

平成24年度実施
東北大学大学院情報科学研究科
博士課程後期入学試験問題
(2013年3月5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8問題が印刷されている。(There are 8 major questions printed in this booklet.)
- 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。(Answer three major questions from them. Use the answer sheet booklet.)
- 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。(If you choose Question 1, use the specified sheet. When answering other questions, fill in the question number in the box of each sheet.)
- 試験終了後、答案用紙に加えて、この問題冊子も回収する。(After examination, both the question and the answer sheet booklet are withdrawn.)

問題1

「震災と情報」をテーマに、あなたが考える問題点について800字以内の日本語で論じなさい。（この問題を選択した場合は、指定された答案用紙に記入すること）

問題2

現代民主主義について、下記に述べられている5つのポイントのなかからあなたが重要だと考えるポイントを1つ選び、メディアとの関係について、日本語または英語で論じなさい。

The state of contemporary democracy has been a popular subject for academics, politicians, media pundits, and the public. Most discussions, regardless of the circle they may thrive in, are bound to reference one or more of the following trends: (a) nostalgia for past forms of political engagement, frequently wrapped in rhetoric that idealizes past iterations of a public sphere (e.g. Calhoun, 1992; Schudson, 1998); (b) limitations to civic involvement imposed by the representative democracy model, as it functions in a mass society resting on a capitalist economy (e.g. Coleman, 2005b; Habermas, 2004; Mouffe, 2000); (c) the aggregation of public opinion within representative democracy models through polling (e.g. Herbst, 1993); (d) declining civic participation through formal channels of political involvement (e.g., Carey, 1995; Hart, 1994; Putnam, 1996); and (e) the growth of public cynicism and disillusionment towards politics and the mass media (e.g., Cappella and Jamieson, 1996, 1997; Fallows, 1996; Patterson, 1993, 1996). These five tendencies characterize contemporary democracies, describe civic engagement in mass societies, and situate the media in the overall equation.

問題3

電子書籍のメリット、デメリットを踏まえたうえで、スマートフォンやタブレット端末の普及に伴う読書の変化、表現の可能性についてあなたの考えを述べなさい。

問題 4

以下の英文で述べられていることをふまえ、フィクションとノン・フィクションの区別に関するあなたの考えを述べなさい(日本語で解答すること)。

Once upon a time, after tossing the works of Annie Dillard on the fire, a student of mine, Paige Wilburne, was indicted for fourth-degree book-slaughter. Well, you know that's not true because I've signaled that it isn't. If "book-slaughter" doesn't fetch you, "page will burn" will. Let me start over: One evening in Dawson Auditorium, after a reading by Annie Dillard, one of my students, Mary O'Donnell, asked the author whether she ever invented scenes in her nonfiction and whether it was ethical to do so. That certainly could have happened, except that I don't know of any Dawson Auditorium or any Mary O'Donnell. It's fiction disguised as fact. What *really* happened? In a paper on ethics and art in nonfiction, one of my students, Carolyn McConnell, said she'd been sorry to hear of Annie Dillard's startling admission: the author had never *really* been awakened by a cat jumping on her chest with bloody paws, as described in *Pilgrim at Tinker Creek*.¹ She'd lied for art's sake. Now, the confession may be apocryphal, but Carolyn is very real, and so was her disappointment. She had wanted to believe in an art *strong* enough to make the truth *good* enough.

I started off with a lie, too, but I quickly admitted it because I didn't want to put certain things at risk: first, your faith in my credibility, which has to do with the kinds of truth-value markers I use; second, your assumptions about the kind of writing I'm doing, which has to do with what are usually called genre markers; and third, your confidence that I will not go too far, literally, and keep on writing forever—in other words, that there *will* be grounds for closure. As I go on now to talk about fiction and nonfiction and the first-person pronoun, I'll be arguing that genre is, among other things, a conclusion we draw from these markers.

Public opinion says that if nearly all references can be verified, a text is nonfiction; if most of them can't, it's fiction. But you and I know it's not that simple. Not only are there many kinds of hybrid genres, new and old, but postmodern theorists have more or less thrown out objective reality. One referent they've tossed on the fire is the unitary "I"—an essential, irreducible, continuous identity. Suppose we are looking at two pieces of writing and wondering which is fiction and which is not. If there is no such

thing as the unvarnished truth, or an “I” to hold accountable for it—then are we stymied? Do we stop right here?

