

平成23年度実施
東北大学大学院情報科学研究科
博士課程前期入学試験問題
(2012年2月29日)

専門試験科目
(一般)

言語・メディア群

注意

- 以下には、専門科目4問題が印刷されている。
- 受験者は、そのなかから3問題を選んで、答案用紙に解答すること。
- 問題1を選択した場合には、指定の解答用紙を使用すること。それ以外の問題を選択した場合は、解答用紙に問題番号を記入すること。
- 試験終了後、答案用紙に加えて、この問題冊子も回収する。

問題 1

「人間」、「多様性」、「普遍性」の3語をキーワードとして、各自考えるところを600字以上800字以内の日本語でまとめなさい。その際、キーワードは3語とも使い、題名をつけて、首尾一貫した論理で記述しなさい。

(この問題を選択した場合には、指定された答案用紙に解答を記入すること。)

問題 2

Baker's Paradox について書かれた以下の文章を読んで、問いに答えなさい。

Now, we can juxtapose the facts of argument structure with the logic of the learning problem. The acquisition of the syntactic properties of verbs is one of the clearest cases in which (A) the no-negative-evidence problem arises. Though Georgia Green (1974: pp.3, 199) first pointed out a learning paradox based on it, C. Lee. Baker (1979) discussed it in a larger context that drew more attention. Consider a child hearing sentence pairs such as those in (1) and forming the associated argument structures.

- (1) John gave a dish to Sam.
give: NP₁ ___ NP₂ to-NP₃
John gave Sam a dish.
give: NP₁ ___ NP₃ NP₂
John passed the salami to Fred.
pass: NP₁ ___ NP₂ to-NP₃
John passed Fred the salami.
pass: NP₁ ___ NP₃ NP₂
John told a joke to Mary.
tell: NP₁ ___ NP₂ to-NP₃
John told Mary a joke.
tell: NP₁ ___ NP₃ NP₂

It would seem to be a reasonable generalization that any verb with the NP₁ ___ NP₂ to-NP₃ argument structure (prepositional dative) could also have a NP₁ ___ NP₃ NP₂ argument structure (double-object dative). This generalization could be captured in, say, a lexical rule such as that in (2), which would allow the child to create a double-object dative corresponding to any prepositional one for some new verb (e.g. *send*), even if he or she had never heard the verb in the double-object form.

- (2) NP₁ ___ NP₂ to-NP₃ → NP₁ ___ NP₃ NP₂

The problem is that not all the verbs with the prepositional argument structure dativize (that is, appear in both versions of the alternation), as (3) shows.

- (3) John donated a painting to the museum.
*John donated the museum a painting.
John reported the accident to the police.
*John reported the police the accident.

But the child has no way of knowing this, given the nonavailability of negative evidence. The fact that he or she hasn't heard the ungrammatical sentences in (3) could simply reflect adults' never having had an opportunity to utter them in the child's presence (after all, there are an infinite number of grammatical sentences the child will never hear). (B) Therefore, the child should speak ungrammatically all his life – or more accurately, the language should change in a single generation so that exceptional verbs such as those in (3) would become regular.

I will call this learning problem "Baker's paradox." It has attracted a great deal of attention among language acquisition researchers. In Pinker (1984) I considered several other lexicosyntactic alternations where the combination of widespread generalization and lexical exceptions creates the same learnability problem. Among them are the passive, shown in (4), the lexical causative alternation, in (5), and the locative alternation, in (6).

- (4) John touched Fred.
Fred was touched by John. (also *hit, see, like, kick, etc.*)
John resembled Fred.
(C) *Fred was resembled by John.
- (5) The ball rolled.
John rolled the ball. (also *slide, melt, bounce, open, close, etc.*)
The baby cried.
*John cried the baby.
- (6) Irv loaded eggs into the basket.
Irv loaded the basket with eggs. (also *spray, cram, splash, stuff, etc.*)
Irv poured water into the glass.
*Irv poured the glass with water.

