

平成 28 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  
(2016 年 8 月 30 日)

専門試験科目 第 5 群  
(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。
- 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。
- 言語系を志望する受験者は、問題 6～問題 8 のなかから、2 問題以上を選択すること。
- メディア系を志望する受験者は、問題 2～問題 4 のなかから、2 問題以上を選択すること。
- 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。
- 問題 5-1 あるいは問題 5-2 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。
- 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

「スポーツ」、「言語」、「メディア」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

以下の文章を読んだ上で、コンピュータ導入による教育イノベーションの可能性と課題について、あなたの考えや提案を答案用紙 1 枚程度の日本語で論じなさい。

職場と同じように、コンピュータが学校教育で中心となるためには、教室内の活動だけでなく、家庭の宿題も含めて、ネットワーク接続されたコンピュータで、大半の学習を生徒がすることが必要です。ただし、そのためには、コンピュータをすべての生徒に与えるための、膨大な費用がかかります。

※出典：Allan Collins, Richard Halverson (著), 稲垣忠 (編訳)  
『デジタル社会の学びのかたち—教育とテクノロジーの再考』, 北大路書房, 2012)

## 問題 3

現代の情報社会は、多種多様なメディアが複雑に絡まり合いながら発展している。このような状況において、社会にとって最も重要である（いかなる側面からでも構わない）とあなたが考えるメディアを1つ取り上げ、その理由とそのメディアの存在意義および社会的役割について、答案用紙1枚程度の日本語で論じなさい。

## 問題 4

英米文学研究者のエレイン・ショウォルターは、大学等での文学教育において学生に習得させたい能力・スキルを以下の 12 項目にまとめている。具体的な文学作品を例に、それを研究対象とする場合に特に重要だと考える能力・スキルを 3 つ選び、それらが重要である理由を答案用紙 1 枚から 2 枚程度の日本語で論じなさい。なお、解答のなかで、どの項目を選んだのかを明確にすること。

1. How to recognize subtle and complex differences in language use.
2. How to read figurative language and distinguish between literal and metaphorical meaning.
3. How to seek out further knowledge about the literary work, its author, its content, or its interpretation.
4. How to detect the cultural assumptions underlying writings from a different time or society, and in the process to become aware of one's own cultural assumptions.
5. How to relate apparently disparate works to one another, and to synthesize ideas that connect them into a tradition or a literary period.
6. How to use literary models as cultural references, either to communicate with others or to clarify one's own ideas.
7. How to think creatively about problems by using literature as a broadening of one's own experience and practical knowledge.
8. How to read closely, with attention to detailed use of diction, syntax, metaphor, and style, not only in high literary works, but in decoding the stream of language everyone in modern society is exposed to.
9. How to create literary texts of one's own, whether imaginative or critical.
10. How to think creatively within and beyond literary studies, making some connections between the literary work and one's own life.
11. How to work and learn with others, taking literature as a focus for discussion and analysis.
12. How to defend a critical judgment against the informed opinions of others.

※出典 : Elaine Showalter, *Teaching Literature*, Oxford, Blackwell, 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。

Es ist längst kein Geheimnis mehr - die deutsche Bevölkerung ist durch eine zunehmende Alterung gekennzeichnet. Die steigende Lebenserwartung sowie die anhaltend niedrige Geburtenrate in Deutschland führen zu einem immer größer werdenden Anteil älterer Menschen.

Dem gegenüber steht die Forderung an jeden Einzelnen, in der so genannten Informations- und Wissensgesellschaft bestehen zu können. Lebenslanges Lernen mit Hilfe von neuen Technologien wird mittlerweile vorausgesetzt. In allen Bereichen des gesellschaftlichen Lebens scheint es unabdingbar zu sein, neue Medien wie das Internet bedienen und nutzen zu können. Der Erwerb von Medienkompetenz scheint zu einer vierten Schlüsselqualifikation wie Lesen, Schreiben und Rechnen zu werden.

Was aber, wenn die Voraussetzungen dafür nicht in allen Bevölkerungsteilen gegeben sind? Gerade ältere Menschen haben während ihrer Berufstätigkeit kaum noch Berührung mit den neuen Medien erfahren. Sie werden erst in der späten Lebensphase mit den neuen technologischen Entwicklungen im Alltag konfrontiert. Ihre Erfahrungen und ihr Wissenspotential sollten nicht ungenutzt bleiben, nur weil sie zurzeit noch nicht die Fähigkeit besitzen, mit dem Internet umzugehen. Es gilt, sie für dieses Medium zu sensibilisieren, Berührungängste abzubauen und vor allem den persönlichen Nutzen aufzuzeigen.

