２０２５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

（　冬期・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

２０２５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

(冬季・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。

Within the Bloomfield (1933, 161) tradition, sentences are split into two essential parts: a nominal part, the subject, which is an argument of the verb, and a verbal part, which is the predicate. On the basis of this dichotomy, Chomsky (1970) defined four major lexical categories, making use of a binary feature system: ±V and ±N (Table 1).

Table 1　Four lexical categories defined by the binary features ±V and ±N.

	±V	±N
Verb	+V	−N
Noun	−V	+N
Adjective	+V	+N
Preposition	−V	−N

Source: based on Chomsky (1970).

　(i)The binary feature system allows generalization over different lexical categories. The categories defined as +V may function as the predicate of the clause. This is illustrated by a verb in (1) and a corresponding adjective in (2):

(1)　The dog smells.
(2)　The dog is smelly.

The complement of categories defined as +N has to be introduced by a preposition. This is shown for an adjective in (3) and for a noun in (4):

(3)　John is fond *(of) chocolate.
(4)　John's fondness *(of) chocolate.

In Romance languages, categories defined as +N may be marked for gender. This is illustrated by the Spanish example (5), where the nominal Word Marker (Harris 1991) and the adjectival inflection are both expressed by the feminine morpheme −a:

(5) mi abuela   bonita

    my grandmother beautiful

    'my beautiful grandmother'

The Bloomfield (1933) principle of endocentricity was translated by the X′ principle in Generative Grammar, according to which projections (X′ and XP) of the head belong by definition to the same category as the head (X⁰). This means, for instance, that the head of a VP can only be V, the head of NP can only be N and the head of AP can only be A. The head of the PPs that are the complement of the adjective and the noun in (3–4) is the preposition *of*.

(ii)The principle of headedness does not apply only to syntactic phrases, it also applies to morphologically complex words. Williams's (1981) Right hand Head Rule defines the head of a morphologically complex word to be the right-hand member of that word. This means that in a prefixed word such as *reinstruct* the free morpheme *instruct* is the head. The verbal category of the head *instruct* is inherited by the complex word *reinstruct*, which is therefore also a verb. In a suffixed word such as *instruction* it is the suffix that is the head and that determines the category of the complex word: both are nominal. Williams states that the head not only determines the category of the complex word, but that all other features also percolate through the head. In the prefixed verbal form *understood* the tense feature on the head *stood* percolates to the prefixed verbal form *understood*. In the verb *conduct* the feature [+latinate] percolates from the head *duct* to the prefixed verbal form *conduct*.

(iii)Although the headedness principle accounts for the categorial and featural identity of the head and its syntactic projections or the complex word in most of the cases, it has been challenged in the literature by the identification of so-called *mixed categories*, in which features of both the head and the non-head seem to play a role in the complex word. For derived (suffixed) words this means that features of their non-head Y seem to percolate to the complex word with category X, inherited from the head X.

In his seminal paper 'Remarks on Nominalizations', Chomsky (1970) makes a distinction between gerundive nominals, as in (6), and derived nominals, as in (7):

(6) John's refusing the offer

(7) John's refusal of the offer

Chomsky mentions (iv)several differences between the two types of nominals. One difference concerns productivity: gerundive nominalizations can be formed fairly freely from propositions of subject-predicate form and the semantic relation between the two is quite regular. In contrast, the productivity of derived nominals is much more restricted and the semantic relations between the derived nominal and the associated proposition are quite varied and idiosyncratic. Another difference concerns the internal structure of the nominal phrase. Gerundive nominals do not have the internal structure of a noun phrase. In (6) it is not possible to replace *John's* by *the*, and it is not possible to add an adjective either, while this is possible in the case of a derived nominal as in (7).

For both types Lees (1960), who, according to Chomsky, took the correctness of the transformationalist position for granted in the earliest work on transformational grammar, proposed a transformational account. Because of the aforementioned differences between gerundive nominals and derived nominals, Chomsky (1970) proposes, however, to separate lexicon and syntax, adopting a lexicalist position,

which has been called the Lexicalist Hypothesis. Derived nominals are not formed by means of a transformation, then, as are gerundive nominals, but are taken with their contextual features from the lexicon.

Whereas Chomsky takes the position that *refuse* and *refusal* constitute a single lexical entry, unmarked for the syntactic feature that distinguishes verbs from nouns, Jackendoff (1975) adopts the alternative theory that *refuse* and *refusal* have distinct but related lexical entries. Their relation is not expressed by a transformational relationship, but by a rule within the lexical component.