Three aspects of the problem give it its sense of paradox. First is the lack of *negative evidence*: if children could count on being corrected or on being given some other signal for every ungrammatical utterance they made, then simply saying something like *I am resembled by Seth* and attending to the resulting feedback would suffice to expunge the passive lexical entry for *resemble*. Second, *productivity*: (D) if children simply stuck with the argument structures that were exemplified in parental speech, never forming a productive rule such as that in (2), then they would never make errors to begin with and hence would have no need to figure out how to avoid or expunge them. Third, *arbitrariness*: the fact that near-synonyms have different kinds of argument structures, such as *give* and *donate*, or *load* and *pour*, or *own* (which passivizes) and *have* (which does not), or *move* (which occurs in a lexical causative) and *go* (which does not) means that the child cannot use some simple semantic guideline indicating where productive rules can be applied and where they are blocked. But in combination these three factors make acquisition of argument structure alternations in the verb lexicon impossible to explain. (E) このため、これまでに提案されてきたこのパラドックスにたいする解決案は、これら3つの仮定のうちの1つ以上を否定してきている。

(出典 : Pinker, Steven (1989) *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*, MIT Press)

(問1) 下線部(A)はどういう問題であるか。本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

(問2) 筆者は、なぜ下線部(B)のようなことが起こるはずだと述べているか。本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

(問3) 下線部(C)の受動化 (passivization)はなぜ非文法的であるか。その理由を自由に考察しなさい。

(問4) 下線部(D)を和訳しなさい。

(問5) 下線部(E)を英訳しなさい。

問題 3

CNN Headlineから引用した以下の英文を読んで、問いに答えなさい。

Some headlines are hailing her as the bravest woman in Mexico. Marisol Valles Garcia, *all of 20 years old, says (A) she's just tired of everyone being afraid.

(B) Valles Garcia, a criminology student, became the police chief this week of Praxedis G. Guerrero, one of the most violent municipalities in the border state of Chihuahua. She was the only person who accepted the top job in a police force whose officers have been abducted and even killed.

"Yes, there is fear," Valles Garcia said Wednesday in an interview with CNN en Español. "It's like all human beings. There will always be fear, but what we want to achieve in our municipality is tranquility and security."

There's good reason for the fear. Just this past weekend, a 59-year-old local mayor, Rito Grado Serrano, and (C) his 37-year-old son, Rogoberto Grado Villa, were killed in a house in which they were hiding (D) in nearby Ciudad Juarez. Another area mayor was killed in June.

Juarez is the bloodiest city in Mexico, (E) with a reported 2,500 people killed in drug violence this year. Praxedis G. Guerrero is located about 35 miles southeast of Ciudad Juarez. Both are in the state of Chihuahua, which borders Texas.

Nationwide, the federal government says, more than 28,000 people have lost their lives since Mexican President Felipe Calderon declared war on the drug cartels after taking office in December 2006.

Valles Garcia sees a non-violent role for (C) her 13-member force, which will be mostly female and unarmed.

"The weapons we have are principles and values, which are the best weapons for prevention," she told CNN en Español. "Our work will be pure prevention. We are not going to be doing anything else other than prevention."

Valles Garcia said she aims to establish programs in neighborhoods and schools, to win back security in public spaces and to foster greater cooperation among neighbors so they can form watch committees.

(F) She has recruited three other women to join the force in the small municipality of 8,500 people, the (G) government-run Notimex news agency said this week.

Valles Garcia said Wednesday she gladly accepted when Mayor Jose Luis Guerrero offered her the job. The first couple of days have gone smoothly, she said.

"Truthfully, we have been very tranquil," she said. "The people have received us very well. They have even supported us. They say it's a great project and they will be with us 100 percent."

(H) Still, the notion of a largely female police force being *helmed by a woman -- and a young one at that -- does not seem to sit well with some people in a country that still retains vestiges of *machismo.

"Are there no men in Chihuahua?" (I) read a headline on a blog on the Periodista Digital website.

But Valles Garcia believes what the job may need is a woman's touch.

"We are simply going to talk with them, with the people, with the families, giving them confidence so they will quit being afraid, so they can leave their houses," she told CNN en Español.

"We have hope that we are going to exchange fear for tranquility and security."

