

平成 30 年 度
前 期 日 程
英 語 問 題

〔注 意〕

1. 問題冊子及び解答用冊子は、試験開始の合図があるまで開いてはいけない。
2. 受験番号は、解答用紙の受験番号欄(各ページ2か所)に正確に記入すること。
3. 問題冊子のページ数は、表紙を除き9ページである。脱落している場合は直ちに申し出ること。
4. 解答用紙は3枚である。解答用紙をミシン目に従って切り離すこと。
5. 解答は、解答用紙の指定されたところに記入すること。枠からはみ出してはいけない。
6. 問題冊子の余白は、適宜下書きに使用してよい。
7. 解答用紙は持ち帰ってはいけない。
8. 問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

I 次の英文(A)と(B)を読み、それぞれの下線部の意味を日本語で表しなさい。

(A) Growing older is an activity we are familiar with from an early age. In our younger years upcoming birthdays are anticipated with a glee that somewhat diminishes as the years progress. Our younger selves feel that time moves slowly, whereas, with advancing years, time seems to fly at an ever-quicken pace. And late in life, or when a person is faced with a terminal illness no matter what their age, the sense of a finite amount of time remaining becomes acute, and there may be a renewed focus on making the most of one's allotted time in life.

(B) Culture is the location of values, and the study of cultures shows how values vary from one society to another, or from one historical moment to the next.

But culture does not exist in the abstract. On the contrary, it is inscribed in the paintings, operas, fashions, and shopping lists which are the currency of both aesthetic and everyday exchange. Societies invest these artefacts with meanings, until in many cases the meanings are so "obvious" that they pass for nature. Cultural criticism denaturalizes and defamiliarizes these meanings, isolating them for inspection and analysis.

(出典：(A)"Ageing: A Very Short Introduction" by Pachana (2017) 98w from p.1; by permission of Oxford University Pressより一部改変

(B)From "Gender" by Anna Tripp (ed.), 2000, Palgrave; Reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillanより一部改変)

II 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

Adults live in many worlds: a perceptual world, a world of the past, a world of the future, and a mediated world, available through TV, books, newspapers, and hearsay. Babies by contrast live in an immediate perceptual world, pretty much exclusively, little guided by memories or anticipations. ① Young babies can be enslaved by perceptual displays, stuck on them and stuck to them. Perception in young babies is not yet integrated into an overall context of behavior, and this integration is an essential part of perceptual development.

The process of habituation obviously serves to free the baby from attention to the increasingly familiar details of his environment. However, it is not for many months after the beginnings of habituation that he shows an ability to ignore new things that crop up while he is trying to do something else. An interesting behavioral trick of this sort is gaze aversion: a literal refusal to look at something, either because it is puzzling or because it is distracting. The latter motive is the more interesting for our purposes. Unfortunately, it is relatively unstudied. But one context where this kind of behavior has been noticed is reaching. Recall that babies of four to five months can be distracted from a reach by the sight of their hand in the visual field. Sometimes a baby at this point in development will look away from the object he is reaching for, presumably so that his hand can get unseen to the object. If this interpretation of the looking away is correct, it implies a rather developed integration of perception with behavior, a realization that an act may be disrupted by its perceptual consequences and an awareness of how to avoid these disruptions.

All of this seems very sophisticated. Unfortunately there are many other real-life situations where the baby does not seem able to call upon such resources. Rudolph Schaffer has remarked that babies are unable to restrain themselves from reaching out to grab any new object that is put before them. ② Not until the last quarter of the first year will babies stop to take a good look at

what is presented to them before reaching out to grab it. An amusing example of how nonfunctional this is was provided by Jerome Bruner.

Bruner gave a baby a toy. The baby took it. He then offered the baby another toy. The baby took it with his other hand. He offered the baby still another toy. If the baby was especially dextrous, he could grab this third one, while keeping a grip on the first two. At this point the baby is sitting like an overtrimmed Christmas tree, not really able to play with any of the three toys. Now comes the denouement. The baby is offered a fourth toy. Crash! The first three drop, any old where, as the baby compulsively reaches out to take the new thing on offer.

Older babies develop a more rational way of coping with situations like this, but it takes a long time.

The same sort of process may be involved in some aspects of the development of object permanence.^③ The baby goes through several stages before he comes to believe that objects continue to exist even when they are no longer in sight. A natural situation is one in which, say, a ball rolls behind a chair. If the child retrieves the ball after its disappearance behind the chair, he must have some understanding of the ball's continuing existence which is not dependent upon his perception of it. A baby's growing ability to find an object that has been hidden can be tested by placing the object inside one of a set of other objects, with various odd permutations carried out to make the finding more difficult. At some point in this developmental sequence a baby will stop his search routine if he finds anything at all under any of the cups or cloths that have been used as hiding places. It doesn't matter how unlike the original target of the search the new object is. This could result from poor memory, or from the kind of distractability we have been talking about. This distractability is over by the time the baby is a year old. At this point and by some mysterious process, our

infant begins to use his perceptual system, rather than being used by it. Internal memories and expectations control the baby's behavior, and he uses his perceptual system to realize these expectations.

Along with this kind of change goes a fascinating change in the status of perception within the hierarchy of systems that control the baby's behavior. We are all familiar with situations in which we refuse to believe our eyes, not accepting the evidence of our senses. We are not normally called upon to doubt our senses in any dramatic context. Most often it is an everyday situation where we are subjected to some illusion. The most dramatic instances come when we are watching a stage magician: we know that we are being deceived yet often cannot say why. There is a clear point in development when, it seems, the baby assumes a similar superior status in regard to the data provided by his senses. There is a developmental shift that results in babies, too, refusing to believe their eyes, when the visual evidence contradicts some internal knowledge about the world.