Daniel Lehman finds a way to keep going. In *Matters of Fact: Reading Nonfiction over the Edge*, he argues that nonfiction does something fiction does not do: it “implicates” both the writer and the reader in social realities and practices outside the text. As he explains, reading *Lolita* is different from reading the biography of a pedophile whose victims may be helped or hurt by what an author says about them. Responsiveness to real people creates a four-way matrix of writer, reader, text, and world. Thus, Lehman can reject an essentialist “I” on or off the page, yet argue for accountability. If warm bodies are involved, that’s a truth-value marker the author must honor and the reader must heed.

注1 アニー・ディラード(1945-)が1974年に発表し、1975年にピューリッツァー賞(一般ノンフィクション部門)を受賞した作品のタイトル。

出典 Susan Lohafer, *Reading for the Storyness*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 2003. [一部改変]

問題 5

以下の問題5-1(ドイツ語)、問題5-2(フランス語)のうちから一つを選択して解答
しなさい。なお、この問題を選択した場合には、辞書を使用しても構わない。ただし、辞書は出
題者が用意したものを使用するので、必要な場合には試験官に申し出ること。

*この問題を選択した場合には、解答用紙左上にある「問題番号」の欄に「5-1」あるいは
「5-2」と記入すること。

問題 5-1

以下のドイツ語の文章を日本語に訳しなさい。

Digitale Medien sind aus vielen Lebensbereichen des modernen Alltags nicht mehr wegzudenken. Oft werden die ersten Erfahrungen im Umgang mit Internet und Handy bereits im Kindesalter gesammelt. Nachdem ganze Generationen mit analogen Medien aufgewachsen sind, werden junge Menschen heute bereits "mit der Maus in der Hand" groß. Für die sogenannte "Digital Natives", den Eingeborenen des digitalen Zeitalters, ist das Internet immer schon dagewesen. Es ist für sie ein elementarer Bestandteil ihrer erzieherischen, gesellschaftlichen und kulturellen Erfahrung. Durch die zunehmende Alltagseinbindung von digitalen Medien, hat sich die Lebenswelt heutiger Jugendgenerationen grundlegend verändert. Anders als früher spielt sich das soziale Leben der Digital Natives in zunehmendem Maße online ab. Und anders als früher ist das Internet für sie die Informationsquelle Nummer eins.

Der Lebenswandel, der durch den Vormarsch digitaler Kommunikationstechnologien hervorgerufen wird, zieht weitreichende Konsequenzen in den Bereichen Wirtschaft, Politik und Bildung nach sich. Zu den größten wirtschaftlichen Verlierern der Entwicklung zählt neben der Musikindustrie zweifellos die Printbranche. Weil besonders junge Leser immer seltener zur Zeitung aus Papier greifen, befinden sich die Auflagen vieler Jugendmagazine im freien Fall. Doch die zunehmende Online-Affinität junger Mediennutzer bedroht nicht nur bestehende Geschäftsmodelle, sie schafft auch Raum für neue. Internetanbieter wie "Google", "Facebook" oder "MySpace" sind die neuen Potentaten im Ringen um die Aufmerksamkeit junger Zielgruppe. Klassische Medienhäuser versuchen dagegen ihre sinkenden Reichweiten mit Diversifikationsmaßnahmen aufzufangen.

問題 5 — 2

以下のフランス語の文章を日本語に訳しなさい。

La porte d'une demeure, notamment l'entrée principale, joue un rôle essentiel dans la mesure où elle est un lieu de passage obligé. C'est au-dessus d'elle que sont traditionnellement accrochés porte-bonheur et autres amulettes – épingles ou paire de ciseaux plantées dans les montants par exemple – destinés à refouler les individus malveillants et les esprits errants qui cherchent à pénétrer dans le foyer. Garder fermées les portes extérieures est encore le meilleur moyen de se protéger de toute intrusion maléfique.

On utilise toujours l'entrée principale pour pénétrer la première fois dans sa nouvelle maison ou au retour de son propre mariage, car emprunter cette voie équivaut à prendre possession des lieux. La porte de service est formellement proscrite dans ces deux circonstances.

出典 Eloïse Mozzani, *Le Livre des Superstitions, Mythes, Croyance et Légendes*.

Paris : Robert Laffont, 1995. [一部改変]

問題6

代用表現の *do so* の扱いについて書かれた次の文章を読んで、後の問いに答えなさい。(Read the following passage on the treatment of a pro-form *do so*, and answer the questions after the passage.)

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) (henceforth C&J) present several arguments that VP structure is flat. They begin by noting that the *do so* “replacement” possibilities illustrated in (1) have traditionally been taken to indicate a VP structure roughly like that in (2).

