

*文学・言語学・文化の各問題から1つを選択し、それぞれの問題に対応する解答用紙に解答しなさい（解答用紙は切り離して使用してよい）。

【文学】 I. 以下の英文を読み、設問に答えなさい。

⁽¹⁾ F. Scott Fitzgerald is one of the most recognized figures in American literary and cultural history, not only as one of the major writers of the twentieth century, but also as a man whose life story excites the fascination of a public that knows him primarily as the author of ⁽²⁾ The Great Gatsby. Any study of Fitzgerald's career must trace its familiar trajectory; early success, then public oblivion, and finally posthumous resurrection; had he lived a few years longer, he might have proved the exception to his own belief that there are no second acts in American lives. ^(A) Fitzgerald's life and work were intertwined from the very beginning; his career spanned one of the most turbulent eras of the century, and from the very start he was part creator, part victim of his new culture of celebrity which accompanied the rise of modern technology. His fame and his marriage coincided, and so today, as in the 1920s, the name of F. Scott and ⁽³⁾ Zelda Fitzgerald are linked in public perception; indeed, ⁽⁴⁾ for the last three quarters of a century they have been indissolubly tied to American popular culture.

Scarcely as week passes that we do not notice an allusion to one or both of them in our mass media. In a bestselling paperback mystery, a leading character marries a beautiful but hopelessly mad woman who slashes the bathroom mirror with lipstick before shattering it, and then collapses bleeding on the floor. He later tells his friend, "I've got Zelda for a wife" (Patterson, *Escape the Night*, 1984, 31).

(Omitted)

Why Scott and Zelda? Other major American writers from Mark Twain and Jack London to ⁽⁵⁾ Earnest Hemingway have entered the public's consciousness without spousal link. Indeed, although she was a more talented writer than Zelda, there has never been, to my knowledge, a conference dedicated to Martha (Gellhorn) and Earnest Hemingway. ^(B) Clearly the Fitzgeralds' lives together had a mythic quality, and their symbiosis made both their successes their tragedies, like the actors who impersonate them today, larger than life. As Mary Gordon has remarked, "The case of Zelda and Scott Fitzgerald . . . as creator and object of creation, may be unique in the history of literature – at least in the history of literary married couples" (Introduction, *Zelda Fitzgerald, The Collected Writing*, xvii). Further, they were extraordinarily attractive, and both worked studiously at developing public personalities that at first enchanted and later repelled the audience they had always courted. Fitzgerald had, as Scott Donaldson has noted (*Fool for Love*, 190); a "histrionic" personality, which coincided with Zelda's lifelong need for ⁽⁶⁾ self-dramatization. So they became ⁽⁷⁾ popular culture icons,

and the story, so irresistible in its dimensions, has become fixed in the imagination of a mass public larger and more curious than they had ever imagined. There is another dimension to the connection between Fitzgerald and American popular culture: ^(C)Fitzgerald knew and liked that culture, he draw on the stories of his youth to retell episodes from his own life, he was a fan of movies, musical comedy, popular songs, songwriters and stars, and the study of the Fitzgeralds and popular culture involves a dialectic between their public performance and public image on the one hand and their use of popular culture in their creative language on the other. (omitted.)

【出典】 *The Cambridge Companion to F. Scott Fitzgerald* by Rush Prigozy. (c)
Cambridge University Press 2001. Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.

1. 本文中に出てくる人名・書名・用語 (1) ~ (7) の内から 5つを選び, 本文に書かれている内容について日本語で説明しなさい。 (10点×5=50点)
2. 下線部(A)について, どのような意味か, 日本語で説明しなさい。 (15点)
3. 下線部(B)について, 内容を日本語で説明しなさい。 (15点)
4. 下線部(C)について, 内容を日本語で説明しなさい。 (20点)

【言語学】Ⅱ. 以下の英文を読み，設問に答えなさい。

What Is Grammar?