※出典: Karina Mahn, Online-Kompetenz von Senioren, Technische Fachhochschule Wildau 2006 [一部改変]

## 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 littérature du Japon possède nombre de caractéristiques qui la distinguent de celle de la Chine et de celle de l'Occident. Ces dernières découlent de cinq facteurs principaux : le rôle de la littérature dans l'ensemble de la culture japonaise ; son développement historique ; la langue japonaise et ses systèmes d'écriture ; le fonds social de la littérature ; et, finalement, l'idée fondamentale que les Japonais se font de la vie, de la mort, de la religion et de la philosophie. En observant ces facteurs et leur interaction, nous pouvons nous faire une idée bien nette de la structure de la littérature japonaise ; il est alors possible de présenter une description bien ordonnée de son histoire, telle qu'elle a évolué au sein de cette structure. L'hypothèse d'une structure synchronique constitue le point de départ pour découvrir un ordre diachronique. Ce qui suit, dans cette introduction, ne s'applique pas forcément et de façon universelle à la méthodologie de l'histoire littéraire en général ; mais sans traiter des caractéristiques qui la distinguent de la littérature d'autres pays, il est impossible de fixer une méthodologie pour la littérature japonaise en particulier.

※出典 : Shuichi Kato, « Introduction », *Histoire de la littérature japonaise*, traduit par E. Dale Saunders, Paris : Fayard, 1985. [一部改変]

## 問題 6

次の文章を読んで後の問いに答えなさい。

English has a large number of partly lexicalized verb-preposition combinations. *Think through, shut up, look over, throw out, and rely on* are a few examples. A sub-class of these constructions are known as verb-particle constructions. These have been discussed by Bolinger (1971) and Fraser (1976) among others. These particles exhibit the syntactic trait of being able to appear on either side of the object noun in transitive expressions. Bolinger (1971) used this characteristic to distinguish them from what he called pure prepositions, which may only appear before the noun, and pure adverbials, which only appear after it. These three classes are illustrated below in (23a, b and c) respectively. (Examples below are from Bolinger (1971). He refers to verb particles as adverbial particles.)

(1) a. *verb particles*

run up the flag

run the flag up

He looked up his friends.

\*He looked his friends up.

b. *'pure prepositions'*

climb up the tree

\*climb the tree up

I can cope with Jones.

\*I can cope Jones with.

c. *'pure adverbials'*

\*I left there the keys.

I left the keys there.

\*He sold regretfully the business.

He sold the business regretfully.

With pronominal objects, the particles usually appear in the postnominal position, which makes the difference between particles and pure prepositions more pronounced:

(2) a. \*run up it

run it up

\*He looked up them.

He looked them up.

b. climb up it

\*climb it up

I can cope with him

\*I can cope him with.

The ordering of particles and pronominal objects is readily explained by a condition that requires the item with the heaviest 'weight' to be clause-final where possible. The heaviest 'weight' is associated with the most or the newest information, or with the longest utterance. When the pronominal is stressed it can be ordered postnominally:

(3) You looked up THEM?! Those were the wrong ones to look up!

In this way, the ordering of particles with respect to pronominal objects is related to Heavy NP Shift, which is generally considered to be a stylistic rule. (A)The syntactic generalization that the particle may appear on either side of the object holds true, where the effect of stylistic or discourse conditions is controlled for.

However, weighting the pure prepositions does not make it possible for them to appear after the object:

(4) \*You can cope him WITH?! Nobody can do that!

Particles and pure prepositions, though they appear superficially quite similar, have different syntactic distributions.

The data above show that there is a class of particles which may occur on either side of a direct object noun phrase, and which preserve a somewhat literal sense. These particles also have a particular semantic property; they impart a resultative sense to the sentence or verb phrase. In Bolinger's words, (B)"the particle must contain two features, one of motion-through-location, the other of terminus or result" (Bolinger (1971) p. 85) In our terminology, this is a measuring-out.