- (1) Max lit a cigar in the dining room with a match, . . .
- a. . . and Mary did so too. (*do so* = VP1 of (2))
 - b. . . and Mary did so with a Zippo. (*do so* = VP2 of (2))
 - c. . . and Mary did so in the living room with a Zippo. (*do so* = VP3 of (2))
- (2) . . . [VP₁[VP₂[VP₃ lit a cigar] in the dining room] with a match]

They then point out the contrary additional possibility of utterances like (3), which may have the meaning that Mary lit a cigar with a match.

- (3) . . . , and Mary did so in the living room.

They note (a) that the sequence *lit a cigar with a match* does not constitute a phrase in (1)–(2), and (b) that a syntactic analysis involving movements of the elements leaving traces or copies that might create the requisite phrasal antecedent is overly complex and otherwise unmotivated. They conclude that *do so* cannot be explained by some process of deletion or replacement of (part of) the antecedent phrase and consequently that *do so* is not diagnostic of a phrase. They claim that *do so* instead refers to unfocused material and remainders focused material in a flat VP.

C&J then argue that this conclusion is supported by other facts. One such fact is what they term “vehicle change” (Fiengo and May 1994). They note the possible occurrence of *do so* in sentences like (4).

- (4) Mary is eating snails, but Bill could never do so.

Here, *do so* must correspond to *eat snails* rather than to *eating snails*. C&J take this lack of tight correspondence between *do so* and what would be its antecedent as evidence that *do so* is not the product of replacing a phrase identical to the antecedent phrase.

Another supporting fact concerns what C&J assume to be similar expressions, such as *do it*, *do the same (thing)*, and *do the opposite (thing)*. Lumping *do so* in with these expressions, C&J note that *X* in the general expression *do X* may have independent semantic content, as in the preceding examples. Hence, *do X* may not strictly correspond semantically to its antecedent, something that can't be explained by saying that *do so* replaces a VP or that *do so* is a pro-form whose reference is determined by the content of its antecedent.

Despite the preceding observations, however, there are reasons to maintain that *do so* is more pro-form-like than C&J claim, that it corresponds structurally to VP (or V'), and hence that VPs with adjuncts have a hierarchical rather than a flat structure.

One of the reasons has to do with the contrast between *do so* and other expressions like *do X*. As C&J recognize, *do so* does not have the same distribution as other *do X* expressions. For example, (5b), but not (5c), is a possible response to the physical act described in (5a).

- (5) a. (Mary does a backflip.)
- b. I bet you can't do that/it/the same thing/something similar.
- c. *I bet you can't do so.

That is, *do X*, but not *do so*, may be used with a nonlinguistic antecedent (Hankamer and Sag 1976).

Further, consider the sentences in (6).

- (6) As for some of the crazy stunts that took place, Bill devoured a ham,
 - a. and Mary did something (similar) with a chicken.
 - b. and Mary did a similar thing with a chicken.
 - c. and Mary did the same thing with a chicken.
 - d. and Mary did that with a chicken.
 - e. and Mary did it with a chicken.
 - f. * and Mary did so with a chicken.

Do X expressions other than *do so*, as in (6a–e), may display an external object (in adjunct form), whereas the parallel *do so*, as in (6f), may not. Thus, *do so* again does not

look like an unqualified member of the *do X* class. Since *do so* and the other *do X* expressions do not have the same distribution, and since only the latter exhibit semantic content independent of the antecedent, *do so* appears to be distinct from the other *do X* expressions and more Pro-form-like in not displaying independent semantic content.

出典 Sobin, Nicholas 2008. "Do So and VP," *Linguistic Inquiry* 39-1.[一部改変]

Q1 Culicover and Jackendoffは *do so* をどのように扱うべきだと論じているか。本文に即して説明しなさい。(Explain the treatment of *do so* Culicover and Jackendoff argue for, with reference to the content of the text.)

Q2 Culicover and Jackendoffが、Q1の主張を裏付けるために述べている議論を要約しなさい。(Summarize the arguments Culicover and Jackendoff present in order to support their claim in Q1.)

Q3 Culicover and Jackendoffの議論に対する筆者の反論を要約しなさい。(Summarize the counter-argument the author presents against Culicover and Jackendoff's arguments.)

問題7

Lexicalization patterns 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。
(Read the following passage on 'lexicalization patterns' and answer the questions after the passage.)

The main purpose of this paper is to show that the 'conflation processes' involved in so-called 'lexicalization patterns' (see Talmy 1985) can receive an adequate explanation when translated into syntactic terms. An analysis of these conflation processes in purely semantic terms like that put forward by Talmy (1985) can be said to be descriptively adequate, but (a) the 'parametric variation' to be found in such processes will be seen to crucially involve morphosyntax, not only semantics (see Snyder 1995).

