２０２１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。

受験記号番号	

成 績	

２０２１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。

It is, naturally, gratifying to see that the issues raised in *Remarks on Nominalization* (*RoN*) are alive and well: the subject of lively debate, also both developed further and challenged in very interesting directions. My own (rather conservative) feeling, for what it is worth, is as expressed by J. F. Newmeyer (2005) in a valuable paper that extends some of the ideas in *RoN* while also correcting flaws: Generally 'on the right track'.

I won't try to elaborate that position here, but will instead discuss the background and motivation for *RoN* and some of the developments that followed from its conclusions in important ways that were not anticipated or appreciated at the time.

The background assumptions, as the paper indicates, are spelled out more carefully in work of the immediately preceding years, mainly Chomsky (1965). As in rational inquiry generally, the primary concern is explanation and understanding: for linguistic theory, what was called **(1)**'explanatory adequacy'. The goal is to construct a theory—Universal Grammar (UG) in conventional terminology—that specifies the possible languages and provides an evaluation procedure that selects the correct language (L), given primary linguistic data. More generally, the approach presupposes what was later called 'the biolinguistics framework' (BL; Massimo Piattelli-Palmarini's term), taking a person's language to be a biological trait of the person, a state of the general faculty of language FL—the topic of UG—much as the person's visual system is a state of the general visual faculty.

There is strong evidence that FL is a true species property, common to humans apart from in severe pathology and without close analogue in other organisms.

Adopting BL, explanatory adequacy requires the further condition that the procedure for selecting a language from the search space be feasible. It must provide a realistic abstract account of language acquisition on the basis of the data available, in particular accounting for the huge gap between the data and what the child knows. It was recognized from the early days of work on generative grammar that **(2)**this problem of Poverty of Stimulus is enormous, and later investigations of what is known by a very young child along with statistical study of the sparsity of data available have revealed that the problem is far more severe even than what was assumed at the time of *RoN*.

Achieving explanatory adequacy, then, requires sharp restriction of the search space and highly constrained search procedures. The latter problem was not seriously addressed until development of the Principles and Parameters (PP) approach, which actually had its roots in *RoN*, though it was not understood at the time. The search procedure is still under intense investigation, with many valuable contributions. The only idea at the time of *RoN* was systematic search, which actually yields an answer though it is radically unfeasible. The main concern in *RoN*, therefore, was restriction of the search space.

It should be noted that the other familiar levels of adequacy (observational, descriptive) are intertwined with explanatory adequacy in the process of discovery by the linguist, and have priority in acquisition (in which case UG, yielding explanatory adequacy by definition, is given, with maturational stages; see Lenneberg, 1967). As is familiar, even the simplest observations—say a field worker's preliminary efforts at phonetic transcription—presuppose a tentative explanatory theory, and elicitation techniques are basically critical experiments, heavily theory-dependent. **(3)**For the linguist, choice of theory (i.e. choice of grammar and, more deeply, UG) is of course dependent on data and description, and conversely for decisions about relevance of observation and accuracy of description. Features of research generally, not specific to language.

Returning to restriction of the search space, at the time of *RoN* there were two cases to examine: Phrase Structure Grammar (PSG) and transformations (TG). PSG was far too rich to be seriously considered as a candidate for UG, facts recognized in the earliest work. There is, for example, nothing in PSG to block a vast array of such rules as NP→V PP. Furthermore the notations (NP, VP, etc.) are a superfluous complication, implicitly incorporating properties of the rule system that should be spelled out explicitly. **(4)***RoN* therefore suggests dispensing with PSG entirely in favor of X-bar theory, sharply restricting the search space; the superfluous vocabulary was reduced twenty years later in Bare Phrase Structure, based on ideas of Peggy Speas and Naoki Fukui. Separating projection from composition led in turn to inquiry into labeling algorithms, productively underway.

Eliminating PSG in favor of X-bar theory had several important consequences. One is a mismatch between the structures that appear at the interface levels: at the sensory motor level (SM), the language generates phonetic form (PF) (or something similar) with linear order; at the conceptual-intentional level (CI), it generates pure structures with no linear order. There is by now extensive evidence confirming the conclusion that linear order and other SM arrangements are not strictly speaking part of language but rather properties of an amalgam of two distinct systems: language proper and SM systems that long preceded the emergence of language in evolutionary history and have no special relation to it. The significance of the conclusion that linear order does not enter into syntax or CI (formal semantics, logical syntax), which is substantial, was only recognized years later, even after the influential work of Tanya Reinhart (1979) on c-command that lent further support to it.