No other aspect of language is likely to cause more anxiety in both native speakers and non-native learners of English than grammar. There seem to be social and even moral implications in the use of “good” or “bad” grammar. But what exactly is grammar, good or bad, and where do the rules for English come from?

Grammar is an essential aspect of all languages. It is a set of conventions and procedures that allow for the smooth operation of the communication process. In essence, (1) grammar is the term we use to represent the organizing system of a language. And of course such a system is needed. Take the following contrived sentence as a case in point:

After two boy yesterday discover the body of a man, the police witnesses asked to contact they urgently.

This sentence has enough grammatical problems to significantly affect communication — the primary purpose of language in the first place. As an (a) ELT teacher, you are probably very familiar with this kind of ungrammatical sentence, and if a student wrote it, you might provide feedback based on the following “rules” of standard English:

- English adds a special marker, normally (b) -s, to show that a noun is plural: *boys*, not *boy*.
- When an action described is in the past, English uses a form of the verb (the past tense) different from that used to express the present time (the present tense): *discovered*, not *discover*.
- In statements in English, (c) the subject of a verb is usually put immediately before it and (d) the object afterward: *the police asked witnesses*.
- In English, different forms of the pronouns are used according to function; the object form after a verb is *them*, not *they*.

Having rules like this is certainly not a bad thing, especially for learners of the language. These particular rules make good sense and are used in most varieties of English around the world, but a few other rules are more contentious — such as the (2) notorious one about not splitting the infinitive (e.g., to really know). Grammar rules are an aspect of what we shall call “(e) traditional grammar.” The traditions are in fact surprisingly modern, in relation to the 1,500 years of the history of English. Most were

invented by the prescriptive grammarians of the 18th and 19th centuries, and it is interesting that the most contentious of them involve aspects of the language that are not crucial to meaning. They are often matters of style that have been given prestige through their use by influential writers.

(3) One major problem with traditional grammar is that its rules were laid down exclusively in relation to written English, especially the sort of literary English used by those considered to be the “best” writers. This meant the writers who were steeped in the classical tradition, for whom good style and good grammar usually meant Latinate style and Latinate grammar. Less formal written English and the spoken language were left out. Inasmuch as such language does not follow traditional rules, it was (and still is to some extent) deemed to be incorrect, or is “ungrammatical.”

As we shall see, ideas of correct grammar are in fact always changing; until the 18th century, for example, the double negative construction that today is not permissible in Standard English was perfectly acceptable. Grammar even varies between contemporary language communities; American English does a few things differently from British English, for instance, although the differences are slight and do not normally interfere with communication.

The word *grammar* was taken into English from French in the 14th century and derives from a Latin (and ultimately Greek) expression meaning “the craft of letters.” The term in the Middle Ages was invariably used in connection with Greek and Latin, both of them languages of great morphological and syntactical complexity. Grammar schools were originally schools where Latin was taught. In the earliest attempts to write grammars of English, Latin was invariably the model against which the newer language was compared, so it is not surprising that our traditional grammatical terms and systems of analysis are Latinate. Ideas of “correct” English have often been derived (illogically) from such comparisons: If Latin does not allow a double negative construction, then English should not either.

Two main aspects of grammar can be distinguished:

- (f) Morphology (from Greek words meaning “form” and “word”) deals with the structure of words—how their forms vary to modify meaning (especially by the addition of different inflections or endings).
- (g) Syntax (from Greek words meaning “together” and “arrange”) deals with the structure of sentences — how words are arranged to give overall meaning to a spoken or written utterance.

This chapter explores these aspects and shows how many of the tricky elements of English developed (e.g., third-person-s in present tense verbs, and irregular verbs such as drink, drank, drunk). It will also show how the grammar of English has been, and continues to be, in a constant state of change. First, however, we look at the different approaches to describing English grammar.