In one of my own investigations I used a device that could make solid objects appear to fade away softly and silently, like puffs of smoke in the wind or banks of fog dissolving in a hot sun. This was achieved by a system of half-silvered mirrors that could be lit to show either an object or a blank space; the perceived change after a gradual change in the lighting was of an object slowly dissolving into nothing. My own older children referred to this device as a Boojum box. Nonetheless they were not the least afraid of the box and were quite happy to climb in and out of it. They "knew" that solid real objects do not dissolve like puffs of smoke. Babies acquire this knowledge toward the end of the first year of life. Faced with my box, young babies seemed to accept that the objects in question were gone. After the disappearance of the object they showed no further interest in the display. By the age of one year, this acceptance of visual input was over. The babies crawled up to the box, banged it, peered around it and then around the rest of the room until they found the object that had

disappeared, at which point they would glare at me, expressing wordlessly the feelings of triumph they may well have been experiencing.

Distrust of the senses and reliance on other sources of knowledge grows
^⑥during development. Indeed there is some evidence that the process goes so far
that one can be led into illusions. Adults are quite susceptible to illusions produced by presenting odd-sized versions of familiar objects. An oversized chair will be as normal-sized and at a closer distance than it really is. A miniature Rolls-Royce is seen as normal-sized but at a greater distance than it really is. But children of up to five or six years of age will give a reasonable estimate of the true size and distance of the aberrant objects presented. Beyond this age they become as susceptible to the illusion as adults are.

Reliance on knowledge rather than on the immediate information from the senses is good policy in many more situations than it is not. Older children can use knowledge to overcome the built-in disabilities of the perceptual system in ways that younger children cannot. A simple demonstration of this is the horizontal-vertical illusion. A vertical line looks longer than a horizontal line that is actually of the same length. If you start with two horizontal lines both of the same length, and rotate one to the vertical position, you have put knowledge of the length before rotation in conflict with the immediate perception that the vertical line is longer. Children of up to six resolve the conflict in favor of perception and say that the vertical line *is* longer. Older children by contrast say that, although the vertical line *looks* longer, both are *really* the same.

This sophisticated separation of appearance and reality is a continuation of the initial separations made in infancy, and a separation that will continue throughout life. Much adult thought is about unseen and unseeable entities: for example, luck, God, responsibility. Any mental system that kept perception in the preeminent position that it occupies in the postnatal period would be quite incapable of coping with these fictive entities. It has been argued that we would
^⑦be happier and healthier if we stayed closer to the world of our senses. That

might be so, but there is no way we shall ever know. The development away from perceptual preeminence seems universal, occurring in all cultures at all times.

(出典："The Perceptual World of the Child" by T.G.R. Bower, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Copyright © 1977 by T.G.R. Bowerより一部改変)

設問(1) 下線部①の意味を日本語で表しなさい。

設問(2) 下線部②の意味を日本語で表しなさい。

設問(3) 下線部③はどのようなことか、本文中の具体例を用いて日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(4) 下線部④はどのようなことか、日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(5) 下線部⑤は、およそ1歳を境に、どのような違いが生じることを示そうとした実験ですか。日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(6) 下線部⑥の内容を本文中の具体例を用いて日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(7) 下線部⑦では、なぜこのように述べられているのか。本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

Ⅲ 人生、誰しも失敗がつきものですが、あなたはこれまでどのような失敗を経験し、そこからいかなることを学びましたか。最も印象的な事例を具体的に1つあげ、70語程度の英語で説明しなさい。

IV 次の日本語の下線部(1)~(3)の意味を英語で表しなさい。

僕は本を楽しみたいという気持ちで、わくわくしながら開きます。少なくとも
(1) 「この本、全然おもしろくなかった」と僕が誇らしげに言うことはありません。自分
がおもしろさをわからなかつただけじゃないかと思うんです。自分が楽しみ方を間違えたのではないかと。

自転車に一度では乗れなかった僕が、何回も練習して自在に乗れるようになった。あの時の快感が忘れられません。だから、自分の才能を棚にあげて適当な発言はできない。どうせ読むなら、楽しむという指標において、本+自分の読み方の総合点では誰にも負けたくないです。誰よりもおもしろく読みたい。

どれだけ腹が減っていても不味い飯は存在します。それでも、どんな店に行つて
(2) も「不味い、不味い」と口癖のように言っている人に腹立ちませんか。そんなに、自分が好きな店を見つけられないものかなと思います。好きな店の気配を嗅ぎわかる嗅覚が育たないものかなと思うんです。お前は何回同じ過ちを繰り返せば気が済むのかと。

読書も同じで、徹底的に否定して批判して溜飲を下げるというスタイルをとって
(3) いる人や、名作と呼ばれるものをこき下ろすことによって個性を出したい人もいて、それが気持ち良いならそれでいいんですけど。評論家じゃなくて、趣味の読書なら楽しんだ方が得だし自分のためにも良いと思うんです。

(又吉直樹『夜を乗り越える』)

V これから英語が2回読まれます。その内容について、以下の設問に日本語で答えなさい。

設問(1) The Golden Rule とはどのようなものですか。

設問(2) ハムスターの死の知らせを聞いた父親は、どういう対応をしましたか。

設問(3) 父親の対応のどこが問題だったのでしょうか。

設問(4) The Platinum Rule とはどのようなものですか。

設問(5) 「私」は The Platinum Rule を、いつ、どのようにして学びましたか。