

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 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。

I. 次の文章を読み、下の問いに答えなさい。

The study of language development in blind children has interesting theoretical implications for our understanding of the role of vision in language acquisition. The vast majority of previous studies on the topic have adopted the view that language development is based on cognitive abilities. According to this view, clearly inspired by the Piagetian tradition, the beginning of language depends on previous cognitive developments, such as the acquisition of notions such as object permanence, means-ends relationships, or the capacity of representation⁽¹⁾. This dependence between cognition and language affects not only the emergence of the first words, but also the meanings expressed by children in their first language productions, as classical researchers of language acquisition have proposed (Brown, 1973; MacNamara, 1972; Slobin, 1973). As for later development, even certain aspects of grammatical development (such as the use of comparative terms in coordinated structures to describe differences in two dimensions) are considered to be dependent on specific cognitive achievements (such as reversibility and operational thinking)⁽²⁾ (Cromer, 1991). According to this view, given that blind children have difficulties in their conceptual development and knowledge of reality, then, their language development is also expected to be subject to deviations from the normal path. Usually, this standpoint has adopted a monolithic view of development (akin to the Piagetian view), with minimal consideration of individual differences. Consistent with this view, any differences found between blind children and sighted children are interpreted as deviant, pathological, or not normal language development. Nevertheless, even when scholars use the latter less pejorative expression of not normal, the differences remain unexplained. Thus, the possibility that certain features of the language of blind children may have different functions is not contemplated; neither is the possibility that there may exist different routes to acquiring language.

This view that there is a cognitive basis for language acquisition has been predominant in the field until very recently and can be observed in many accounts of blind children's language development. Many characterizations of blind children's language are anchored in the assumption that blind children's conceptualization of reality cannot be the same as that of the sighted children. Consequently, their difficulties in conceptualizing reality result in specific features of their language.

One of these difficulties is that young blind children do not describe characteristics of objects, or their locations. In other words, they show a great difficulty in describing external reality. In tune with this, it was also considered that, in general, blind children do not make reference to actions performed by other people, but only to their own actions. (Andersen et al., 1984, 1993; Dunlea, 1984, 1989; Urwin, 1978, 1984a). Precisely because of this, a number of authors concluded that blind children's speech was egocentric or self-centred, and not externally oriented.

Apart from being egocentric, some scholars claim that blind children's speech is less creative compared to that of sighted children. This lack of (or severely reduced) creativity is shown in the absence of idiosyncratic terms invented by the children themselves, the absence of overextensions in their speech, and their enormous use of stereotypic and formulaic speech (Andersen et al., 1984; 1993; Dunlea, 1989; Miecznikowski & Andersen, 1986). Finally, it is argued that due to blind children's difficulties in perform deictic shifts, blind children produce many reversal errors when using pronouns (Andersen et al., 1984; Dunlea, 1989)⁽³⁾.

The account of blind children's language offered by authors who were impressed by the so-called cognitive basis for language coincides with the descriptions and interpretations of blind children's language given by

psychoanalytically oriented scholars. In a way, it can be said that the cognitively based authors offer a newer version of proposals made by earlier authors, who had clinical experience with blind children. Thus, there is a clear link between a number of early studies of blind children, clearly influenced by psychoanalytic theory, and those of more recent scholars who are more cognitively oriented. For example the characterizations of blind children's language as parroting, speaking without meaning, or echolalic speech by earlier authors (Burlingham, 1961, 1965; Nagera & Colonna, 1965; Wills, 1979), show a clear resemblance to the descriptions of formulaic speech by more recent researchers (Dunlea, 1989)⁽⁴⁾.

(Miguel Pérez-Pereira and Gina Conti-Ramsden (2020) *Language development and social interaction in blind children*. Routledge より抜粋)

1. 下線 (1) の文を日本語に訳しなさい。
2. 下線 (2) の文の内容を、本文に即して解説しなさい。
3. 下線 (3) の文の内容について、なぜ **blind children** においてこのような現象が生じるのか、考えられる理由を述べなさい。
4. 下線 (4) の部分の内容について、**blind children** について従来報告されてきた現象と、最近注目されている現象とは、どのような点で類似していると言えるのか、本文全体の趣旨を踏まえて論理的に説明しなさい。

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。解答順は任意でよい。

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. 音素 (phoneme) | 2. プロソディー (prosody) |
| 3. 形態素 (morpheme) | 4. 音象徴 (sound symbolism) |
| 5. 関係節 (relative clause) | 6. 談話標識 (discourse marker) |
| 7. 失語症 (aphasia) | 8. 皮肉 (irony) |
| 9. 心の理論 (theory of mind) | 10. 機能語 (function word) |

以下、解答欄