An event that achieves a result is an event with a temporal endpoint -- a delimited -- and measured out -- event. The class of verb particles have the semantic property of imposing delimitedness on the event described by a verb phrase or sentence, as well as the syntactic property of appearing on either side of the noun phrase object:

(5) look up a name in the phonebook in an hour/\*for an hour

look a name up in the phonebook in an hour/\*for an hour

think up an answer in an hour/\*for an hour

think an answer up in an hour/\*for an hour

If I *look up a name* or *think up an answer*, my action of looking or thinking has a clear result or termination. The name has been found; there is an answer that did not exist before. Either the object itself has been changed or the activity has progressed 'through' the object itself during the course of the event. The object in the verb-particle construction measures out the event. The verb particle must occur with the MEASURE aspectual role.

Unlike verb particles, prepositions do not always require a delimited interpretation. The examples in (6) below do not require a delimited interpretation, and therefore cannot be associated with the MEASURE aspectual role. The examples in (7) do, but even so they are not associated with the MEASURE role. In neither case do the prepositions demonstrate the same syntactic behavior as the verb particles. (Compare the examples in (6) and (7) with those in (5).)

- (6) look at a photograph \*in an hour/for an hour  
\*look a photograph at  
think about a problem \*in an hour/for an hour  
\*think a problem about
- (7) fly to the moon in an hour/\*for an hour  
\*fly the moon to  
walk to the cliff in an hour/\*for an hour  
\*walk the cliff to

Prepositions such as *to*, which introduce goal phrases, generally impose a delimited interpretation as in (7), but they do not express a result in the same way that particles do. Although the events expressed by these verb phrases are delimited events, having a distinct temporal endpoint, the endpoints are not reached by either changing or 'traveling through' the objects, moon and cliff. After looking up a name, the name is in some sense *up* (speaking facetiously) but the moon is not *to*. Particles have a special semantic relationship with the direct object, not shared by goal phrase prepositions such as *to*.

Particles are a distinct syntactic class, distinguishable by their syntactic behavior from goal prepositions and what Bolinger calls pure prepositions. Particles may appear on either side of the object noun phrase. They also have a special aspectual function. Particles must occur with the MEASURE aspectual role. (C) Whatever the proper analysis is of the syntax of these particles, some reference must be made to the fact that they require the MEASURE role, or an important generalization has been missed.

※出典 : Carol L. Tenny 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. からの抜粋 [一部改変]

問 1 下線部(A)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 2 下線部(C)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 3 本文では、particle と pure preposition の違いについて、統語と意味の二面から論じている。  
この両者は、統語と意味のそれぞれについてどのような違いがあるのか、例文に言及しつつ日本語で論じなさい。

問 4 下線部(B)について、motion-through-location の feature と、terminus or result の feature の両方を表現している日本語の構文の例を指摘し、その特徴を英語の verb particle 構文と比較して論じなさい。

## 問題 7

overgeneralization を避けるために言語学習者が用いる方略の 1 つである statistical pre-empting 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。

In this chapter, we address the question of how the learner knows whether a pattern can be extended for use with new verbs for the sake of production, that is, the question of productivity. We need to explain how generalizations are constrained: How do children avoid or recover from (A)overgeneralizing their constructions?

There has been much discussion in the literature about productivity. At least four factors have been proposed as relevant to predicting a pattern's productivity: (a) the number of times an item occurs—its token frequency or degree of *entrenchment*; (b) statistical pre-emption: the repeated witness of the word in a competing pattern; (c) the absolute number of distinct items that occur in a given pattern or a pattern's *type frequency*; and (d) the variability of the items that occur in a given pattern: a pattern's *degree of openness*.

In order for *any* of these factors to work in constraining generalizations, some memory of how particular words are used in particular constructions is essential. That is, the only way to account for particular productivity is to recognize item-specific knowledge.

Several theorists have argued that the process of entrenchment or hearing a pattern with sufficient frequency plays a key role in constraining overgeneralizations. For example, Brain and Brooks (1995) propose a “unique argument-structure preference” such that once argument structure pattern has been learned for a particular verb, that argument structure pattern tends to block the creative use of the verb in any other argument structure pattern, unless a second pattern is also witnessed in the input. Brooks et al. (1999) demonstrated that children in an experimental setting were more likely to overgeneralize verbs that were used infrequently (e.g. to use *vanish* transitively), and less likely to overgeneralize frequently occurring verbs (e.g. to use *disappear* transitively). The difference was attributed to the difference in frequency. This sort of explanations, however, does not address the fact that verbs that frequently appear in one argument structure pattern can in fact be used creatively in new argument structure patterns, without any trace of ill-formedness as in:

- (1) She sneezed the foam off the cappuccino.
- (2) She danced her way to fame and fortune.
- (3) The truck screeched down the street.

