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

（　冬期・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。

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

（冬期・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】　次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

　　Florence Nightingale's attitude to health and the deprived must be seen in the light of her own idiosyncratic theology. Educated by her mother and (from 1827) by an evangelical governess, exposed to the philosophy of the Enlightenment, biblical criticism, and new scientific theories, like a number of her contemporaries she heard Matthew Arnold's 'melancholy, long, withdrawing roar' (M. Arnold, Dover Beach) of the sea of faith. Aware of her own spiritual need she sought guidance from different mentors, and at the age of thirty-two tried to set out her own philosophy in '*Suggestions for thought*', dedicated to 'The Artizans of England—Seekers after Truth', whom she thought had been led astray by the teachings of the positivists. Volumes 1 and 3 are devoted to explaining God's will and God's law, and have Unitarian undertones. As disciple of the teaching of Quetelet, (1)she believed there was a causal explanation for all human behaviour, and if the cause was corrected behaviour would improve; this argument, she thought, could be applied to health. If the factors causing ill health were removed mankind would become healthy, and the key to this lay in sanitary science. In an involved exegesis she linked this with God's will, which was that mankind must help mankind: as an example men should not pray to be delivered from cholera but bend their efforts to supplying clean water and proper sanitation. (2)She looked to the day when sanitary science would overcome ill health and when hospitals, which she regarded as an 'intermediate state of civilization', would be abolished. She feared that the germ theory of infection (which she came to acknowledge) would lead people into ignoring the need for hygiene and sanitation. Influenced by Spinoza, she argued that God's laws were unalterable and therefore miracles were impossible. God's law was manifest in nature, and it is noticeable that in her best-selling book *Notes on Nursing* (1860) she referred to disease as being 'a reparative process which Nature has instituted' (McDonald, *Nightingale School*, 580). (3)It was the duty of the nurse to put the patient in a position for nature to act on him; the nurse was thus aiding God's law, hence the emphasis on fresh air and the design of the Nightingale wards.

　　Florence Nightingale's attitude to women was contradictory. She considered them selfish, and, though she adulated a chosen few, she preferred working with men. (4)She was an early campaigner for women's rights, supporting the women's suffrage movement, though attached more importance to the campaign for married women's property rights. She was an opponent of the Contagious Diseases Acts, writing two letters to the *Pall Mall Gazette* (3 March 1870, 18 March 1870), under the pseudonym Justina. She inveighed against the limitations imposed on educated women undertaking worthwhile and paid work. (5)However, in her later years she was irritated by women clamouring to enter male preserves like medicine, maintaining that there was plenty to be done in women's work like midwifery, teaching, and nursing. She made no common cause with women claiming the right to train as physicians. She argued against J. S. Mill that the lack of a vote was the least of women's disabilities. Her attitude to women was patrician, though at the end of her life she accepted that she had not taken sufficient account of 'ordinary women'. In fact she was a child of her time, and she lived for ninety years: the enthusiasms of radical youth were replaced by a more reactionary old age.

—adapted *from* Monica E. Baly, and H. C. G. Matthew, "Nightingale, Florence (1820–1910)" in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

問1　下線部 (1) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

問2　下線部 (2) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

問3　下線部 (3) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

問4　下線部 (4) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

問5　下線部 (5) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

【 Ⅱ 】　次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

　In ordinary life, we sometimes find ourselves talking about the meanings of words and sentences. For example, I am at home reading, but find myself confused. I don't know what something means. If I ask my wife the meaning of a word, she will give me an answer:

"What does 'kakapo' mean?"
"It's a kind of parrot."

When I ask what a word means, I typically get more words – perhaps in the language I used in my question, perhaps in another, but nonetheless more words. (1)Can meanings be words? The answer is obviously "no," if we want to approach meaning as scientists. Because, supposing that the meaning of "kakapo" is "a kind of parrot," what about the meanings of "kind" and "parrot"? More words. Eventually identifying the meaning of a piece of language with more language is bound to become circular, as a word is defined in terms of some of the very words which it helps define.

