

김영문 영어학 2021학년도 기출문제 적중 사례

2021학년도 기출문제	김영문 영어학 적중 사례
<p data-bbox="125 347 349 392">B형 5번</p> <p data-bbox="125 451 741 480">Read the passage and follow the directions. [4 points]</p> <div data-bbox="125 507 1099 1460"> <p data-bbox="577 499 645 523"><A></p> <p data-bbox="136 531 1088 687">To account for some syntactic phenomena in English, we can resort to phrasal categories such as VP, TP, CP, and so on. First, let us assume that only constituents which belong to the same phrasal category can be coordinated. For example, NP can conjoin with another NP, but not with AP.</p> <p data-bbox="136 703 517 775">(1) a. The student or the teacher b. *The student or very pretty</p> <p data-bbox="136 791 819 815">The same restriction also holds true with clausal structures.</p> <p data-bbox="136 831 1088 903">The bracketed structures in (2a) and (2b) are clearly different, since they cannot be coordinated by the conjunction or, as shown in (2c).</p> <p data-bbox="136 919 936 1031">(2) a. We didn't intend [you to hurt him]. b. We didn't intend [for him to hurt you]. c. *We didn't intend [you to hurt him] or [for him to hurt you].</p> <p data-bbox="136 1046 1088 1118">So, based on the phrasal category and the assumption about coordination, we can explain the ungrammaticality of the sentences such as (2c).</p> <p data-bbox="136 1134 1088 1206">Second, the restriction on wh-cleft sentences can also be attributed to phrasal categories.</p> <p data-bbox="136 1222 696 1246">(3) What I'll do is [VP postpone the meeting].</p> <p data-bbox="136 1262 1088 1334">VP can be in the focus position (the position after be verb) of wh-cleft sentences like (3). Consider further the following examples.</p> <p data-bbox="136 1350 887 1422">(4) a. Bill promised [CP Ø PRO to behave himself]. b. What Bill promised was [CP Ø PRO to behave himself].</p> <p data-bbox="136 1437 674 1461">(5) a. They believe [TP him to be innocent].</p> </div>	<p data-bbox="1144 355 1603 384">2020년 9-10월 2주차 1번 문제 유사</p> <p data-bbox="1133 451 1783 480">1. Read the passages and follow the directions. [4points]</p> <div data-bbox="1133 507 2107 1460"> <p data-bbox="1585 499 1653 523"><A></p> <p data-bbox="1144 531 2096 603">There is some evidence from sentences like (1) below that inverted auxiliaries in main-clause yes-no questions occupy the head C position of CP in English:</p> <p data-bbox="1144 643 1704 786">(1) speaker a: What were you going to ask me? speaker b: (a) If you feel like a Coke (b) Do you feel like a Coke? (c) *If do you feel like a Coke?</p> <p data-bbox="1144 834 2096 1161">The fact that the inverted auxiliary do in (1b) occupies the same pre-subject position (in front of the bold-printed subject <i>you</i>) and the fact that <i>if</i> and <i>do</i> are mutually exclusive (as we see from the fact that structures like (1c) are ungrammatical) suggest that inverted auxiliaries (like complementisers) occupy the head C position of CP. This in turn means that main-clause questions are CPs headed by a C which is interrogative in force by virtue of containing an interrogative force feature which can be represented as [Int-Force]. Interestingly, an interrogative main clause can be co-ordinated with a declarative main clause, as we see from sentences like (2) below:</p> <p data-bbox="1144 1209 1951 1233">(2) [I am feeling thirsty], but [should I save my last Coke till later]?</p> <p data-bbox="1144 1281 2096 1460">In (2) we have two (bracketed) main clauses joined together by the co-ordinating conjunction but. The second (italicised) conjunct <i>should I save my last Coke till later?</i> is an interrogative CP containing an inverted auxiliary in the head C position of CP. Given the traditional assumption that only constituents which belong to the same category can be co-ordinated, it follows that the first conjunct</p> </div>

b. *What they believe is [TP him to be innocent].

The verb promise in (4a) is known to take a CP (Complementizer Phrase) complement which is headed by a null complementizer \emptyset , and we find that CP can be in the focus position, as shown in (4b). Meanwhile, in (5a), the verb believe requires a TP (Tense Phrase) complement, and from the ungrammaticality of (5b), it is clear that TP cannot be in the focus position of a wh-cleft sentence. Thus, based on the types of phrasal categories, we can explain the restriction on wh-cleft sentences.

Note 1: ‘*’ indicates the ungrammaticality of the sentence.

Note 2: ‘PRO’ is a null pronoun which represents the understood subject of some infinitive clauses.

