

令和 8 年 度

前 期 日 程

英 語 問 題

〔注 意〕

1. 問題冊子及び解答用紙は、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記入欄及び受験番号マーク欄に正確に記入・マークすること。なお、マークは該当する数字を塗りつぶすこと。
3. 問題冊子のページ数は、表紙を除き 11 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 1 枚である。
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. マーク式解答は、解答用紙のマーク欄にマークしなさい。例えば(イ)と解答する場合は、次の例のように㊦をマークしなさい。

(例)

(i)	㊦	㊧	●	㊨
-------	---	---	---	---

7. 問題冊子の余白は、適宜下書きに使用してよい。
8. 解答用紙は持ち帰ってはいけない。
9. 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) Nonhuman animals have long been seen as a crucial source of evidence regarding the nature and origins of human social capacities, such as communication, deception, culture, technology, politics, and morality. Humans distinctively excel at these forms of sociality, which led theorists in many disciplines to hypothesize that humans possess unique adaptations facilitating advanced social cognition. Many of these social activities presume an ability to attribute mental states such as perceptions, beliefs, and desires to other social agents, which might suggest that humans uniquely evolved a “theory of mind” that enables these attributions.

(Buckner, Cameron. 2024. “Animal social cognition.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/animal-social-cognition/>)

- (B) In novels, there is often a moment when characters realize they have been living in a dream (or nightmare), when scales fall from their eyes and a new direction is taken. This happens in plots from history too, but it usually takes longer, and the moment of realization is nearly always too late.

(Stonebridge, Lyndsey. 2024. “We Are Free to Change the World: Hannah Arendt's Lessons in Love and Disobedience” *Random House Publishing Group* January 18. <https://lithub.com/why-we-should-all-read-hannaharendt-now/>)

II 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

In the forests of eastern Australia, satin bowerbirds create structures known as “bowers.” The males gather twigs and place them upright, in two bundles, with a gap in the middle, resulting in what looks like a miniature archway. All around the bower the bird scatters small objects—shells, pieces of plastic, flower petals—which all possess the same property: the color blue. Studies suggest that the purpose of the bowers is to impress and attract females. But their beauty and intricacy have left some researchers wondering whether they shouldn't be considered art.

Of course, figuring out whether something is a work of art requires answering some tricky philosophical questions. Are animals even capable of creating art? And how can we tell whether something is a work of art rather than just a coincidentally beautiful object?

First, it's important to outline various theories of what makes something a work of art. There's a general agreement that art must have some sort of producer and some possible or intended audience. In this way, it's similar to other forms of communication. But the rest of the picture is unclear, and there's no universally agreed-upon definition of art. In fact, art has proven so difficult to define that Scottish philosopher W. B. Gallie once suggested it might be an “essentially contested concept”—an idea for which there is no correct definition.

That being said, some popular views have emerged. Leo Tolstoy famously suggested art is a conduit for emotion, writing in 1897 that “one man consciously, by means of certain external signs, hands on to others feelings he has lived through, and that other people are infected by these feelings and also experience them.” Plato and Aristotle emphasized the representational role of art: the idea that a work of art must in some way mimic, depict or “stand in” as a sort of sign for something else. Some philosophers believe that creating art requires intention—for example, a sculptor will mold clay with the intention of having it

look like Abraham Lincoln. And nonhuman animals, they'll argue, simply don't have the right kind of intentions for art-making.

And yet, it's not clear how much intention really does matter for art.
(A) Philosopher Brian Skyrms has pointed out that communication arises even in animals that plausibly do not have sophisticated intentions like our own. For example, fireflies signal to mates with flashes, and this seems to be largely an evolved behavior. Communication can even emerge via simple reinforcement learning, as when a dog learns to associate a certain call with dinner.

These aren't instances of art. But they reveal how meaningful signs or representations can operate without the need for complex intentions. Given that much art also serves a communicative role, I argue that there's reason to think that art might be able to come about in less intention-demanding ways too. Ornithologist* Richard Prum also takes a communicative view of art, but one where art is meant to be evaluated for its beauty. The beauty of a work functions as an indicator of the artist's reproductive fitness — and this can apply to both humans and animals.

Some might not like an account like Prum's, since it seems to allow creations like bowers to count as art. And yet, as philosopher Denis Dutton points out in his 2009 book *The Art Instinct*, mate attraction and fitness broadcasting can be the primary motivation behind many human works of art too.