Describing Grammar

English grammar seems quite complex to the newcomer. Of course native speakers acquire it automatically and are able to use it without thought, but being able to analyze and describe it is an entirely different matter. ELT teachers know from experience the challenge of trying to elucidate grammatical complexities in the classroom. Likewise, researchers in applied linguistics strain to capture the complete grammar system in a single reference book; for example, *The Cambridge Grammar of Spoken and Written English* has around 950 pages and still struggles to describe every detail of the language. In fact, it is probably impossible to describe completely and accurately the full grammar of English, and this inevitably means that only certain elements are highlighted in any particular situation so that these elements can be small enough for students (and teachers!) to understand. This reminds us of a story from India about the five blind men of Hindustan who went out to learn about an elephant. They all felt different parts of the elephant's body and came to very different conclusions about what such an animal is like. The man who felt the trunk thought an elephant was like a snake, the one who felt a leg thought an elephant was like a tree, the one who felt the ear thought an elephant was like a fan, and so on.' Similarly, our view of grammar depends on which elements we happen to focus on.

Various approaches to grammar can be taken. DeCarrico and Larsen-Freeman summarize a number of them as follows.

- (h) *Prescriptive grammar*. This type of grammar asserts which forms are correct and which are incorrect. It thus tells us how we ought to speak and what we ought not to say. It tends to bring value judgments into play, referring to forms from standard varieties of English as correct or "good" English and forms from non-standard varieties as incorrect or "bad" English. Many of the problematic rules of English come from this approach to grammar.
- (i) *Descriptive grammar*. This is a more linguistically sound approach in which the rules of English are described from the way people actually use the language. Modern applied linguists can analyze large language databases (corpora) of 100 million words

or more and understand the way grammar features are being used in the real world, not only by speakers of standard varieties but also by speakers of non-standard varieties. This approach reports actual grammar usage but makes no value judgments about that usage.

- (i) *Pedagogical grammar*. This type of grammar caters to the needs of second language learners and teachers. Although it may prescribe some general rules, it is typically mainly descriptive in nature, drawing on a wide range of insights from both formal and functional approaches, as well as other applied linguistics disciplines such as discourse analysis and pragmatics.
- *Formal grammar*. This is a model of grammar that focuses on the forms (rules) themselves and how they operate within the overall system. Many people have this model in mind when they think of traditional grammar.
- *Functional grammar*. Whereas formal grammar focuses on forms, functional grammar goes beyond this and also considers appropriate language use. It looks at the relationships between linguistic forms and their practical functions. For instance, the linguistic form *How are you doing?* normally functions as an informal greeting to friends rather than an actual question. This focus on both form and function is sometimes also referred to as discourse grammar.
- *Lexicogrammar*. This is a model of language that recognizes that grammar and vocabulary are not really two different systems but one integrated whole. It attempts to explain how meaning is constructed by the interrelationship between lexis and grammar, highlighting, for instance, multi-word units such as *to make a long story short* that have a single meaning or function (in this example, reaching a conclusion). These multi-word units are extremely common in language, but more traditional formal grammars have a difficult time explaining them.

These approaches to grammar have had various degrees of influence over the years, with the more descriptive and integrative perspectives currently being favored. At a more personal level, however, your own approach to grammar has probably been influenced by a number of factors, including the school environment you were brought up in, the one you teach in, the attitudes at the teacher training program you attended or are attending, the place of grammar in your school syllabus, and the attitudes of your culture toward the issue of correctness versus flexibility. You are also likely to be influenced by the grammar reference book you use. Whether this is a formal or functional grammar book, either with or without prescriptive tendencies, it will surely color the way you present grammar to your students.