- (i) She argued persuasively or that their offer should be rejected.
- (ii) They offered us a choice of red wine, white wine, or beer.
- (iii) What he claims is that he was insulted.
- (iv) What we hadn’t intended was you to get hurt.

Based on <A>, choose ONE ungrammatical sentence between (i) and (ii) in and ONE grammatical sentence between (iii) and (iv) in . Then, explain why the chosen sentences are ungrammatical or grammatical on the basis of the description in <A>.

I am feeling thirsty must also be a CP; and since it contains no overt complementiser, it must be headed by a null complementiser. This means that all complete clauses contain an (overt or null) complementiser.

However, Exceptionally Cased Marking complement clauses like 'believe' seem to be TPs which lack the CP layer found in complete clauses, and for this reason they can be considered defective clauses.

Don't forget that conjoined clauses or phrases must be the same categories.

- (i) I want Mary to come to Japan and for her to see my parents.
- (ii) We didn’t intend you to hurt him or for him to hurt you.
- (iii) I will arrange to see a specialist and for my wife to see one at the same time.
- (iv) They wanted him to be innocent.

Identify and explain the ungrammatical sentence(s) in , referring to the passage <A>.

	출제 영역	문항 난이도
서술형4점	통사론	중
예시 답안	[Answer] (ii) is ungrammatical. The clause 'you to hurt him' is a TP and the clause 'for him to hurt you' is a CP. This violates the restriction the conjoined clauses must be the same categories. (ii) 설명이 잘 맞으면 4점을 준다. 부분 점수 없다.	
point	(i) I want [CP \emptyset [TPMary to come to Japan and [CP for [TP her to see my parents]]. (ii) *We didn’t intend [TP you to hurt him] or [CP for him to hurt you.] 여기서 intend는 believe 유형일 때는 뒤의 clause는 TP로 null complementizer를 취하지 않는다. 반면 want 유형일 때는 반드시 for를 취한다. 그런데 동시에 섞어서 사용될 수는 없다. (iii) I will arrange [CP \emptyset [TP to see a specialist]] and [CP for [TP my wife to see one at the same time]]. (iv) They wanted [CP \emptyset [TP him to be innocent]].	

2021학년도 기출문제

B형 5번

Read the passage and follow the directions. [4 points]

<A>

To account for some syntactic phenomena in English, we can resort to phrasal categories such as VP, TP, CP, and so on. First, let us assume that only constituents which belong to the same phrasal category can be coordinated. For example, NP can conjoin with another NP, but not with AP.

(1) a. The student or the teacher

b. *The student or very pretty

The same restriction also holds true with clausal structures.

The bracketed structures in (2a) and (2b) are clearly different, since they cannot be coordinated by the conjunction or, as shown in (2c).

(2) a. We didn't intend [you to hurt him].

b. We didn't intend [for him to hurt you].

c. *We didn't intend [you to hurt him] or [for him to hurt you].

So, based on the phrasal category and the assumption about coordination, we can explain the ungrammaticality of the sentences such as (2c).

Second, the restriction on wh-cleft sentences can also be attributed to phrasal categories.

(3) What I'll do is [VP postpone the meeting].

VP can be in the focus position (the position after be verb) of wh-cleft sentences like (3). Consider further the following examples.

(4) a. Bill promised [CP Ø PRO to behave himself].

b. What Bill promised was [CP Ø PRO to behave himself].

(5) a. They believe [TP him to be innocent].

b. *What they believe is [TP him to be innocent].

김영문 영어학 적중 사례

2020년 7-8월 영역별 모고 1회 1번 유사

1. Read the passages and follow the directions. [4points]

<A>

More generally, the null complementizer analysis would enable us to arrive at a uniform characterisation of all finite clauses as CPs in which the force of a clause is indicated by the force feature carried by an (overt or null) complementiser introducing the clause. Empirical evidence in support of the null complementizer analysis of bare complement clauses like the bracketed clause in (1) comes from co-ordination data in relation to sentences such as:

(1) We didn't think [he had resigned] or that he had been accused of corruption.

In terms of coordination principle that the coordinated phrases or clause must have the same form, the clause [*he had resigned*] must be a CP because the sentence in (1) is grammatical and the that-clause is a CP.

The possibility of the deletion of the complementiser is due to the structure of the clause. For example, the complementizer cannot be deleted in the focused position and Exceptionally Case Marking constructions such as believe-type infinitives cannot allow for any complementizer.

(i) What she wanted was for him to apologize.

(ii) What she wanted was him to apologize.

(iii) I will arrange to see a doctor and for Mary to see one at the same time.

(iv) We didn't intend you to hurt him or for him to hurt you.

Identify and explain the ungrammatical sentence(s) in , referring to the passage <A>.