注：*all of 若干、*helm 舵を取る、*machismo 男としての権力意識

(出典：http://articles.cnn.com/2010-10-20/world/mexico.female.police.chief_1_police-force-ciudad-juarez-municipality?_s=PM:WORLD)

以下の(1)-(9)の中から5問を選び、その設問に答えなさい(選んだ問題番号は明記しなさい)。

- (1) 下線部(A)の英文の統語構造を分析し、「名詞句 (noun phrase)」と「述部 (predicate)」という用語を2つとも用いて、2行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。
- (2) 下線部(B)の語順にかんする特徴を分析し、1行程度の日本語で説明するとともに、下線部(B)を和訳しなさい。
- (3) 下線部(C) (2カ所ある) で、year/member が複数形にならない理由について、類例を挙げながら、2行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。
- (4) 下線部(D)の nearby と、類似の単語 near について、その共通点と相違点を、それぞれ、少なくとも1つずつ指摘しなさい。
- (5) 不定冠詞 a と形容詞 reported に特に注意しながら、下線部(E)を和訳しなさい。
- (6) 下線部(F)の中の three other women は、日本語に訳せば、「3人の他の女性」ではなく「他の3人の女性」となる。一方、英語では、other three women とは言えない。このように、名詞句内に生じる要素の間に許される語順が日本語と英語で異なる例を、上記以外に少なくとも2つ挙げなさい。
- (7) 下線部(G)の複合語の意味を日本語で述べるとともに、この複合語の言語学的特徴について、2行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。
- (8) 下線部(H)を和訳しなさい。
- (9) 下線部(I)の語順にかんする特徴を分析し、1行程度の日本語で説明するとともに、下線部(J)を和訳しなさい。

問題 4

次の英文は「英語を学習することの利点について」というタイトルで日本人学生が書いた文章である。この文章について、語彙的・文法的・文体的・文章構成的に見てどのような問題点があるかを言語学的に論じるとともに、より文法的に正しく、読みやすい文章にするにはどうしたらよいかを示しなさい。

We can get more valuable life through learning English. First of all, English is essential for study in university. Now the various books of the world, such as textbooks, treatises, reference books, and so on. You should study English in order to use these books perfectly. Because you may have to do a paper in English. In addition, English is used by many people all over the world as a common language. If you can speak English a little, traveling abroad gets closer to you. The more you study English, the more you communicate your ideas fluently with foreigners. Visiting in many countries, you can know various cultures and get wider view. You can make a better choice among so many jobs. If you get good scores in qualification exams, for example, TOEIC, it operates to your advantage in job hunting. Thus, learning English brings us many merits.

平成23年度実施
東北大学大学院情報科学研究科
博士課程前期・後期入学試験問題
(2012年2月29日)

共通外国語科目
(英語)

言語・メディア群

- 試験終了後、解答用紙に加えて、この問題冊子も回収する。

問題 1

次の文章は、会話などから人の心を読み取る方法について書かれた本の一節である。これを読んで後の問いに答えなさい。

Some conversations, particularly those about delicate subjects, remind me of scenes from the nature programs my kids watch: A small bird is sitting in a nest on the ground. As a predator ^(注) approaches, she pretends to have a broken wing and goes away, leading the predator away from her young. Or the male frog makes his brightly colored throat swell to four times its normal size to reveal his irresistible charms to an available female, this attracting her to him.

There are many parallels between how people interact and the dynamics that occur in the animal world. ①We humans distract and lure, as all creatures do. We lead others away from subjects we want to avoid, or pull them in the direction we want them to go. We accomplish this by using a stock of communication techniques developed for the sake of social survival: words and tone, actions, and even silence. Some are instinctive; others are conscious maneuvers.

②As helpful as it is to know how to ask questions and listen to answers, not all questions are welcome and not all answers are plain enough. We often tackle subjects that are unpleasant, humiliating, and even threatening. We steer conversations away from topics that would reveal our weakness or mistakes and usually try to avoid embarrassing others. We're socialized not to boast openly or lie. And most of us try very hard to respect those and other similar rules.

If we don't want to admit our shortcomings, openly boast our accomplishments, or lie about our mistakes, how do we handle situations in which we need or want to do just that? We rely on our stockpile of verbal and behavioral maneuvers.

In this chapter you'll learn to recognize and interpret these maneuvers. The topics discussed there range from manipulative answers and other fairly straightforward verbal traits to typical conversational detours and more complex habits. Like all other traits and behaviors, these conversational maneuvers should always be viewed alongside other characteristics as you try to establish a pattern.

* * *

When I realize someone may be trying to direct or control a conversation, I always ask myself what he's trying to accomplish. By examining a person's behavior in the context of the broader conversation, I can usually identify his objective. When it isn't clear from my observations alone, a few questions will generally bring the answer to the surface.