Upon closer inspection, effects that might be ascribed to entrenchment are better attributed to a statistical process of pre-emption, critically involving the role of semantic or pragmatic

contrast.

That is, one way that overgeneralization can be minimized is based on the idea that more specific knowledge always pre-empts general knowledge in production, *as long as either would satisfy the functional demands of the context equally well*. The idea that more specific information should override more general information when the two are functionally equivalent is one with much precedent.

In the case of morphological pre-emption (or blocking), this idea is already familiar. While the agentive nominalizing suffix, *-er*; for example, is partially productive (one who is prone to squabbles can be called *squabbler*), it does not apply to words for which there already exists an agentive nominal counterpart. For example, someone can *ref* a game, he is not a *reffer*, because *referee* pre-empts the creation of the new term *reffer*.

The fact that statistically based pre-emption involving related, but non-synonymous constructions, plays a role in avoiding overgeneralizations has in fact been demonstrated empirically. (B)Brooks and Tomasello (1999) found that children aged six or seven were less than half as likely to productively produce a novel verb in a transitive frame when the verb had been modeled in both an intransitive and periphrastic causative construction, than when it was only modeled in the simple intransitive. For example, if the child had heard both *The ball is taming*, and *He's making the ball tam*, then they were less likely to respond to "what's the boy doing"? with *He's taming the ball*, than they were if only the simple intransitive had been witnessed. It seems that hearing the novel verb used in the periphrastic causative provided a really available alternative to the causative construction, statistically pre-empting the use of the latter. That is, hearing a periphrastic causative in a context in which the transitive causative would have been at least equally appropriate led children to avoid generating a transitive causative in a similar contextual situation.

The Brook et al. (1999) finding that high-frequency verbs are less likely to be overgeneralized than low-frequency verbs is consistent with the idea that it is pre-emption that prevents overgeneralization, not the frequency of the verb per se. That is, the pre-emptive context in which *disappear* might have been expected to occur transitively but instead is witnessed intransitively (in a periphrastic causative construction) occurs more frequently than the same pre-emptive context for *vanish*.

Alishahi and Stevenson (forthcoming) have successfully applied statistical pre-emption in a computational model of argument structure learning; the system recovers from overgeneralizations such as *She falled the cup*, by consistently hearing *fall* used intransitively even when an actor argument was part of the message to be conveyed (as in *She made the cup fall*).

There is a clash in information-structure properties that results in a preference for (5) over (4). (C)In learning to avoid examples like (4), the child may be aided by statistical pre-emption in the input:

- (4) ??Who did she give a book?  
(5) Who did she give a book to? (preferred, despite prescriptive injunction against stranded prepositions)

That is, when a learner might expect to hear a form like that in (4), she is statistically overwhelmingly more likely to hear a form such as (5). (In online data, actual occurrences of questioned prepositional goals outnumber questioned ditransitive recipients by roughly forty to one). This statistical pre-emption may lead the child to disprefer questions such as that in (4) in favor of ones such as (5).

(D)The pre-emptive process, unlike the notion of simple high token frequency, predicts that an expression like (6) would *not* be pre-empted by the overwhelmingly more frequent use of sneeze as a simple intransitive (as in (7)) because the expressions do not mean at all the same things.

- (6) She sneezed the foam off the cappuccino.  
(7) She sneezed.

At the same time, frequency does play some role in the process of statistical pre-emption exactly because the pre-emption is statistical. Only upon repeated exposures to one construction in lieu of another related construction can the learner infer that the second construction is not conventional. As noted above, this requires that a given pattern occur with sufficient frequency.

