q. If a language has transitive *need*, then it necessarily has transitive *have* (though not the other way around).

This generalization was established by looking at a considerable number of languages. It is formulated in such a way as to be readily testable as work on additional languages comes into play.

This comparative syntax generalization about *need* and *have*, although finer-grained, is similar to some of Greenberg's (1966) universals. More specifically, it is similar to those that he put forth as being exceptionless. Just as ours can be tested across more and more languages in the future, so have Greenberg's proposals for exceptionless generalizations been tested to some extent.

Our generalization about *need* and *have* is not, however, comparable to those of Greenberg's 'universals' that he put forth as '(overwhelming or strong) tendencies'. As Hawkins (1983) in effect noted, a reasonable way to interpret these 'tendencies' is to take them to be examples of potential cross-linguistic generalizations that have, however, sharp counterexamples. As in Hawkins's work, one can try to reformulate one or another of these 'tendencies' in such a way that the counterexamples disappear. Alternatively, the 'tendency' in question may have been, in one or another case, simply a mistaken proposal.

The distinction between ‘tendencies’ and universals is overlooked by Dunn et al. (2011), who in particular misinterpret the proposed universals of generative syntax as ‘tendencies’. (IV) Dunn et al. (2011) also, in a way that will affect their statistical discussion, underestimate the number of syntactically distinguishable human languages by orders of magnitude. The often cited figure of 5000 languages, while perhaps useful in some way, is hardly relevant to the study of syntax.

An estimate of 5000 languages would have to evaluate the contribution of Italy at one language. Yet Renzi and Vanelli (1983) showed that in Northern Italy alone one can individuate at least 25 syntactically distinct languages/dialects solely by studying the syntax of subject clitics. I myself have had the privilege of participating in a Padua-based syntactic atlas/(micro)comparative syntax project with Paola Benincà, Cecilia Poletto, and Laura Vanelli, extrapolating from which it is evident that a conservative estimate would be that present-day Italy has at least 500 syntactically distinct languages/dialects. 500,000 would then be a (very) conservative extrapolation to the number of syntactically distinct languages/dialects in the world at present. A less conservative number can be arrived at as follows.

We know that there are distinct varieties of English – many syntactic differences have been discussed that distinguish American from British English. And various regional syntactic differences within the United States or within the United Kingdom are well known. But what if it turned out that for every single pair of English speakers (and similarly for other languages) one could find at least one sharp syntactic difference? My own experience in observing the syntax of English speakers, both linguists and non-linguists, makes me think that it is likely that no two speakers of English have exactly the same syntax. If it is true that no two English speakers have the same (syntactic) grammar, then the number of syntactically distinguishable varieties of English must be as great as the number of native speakers of English. Extrapolating to the world at large, one would reach the conclusion that the number of syntactically distinct languages/dialects is at least as great as the number of individuals presently alive (i.e. more than 5 billion). Adding in those languages/dialects which have existed but no longer exist (not to mention those which will exist but do not yet exist) it becomes clear that the number of syntactically distinct (potential) human languages is far greater than 5 billion.

One might object that many of these languages/dialects will be distinct from one another only to an insignificant degree. For example, two English speakers might have identical syntax everywhere except in particle constructions, and even there, the differences might readily lend themselves to being called ‘tiny’, especially if, as is often the case, they had no effect on mutual comprehension. Yet such tiny differences may (or may not) be of substantial theoretical importance.

(V) It is worth noting the modest significance of the number of (possible) human languages for the acquisition of syntax. Under the assumption that acquisition proceeds by parameter setting, the child does not pick its language whole out of a set consisting of all possible languages. Rather, the child sets individual (syntactic) parameters. If the number of possible languages were so large that the number of parameters the child had to set was unmanageable (i.e. not learnable in the amount of time available), there would indeed be a problem. However, the number of independent binary-valued syntactic parameters needed to allow for 5 billion syntactically distinct grammars is only 33 (2 raised to the 33rd power is about 8.5 billion). It seems plausible that the child is capable of setting at least that many syntactic parameters. If the number of independent binary-valued syntactic parameters is a still manageable 100, then the corresponding number of grammars is, innocuously, over one million trillion trillion (i.e. greater than 10 raised to the 30th power).

The descriptive generalization stated in Harves and Kayne (2012), to the effect that transitive *need* depends on transitive *have*, was formulated as a hypothesis about all human languages. Testing it on a given language is often straightforward. Occasionally it is not, insofar as in some languages it may not be immediately clear what the counterparts of *need* and *have* are. For example, in some languages, it is difficult to separate the counterpart of *need* from that of *want*. This is part of a more general point, namely that the testing of comparative syntax hypotheses requires being able to individuate counterparts in the next language of elements from the first language. That is sometimes relatively easy, sometimes not.