I think it's safe to say some animal creations don't count as art. The webs of most spiders, though intricate and carefully designed, appear to exist for utilitarian purposes and serve no evaluative or communicative function. The
(v) same goes for most anthills.

But what about animal songs? The structures of the songs of humpback whales are complex, featuring parts and repeated patterns that researchers often describe as “themes” and “verses.” The songs are long — sometimes up to 30 minutes. Because males perform these songs primarily during mating season, it's plausible that female whales assess them for their beauty, which serves as a

way to gauge the singer's genetic fitness. Details of songs even vary from whale population to population, often changing over the course of a mating season.

Off the coasts of Japan, male white-spotted puffer fish create impressive nests to attract females. The male puffer fish uses his mouth to remove rocks from the sand and his body to wiggle out long, strategically placed grooves. The finished product is a multi-ringed sand mandala** about 6 feet in diameter. Like the bowers, the nests of the puffer fish are beautiful and involve mate attraction. Yet some researchers argue that since these sorts of works all look roughly the same — have the same shape, use the same materials and so on — they're more likely the result of evolved, inflexible dispositions than more creative processes.

But it's worth noting that many human works of art bear core similarities as well. Many paintings use flat surfaces, oils or acrylics. Many songs follow the same chord patterns. And would we still consider human sculptures art if we discovered much about the motivation to build them could be explained by evolution? I think we would.

Many human cases of art involve more than one person, sometimes even a large group. Think of all the people it takes to make a modern film. Does anything like that happen in animals? Consider the blue manakin bird of South America. Male blues will form groups, often of three or more, which then practice an elaborate song-and-dance routine to later perform in front of females. The practice is detailed and dutiful. The groups hone their moves. This involves learning and memorization, not just genetics. Flaws in the performance are challenged and corrected. Sometimes during practices, a juvenile male will even fill in as a mock female. It's not The Beatles. But the similarity to music groups seems hard to deny. At the same time, it's worth wondering whether, beyond conveying their eagerness to mate, the birds are trying to "say" or "express" anything more with their performance. And do they know it's beautiful?

All this leaves room for doubt about whether animals really make art. To me, a key question is whether there's any animal art that doesn't have to do with

inating, and instead expresses something more complex or sentimental. Without being able to get into the heads of animals, it's hard to say. But it's plausible that humans aren't alone in their artistic pursuits.

(Simpson, Shawn. 2025. "Can animals make art?" *The Conversation*, March 19. <https://theconversation.com/can-animals-make-art-248503> より一部改変)

Notes:

*ornithologist: a person who studies birds

**mandala: a circular figure that represents the universe in Hindu and Buddhist symbolism

設問(1) 下線部(i)～(vi)の語句の本文中での意味に最も近いものを、(イ)～(ニ)からそれぞれ1つ選び、解答欄の選択肢を塗りつぶしなさい。

(i) intricacy

(イ) attractiveness

(ロ) complexity

(ハ) implication

(ニ) intimacy

(ii) tricky

(イ) difficult

(ロ) false

(ハ) skillful

(ニ) unrealistic

(iii) a coincidentally beautiful object

(イ) an object that happens to be beautiful

(ロ) an object that is intended to be beautiful

(ハ) an object that is valued for its beauty

(ニ) an object that obscures its beauty

(iv) is a conduit for

(イ) contributes to

(ロ) conveys

(ハ) is defined by

(ニ) is in line with

(v) utilitarian

(イ) conceptual

(ロ) decorative

(ハ) practical

(ニ) sensitive

(vi) gauge

(イ) admire

(ロ) express

(ハ) increase

(ニ) judge

設問(2) 下線部(A)～(C)に関して、本文の内容に最もよく合っているものを、

(イ)～(ニ)からそれぞれ1つ選び、解答欄の選択肢を塗りつぶしなさい。

(A) how much intention really does matter for art

- (イ) Brian Skyrms suggests that animals would be able to produce art if they had human-like intentions.
- (ロ) Although not an instance of art, firefly flashing is described as an evolved form of highly intentional behavior.
- (ハ) It is implied by the author that artistic intentions may sometimes obstruct communication.
- (ニ) The author thinks that art may not necessarily be accompanied by much intention.