※出典 : Goldberg, Adele E. (2006) *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalizations in Language* (Oxford University Press) [一部改変]

[問 1] 下線部(A)について、どういうことかを、本文中からその具体例を引用しつつ、3行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。

[問 2] 下線部(B)を日本語に訳しなさい。

[問 3] 下線部(C)について、子どもは(4)のような構文を誤って修得することはないという事実を、statistical pre-emption の概念はどのように説明できると論じているか。statistical pre-emption とは何かの説明も含めて、5行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。

[問 4] 下線部(D)について、high token frequency の概念だけに基づくと、(6)のような sneeze の用法はなぜ pre-empt されてしまうことになるのか。vanish と disappear の間の差異についての本文中での記述を要約しつつ、3行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。

## 問題 8

Jackendoff and Pinker (2005) の論文では、Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky (2005) の言語進化論が極小主義の言語観、特に文法対レキシコンという二分法と結びついていることを問題視する。以下に抜粋するのは、著者らがその二分法への反論を展開している箇所である。これを読んで後の問いに答えなさい。

Among the assumptions of mainstream generative grammar of the past 50 years are that entries stored in the lexicon consist of simple words and morphemes, devoid of the combinatorial structure seen in phrases and sentences, and that phrases and sentences are assembled by operations that build, combine, and move syntactic trees. This theory goes well beyond the traditional distinction between productive computational operations and stored memory entries, because it identifies the former with a general, recursive syntactic tree-processor and the latter with a list of syntactically unstructured words. Thus the clustering of interlinked concepts in Hauser, Chomsky, & Firth (2002) and Fitch, Hauser, & Chomsky (2005)—language as it is understood by linguists, the core of language, abstract computation, narrow syntax, recursion, and the uniquely human part of language—depends on this conception of the division of labor between grammar and lexicon, a conception that goes back to classical generative grammar and traditional grammar before it (e.g. Bloomfield 1933).

Despite Fitch, Hauser, & Chomsky's assurances, this conception is not terminological: it is an empirically testable hypothesis. Over the past twenty years, it has come into question through research within a variety of frameworks, especially Construction Grammar (Fillmore 1988; Fillmore, Kay, & O'Conner 1988; Zwicky 1994; Goldberg 1995), Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Ginzburg & Sag 2000; Pollard & Sag 1987, 1994), Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1998), Lexical Functional Grammar (Bresnan 1982), and Parallel Architecture/Simpler Syntax (Culicover 1999; Jackendoff 2002; Culicover & Jackendoff 2005). All of these have concluded that the grammar/lexicon distinction must be reframed.

Space precludes our giving more than a taste of the evidence for this substantial rearrangement of the grammatical universe. (A) But the key phenomenon is the ubiquity of idioms and constructions which defy analysis in terms of principles of combinatorial syntactic phrase structure that apply across the language, on the one hand, and lexical items consisting of individual words, on the other. English speakers know, alongside their knowledge of words, an enormous number of idioms. Many idioms have normal syntax conforming to general rules: *kick the bucket* is a VP, *son of a gun* is a NP, *down in the dumps* is a PP, *the jig is up* is a sentence, and so on. (B) But a few have anomalous syntax, e.g. *by and large, for the most part, all of a sudden*. Many have variables for open argument places, e.g. *take NP for granted, give NP a piece of Pronoun's mind, put NP in Pronoun's place, the cat's got NP's tongue*. And some have both anomalous syntax and variables, such as *Far be it from NP to VP, How dare NP VP!* We also find noncanonical utterance types like (1), as well as other noncanonical pieces of syntax with varying degrees of productivity

such as (2).

- (1) a. *PP with NP!* Off with his head! Into the trunk with you!  
b. *How about X?* How about a cup of coffee? How about we have a little talk?  
c. *NP+acc Pred?* What, me worry? Him in an accident?  
d. *NP and S* One more beer and I'm leaving.  
e. *The more S* The more I read, the less I understand.
- (2) a. *Numbers:* three hundred fifty-five million, one hundred twenty-five thousand  
b. *N-P-N construction:* dollar by dollar, face to face, house by house

Presumably English is not alone in having a sizable number of these “syntactic nuts” (to use the term of Culicover 1999).

Fitch, Hauser, & Chomsky’s definition of FLN (the faculty of language in a narrow sense) contains a quiet hedge against such recalcitrant data. The word *core* in “core computational phenomena” adverts to the distinction made by Chomsky (1981) between “core grammar”—the deep regularities of language—and the raffish “periphery”, which includes “phenomena that result from historical accident, dialect mixture, personal idiosyncrasies, and the like” (Chomsky & Lasnik 1993). Chomsky and Lasnik advocate “putting aside” such phenomena, which include idioms and constructions of the sort in (1)-(2). And since they cannot be identified with a generic recursion operation, Fitch, Hauser, & Chomsky would have to place them in FLB (the faculty of language in a broad sense). (c) Yet this defense is unsatisfactory.