First of all, it will be necessary to review some of the main insights of Talmy's work. As is well-known, this cognitive linguist claims that languages can be classified according to how semantic components like Figure, Motion, Path, Manner, or Cause are conflated into the verb. For example, conflation of motion with path is argued to be typical of Romance languages like Spanish (see (1)), whereas conflation of motion with manner is typical of English (see (2)).

- (1)
- a. La botella entró a la cueva flotando.
the bottle went+into to the cave floating
 - b. La botella salió de la cueva flotando.
the bottle went+out of the cave floating
 - c. El globo subió por la chimenea flotando.
the balloon went+up through the chimney floating
 - d. La botella se alejó de la orilla flotando.
the bottle went+away from the bank floating
- (2)
- a. The bottle floated into the cave.
 - b. The bottle floated out of the cave.
 - c. The balloon floated up the chimney.
 - d. The bottle floated away from the bank.

In fact, Spanish and English can be regarded as two poles of a typological dichotomy that Talmy (1991) characterized as 'verb-framed languages' versus (b) 'satellite-framed languages'. Given this distinction, there are languages encoding the path element into the verb: for example, consider the Spanish path verbs *entrar* 'go in(to)', *salir* 'go out', *subir* 'go up', etc. By contrast, other languages do not incorporate the path into the verb

but leave it as a satellite around the verb. According to Talmy, the latter option is typically found in the majority of Indo-European languages (Romance being excluded). When the path remains as a satellite, one option becomes available: the manner component (for example, *floating* in the example in (2)) can be encoded into the verb.

(c) The well-known 'elasticity' of the verb meaning in English (cf. Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1988) can be exemplified with data involving not only conflation of motion with manner (see (2)), but also conflation of causation with manner (see examples in (3)). The fact that the directionality or path component remains as a satellite in English allows the manner component (e.g. *brushing*) to be conflated into the causative verb in (3). As expected, the lexicalization pattern corresponding to the Romance languages (i.e. the path incorporates into the verb, saturating it lexically) prevents them from having the kind of verbal elasticity in (3), the manner component being then forced to be expressed as an adjunct if necessary: e.g., cf. Sp. *ella quitó las hilas con un cepillo/cepillando* (lit.: 'she took+out the lint with a brush/brushing').

- (3)
- a. She brushed the lint off (the coat).
 - b. She brushed the tangles out.
 - c. She brushed the crumbs into the bowl.
 - d. She brushed melted butter over the loaves.
 - e. She brushed the coat clean.
 - f. She brushed her way to healthy hair.

Notice that it is precisely the conflation of the motion or causation verb with manner that accounts for those cases where the construction rather than the verb has been argued to determine the argument structure (see Jackendoff (1990, 1997, or Goldberg 1995). As shown in Jackendoff (1990, 1997), constructions like those in (4) and (5) have syntactic and semantic restrictions of their own and, in this sense, it is indisputable that each of them deserves the status of 'constructional idioms'. Moreover, Jackendoff (1997:554f) noted that these constructions can be considered instances of a more general abstract construction, the 'verb subordination archi-construction' in (6).

- (4) 'One's way construction':
e.g. (d) He moaned his way out of the room.
a. [VP V [bound pronoun]'s way PP]
b. 'go PP (by) V-ing
- (5) 'Resultative construction':
e.g. He wiped the table clean.
a. [VP V NP {AP/PP}]

- b. cause NP to become AP / go PP by V-ing (it)
- (6) 'Verb subordination Archi-construction'
- a. [vp V ...]
- b. 'act (by) V-ing'

Although we do not have any problem attributing the status of 'constructional idioms' to the constructions in (4) and (5) in the sense that each of them has its own set of syntactic and semantic peculiarities, we want to show that Jackendoff's (1997) 'Verb subordination Archi-construction' in (6), as it stands, can be regarded as an epiphenomenon, once a principled account of the parametric variation in the lexicon-syntax interface is taken into account.

Quite importantly, we claim that the relevant explanation of the parametric issue concerning the existence of (3)-(5) in English, but not in Romance, can not be formulated in purely semantic or aspectual terms, since it can be argued to have nothing to do with the positive or negative application of some *ad hoc* operations over 'Lexical Conceptual Structure' (LCS) (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1988), the 'Aspectual Structure' (Tenny 1994), or the 'Event Structure' (Pustejovsky 1991), but with one empirical fact: i.e., the syntactic properties associated with the lexical element encoding directionality are not the same in English as in Romance.

'Semanticocentric' analyses run into problems when language variation is taken into account, since no principled explanation can be given to why some languages (e.g. Romance) appear to lack the relevant LCS operation, the aspectual operation or the event-type shift strategy involved in the conflation process in (2) and (3). Accordingly, we will take pains to show that the solution of such a problem cannot be stated in *purely* semantic or aspectual terms.