(B) white-spotted puffer fish

- (イ) The male puffer fish attract females to build their nests.
- (ロ) The nests made by the puffer fish show an overall similarity in shape and materials.
- (ハ) There is a consensus among researchers that the nests of the puffer fish show their ingenuity.
- (ニ) The author points out that there are many human art works that are modeled after the nests of the puffer fish.

(C) the blue manakin bird

- (イ) The birds' group performance is determined by training as well as genes.
- (ロ) It is not uncommon for a female bird to join the male birds' song-and-dance practices.
- (ハ) The author clearly rejects the parallel between the birds' dance and human music.
- (ニ) The author clearly believes that the birds' dance is motivated by artistic instinct.

設問(3) 下線部(1) the representational role of art について、本文の内容に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(4) 下線部(2) I think we would について、筆者の考えの具体的な内容を本文の内容に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(5) 下線部(3) All this leaves room for doubt about whether animals really make art という筆者の発言を受けて、あなたは人間以外の生物と芸術の関係についてどう考えますか。本文中で言及されている具体例のうち最低1つに触れながら、あなたの考えを 40～50 語程度の英語で述べなさい。

Ⅲ 客観的な事実よりも、個人の感情や信念に訴えかける情報の方が人々の意見形成や行動に大きな影響を与える「ポスト真実」(post-truth)の時代が到来したと言われています。このような時代を生きる上で、物事のありようを見極める力を養うために、学問の探究を通してどのような知性や技能を磨くことが求められると考えますか。具体例を挙げて、80 語程度の英語で述べなさい。

Ⅳ 次の和文(A)と(B)のそれぞれの下線部の意味を英語で表しなさい。ただし、(B)では文学部の志願者は(イ)を、文学部以外の学部志願者は(ロ)を選んで解答しなさい。なお、志願する学部以外の問題を選択した解答は採点の対象となりません。

(A) (すべての学部志願者)

ヒトが感じる音は、「耳でとらえられた音波が脳に送られ、脳内での処理を経ることで知覚される感覚」と定義できる。ここで注意したいのは、「脳で生じる音の感覚」には個人差が大きいということだ。同じ音が、人によって高く感じられることもあれば、別の人にとっては低く感じられることもある。同一個人でも音の感じ方は状況によってことなることがある。

(伊藤浩介監修・西村尚子執筆、2024、「音楽の脳科学 音楽が生む感動の秘密を脳から解きあかす」『ニュートン』12月号、ニュートンプレスより一部改変)

(B)

(イ) (文学部志願者)

じぶんの身体というものは、だれもがじぶんのもっとも近くにあるものだとおもっている。たとえば包丁で切った傷の痛みはわたしだけが感じるもので、他人は頭でわかっても、わたしの代わりに痛んでくれるわけではない。その意味で、わたしとはわたしの身体であるといいうるほどに、わたしはまちがいないくわたしの身体の近くにありそうである。ところが、よく考えると、わたしがじぶんの身体についてもっている情報は、ふつう想像しているよりもはるかに貧弱なものだ。身体の全表面のうちじぶんで見える部分というのは、ごく限られている。だれもじぶんの身体の内部はもちろん、背中や後頭部でさえじかに見たことがない。ましてや他人がこのわたしをわたしとして認知してくれるその顔は、終生見ることができない。そして難儀なことにこの顔に、じぶんではコントロール不可能なじぶんの感情や気分が露出してしまふ。いってみれば、ひとはじぶんの身体を、いわば目隠ししたまま経験するほかないのであって、危ういばかりに無防備なのである。

(鷲田清一、2014、『哲学の使い方』岩波書店)

(ロ) (文学部以外の学部の志願者)

実験科学の世界では、仮説にぴたりと合致するような結果が得られることはまずないといってよい。その際、ほとんどの研究者はこう考える。自分の仮説は間違っていない。ただ、実験の方法がよくないから、よいデータが出ないのだと。そこで条件を少しずつ変えて、繰り返し実験を行うことになる。しかし、ほとんどの場合、実験がうまくいかないのは、実は、仮説そのものが間違っているからなのだ。

だが、研究者は頑迷なので自説に固執してしまう。かくして膨大な時間と試行錯誤が浪費される。なので、科学研究にほんとうに必要な才能は、天才性やひらめきというよりは、むしろ、自己懷疑、(失望に対する)耐性、^{いさぎよ}潔い^{あきら}諦め、といったものとなる。

(福岡伸一、2025.『動的平衡は利他に通じる』朝日新聞出版より一部改変)