

2024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

外国語試験      英語

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	

2024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

外国語試験 ( 英語 )

---

問題【I】と問題【II】について日本語で解答しなさい。

【I】 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

\*Heritage languages feature increasingly in discussions of bilingualism, and with good reason: few cases of bilingualism are truly balanced, with both languages equally dominant. Instead, one language often wins out over the other, owing to the shifting attention that arises from shifting sociolinguistic circumstances. (1) This asymmetric bilingualism results in heritage language, the weaker language of a bilingual dyad. Consider the following definition:

A language qualifies as a heritage language if it is a language spoken at home or otherwise readily available to young children, and crucially this language is not a dominant language of the larger (national) society... [A]n individual qualifies as a heritage speaker if and only if he or she has some command of the heritage language acquired naturalistically... although it is equally expected that such competence will differ from that of native monolinguals of comparable age. (Rothman, 2009: 156)

As with all definitions meant to neatly characterize a heterogeneous group of individuals, this one is an idealization, as is the idealized monolingual (e.g., Chomsky, 1965) or the truly balanced bilingual (Grosjean, 2010). Deviations from this idealization are observed, such that there are cases where the roles of the stronger and weaker language may be reversed, as sometimes happens with returnees (Flores, 2017; Kanno, 2000; Potowski, 2018).

(2) Heritage-language studies have been coming to grips with the tension between recurrent similarities across different heritage languages, which indicate the universality of underlying processes, and the effects of situational factors on the same heritage language. While we focus on the similarities in the current paper, we are cognizant of the need to acknowledge the influence of situational factors, especially in cases where the dominant language exerts influence on the heritage grammar. The current work sets as its aim a more specific question: what would it take to develop a model of the nature of heritage-language grammars, and how could such a model inform our general understanding of linguistic competence and the development of this competence? Still, some words by way of introduction to the topic of heritage languages are in order.

Heritage speakers are bilinguals, simultaneous or sequential, who were raised in homes where a language other than the dominant language of the broader community was spoken (Valdés, 2000). In cases of simultaneous bilingualism, heritage speakers begin acquiring the less dominant, heritage language concurrently with the dominant, majority language. In cases of sequential bilingualism, heritage speakers first begin acquiring the heritage language. (3) In both cases, the dominant language of the broader speech community eventually becomes the dominant language of the heritage speaker, such that they feel most comfortable using that language to communicate. Abilities in the heritage language persist, but the bilingualism is typically heavily imbalanced in favor of the dominant language. As a result, the heritage

---

language differs from the baseline language that served as the input for acquisition. For many researchers interested in heritage languages, the salient fact is that heritage speakers instantiate cases where the typical acquisition trajectory or outcome is not always observed. Put simply, heritage speakers constitute an outcome often assumed to be impossible outside of pathology or trauma: children exposed to a language from birth who nevertheless appear to deviate from the expected native-like mastery in pronounced and principled ways. In other words, heritage languages show what stays and what undergoes change when a language system is disrupted. Predicting what stays and what goes is one of the main challenges faced by researchers who study heritage systems. (4) By revealing the load-bearing aspects of heritage grammars where baseline features are intact, as well as areas of vulnerability, heritage languages are at least as informative to our understanding of grammar as the monolingual idealizations that dominate linguistic theory.

(注) \*heritage language 継承語。社会生活の場において使用される言語と異なる、家庭内で継承された言語のこと。

[Adapted from Maria Polinsky and Gregory Scontras (2020) “Understanding Heritage Languages,” *Bilingualism* 23, 4-20]

問1 下線部 (1) の内容を本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

---

---

---

---

問2 下線部 (2) を日本語に訳しなさい。

---

---

---

---

問3 “both cases”の内容に触れながら、下線部 (3) を日本語に訳しなさい。

---

---

---

---

---

受験記号番号	
--------	--

---

---

問4 下線部 (4) を日本語に訳しなさい。

---

---

---

---

---

---

【Ⅱ】 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

Art worlds consist of all the people whose activities are necessary to the production of the characteristic works which that world, and perhaps others as well, define as art. Members of art worlds coordinate the activities by which work is produced by referring to a body of conventional understandings embodied in common practice and in frequently used artifacts. The same people often cooperate repeatedly, even routinely, in similar ways to produce similar works, so that we can think of an art world as an established network of cooperative links among participants. If the same people do not actually act together in every instance, their replacements are also familiar with and proficient in the use of those conventions, so that cooperation can proceed without difficulty. Conventions make collective activity simpler and less costly in time, energy, and other resources; but they do not make unconventional work impossible, only more costly and difficult. Change can and does occur whenever someone devises a way to gather the greater resources required or reconceptualizes the work so it does not require what is not available.

(1) Works of art, from this point of view, are not the products of individual makers, “artists” who possess a rare and special gift. They are, rather, joint products of all the people who cooperate via an art world’s characteristic conventions to bring works like that into existence. Artists are some subgroup of the world’s participants who, by common agreement, possess a special gift, therefore make a unique and indispensable contribution to the work, and thereby make it art.

Art worlds do not have boundaries around them, so that we can say that these people belong to a particular art world while those people do not. I am not concerned with drawing a line separating an art world from other parts of a society. Instead, we look for groups of people who cooperate to produce things that they, at least, call art; having found them, we look for other people who are also necessary to that production, gradually building up as complete a picture as we can of the entire cooperating network that radiates out from the work in question. (2) The world exists in the cooperative activity of those people, not as a structure or organization, and we use words like those only as shorthand for the notion of networks of people cooperating. For practical purposes, we usually recognize that many people’s cooperation is so peripheral and relatively unimportant that we need not consider it, keeping in mind that such things change and what was unimportant today may be crucial tomorrow when events suddenly have made that kind of cooperation difficult to obtain.

Art worlds do not have clear boundaries in another sense. To the sociologist studying art worlds, it is as clear as, but no clearer than, it is to the participants in them whether particular objects or events are “really art” or whether they are craft or commercial work, or perhaps the expression of folk culture, or maybe just the embodied symptoms of a lunatic. Sociologists, however, can solve this problem more easily than art world participants. (3) One important facet of a sociological analysis of any social world is to see when, where, and how participants draw the lines that distinguish what they want to be taken as characteristic from what is not to be so taken. Art worlds typically devote considerable attention to trying to decide what is and isn’t art, what is and isn’t their kind of art, and who is and isn’t an artist; by observing how an art world makes those distinctions rather than trying to make them ourselves we can understand much of what goes on in that world.

In addition, art worlds typically have intimate and extensive relations with the worlds from which they try to distinguish themselves. They share sources of supply with those other worlds, recruit personnel from them, adopt ideas that originate in them, and compete with them for audiences and financial support. (4) In some sense, art worlds and worlds of commercial, craft, and folk art are parts of a larger social organization. So, even though everyone involved understands and respects the distinctions which keep them separate, a sociological analysis should take account of how they are not so separate after all.

問 1 “this point of view”の内容に触れながら、下線部 (1) を日本語に訳しなさい。

---

---

---

---

---

問 2 下線部 (2) を日本語に訳しなさい。

---

---

---

---

問 3 下線部 (3) を日本語に訳しなさい。

---

---

---

---

問 4 下線部 (4) の内容を本文に即して具体的に日本語で説明しなさい。

---

---

---

---