出典: Mateu, J. and G. Rigau (2002) "A Minimalist Account of Conflation Processes: Parametric Variation at the Lexicon-Syntax Interface," *Theoretical Approaches to Universals*, ed. by A. Alexiadou, John Benjamins. [一部改変]

Q1: 筆者が下線部(a)のように主張する根拠について、本文に即して説明しなさい。
(Explain why the author claims the underscored part (a), with reference to the content of the text.)

Q2: 下線部(b)はどういう言語のことか。本文の内容に即して説明しなさい。
(Explain what kind of language the underscored part (b) refers to, with reference to the content of the text.)

Q3: 下線部(c)はどういう状態のことか。本文の内容に即して説明しなさい。
(Explain what property the underscored part (c) refers to, with reference to the content of the text.)

Q4: 下線部(d)を和訳しなさい。(Translate the underscored part (d) into Japanese.)

Q5: 本文で論じられている‘lexicalization patterns’の分類に従うと、あなたの母国語は、verb-framed language と satellite-framed language のいずれに属すると考えられるか。あるいは、いずれにも属さない第三のタイプであるか。あなたの主張を、それを裏付ける具体例のミニマル・ペアを1組以上挙げながら述べなさい。
(Given the binary classification of ‘lexicalization patterns’ discussed in the text, which type does your mother tongue belong to, the verb-framed languages or satellite-framed languages? Or does it belong to a third type? Your answer should include at least one minimal pair of examples demonstrating your point.)

問題8

英語の強勢付与について書かれた次の文を読んで、問いに答えなさい。(Read the following text about the stress assignment in English and answer the questions below.)

While phrases tend to be stressed phrase-finally, i.e. on the last word, compounds tend to be stressed on the first element. This systematic difference is captured in the so-called nuclear stress rule ('phrasal stress is on the last word of the phrase') and the so-called compound stress rule ('stress is on the left-hand member of a compound'), formalized in Chomsky and Halle (1968: 17). Consider the data in (1) for illustration, in which the most prominent syllable of the phrase is marked by an acute accent:

- (1) a. **noun phrases:**
[the green **car**pet], [this new **hou**se], [such a good **job**]
b. **nominal compounds:**
[páyment problems], [installátion guide], [spáce requirement]

This systematic difference between the stress assignment in noun phrases and in noun compounds can even lead to minimal pairs where it seems to be only the stress pattern that distinguishes between the compound and the phrase (and ^(A)their respective interpretations).

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| (2) | nominal compound | noun phrase |
| a. | bláckboard
'a board to write on' | a black bóard
'a board that is black' |
| b. | gréenhouse
'a glass building for growing plants' | a green hóuse
'a house that is green' |
| c. | óperating instructions
'instructions for operating something' | operating instrúctions
'instructions that are operating' |
| d. | instálling options
'options for installing something' | installing óptions
'the installing of options,' or
'options that install something' |

While the compound stress rule makes correct predictions for the vast majority of nominal compounds, it has been pointed out that there are also numerous exceptions to the rule. Some of these exceptions are listed in (3). The most prominent syllable is again marked by an acute accent on the vowel.

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------------|
| (3) | geologist-astrónomer | apple píe |
| | scholar-áctivist | apricot crúmble |
| | Michigan hóspital | Madison Ávenue |
| | Boston márathon | Penny Láne |
| | summer night | aluminum fóil |
| | may flówers | silk tíe |

How can we account for such data? One obvious hypothesis would be to say that the compound stress rule holds for all compounds, so that, consequently, the above word combinations cannot be compounds. But what are they, if not compounds? Before we start

reflecting upon this difficult problem, we should first try an alternative approach.

Proceeding from our usual assumption that most phenomena are at least to some extent regular, we could try to show that the words in (3) are not really idiosyncratic but they are more or less systematic exceptions of the compound stress rule. This hypothesis has been entertained by a number of scholars.

Although these authors differ slightly in details of their respective approaches, they all argue that rightward prominence is restricted to only a severely limited number of more or less well-defined types of meaning relationships. For example, compounds like *geologist-astronomer* and *scholar-activist* differ from other compounds in that both elements refer to the same entity. A *geologist-astronomer*, for example, is a single person who is an astronomer and at the same time a geologist. Such compounds are called copulative compounds. For the moment it is important to note that this clearly definable subclass of compounds consistently has rightward stress (*geologist-astrónomer*), and is therefore a systematic exception to the compound stress rule. (B) Other meaning relationships typically accompanied by rightward stress are temporal or locative, or causative, usually paraphrased as 'made of,' or 'created by.' It is, however, not quite clear how many semantic classes should be set up to account for all the putative exceptions to the compound stress rule. This remains a problem for proponents of (C) this hypothesis. It also seems that certain types of combination choose their stress pattern in analogy to combinations having the same rightward constituents. Thus, for example, all *street* names involving *street* as their right-hand member pattern alike in having leftward stress (e.g. *Óxford Street*, *Máin Street*, *Fóurth Street*), while all combinations with, for example, *avenue* as right-hand member pattern alike in having rightward stress.

