前期日程

令和７年度入学試験問題

英　　語

注　意　事　項

1．　この問題冊子は、試験開始の合図があるまで開いてはいけません。

2．　解答用紙は問題冊子とは別になっています。解答は解答用紙の指定されたところに記入しなさい。それ以外の場所に記入された解答は、採点の対象となりません。解答用紙は４枚あります。

3．　本学の受験番号をすべての解答用紙の指定されたところへ正しく記入しなさい。氏名を書いてはいけません。

4．　この問題冊子は、表紙を含めて20ページあります。問題は４ページから16ページにあります。ページの落丁・乱丁及び解答用紙の汚れ等に気付いた場合は、監督者に申し出なさい。

5．　問題冊子の余白等は適宜利用しても構いませんが、どのページも切り離してはいけません。

6．　この問題冊子は持ち帰りなさい。

1 次の英文を読んで以下の問に答えなさい。

What does the word "nature" mean to you? Does it bring to mind visions of wild places away from the busy world of people, or does it include humans too? The meaning of nature has changed since the word was first used back as early as the 15th century.

Now a new campaign, *We Are Nature*, aims to persuade dictionaries to include humans in their definitions of nature. (1)This campaign, a collaboration between a group of lawyers and a design company, involves a petition and open letter, as well as a collection of alternative definitions supplied by various thinkers and authors. Here's my definition of nature:

> The living world comprised as the total set of organisms and relationships between them. These organisms include bacteria, fungi, plants and animals (including humans). Some definitions may also include non-living entities as part of nature—such as mountains, waterfalls and cloud formations—in recognition of their important role underpinning the web of life.

Derived from the Latin *natura*, literally (a) "birth", nature used to only refer to the innate qualities or essential disposition of something. But with the passage of time, it also began to describe something "other" or separate from humans. For example, the Oxford English Dictionary defines nature as "the phenomena of the physical world collectively, especially plants, animals, and other features and products of the Earth itself, as opposed to humans and human creations".

But how did we arrive at such a definition, which depends on us being ア[( ) ( ), ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ),] the natural world? Since the 17th century, a rationalist world view, prompted by philosophers such as René Descartes, increasingly saw things from a mechanical perspective, comparing the workings of the universe to a great machine. Instead of seeing some kind of divine spirit inhabiting the natural world, this perspective emphasised the split between the human mind and physical matter.

Anything non-human fell into the latter category and was likened to clockwork

machinery. But that view has since been found to lead to animal cruelty, and many environmental bodies, including the European Environment Agency, suggest this disconnect is (b) the decline of nature.

Is it OK to change words in a dictionary by (c) to publishing companies? One might argue yes, if the scientific evidence suggests the distinction between nature and humans is false—something I have argued on the basis of findings in biology, ecology and neuroscience.

A dictionary definition represents society's framing of the natural world. This in turn influences our perception of our place within it—and the actions we take to protect nature. So, the words we use have real-world impacts: they frame how we think and determine how we feel and act. Linguist George Lakoff has argued that they ultimately structure our society.

My children are growing up in a world where humans feel disconnected from nature—indeed, the UK ranks among the most disconnected countries. Research shows this leads people to make fewer positive environmental changes to their behaviour, such as (d) their carbon footprint, recycling, or doing voluntary conservation work.

Conversely, when people feel they are connected with nature, they are not only greener in their behaviour but they tend to be happier. So, I absolutely want my kids to grow up feeling they are part of nature.

To change the primary definition of nature from "as opposed to humans" to "including humans" will require more people to use the word in a way that reflects how humans are a part of the whole web of life.

The great thing is, by doing this, we rekindle the bonds of care towards the living world around us. And by (e) the illusion of our separation from nature, we can also expect to live happier lives. Words matter—there is restoration and joy from talking about how we are nature.

(Adapted from an essay by Tom Oliver in *The Conversation*)

問1　下線部(1)の目的はどのようなことか。20字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

問2　空欄(　a　)～(　e　)に入れるのに最も適切な語を次の1～5から選び、番号で答えなさい。ただし、同じものを繰り返して用いないこと。

1. abandoning　　2. accelerating　　3. appealing
4. meaning　　5. reducing

問3　文中のア[　　]の中には以下の語が入る。文意に沿うように並べかえ、2番目と5番目に来る語を答えなさい。

[a / apart / from / of / part / rather / than]

問4　筆者は、辞書と人間社会の関係をどのように捉えているか。40字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

2 次の英文を読んで以下の問に答えなさい。

Human social intelligence is far superior to that of even the largest brained of our primate cousins. We can cooperate in large groups to do quite complicated tasks such as planning and organizing a hunt, building a house, or playing football. It is easy enough to teach a chimpanzee to play a game with a ball, but unimaginable that a group of chimpanzees could learn to play team sports.