Consider the case from (3) of:

(9) Mary has written four.

Transposing word-for-word into French yields, as in (4), an unacceptable result:

(10) *Marie a écrit quatre.

The transposition itself was straightforward, though, in the sense that for each English word there existed an obvious (near-)perfect match in French. Now the closest acceptable counterpart to (9) in French is, as in (5):

(11) Marie en a écrit quatre.

which contains a pronominal clitic *en* not seen in English. This is an example of a not-so-easy transposition, as we can see if we now ask what the closest word-for-word English counterpart of the acceptable French sentence (11) would be. Abstracting away from the word order difference between (11) and (12) (which is the same word order difference as in (1) vs. (2)), one possibility for an exact match for French *en* would seem to be (even though there is no visible *of* in (11)):

(12) Mary has written four of them.

Alternatively, as in Kayne (2004), a still closer match for French *en* in (11) might be (archaic) *thereof*, rather than *of them*. (Whether *en* is best matched by *thereof* or by *of them*, (11) may contain a silent counterpart of *of*.)

Although it is not always easy to pin down the word-for-word counterpart in Language B of some sentence in Language A, the problem is not equally widely found for all pairs of languages A and B. On the whole, the ‘counterpart’ problem is likely to be more acute the more distant or different A and B are from one another. Finding the counterpart to French (11) in Italian is easier than it is in English, since Italian has:

(13) Maria ne ha scritto quattro.

which matches (11) perfectly.

The varying difficulty of the question of ‘counterparts’ of words (or morphemes) across languages feeds into the more general fact that it is easier to search for comparative syntax correlations across a set of more closely related languages than across a set of less closely related languages. If the languages being compared are more closely related/more similar to one another, it is almost certain that there will be fewer variables that one has to control for, and that there will therefore be a greater likelihood of success in pinning down valid correlations.

(VI) These considerations have led to a surge in what has been called ‘micro-comparative syntax’ work, in which the languages being compared are particularly close to one another.

In comparative syntax, as in syntax in general, one can and must also aim at explanatory adequacy, above and beyond observational and descriptive adequacy. In the case of comparative syntax, we can try to understand, in general UG terms, why a given cross-linguistic correlation should hold in the first place. For example, Harves and Kayne (2012) propose that the reason that transitive *need* depends on transitive *have* is that the only way in which the language faculty allows transitive *need* at all is via incorporation of nominal *need* to a silent counterpart of an otherwise existing transitive *have*.

(VII) It is to be noted that both for comparative syntax and for syntax in general there is no suggestion in any of the preceding discussion that descriptive adequacy must be met in a fully prior way to explanatory adequacy or that descriptive adequacy must fully wait until observational adequacy is met. In practice one must aim at all three simultaneously, and work simultaneously on developing more and more observations, generalizations and explanations.

Nor is there any suggestion in what precedes that comparative syntax is solely interested in delineating the parameters that underlie cross-linguistic syntactic differences. If anything, the primary importance of comparative syntax lies in the fact that it provides us with new kinds of evidence bearing on questions concerning the general character of the language faculty. Figuring out what cross-linguistic generalizations hold and why exactly they hold will invariably help us to narrow down the set of hypotheses that we entertain about the language faculty.

[adapted from Richard S. Kayne "Comparative Syntax," in *Lingua* 130 (2013), 132-151.]

問1 下線部 (Ⅶ) について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問2 下線部 (Ⅲ) を日本語に訳しなさい。

問3 下線部 (III) を日本語に訳しなさい。

問4 下線部 (IV) について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問5 下線部 (V) について、具体的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、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問7 下線部 (VII) を日本語に訳しなさい。

問8 本文で述べられている Harves and Kayne (2012)の研究を具体例として用いて、comparative syntax における descriptive adequacy と explanatory adequacy について説明しなさい。

問9 著者が考える comparative syntax の最も重要な点について説明しなさい。

【Ⅱ】以下の日本語の文を英語に訳しなさい。

好奇心の追求としての科学は、また人間の活動して限界があることにも気づかねばならない。科学の進歩によって人類がすべてを明らかにできると楽観的に考えることはできるであろうが、またそのようなことが本当に幸せなのかということを考えてみることも大切であろう。科学と宗教にはそれぞれの役割があり、またそれぞれに限界があることを認めた上で、異なる方法と局面でいずれも人の幸せに結びつくものでなければならない。

【本庶 佑『がん免疫療法とは何か』（岩波新書）より】