Chomsky uses examples such as (6) and (7) to make a distinction between syntax and lexicon, based on the observation that a gerund like *refusing* is rather verbal and that a derived nominalization like *refusal* is rather nominal. It has, however, been shown in the literature that **(v)**more types of gerunds have to be distinguished, making the picture more complex. Malouf (2000) gives the following examples:

(8)   Everyone was impressed by Pat artfully folding the napkins.

(9)   Everyone was impressed by Pat's artfully folding the napkins.

(10) Everyone was impressed by Pat's artful folding of the napkins.

Example (9) corresponds to Chomsky's example (6). Malouf considers (10) to be fully nominal and to behave like any other English common noun. He calls (10) a nominal gerund. The other examples are analyzed as verbal gerunds, but showing a mix of verbal and nominal properties, providing a challenge to any syntactic framework that assumes a strict version of X′ theory. Both (8) and (9) are considered to be verbal because of the presence of an adverb instead of an adjective. Furthermore both (8) and (9) contain an accusative object, while the complement in (10) is introduced by the preposition *of*. As has been shown above, the feature +N generalizes over categories (the noun and the adjective, but not the verb and the preposition) that cannot take a complement that is not introduced by a preposition. Example (9) is also less verbal than (8), because of the genitive form *Pat's*, a possessive form normally associated with nouns. Conversely, the form *Pat* in (8) can be analyzed as the subject of the gerund *folding*, probably an accusative form in modern English, because *Pat* could be replaced by *him*. This means that, of these three types of gerunds exemplified in (8–10), (8) contains the most verbal one and (10) the most nominal one. The consequence is that in (10), the gerund, although formed in a regular and productive way, would have to be treated like the derived nominal *refusal*. On the other hand, two different transformational derivations would have to account for the distinction between (8) and (9).

The distinction between four types of nominalizations that differ in minimal ways from each other, going from the most verbal type (8) to the most nominal types (7) and (10), via the intermediary type (9), shows that the dichotomic distinction between +V and +N, as proposed by Chomsky (1970), is too strong: nominalizations can be verbal to various degrees, which means that nouns cannot be simply analyzed as −V. Chomsky's proposal to take *refuse* and *refusal* as a single lexical entry, unmarked for the syntactic feature that distinguishes verbs from nouns, accounts for the differences on the basis of contextual features taken from the lexicon between the gerund and the derived nominal, but different transformations have to be proposed for the three types of gerunds presented in (8–10), resulting in a contextual configuration for the nominal gerund (10) that is identical to the configuration for the derive nominal (7) and totally different from the contextual configuration of the verbal base illustrated by the verbal gerund in (8). **(vi)**Jackendoff's (1975) assumption that verbs and derived nominals such as *refuse* and *refusal* have distinct but related lexical entries, expressed by separate lexical categories is a problem for mixed categories such as the four types of nominalizations. If *fold* is a verb and if *folding* is a gerund transformationally derived from the verb, it would also be a verb. But how to account then for the occurrence of *folding* in (8–10) in nominal positions? It would have to be assumed that the verbal form *folding*

as a head would have to be dominated by the nominal projection NP, which would violate the X′ principle. Similarly, if *refusal* in (7) is a noun in the lexicon, lexically related to the verb *refuse* in Jackendoff's theory, how to account then for the fact that *refusal* takes a complement just like its verbal base *refuse*, under Williams's (1981) feature percolation principle, which would forbid features of the non-head *refuse* to percolate to the suffixed form *refusal*?

[adapted from Sleeman, Petra (2023) "Mixed Categories," in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Morphology*, Wiley-Blackwell]

問1　下線部 **(i)** についてその内容を本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

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

問3 下線部 (iii) を日本語に訳しなさい。

問4 下線部 (iv) についてその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。

[Ⅱ] 以下の日本語の文を英語に訳しなさい。

　昨今、英語の4技能の中でも特に「スピーキング」が重視され、日本の伝統的な英語教育が文法読解偏重であったと指摘されていることは皆さんもご存じのとおりです。そのような流れの中で、英文読解やリーディングが何かと批判の対象となりやすいのは、不思議なことではないでしょう。

　しかし現代において、リーディングは他の3技能を鍛える上で最も有効なアプローチと言えます。英語力の向上に不可欠な大量のインプット（読んだり聞いたりして英語を受信すること）を日本にいながら行う上で、正確な読解力は非常に強力な武器となるからです。

【北村一真『名文で学ぶ英語の読み方』(SBクリエイティブ)】