Let us, however, also briefly explore the other hypothesis, which is that word combinations with rightward stress cannot be compounds, which raises the question of what else such structures could be. One natural possibility is to consider such forms as phrases. However, this creates new serious problems. (D) First, such an approach would face the problem of explaining why not all forms that have the same superficial structure, for example [noun-noun], are phrases. Second, one would like to have independent criteria coinciding with stress in order to say whether something is a compound or a phrase. This is, however, impossible: apart from stress itself, there seems to be no independent argument for claiming that *Mádison Street* should be a compound, whereas *Madison Ávenue* should be a phrase. Both have the same internal structure (noun-noun), both show the same meaning relationship between their respective constituents, both are right-headed, and it is only in their stress patterns that they differ. A final problem for the phrasal analysis is the above-mentioned fact that the rightward stress pattern is often triggered by analogy to other combinations with the same rightward element. (E) This can only happen if the forms on which the analogy is based are stored in the mental lexicon. And storage in the mental lexicon is something we would typically expect from words (i.e. compounds), and only exceptionally from phrases (as in the case of *jack-in-the-box*).

出典 : Plag, I. (2003) *Word-Formation in English*, Cambridge University Press. [一部改変]

Q1. (2)のデータをもとに下線部(A)を説明しなさい。(2)のペアの複合語と句は意味的にどのような違いがあるだろうか。説明の際には、以下の概念のうち、少なくとも一つを使いなさい: 合成性、語彙化、透明性。(Explain the underlined part (A) based on the data in (2). How do the compound and phrase in these pairs differ

semantically? In answering this question, use at least one of the following concepts: compositionality, lexicalization, transparency.)

Q2. 下線部(B)の観察を、このテキストの中にあるデータを用いて例示しなさい。
(Illustrate the observation in (B) by using the data given in this text.)

Q3. 下線部(C)の *this hypothesis* が何を指すか、説明しなさい。(Explain what "this hypothesis" in (C) refers to.)

Q4. 下線部(D)で述べられている問題を、このテキストにあるデータを用いて、具体的に説明しなさい。(Explain the problem discussed in (D) concretely, using the data in this text.)

Q5. 主語の *this* が何をさすかを明示しつつ下線部(E)の一文を日本語に訳しなさい。
(Translate the sentence in (E) into Japanese. In doing so, specify what the subject "this" refers to.)

Q6. このテキストの内容が正しいとすると、次のイタリック体の表現には、どのように強勢が付与されるだろうか? それぞれについて、第一強勢の位置を予測し、なぜそのような予測になるのかを説明しなさい。(If the above text is correct, how will the following italicized combinations be accented? In each case, predict the place of the primary accent and explain how you reach that prediction.)

(i) *Shakespeare sonnet*

(ii) *bathroom towel designer* 'designer of towels for the bathroom'

平成24年度実施
東北大学大学院情報科学研究科
博士課程後期入学試験問題
(2013年3月5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。(After examination, both the question and the answer sheet booklets are withdrawn.)

問題 1

次の文章は eHarmony というサイトをめぐると新聞記事である。これを読んで後の問いに答えなさい。(The following passage is a newspaper article about a Web site called eHarmony. Read this passage and answer the questions below.)

In the quest to find true love, is filling out a questionnaire on a Web site any more scientific than praying to St. Valentine?

Yes, according to psychologists at eHarmony, an online company that claims its computerized algorithms will help match you with a “soul mate.” But this claim was criticized in a psychology journal last year by a team of academic researchers, who concluded that “no compelling evidence supports matching sites’ claims that mathematical algorithms work.”

In response, eHarmony’s senior research scientist, Gian C. Gonzaga, went into the academic lions’ den known as S.P.S.P. — the big annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, held recently in New Orleans. Armed with a PowerPoint presentation, Dr. Gonzaga faced a packed hall of researchers eager for a peek at eHarmony’s secrets.

Unlike many other Web dating services, eHarmony doesn’t let customers search for partners on their own. They pay up to \$60 per month to be offered matches based on their answers to a long questionnaire, which currently has about 200 items. The company has gathered answers from 44 million people, and says that its matches have led to more than half a million marriages since 2005.