Adopting X-bar theory, it follows that each language must choose a value for what was called the 'head parameter': head-first or head-final. This consequence of X-bar theory and other research through the '70s led to a new approach to achieving explanatory adequacy, the PP framework, distinguishing (i) fixed principles that determine the array of possible languages—the search space—and (ii) a finite set of parameters that have to be set in acquiring a language. This approach is a sharp departure from the tradition, including early generative grammar. It eliminates rule systems apart from TG. **(5)**Through the same post-*RoN* years, TG was radically simplified in ways I will not review here, reaching finally the conclusion that the ubiquitous property of displacement in natural language, the basic concern of TG, is provided by the simplest computational operation, and in fact is its simplest case. Along with radical simplification of the search procedure (see Yang et al., 2017), the PP framework thus offered the first real hope for achieving feasible explanatory adequacy.

To realize this hope it is necessary to establish the status of parameters and to ensure that the search procedure through the set of parameters is feasible. The 'head parameter' is a good starting point. More precisely, there is no head parameter, hence no question about how it evolved or how it is captured in UG and stored in the brain. There is simply a mismatch between two systems: language proper and the SM system of externalization. In language acquisition, it is necessary to resolve the mismatch, but it is not technically a parametric choice. Much more far-reaching conclusions are reached in Ian Roberts's important work on parameters (see Yang et al., 2017), which not only sharply restricts the search procedure but concludes finally that **(6)**parameters are 'emergent', not given in UG as assumed in the PP framework.

Another consequence of X-bar theory is that all constructions are endocentric. This however is incorrect. Exocentric constructions abound. In practice, these were forced into the endocentric framework by various artifices and stipulations, problems not addressed until Chomsky (2013), leading to new explorations into labeling algorithms and a systematic solution to the problem of when Move (Internal Merge) may, must, or does not apply.

Returning to *RoN*, with PSG eliminated, the problem of restriction of the search space reduced to the resort to TG-related devices that were then being used promiscuously, well beyond the formulations of TG that existed. That was notoriously the case in generative semantics, but also in more restricted approaches. For examining these issues, an obvious choice of materials was Robert Lees's (1960) careful and comprehensive study of English nominalization, the object of inquiry in *RoN*.

One category of nominalizations, gerunds, raises no problems: The rules are simple and productive, with no relevant anomalies. But application of TG-style devices to other types of nominalization was highly problematic. The rules were complex, varied, unmotivated, often idiosyncratic in form and interpretation. Accordingly the mechanisms involved yielded an expansive search space, undermining the quest for feasible explanatory theory.

(7) The problem was significantly reduced by separating the lexicon from the generative rules and resorting to the featural analysis of syntactic categories (Chomsky, 1965) to establish a class of derived nominals, not formed transformationally from underlying sentences but listed lexically, embedded within a broader class of nominal structures. Idiosyncrasies remained, as is typical of the lexicon (Bloomfield's 'list of exceptions'), but were sharply reduced, with many of their properties derived from more general lexical properties. There has since been extensive investigation of lexical properties in many domains, often reviving traditional insights within the generative framework.

That was the basic strategy of *RoN*, generally 'on the right track' in my opinion. **(8)**Parts have been incorporated into subsequent inquiry into UG, with substantial consequences, not then recognized or understood. Parts have been developed in diverse ways, and are also strongly contested. From a personal perspective after fifty years, a welcome outcome.

[adapted from Noam Chomsky, "Remarks on Nominalization: Background and motivation", in *Nominalization*, Oxford University Press]

受験記号番号	

問１　下線部 **(1)** 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 **(2)** について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問３　下線部 **(3)** について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

受験記号番号	

問４　下線部 **(4)** 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 **(5)** を日本語に訳しなさい。

問６　下線部 **(6)** について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

受験記号番号	

問７　下線部 **(7)** について、具体的内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問８　下線部 **(8)** を日本語に訳しなさい。

受験記号番号	

［II］以下の日本語の文を英語に訳しなさい。

人は新しい知識をすでにもっている知識に関係づけて学ぶとき、もっともよく学ぶことができる。一定量の知識がないと、新しい知識をすでにもっている知識に関係づけて、知識のシステムを作ることができない。実際、子どもが母語を学ぶとき、最初は非常にゆっくりしたスピードでしかことばを覚えることができない。単語をほとんど知らない状態では、新しい単語を覚えるのは困難だからである。しかし50語ほど単語を覚えたのちは、ことばを覚えるスピードが急速に上がる。すでに覚えた単語を新しい単語の意味の推論に使うことができるからである。その後、新しいことばを覚えるスピードは徐々に落ち着く。新しい単語を語彙に加えつつ、すでに知っている単語の意味の修正もおこない、必要に応じて概念分野全体の修正もおこなうようになるからである。

【今井むつみ著『英語独習法』（岩波新書）より】