

2025年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期2年の課程入学試験

(夏期・一般選抜) 問題

外国語試験 英語

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

| | |
|----|--|
| 成績 | |
|----|--|

2025年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期2年の課程入学試験

(夏期・一般選抜) 問題

外国語試験 (英 語)

問題 Ⅰ と問題 Ⅱについて日本語で解答しなさい。

Ⅰ 以下の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

‘We need people to wake up. We need people to start paying attention!’ People often say that is why the apocalyptic environmental story needs to be shared far and wide. Or, as they argue, the apocalyptic *truth*. I get it. On many environmental issues, we’ve been sleepwalking for a long time. We’ve pushed action further and further into the future – happy to do so because it can take decades or more for environmental impacts to hit us. Except the decades have passed and now we are here. The impacts have arrived: it’s already happening.

To get this out of the way, let me make (1)one thing absolutely clear: I’m no climate change denialist or minimiser. I spend my life – inside and outside work – researching, writing and trying to understand our environmental problems and how to solve them. The world has lacked urgency to act. Bringing attention to the magnitude of potential impacts is essential if we want things to change. But that is a long way from telling kids they’re ruined.

Let’s, for now, say that total doom is an exaggeration. Does that really do *harm*? (2)If it makes people take these issues seriously, that can only be a good thing, surely, and the exaggeration simply acts as a counterbalance to those who underplay the issue. But I’m convinced that there is a better, more optimistic and honest way forward.

There are several reasons why I think these doomsday messages do more harm than good. First, the doom narratives are often untrue. I don’t expect you to believe me on that straight away, but I hope that by the end of the book I will have convinced you that while these problems are big and pressing, they are solvable. We will have a future. By ‘we’ I mean us, collectively, as a species. Yes, many people could be severely impacted, or even have that future taken away from them, so it’s up to us to decide *how many* people, based on the actions we take. If you believe people have the right to the truth, then you should be against these exaggerated doomsday stories.

Second, it makes scientists look like idiots. (3)Every doomsday activist that makes a big, bold claim invariably turns out to

be wrong. Every time this happens it chisels another bit of public trust away from scientists. It plays right into the hands of deniers. When the world *doesn't* end in 10 years, deniers turn around and say, 'Hey, look, the crazy scientists got it wrong again. Why should anyone listen to them?' In nearly every chapter of this book I'll list doomsday claims that turned out to be completely untrue.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, our impending doom leaves us feeling paralysed. If we're already screwed, then what's the point in trying? (4)Far from making us more effective in driving change, it robs us of any motivation to do so. I recognise this from my own dark period when I nearly walked away from the field entirely. I can assure you that after reframing how I saw the world, I have had a *much, much* bigger impact on changing things. When it comes down to it, doomsday attitudes are often no better than denial.

This option of 'giving up' is only possible from a place of privilege. Let's say we stop trying and temperatures climb by another degree or two, taking us well past our climate targets. If you live in a wealthy country, you'll probably be okay. It won't be plain sailing, but you can buy your way out of serious danger. (5)That's not true for many less fortunate people, though. Those in poorer countries cannot afford to protect themselves. Accepting defeat on climate change is an indefensibly selfish position to take.

– from Hannah Ritchie, *Not the End of the World:*

How We Can Be the First Generation to Build a Sustainable Planet

設問1 下線部（1）の具体的な内容について、本文の記述に即して、日本語で説明しなさい。

設問2 下線部（2）を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問3 下線部（3）を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問4 下線部（4）を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問5 下線部（5）の具体的な内容について、本文の記述に即して、日本語で説明しなさい。

II 以下の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

(1)Philosophical meditations about life present a *portrait*, not a theory. This portrait may be made up of theoretical pieces – questions, distinctions, explanations. Why isn't happiness the only thing that matters? What would immortality be like and what would be its point? Should inherited wealth be passed on through many generations? Are Eastern doctrines of enlightenment valid? Yet the concatenation of these bits of theory constitutes a portrait nonetheless. Think of what it is like to dwell before a painted portrait – one by Raphael or *Rembrandt or Holbein, for example – and to let it then dwell within you. Think also of the ways this differs from reading a clinical description of a particular person, or a general psychological theory.

The understanding gained in examining a life itself comes to permeate that life and direct its course. To live an examined life is to make a self-portrait. (2)Staring out at us from his later self-portraits, Rembrandt is not simply someone who looks like that but one who also sees and knows himself *as* that, with the courage this requires. We see him knowing himself. And he unflinchingly looks out at us too who are seeing him look so unflinchingly at himself, and that look of his not only shows himself to us so knowing, it patiently waits for us too to become with equal honesty knowing of ourselves.

Why is it that no photograph of a person has the depth a painted portrait can have? (3)The two embody different quantities of time. A photograph is a “snapshot,” whether or not it was posed; it shows one particular moment of time and what the person looked like right then, what his surface showed. During the extended hours a painting is sat for, though, its subject shows a range of traits, emotions, and thoughts, all revealed in differing lights. Combining different glimpses of the person, choosing an aspect here, a tightening of muscle there, a glint of light, a deepening of line, the painter interweaves these different portions of surface, never before simultaneously exhibited, to produce a fuller portrait and a deeper one. The portraitist can select one tiny aspect of everything shown at a moment to incorporate into the final painting. A photographer might attempt to replicate this, isolating and layering and interweaving aspects of many photographs of the face at different times; could these many minute choices then result in a final printed photograph that achieved the full depth of a painting? (4)However, during the hours he spends with his subject, a painter can come to know things the visible surface did not show – what the person said, the manner of his behavior toward others – and hence add or emphasize details to bring to the surface what resides underneath.

The painter concentrates a person over an extended time into a presence at one moment that, however, cannot be taken in fully in a moment. Because so much more time is concentrated in a painting than a photograph, we need – and want – to spend more time before it, letting the person unfold. (5)In our own memory, too, perhaps we recall people in a way that is more like paintings than snapshot photographs, creating composite images that include details we have culled over many hours of seeing; a

painter then would be doing with greater skill and more control what our memory does naturally.

*Rembrandt レンブラント、オランダの画家 (1606～1669)

– adapted from Robert Nozick, *The Examined Life: Philosophical Meditations*

設問1 本文の記述に即して、下線部(1)の事柄を具体的に説明しなさい。

設問2 下線部(2)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問3 本文の記述に即して、下線部(3)の意味するところを具体的に説明しなさい。

設問4 下線部（4）を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問5 下線部（5）を日本語に訳しなさい。