

令和 3 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8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。(B)については、引用符の中の単語は英語のままでよい。

(A) One of the oddest aspects of American culture is our general dismissal of commensality. Most human cultures have considered food preparation and consumption, especially consuming food together, as essential to family, tribal, religious, and other social bonds. Some people would go even further and say that as social creatures, eating together makes us more socially adept and indeed happier human beings. However, in our highly individualistic society the value of eating and drinking together is probably honored more in the breach than in the observance.

(From FOOD FIGHTS: HOW HISTORY MATTERS TO CONTEMPORARY FOOD DEBATES edited by Charles C. Ludington and Matthew Morse Booker. Copyright · 2019 by the University of North Carolina Press. Used by permission of the publisher. www.uncpress.org より一部改変)

(B) In language, the relationship between the form of a signal and its meaning is largely arbitrary. For example, the sound of “blue” will likely have no relationship to the properties of light we experience as blue nor to the visual written form “blue,” will sound different across languages, and have no sound at all in signed languages. No equivalent of “blue” will even exist in many languages that might make fewer or more or different color distinctions. With respect to language, the meaning of a signal cannot be predicted from the physical properties of the signal available to the senses. Rather, the relationship is set by convention.

(From Science, Vol. 366, Issue No. 6464, “Language and the brain”, by Lera Boroditsky, Copyright · 2019 The American Association for the Advancement of Science. Reprinted with permission from AAAS.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。

Writing is an unnatural act. As Charles Darwin observed, "Man has an instinctive tendency to speak, as we see in the babble of our young children, whereas no child has an instinctive tendency to bake, brew, or write." <sup>①</sup> The spoken word is older than our species, and the instinct for language allows children to engage in articulate conversation years before they enter a schoolhouse. But the written word is a recent invention that has left no trace in our genome and must be laboriously acquired throughout childhood and beyond.

Speech and writing differ in their mechanics, of course, and that is one reason children must struggle with writing: it takes practice to reproduce the sounds of language with a pencil or a keyboard. But they differ in another way, which makes the acquisition of writing a lifelong challenge even after the mechanics have been mastered. Speaking and writing involve very different kinds of human relationship, and only the one associated with speech comes naturally to us. Spoken conversation is instinctive because social interaction is instinctive: we speak to those with whom we are on speaking terms. When we engage our conversational partners, we have an inkling of what they know and what they might be interested in learning, and as we chat with them, we monitor their eyes, their face, and their posture. If they need clarification, or cannot swallow an assertion, or have something to add, they can break into the conversation or follow up in turn.

We enjoy none of this give-and-take <sup>②</sup> when we cast our bread upon the waters by sending a written missive out into the world. The recipients are invisible and inscrutable, and we have to get through to them without knowing much about them or seeing their reactions. At the time that we write, the reader exists only in our imaginations. <sup>③</sup> Writing is above all an act of pretense. We have to visualize ourselves in some kind of conversation, or correspondence, or oration, or soliloquy, and put words into the mouth of the little avatar who represents us

in this simulated world.

The key to good style, far more than obeying any list of commandments, is to have a clear conception of the make-believe world in which you're pretending to communicate. There are many possibilities. A person thumb-typing a text message can get away with acting as if he is taking part in a real conversation. An activist composing a manifesto, or a minister drafting a sermon, must write as if they are standing in front of a crowd and whipping up their emotions.

Which simulation should a writer immerse himself in when composing a piece for a more generic readership, such as an essay, an article, a review, an editorial, a newsletter, or a blog post? The literary scholars Francis-Noël Thomas and Mark Turner have singled out one model of prose as an aspiration for such writers today. They call it classic style, and explain it in a wonderful little book called *Clear and Simple as the Truth*.

The guiding metaphor of classic style is seeing the world. The writer can see something that the reader has not yet noticed, and he orients the reader's gaze so that she can see it for herself. The purpose of writing is presentation, and its motive is disinterested truth. It succeeds when it aligns language with the truth, the proof of success being clarity and simplicity. The truth can be known, and is not the same as the language that reveals it; prose is a window onto the world. The writer knows the truth before putting it into words; he is not using the occasion of writing to sort out what he thinks. Nor does the writer of classic prose have to argue for the truth; he just needs to present it. That is because the reader is competent and can recognize the truth when she sees it, as long as she is given an unobstructed view. The writer and the reader are equals, and the process of directing the reader's gaze takes the form of a conversation.

A writer of classic prose must simulate two experiences: showing the reader something in the world, and engaging her in conversation. The nature of each experience shapes the way that classic prose is written. The metaphor of showing implies that there is something to see. The things in the world the

writer is pointing to, then, are *concrete*: people (or other animate beings) who move around in the world and interact with objects. The metaphor of conversation implies that the reader is *cooperative*. The writer can count on her to read between the lines, catch his drift, and connect the dots, without his having to spell out every step in his train of thought.