　A more sophisticated view similar to this one is known as *meaning holism*. Most famously supported by the philosopher Quine, the theory of holism claims that the meaning of a word or phrase or sentence depends on its relationships with other words, phrases, and sentences. For example, it might be argued that part of what makes up the meaning of *tall* is that it's opposed to the meaning of *short* (something that seems quite plausible). More precisely, holist theories tend to be *functional* in the sense that it is some aspect of the use of a piece of language which makes for its meaning, so we should really say that part of the meaning of *tall* is that if you call something *tall*, you should not at the same time call it *short*, and if you call something *tall* you should be willing to also call it *not short*. (2)The big issue for holism is to find a way to say which of the relations among words, phrases, and sentences are important to semantics. Radical holism takes the position that there is no line to draw between connections of this plausible sort (*tall* with *short*) and all of the connections among words, phrases, and sentences (*tall* with *I like beans and so I plan to make red bean soup for dessert*). In that case, the semantic system of a language will be a complex, interconnected network, and all meaning will be relative to the whole system. It's difficult to see how meaning can be studied in a scientific way from this perspective. (I should say that it's hard to assess whether holism is in general incompatible with scientific linguistic semantics because over the years a wide variety of theories have been labeled as "holistic.")

　(3)Linguists who study meaning don't believe that the study of meaning should be unscientific. They feel this way in the first instance not because they are better philosophers than Quine and his followers, but because their experience with language shows them that the way languages express thought is not as arbitrary as the holist's way of looking at matters would lead you to expect. Instead, they find overwhelming evidence for deep and consistent patterns in how languages express meaning, patterns which are in need of scientific explanation. Thus, though the initial intuition that we started with, that the meanings of words involve their relations with other words, is probably correct in some sense, it does not by itself provide a basis for the scientific study of linguistic meaning. Therefore it has not been incorporated much into the thinking of formal semanticists. It is more relevant to the practice of the field of semiotics, the study of symbolic systems generally (including language to the extent that it has something in common with such things as the "meaning" of foods and clothes).

If meanings aren't words, our next guess might be that meanings are something in the mind: concepts, thoughts, or ideas. When you understand the meaning of the word *dog*, your mind (and brain) change in certain ways. At some point you form a concept of dogs (let's indicate the concept with capital letters: DOG). Then, you associate this concept with the English word *dog*, and from then on you have an ability to use the word *dog* whenever the concept DOG is active in your thoughts. From here it's a short step to saying that DOG is the meaning of *dog*. This theory would explain the patterns in how languages express meaning in terms of the nature of concepts, and perhaps ultimately in terms of the way the brain is structured. Let's call this perspective (4)the idea theory of meaning.

One obvious challenge for the idea theory is to come up with a sound psychological theory of what concepts and ideas are. This psychological theory needs to provide a concept or idea for every meaningful piece of language. Thus, there will need to be ideas and concepts associated with each of the following (at least in any situation in which they are meaningful):

Dogs and cats

The picture of my wife

Three

Whatever

The president lives in Washington, DC.

Had been sleeping

Why

Who said that we had to be at the airport so early?

-ed (the past tense marker)

The idea theory needs to say what idea is associated with *whatever, why,* or *three*, and this doesn't seem as easy a project as explaining what idea is associated with *dog*. (5)At least, the idea theory provides no quick and easy path to a complete theory of meaning. But even if it's not going to be easy, the idea theory may work. Certainly, something is going on in our minds when we use words and phrases, so in some sense there are ideas associated with all meaningful language.

—adapted *from* Paul H. Portner, *What is Meaning?*

問1　下線部 (1) について、著者がそのように考える理由を本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

問2　下線部 (2) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

問3　下線部 (3) を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

問4　下線部 (4) の内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

問5　下線部 (5) について、著者がそのように考える理由を本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____