Even if there is no apparent reason for a person to manipulate a conversation, just the fact that he communicates in a particular way—volunteering information about himself, bragging, criticizing, or whatever—may have

implications about his personality. If someone drops names ^(注) for a specific reason, for example, it may not say much about his character. But if he routinely name-drops, even when the name has little to do with the topic at hand, that points to insecurity, a need for acceptance, and a desire to call attention to himself.

People try to manipulate conversations for many different reasons both positive (to avoid embarrassing or hurting another person) and negative (to cover up a lie, to trick someone, or to pull someone into an argument). When you notice that someone is attempting to steer a discussion, ask: What does he have to gain? Does his behavior reflect an attempt to achieve a specific goal, for instance to gather facts or protect someone's privacy? Or does his maneuvering indicate low self-esteem or a need for attention? Pursue the conversation until you're fairly certain of the answer. You may have to watch and listen closely to spot some maneuvers; they may come and go quickly. Other techniques are easy to see, but their motivation is not as obvious. Whichever is the case, try to identify both the method and the motive. Once you do, you will gain tremendous insight into a person's character.

--Jo-Ellen Dimitrius and Mark Mazzarella, *Reading People*, Ballantine Books, New York

注: predator:捕食者

drop names:知っている有名人のことを得意げに口に出す

1. 下線部(1)に、「私たち人間も他の生き物と同様 distract したり、lure したりする」とあるが、他の生き物についての distracting と luring の例を本文内から探し出し、それぞれについて日本語で説明しなさい。
2. 下線部(2)を日本語にしなさい。
3. ***の印の後に続く3つの段落について、それぞれ1～2行程度の日本語による要約文を作りなさい。

問題 2

次の文章の下線部分(A)、(B)を英語に直しなさい。

みなさんがこれから生きて行く時代はたいへんに困難なものとなります。

戦争に巻き込まれるとか、大災害に襲われるとかいうことではありません。そうではなくて、みなさんがこれから幸福な人生を送るために、どういう努力したらいいのか、その「やりかた」がよくわからないということです。

(A)まじめに受験勉強をして、いい大学を出て、一流企業に就職したり資格や免状を手に入れば、あとは生計について心配はしなくてよいというような「人生設計」を立てることがむずかしくなった。

ただし、「むずかしくなった」だけで、まるで不可能になったわけではありません。そこがむしろ問題なんです。受験勉強なんか無駄、学歴なんか無意味、資格や免状も無価値というところまでいっそ徹底していれば、頭の切り換えもできるのですが、そうではありません。報われると信じて努力して報われる人もいるし、努力したのに報われなかった人もいます。

その分かれ目にはっきりした法則性がないのです。それが私たちの時代の「困難さ」の実体です。

グローバル経済の中で、努力と報酬の間の相関が希薄になりました。みなさんが名前も知らないような遠い国で国債が値下がったり、不動産バブルがはじけたり、洪水が起きたりすると、いきなり勤めていた会社の株価が暴落したり、人員整理されたりする。「どうして？」と訊いても、誰もうまく答えられない。私たちが顔を知っている人たちの間でなら、努力したことや才能があることはわかってもらえます。でも、グローバル経済体制で私たちは顔の知らない人々、何を考えているのかわからない人たちと深いつながりを持ってしまった。その人たちの身に起きたことが私たちの生活にいきなり死活的な影響をもたらす。私たちはそういう時代にいます。

そういう時代にみなさんはどう生きればいいのかでしょう。(B)私に言えるのは一つだけです。どんな学問や仕事を選ぶにしても「努力することそれ自体が楽しい」ことを基準にして下さい。日々の努力そのものが幸福な気分をもたらすなら、グローバルスタンダードのどう「格付け」されるかなんて、どうだっていいじゃないですか。

私自身は20代からずっと哲学の本を読むことと武道の稽古に打ち込んできました。とても楽しい時間でした。結果的にそれで生計を立てることができましたが、若いときは「そんなことやって何になるんだ」と言われ続けました。でも、気にしなかった。みなさんも「それが何の役に立つのかわからないけれど、どうしてもやりたい、やっていると楽しい」ことをみつけてください。そうすれば、「努力したけれど報われなかった」という言葉だけは口にしないで済むはずです。

内田樹 http://blog.tatsuru.com/2012/01/09_1228.php より