Classic prose, Thomas and Turner explain, is just one kind of style, whose invention they credit to seventeenth-century French writers such as Descartes and La Rochefoucauld. The differences between classic style and other styles can be appreciated by comparing their stances on the communication scenario: how the writer imagines himself to be related to the reader, and what the writer is trying to accomplish.

Classic style is not a contemplative or romantic style, in which a writer tries to share his idiosyncratic, emotional, and mostly ineffable reactions to something. Nor is it a prophetic, oracular, or oratorical style, where the writer has the gift of being able to see things that no one else can, and uses the music of language to unite an audience.

Less obviously, classic style differs from practical style, like the language of memos, manuals, term papers, and research reports. (Traditional stylebooks such as Strunk and White are mainly guides to practical style.) In practical style, the writer and reader have defined roles (supervisor and employee, teacher and student, technician and customer), and the writer's goal is to satisfy the reader's need. Writing in practical style may conform to a fixed template (a five-paragraph essay, a report in a scientific journal), and it is brief because the reader needs the information in a timely manner. Writing in classic style, in contrast, takes whatever form and whatever length the writer needs to present an interesting truth. The classic writer's brevity "comes from the elegance of his mind, never from pressures of time or employment."

⑥ Classic style also differs subtly from plain style, where everything is in full view and the reader needs no help in seeing anything. In classic style the writer

has worked hard to find something worth showing and the perfect vantage point from which to see it. The reader may have to work hard to discern it, but her efforts will be rewarded. Classic style, Thomas and Turner explain, is aristocratic, not egalitarian: “Truth is available to all who are willing to work to achieve it, but truth is certainly not commonly possessed by all and is no one’s birthright.”

The different prose styles are not sharply demarcated, and many kinds of writing blend the different styles or alternate between them. (Academic writing, for example, tends to mix practical and self-conscious styles.) Classic style is an ideal. Not all prose should be classic, and not all writers can carry off the pretense. But knowing the hallmarks of classic style will make anyone a better writer, and it is the strongest cure I know for the disease that enfeebles academic, bureaucratic, corporate, legal, and official prose.

(“A Window Onto the World” from THE SENSE OF STYLE: THE THINKING PERSON’S GUIDE TO WRITING IN THE 21ST CENTURY by Steven Pinker, copyright © 2014 by Steven Pinker. Used by permission of Viking Books, an imprint of Penguin Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC. All rights reserved. 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が指す内容を日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

設問(3) 下線部③が指す内容を日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

設問(4) 下線部④の意味を日本語で表しなさい。

設問(5) 下線部⑤が指す内容を日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

設問(6) 下線部⑥の意味を日本語で表しなさい。

Ⅲ 長期にわたって何かに取り組む場合、前向きな姿勢を保ち続けるのが難しいことがあります。そのような状況になった時、具体的にどうすれば抜け出せるでしょうか。あなた自身もしくは他の人の経験を1つ例に挙げて、70語程度の英文で述べなさい。

IV 次の日本文の下線部(1)～(3)の意味を英語で表しなさい。

脳の進化の歴史をたどれば、人間は合理的に考えることのできる知性を発達させ<sup>(1)</sup>ることで繁栄もしてきましたが、その合理性を適度に抑えることで集団として協調行動をとることが可能になりました。

それが、今日まで人類が発展を続けることができた大きな要素だったのではないかと考えることができます。果たして、合理性だけが発達した人間は、どのように<sup>(2)</sup>扱われるのでしょうか？ 彼らは、異質なものとして人間社会からは排除されてしまうのです。

ただ、その人間が作り出した合理性の塊が人工知能だとすれば、これは人間の<sup>(3)</sup>不合理性とは補完的に働き、強力なパートナーシップを築くことも可能性としては十分にあり得ます。AI との勝負、などと煽るつまらないビジネスをしている場合ではなく、このディレクション(使い方)ができるかどうかこそが人類の課題と言えるでしょう。

(中野信子、2020、『空気を読む脳』講談社 より一部改変)



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) ダイヤモンドの語源はギリシャ語でどのような意味を持つ言葉に由来しますか。

設問(2) ダイヤモンドは装飾の他にどのような用途で使われましたか。2つ事例を挙げなさい。

設問(3) ダイヤモンドは炭素がどのような状態になった時に生成されますか。

設問(4) Kimberley Mine の開鉱の結果、どのような現象が起こり、それはダイヤモンドにどのような影響を及ぼしましたか。

設問(5) 婚約指輪は、いつ、どのようなことが契機となって始まりましたか。