But regardless of what kind of grammar book you use, it is important to be aware of its limitations. Many teachers look at grammars as an unerring source of “true knowledge” about language, but this faith may be misplaced. Although modern corpus-based descriptive grammars are very good, (4) they have all had to make compromises. The first is purely practical: Grammars need to be a manageable size, even though this means many language matters are inadequately covered or not included at all. Even 1,000-page grammars do not provide the complete coverage their authors would like. The net result is that grammars always represent to some degree an idealized version of the language. A second issue concerns what form of English is included in the grammar. Given the range of English varieties around the world, it is impossible to take into account every detail of every variety in a single book. Therefore, most grammars focus on Standard English, typically British or American. Thus the book that teachers use may not accurately describe the variety of English they are involved with—e.g., Pakistani English or Kenyan English. Third, even though corpus-based grammars are a significant improvement on made-up data, they still only relate to the corpus they were based on. No corpus can fully represent a language, and so any grammar based on a corpus reflects the limitations of its parent corpus. Another problem relates to (5) the ever-changing nature of English grammar. Although the core features seem to be relatively stable, some elements are in a state of flux. The changes are not as rapid as those affecting vocabulary, yet grammar books, like dictionaries, are always in the state of becoming out of date.

【出典】 Used with permission of University of Michigan Press, from *Why Is English Like That?*, Norbert Schmitt, Richard Marsden, 2006; permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

1. 下線部(a)～(j)の用語の中から5つを選び, 日本語で過不足なく説明しなさい。(10×5=50点)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) ELT | (b) -s |
| (c) the subject | (d) the object |
| (e) traditional grammar | (f) Morphology |
| (g) Syntax | (h) Prescriptive grammar |
| (i) Descriptive grammar | (j) Pedagogical grammar |

2. 本文中の二重下線部(1)～(5)の内容を日本語で説明しなさい。(10×5=50点)

【文化】Ⅲ. 以下の英文を読み、設問に答えなさい。

While the story of native American religion began thousands of years before Europeans (1) 'discovered' the New World, American religion as we know it was imported by European discoverers, having originated in the western Mediterranean lands before (2) 1492. In the provinces that today make up modern Spain there coexisted and clashed three faiths; Judaism, Catholic Christianity, and Islam.

In the Western Hemisphere of 1492 there was no writing, there were no books. The plentiful old books in the Eastern Hemisphere, however, told (3) stories of the calling, in sequence, of Israel, of a Jewish teacher named Jesus, and of the prophet Muhammad. Out of their calls came groups that today are often classified as the People of the Book. They differed vastly in their understanding of ancient scriptures — they even disagreed about what those scriptures were.

What they held in common, however, stood in contrast to what they found in the Western Hemisphere. (4) While native Americans were engrossed in faiths that situated them in the world of nature, the Europeans had historical faiths; they were interested in events. The three faiths all taught profoundly skeptical views of human existence. The thrust of European religious life was away from simply valuing earthly life and toward founding a relationship with an unseen God who existed within and also beyond their world. Believers wanted to be detached in many ways from earthly life and attached to heavenly life through a process called salvation.

For the People of the Book reality encompassed several levels: heaven, earth, and perhaps a netherworld. On earth there were also divisions of sorts the Indians seldom knew: between the political and religious communities and between formal religious leaders and everyone else. *Being human was quite complicated*. Yet the most decisive aspect of these faiths was that they established a sense of direct address between God, who was above and beyond, and the believer. They all became religions of 'the World.' God, perhaps through leaders like priests or prophets, could speak to the believer. (5) God could tell him to engage in crusades or conquests.

【出典】 From *Pilgrims in Their Own Land* by Martin Marty, copyright (c) 1984. Reprinted by permission of Little, Brown, an imprint of Hachette Book Group, Inc.

- (1) 下線部(1)で discovered の語が quotation mark に入っているのはなぜですか。理由を説明しなさい。(20点)
- (2) この文章と関連する、下線部(2)の年に起こった大きな事件は何ですか。(20点)
- (3) 下線部(3)に述べられている三つの召命の物語は、それぞれどの宗教と関わる物語ですか。「～の召命の物語は〇〇教に関わる」という形で答えなさい。(20点)
- (4) 下線部(4)を日本語に訳しなさい。(20点)
- (5) 下線部(5)にあるような、宗教が他国の侵略や他民族の征服を推進する可能性について、考えを述べなさい。(20点)