【3】 〔長文総合〕《神戸大》

解答時間 30 分

次の文章を読んで、問1~3に答えなさい。

Often we find it very difficult to give a clear and systematic account of everyday things, ideas, actions and events that surround us. We just take them for granted. We rarely need to state in an accurate manner what they are really like. For instance, we all know what a game is. (1) Yet, we find it very difficult to state explicitly what the simple word *game* means.

The same is true of the term *word*. We use words all the time. We know by instinct what the words in our language are. Nevertheless most of us would be hard pushed to explain to anyone what kind of object a word is. If a couple of Martian* explorers (with a basic understanding of English) came off their spaceship and stopped you in the street to inquire what earthlings* meant by the term WORD, what would you tell them? I suspect you might be somewhat vague and uncertain. Although you know very well what words are, you might find it difficult to express explicitly what it is that you know about them.

What is a word? It is not only Martian explorers curious about the way earthlings live who might want to know what words are. We too have an interest in understanding words because they play such an important role in our lives. It is impossible to imagine human society without language. And equally, it is impossible to imagine a human language that has no words of any kind. It is impossible to understand the nature of language without gaining some understanding of the nature of words. We must clarify what we mean when we use the term "word." (2)This clarification is essential if our investigations are to proceed, for we mean quite a few very different things when we talk of words.

A standard definition of the word is found in a paper written in 1926 by the American linguist Leonard Bloomfield, one of the greatest linguists of the twentieth century. According to Bloomfield, "a minimum free form is a word." By this he meant that the word is the smallest meaningful linguistic unit that can be used on its own. It is a form that cannot be divided into any smaller units that can be used independently to convey meaning. For example, *child* is a word. (3) We cannot divide it up into smaller units that can convey meaning when they stand alone.

Contrast this with the word *childish* which can be analyzed into *child* and *-ish*. While the *child* bit of *childish* is meaningful when used on its own (and hence is a word), the same is not true of *-ish*. Although according to the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED) -ish* means something like "having the (objectionable*) qualities of" (as in *mannish, womanish, devilish, sheepish, apish* etc.), (4)there is no way we can use it on its own. If someone shouted to you in the street, "Hey, are you *-ish*?" you might smile puzzled and think to yourself, "Isn't he weird!"

注

Martian 火星人の; earthling(s) 地球人; objectionable 好ましくない

- 問1 下線部(1)を日本語に訳しなさい。
- 問 2 下線部(2)のように著者が考える理由を 30 字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。ただし、句読点も1字に数えます。
- 問3 下線部(3), (4)を, それぞれ it が表す内容を明らかにしながら, 日本語に 訳しなさい。

^{【3】}systematic [sìstəmétik]「体系的な」account [əkáunt]「説明」take A for granted「A を当然と思う」state A[stéit]「A を詳しく説明する」accurate [ékjurət]「正確な」explicitly [iksplísitli]「明白に」「言葉ではっきりと」by instinct[ínstiŋkt]「本能的に」inquire A[inkwáiər]「A について尋ねる」vague [véig]「曖昧な」clarify A[klærəfài]「A を明らかにする」clarification [klærəfikéiʃən]「説明」「解明」an investigation[invèstəgéiʃən]「調査」proceed[prəsí:d]「前進する」definition [definition]「定義」minimum [mínəməm]「最低限の」meaningful [mí:niŋfəl]「意味のある」be divided into A[diváidid]「A に分けられる」independently [indipéndəntli]「独立して」convey A[kənvéi]「A を伝える」analyze A [ænəlàiz]「A を分析する」be puzzled [pʌ'zld]「困っている」