First, idioms and constructions are as specific to language as any other syntactic phenomenon. That is, they do not come for free with understanding the concepts underlying word meanings, and therefore cannot be relegated to FLB.

Second, idioms and constructions are not “peripheral” to language on any ordinary understanding of that word. We know of no accurate estimates, but the number of idioms and constructions that speakers know appears to be of comparable magnitude to the number of words. Furthermore, an examination of any stretch of actual language shows that idioms and constructions make up a substantial proportion of speakers’ usage.

Third, relegating the syntactic nuts to the periphery is computationally arbitrary, because they use the same mechanisms of phrase structure and argument structure as the “core” phenomena of canonical words and structures. For instance, idioms such as *take NP for granted* require arguments, just like ordinary transitive verbs. More problematic, they can override even the most basic mechanisms of recursive combination that are assumed to be at the heart of the language faculty. For instance, there are VP constructions in which the complement of the VP is not determined by the verb (Jackendoff 1990a, 1997a; Goldberg 1995):

- (3) a. He sang/drank/slept/laughed his head off.  
b. Bill belched/lurched/joked/laughed his way out of the meeting.  
c. Sara slept/drank/sang/laughed the whole afternoon away.

- d. The trolley squealed/rumbled around the corner.
- e. Bill drank the pub dry.

The underlined complements in these examples are not determined by the verb, as would happen automatically in standard recursive phrase structure operations. Indeed these constructions preclude the verb taking its own object, e.g. *He drank (\*scotch) his head off*, *Sara drank (\*scotch) the whole afternoon away*, etc. Goldberg and Jackendoff have argued that these constructions are idioms with VP structure in which the verb functions as an argument rather than playing its default role as semantic head. (D) Hence these “peripheral” phenomena commandeer the same computational machinery as the “core” phenomena of phrase structure and argument structure; they are not simple, ad hoc bits that are memorized by some mechanism separate from the combinatorial engine of language. Perhaps not coincidentally, idioms, constructions, and other syntactic nuts have been virtually ignored within the mainstream traditions of Government-Binding Theory and its successor, the Minimalist Program.

The conclusion from these widespread phenomena is that human memory must store linguistic expressions of all sizes, from individual morphemes to full idiomatic sentences (such as *The jig is up*). These expressions furthermore fall along a continuum of generality, defined by the number and range of variables they contain. At one extreme are word-like constants such as *dog* and irregular forms such as *bought*, with no variables to be filled. Moving along the continuum, we find mixtures of idiosyncratic content and open variables in idioms like *How dare NP VP* and *take NP for granted*. Still more general are the argument structures of individual predicates such as *dismantle NP* and *put NP PP*. Finally, at the other extreme are rule-like expressions consisting only of very general variables such as  $V \rightarrow V$ -suffix and  $VP \rightarrow V$  (NP).

※出典: Ray Jackendoff and Steven Pinker (2005) “The nature of the language faculty and its implications for evolution of language (Reply to Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky)”, *Cognition* 97, 211-225. [一部改変]

問 1 下線部 (A) を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 2 下線部 (B) のいう anomaly について、日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

問 3 下線部 (C) のように筆者らが考える根拠が本文中に 3 つ与えられている。  
それらを日本語で簡潔に要約しなさい。

問 4 下線部 (D) の考え方についてあなたはどのように考えますか。(3) a-e の中から構文を 1 つ選び具体的に日本語で論じなさい。

平成28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  
(2016年8月30日)

共通外国語科目 第5群  
(英語)

- 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

“Foreign lives”と題された次のエッセイを読み、後の問いに答えなさい。

Eating chips in a Singapore McDonald’s with his press clippings proudly spread in front of him, Mohammed Mukul Hossine is revelling in his status as a published poet. The 25-year-old Bangladeshi’s day job is working on the piling for a new block of luxury flats. With a father back home undertaking the \*haj this year, and one of his eight siblings still in school, he needs the money. His book of poems, “Me Migrant”, which he paid to have translated from Bengali to English, and which were then “transcreated” by Cyril Wong, a Singaporean poet, will not be a bestseller. But it has drawn some attention to a large, often overlooked slice of Singapore’s population: its one-million “work permit” holders—migrant workers on two-year contracts. The poems suggest, unsurprisingly, that their lives are pretty miserable.