The verb promise in (4a) is known to take a CP (Complementizer Phrase) complement which is headed by a null complementizer \emptyset , and we find that CP can be in the focus position, as shown in (4b). Meanwhile, in (5a), the verb believe requires a TP (Tense Phrase) complement, and from the ungrammaticality of (5b), it is clear that TP cannot be in the focus position of a wh-cleft sentence. Thus, based on the types of phrasal categories, we can explain the restriction on wh-cleft sentences.

Note 1: ‘*’ indicates the ungrammaticality of the sentence.

Note 2: ‘PRO’ is a null pronoun which represents the understood subject of some infinitive clauses.

- (i) She argued persuasively or that their offer should be rejected.
- (ii) They offered us a choice of red wine, white wine, or beer.
- (iii) What he claims is that he was insulted.
- (iv) What we hadn’t intended was you to get hurt.

Based on <A>, choose ONE ungrammatical sentence between (i) and (ii) in and ONE grammatical sentence between (iii) and (iv) in . Then, explain why the chosen sentences are ungrammatical or grammatical on the basis of the description in <A>.

문항 유형 및 배점	출제 영역	문항 난이도
4점	영어학 -통사론	중
예시 답안	(ii) is ungrammatical because the complementizer <i>for</i> must be present in the focused position in (ii). (iv) is ungrammatical because the ECM verb intend cannot take the complementizer <i>for</i> .	
채점 기준	(i)의 설명이 맞으면 2점을 준다. (ii)의 설명이 맞으면 2점을 준다. 부분 점수 없다. 영어표현의 오류가 있을 시 0.2점씩 감점하고 최대 1점까지만 감점한다.	

- (i) What she wanted was for him to apologize.
- (ii) *What she wanted was him to apologize.
- (iii) I will arrange to see a doctor and for Mary to see one at the same time.
- (iv) *We didn't intend you to hurt him or for him to hurt you. → We didn't intend you to hurt him or him to hurt you.

2021학년도 기출문제

A형 7번

Read the passage and follow the directions. 【4 points】

<A>

‘Locative inversion’ involves the preposing of a locative phrase before the verb and the postposing of the subject after the verb, as illustrated below.

- (1) a. John ran into the house.
b. Into the house ran John.
- (2) a. A woman stood on the corner.
b. On the corner stood a woman.

Note that (1b) can be derived from (1a) by moving the locative phrase into the house to the front of the sentence and by inverting the verb ran and the subject John. Likewise, we can derive (2b) from (2a). Meanwhile, there is some restriction with ‘locative inversion.’ Consider the following examples.

- (3) a. My friend Mary seated my mother among the guests of honor.
b. *Among the guests of honor seated my mother my friend Mary.
c. *Among the guests of honor seated my friend Mary my mother.
- (4) a. The women danced beautiful dances around the fire.
b. *Around the fire danced beautiful dances the women.
c. *Around the fire danced the women beautiful dances.

All the examples above clearly show that the basic verb types affect the grammaticality of ‘locative inversion.’

Note: ‘*’ indicates the ungrammaticality of the sentence.

- (i) Out of the house came an old lady.
(ii) Under the bridge lived a troll a good life.

Based on <A>, state whether or not each sentence in is grammatical. Then, explain why each sentence is grammatical or ungrammatical on the basis of the description in <A>.

김영문 영어학 적중 사례

2020년 9월 3주차 기제작 문제 3주차 4번 유사

4. Read the passage and answer the questions. [4points]

<A>

Consider (1) and (2) below:

- (1) That the film ended so soon was a shame.
(2) It was a shame that the film ended so soon.

We can move (extrapose) the clause that the film ended so soon from a clause-initial to a clause-final position, as in (2). The pronoun *it* is inserted in the position vacated by the subject clause. This movement establishes the constituent status of the subject clause. And Extraposition from NP seems to be more acceptable if the verb phrase is relatively light; for example, if it consists of an intransitive verb or a raising verb. Also the extraposed elements must be a constituent.

- (i) We employed two people last week from European Union countries.
(ii) Three men noisily left the theatre who were drunk.
(iii) Six women on their heads appeared with yellow hats.
(iv) The dogs escaped that were chained to the house.

Find out the ungrammatical or unacceptable sentence(s) in and explain the ungrammaticality, referring to the passage <A>.

문항 유형 및 배점	출제 영역	문항 난이도
4 점	영어학 - 외치	중
예시 답안	(ii) is ungrammatical because the verb is not an intransitive verb or a raising verb but a transitive verb. (iii) are ungrammatical because PP <i>with yellow hats</i> is not a constituent.	
채점 기준	(ii), (iii)의 설명이 맞으면 각각 2점씩 준다. (iii) 영어표현의 오류가 있을 시 0.2점씩 감점하고 최대 1점까지만 감점 한다.	