Dr. Gonzaga, a social psychologist who previously worked at a marriage-research lab at the University of California, Los Angeles, said eHarmony wouldn’t let him disclose its formulas, but he did offer some revelations. He said its newest algorithm matches couples by focusing on six factors:

- ¶ Level of agreeableness — or, put another way, how quarrelsome a person is.
- ¶ Preference for closeness with a partner — how much emotional intimacy each wants and how much time each likes to spend with a partner.
- ¶ Degree of sexual and romantic passion.
- ¶ Level of extroversion and openness to new experience.
- ¶ How important spirituality is.
- ¶ How optimistic and happy each one is.

The more similarly that two people score in these factors, the better their chances, Dr. Gonzaga said, and presented evidence, not yet published, from several studies at eHarmony Labs. One study, which tracked more than 400 married couples matched by eHarmony, found that scores from their initial questionnaires correlated with a couple’s satisfaction with their relationship four years later.

“It is possible,” Dr. Gonzaga concluded, “to empirically derive a matchmaking algorithm that predicts the relationship of a couple before they ever meet.”

(A) Not so fast, replied the critics in the hall. They didn’t doubt that factors like agreeableness could predict a good marriage. But that didn’t mean eHarmony had found the secret to matchmaking, said Harry T. Reis of the University of Rochester, one of the authors of last year’s critique.

“That agreeable person that you happen to be matching up with me would, in fact, get along famously with anyone in this room,” Dr. Reis told Dr. Gonzaga.

He and his co-authors argued that eHarmony’s results could merely reflect the well-known “(B)person effect”: an agreeable, non-neurotic, optimistic person will tend to fare better in any relationship. But the research demonstrating this effect also showed that it’s hard to make predictions based on what’s called a (C)dyadic effect — how similar the partners are to each other.

“In the existing literature, similarity components are notoriously weak at accounting for relationship satisfaction,” said Paul W. Eastwick of the University of Texas, Austin. “For example, what really matters for my relationship satisfaction is whether I myself am neurotic and, to a slightly lesser extent, whether my partner is neurotic. Our similarity on neuroticism is irrelevant.”

Dr. Gonzaga agreed that previous researchers hadn’t been able to predict satisfaction based on partners’ similarities. But he said that was because they hadn’t focused on the factors identified by eHarmony, like the level of sexual passion, where it was especially important for the partners to be compatible. And while some traits, like agreeability, may be helpful in any relationship, he said, it still helped for partners to be similar.

“Let’s say you measure agreeableness on a scale of 1 to 7 for each partner,” Dr. Gonzaga said. “A couple with a combined score of 8 has better chances than a couple with a lower score, but it also matters how they got to 8. A couple with two 4s is better off than a couple with a 1 and a 7.”

His assertion left the critics slightly intrigued but quite unconvinced. “If dyadic effects are real, and if eHarmony can establish this point validly, then this would be a major advance to our science,” Dr. Reis said. But he and his colleagues said that eHarmony hadn’t yet carried out, let alone published, the sort of rigorous study necessary to prove that its algorithm worked.

“They have run a few studies, without peer review, that examine existing couples,” said Eli J. Finkel of Northwestern University, the lead author of the critical paper last year. “But it’s crucial to remember that that’s not what their algorithm is supposed to do. The algorithm is supposed to take people who have never met and match them.”

To verify the algorithm’s effectiveness, the critics said, would require a randomized controlled clinical trial like the ones run by pharmaceutical companies. Randomly assign some individuals to be matched by eHarmony’s algorithm, and some in a control group to be matched arbitrarily; then track the resulting relationships to see who’s more satisfied.

“Nobody in the world has the treasure chest of resources for relationships research that eHarmony has,” Dr. Finkel said, “so we can’t figure out why they haven’t done the study.”

Dr. Gonzaga said he had ethical qualms about matching people arbitrarily, and that such a trial seemed unnecessary in light of eHarmony’s other studies. “(D)We have what I think is unique evidence showing that couples high in compatibility are more satisfied with their relationships,” Dr. Gonzaga said. “It makes us comfortable that we’ve done our job well.”

Even if eHarmony is not interested in doing the clinical trial, the work presumably could still be conducted by outsiders. The academic critics estimated the

trial might cost between \$250,000 and \$1 million, and said they would run it themselves if the money were provided.

Until then, they remain skeptical of secret algorithms, but they do offer some encouragement to singles seeking online connections. Whether or not the algorithms work, the dating sites offer lots of potential mates, and there's some screening done simply by self-selection. After all, it takes an effort to go through the process of registering, particularly when it requires answering a couple of hundred questions.