The International Labour Organisation estimates that the Asia-Pacific region was host in 2013 to 25.8 million migrant workers. They have done wonders for both their home and destination countries. Rapidly ageing societies such as Japan, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan are short of workers. Younger, poorer places such as Bangladesh, India, Nepal and the Philippines need (1)the money their emigrants send home. So Cambodians work on South Korean farms; young Chinese men work in Tokyo’s convenience stores; and South Asians toil on Singapore’s building sites. The World Bank estimates that of the ten countries that receive the most in remittances from overseas workers, five are in Asia. In the Philippines, remittances are equal to 10% of GDP.

In Singapore 1.4 million workers, or 38% of the workforce, are foreigners on time-limited passes. Most come without their families. Many of the 326,000 construction workers live in dormitories; the 232,000 domestic workers live in their employers’ homes. Many can repeatedly renew their two-year contracts. But they are given virtually no hope of becoming “permanent residents”—as other long-staying foreigners can—let alone Singaporean citizens. Women who become pregnant are sent home; workers who overstay are caned and deported (“law and order so accurate here,” notes one of Mr. Mukul’s poems in praise of “beloved Singapore”). Some politicians say that, since their stays are limited and they impose little burden on local infrastructure, pass-holders should not really be counted as part of the population at all.

Some of course suffer exploitation and misfortune. Mr. Mukul’s first visit to Singapore in 2008 came after his father had sold land to pay the \$7,400 fee demanded by job agents in Bangladesh. But his employer went bust and he had to return home penniless. It is a typical story, says Jolovan Wham of HOME, a charity that works with migrant workers. (2)Singapore limits agents’ fees to two months’ wages, but cannot police what happens in the home countries. So many workers toil for months to repay their debts. If they fall ill, are injured or find

themselves in dispute with their employers, they have few resources, though local NGOs help—it was through one, HealthServe, that Mr. Mukul found the cash to have his book published.

His book is not full of anger (despite one poem in which he declares “I want to announce war.”) Rather it is about homesickness, missing his family—especially his mother—and the isolation of the migrant’s life. His own favorite is called simply “Loneliness”, and finishes: “Stranded immigrant, unending solitude.” In this Mr. Mukul is also typical: he is far from the only migrant worker-poet; and that loneliness reflects the preoccupations of many others: missing spouses, and children growing up not knowing one parent; thwarted romances; lost homes.

Though literature is particularly central to Bengali culture, workers from many nations have taken up writing. Shivaji Das, a Singapore-based writer and management consultant, helps organise poetry competitions in Singapore and Malaysia with entries in Chinese, Tagalog, Bahasa Indonesia, Tamil as well as Bengali. <sup>(3)</sup>昨年のシンガポール大会で優勝したのは29歳建設労働者で南インド出身の N. Rengarajan である, whose poem on the pluses and minuses of migrant life sums up many of the recurring themes. Translated from the Tamil, it concludes: “Living in a foreign land/ we can buy everything that has a price/ but love and affection./ Ours is not a foreign life/ our lives are foreign to us.”

Mr. Das notes that the reaction of many people to the poetry is surprise. Migrants can write! They even have emotions! So it not only gives those who are interested a platform and a chance to share their work and their feelings. It also helps to change public attitudes. Singapore is a sought-after and hence expensive destination for migrants, compared with, say, the Middle East. So some who come are well educated and even, at home, comfortably off. They are, through self-selection, adventurous and ambitious. <sup>(4)</sup>Unenviable though their lives in Singapore seem, many are there through repeated choices, suggesting both the lack of opportunity they felt at home, and that Singapore’s treatment of migrants is seen as better than most.

Mr. Mukul, a high-school graduate who has been writing songs and poetry since he was 12, found construction work hard, fainting on the fourth day of his first job, humping sacks of cement. Yet he keeps coming and keeps writing, and now dreams the impossible dream: of becoming Singaporean.

注：\*haj (成人したイスラム教徒が一生に一度は行わなければならない)メッカへの巡礼

※出典：The Economist June 11th, 2016 [一部改変]

問1 下線部(1)と同じものを指す英単語を本文中から1つ挙げなさい。

問2 下線部(2)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問3 後続の関係節とつながるように、下線部(3)を英語にしなさい。

問4 下線部(4)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問5 Mohammed Mukul Hossine 氏の foreign life についてこのエッセイの中で述べられていることを、過去・現在・未来に言及する形で、10行～15行程度の日本語でまとめなさい。氏の名前は「M氏」と略しなさい。