"If I were single, I would be using a service like eHarmony, but with my eyes wide open," Dr. Reis said. "Anybody who thinks eHarmony really knows what's best for you is making a big mistake. But it is providing access to people who are really interested in a relationship instead of just gaming. I'd tell myself I'll meet 100 women in the next six months, and if I find one, then I'm happy. Where else can I meet 100 women?" (*New York Times*, February 11, 2013)

Q 1 下線部(A)の Not so fast. の部分は、何について、そしてなぜ not so fast と述べているのか日本語または英語で説明しなさい。(What does (A) *Not so fast* refer to in this text? And why did they say so? Answer in Japanese or in English.)

Q 2 下線部(B)と(C)の person effect と dyadic effect は、それぞれどのような効果を言っているのか、日本語で説明しなさい。(What kind of effects do the person effect in (B) and the dyadic effect in (C) mean? Explain them in Japanese.)

Q 3 Dr. Gonzaga の主張に対して Dr. Reis、Dr. Eastwick、Dr. Finkel らは、大きくまとめて2種類の批判を行っている。その2種類の批判、およびそれに対する Dr. Gonzaga による反論を日本語または英語で要約しなさい。(Dr. Reis, Dr. Eastwick and Dr. Finkel are criticizing Dr. Gonzaga's claims in two respects. Summarize their criticisms and Dr. Gonzaga's counter-arguments to them in Japanese or in English.)

Q 4 本文で述べられている eHarmony のようなサイトについて、あなた自身がどのように感じるか、思うところを10行程度の英語で述べなさい。(What do you personally think of Web sites like eHarmony? Explain your personal view in English. Use about 10 lines.)

問題 2

次の(A)と(B)から一つを選択し、解答しなさい。(Answer either (A) or (B) below.)

(A)

次の文章の下線部(1)と(2)を英語に直しなさい。なお、この文章における「ループ(loop)」と「メモ(memo)」とは、脳内のワーキングメモリと呼ばれる仕組みに

おける情報処理の機構を言い、「ループ」は耳からの情報を反芻する仕組みであり、「メモ」とは視覚イメージを保存する仕組みである。

先に私たちは、耳から入った刺激を心の中でめぐらすことができるのと同様に、眼から入った刺激も心にしばらく焼きつけることができると書いた。しかし実は、音が響き続ける時間とイメージを焼きつけることのできる時間には、圧倒的なひらきがある。後者はせいぜいショーウィンドウのケーキを見て、席に戻るまでの間くらいの長さしか保持できない。その後は思い出そうとしても、像を復原できないのが普通なのである。

①だからイメージにもとづく決定は、おのずと瞬時になされることになる。つまり、決定をした内容をあらためて点検する余裕がないのだ。逆に、言語にもとづく決断は時間を要する。ついついくり返し、内容を検討してしまうためである。つまりループからの情報による判断は、逡巡的であるのに対し、メモからのものは衝動的という特徴を持つ。

通常は双方がほどよくミックスされた状態になっている。②けれど判断がメモからのものに一方的に偏ると、往々にして行動は途轍もなく瞬時的、すなわちあと先を考えない側面を見せるようになる。それが時として、「キレる」という形となって現れると考えられるのだ。そして昨今、そういうタイプの人間は確実にその数を増していると考えられる。なぜか? 明らかに生活のIT化の影響と想像されるのだ。

ITが極端に資格に依存していることはあらためて指摘するまでもないだろう。その典型が、すでにふれた通りケータイである。ケータイによるコミュニケーションのサル化が、言語による情報処理に依存しない思考判断傾向を加速化させている。(正高信男「考えないヒト」より)

(B)

The following passage is a brief description of a book *The Language Revolution* by David Crystal. Read this and answer the question below.

We are living through the consequences of a linguistic revolution. Dramatic linguistic change has left us at the beginning of a new era in the evolution of human language, with repercussions for many individual languages.

In this book, David Crystal, one of the world's authorities on language, brings together for the first time the three major trends which he argues have fundamentally altered the world's linguistic ecology: first, the emergence of English as the world's first truly global language; second, the crisis facing huge numbers of languages which are currently endangered or dying; and, third, the radical effect on language of the arrival of Internet technology.

Examining the interrelationships between these topics, Crystal encounters a vision of a linguistic future which is radically different from what has existed in the past, and which will make us revise many cherished concepts relating to the way we think

about and work with languages. Everyone is affected by this linguistic revolution.

The Language Revolution will be essential reading for anyone interested in language and communication in the twenty-first century.

QUESTION: The underlined part is the three major language trends Crystal brings together in this book. Choose one from these three and express your own view about it in English.