There are other exclusively human dimensions of social life. [ア] Perhaps this originated in the usefulness of being able to recruit members of other groups in times of expansion and exploration. One of the costs of migration to a social animal is that it has the potential to fragment social networks: that cost can limit the willingness of individuals or small groups to move far from their kin*. *Homo sapiens* seems to have been better than other early humans at overcoming (1)this cost, partly by being better at maintaining connections over a distance, and partly by being good at making new friends in new places.

Our social world is not limited to friends and relatives. [イ] We have also recruited members of other species. Many species live in interdependent relationships with others—pilot fish and sharks, oxpeckers and elephants, to name just two examples—but the connections established tens of thousands of years ago between humans and dogs are rather different. Those connections depend on exploiting the social capacities of both species. There is more to it than that, of course. Genetically dogs have few differences from wolves, but they have been bred or at least selected for their social capacity. How this process began is very mysterious. Domestication is a uniquely human (a) and so there are few analogies to help us out, but perhaps abandoned or captured wolf cubs were raised in human families, and certainly there would have been (b) in favor of those that formed strong social bonds with humans and against those that were more aggressive or independent. The process would be repeated later with other social mammals: sheep and goats, cattle and horses, and so on. Perhaps we should simply say that humans were preadapted to domesticate, meaning that one unexpected side (c) of our species' investment in sociality was the capacity to socialize members of other social species.

The original team of apes and wolves was a [I] combination. Dogs' sharp sense of smell and physical strength made up for our developing weaknesses in both areas. No other species of apes or early humans domesticated dogs, but *homo sapiens* probably did it several times during our (d) around the globe. Dogs are not only social like us but also mobile; they are creatures willing to sacrifice territoriality to their membership of a wider social group. [ウ] They accompanied the first humans into the New World and later crossed from Eurasia into Australia. Dogs accompanied us on all our great explorations to the most remote Pacific and Atlantic islands, and then to both polar ice caps. Dogs even preceded us into space. At first, they helped us hunt by day and guard our temporary nests during the nighttime when our primate eyes were so much feebler than theirs. [エ] Later, when we had domesticated other species, they helped tame and control them, and protect our flocks from other predators. Now they mostly provide (e), a fundamental human need that also derives from our increased sociality.

(Adapted from Greg Woolf, *The Life and Death of Ancient Cities: A Natural History*)

注 *kin 共通の祖先をもつ一族、同族

問1 下線部(1)の this cost とは何か。25字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

問2 空欄 (a) ～ (e) に入れるのに最も適切な名詞を次の1～5から選び、番号で答えなさい。ただし、同じものを繰り返して用いないこと。

1. companionship 2. effect 3. expansion 4. selection 5. trait

問3 空欄 [I] に入れるのに最も適切な語を次の選択肢から1つ選び、番号で答えなさい。

1. difficult 2. free 3. losing 4. random 5. winning

問4 以下の文は、本文中の [ア] ～ [エ] のどこかに入る。最も適切な箇所を記号で答えなさい。

As a species we have a special talent for friendship.

3 *Read the following text and answer the questions.*

The economic data suggest that technological progress is slowing down. To see this, consider a thought experiment from the economic historian Robert Gordon.

Imagine you are a typical inhabitant of the United States in 1870. You live on a rural farm; you produce most of your food and clothing yourself. Your only sources of light are candles, whale oil, and gas lamps if you're lucky. If you're a man, you face exhausting physical labour, sometimes from the age of twelve onwards. If you're a woman, you face unrelenting toil as a housewife: one calculation found that in 1886 "a typical North Carolina housewife had to carry water eight to ten times a day. Over the course of a year she walked 148 miles toting water." You rely on horses for transport. Mostly your life is one of isolation: the telephone doesn't yet exist, and the postal service doesn't reach your farm. Life expectancy at birth is thirty-nine years, and modern forms of leisure are unknown. The tallest building in New York City is a church steeple.

Now, suppose that one morning, you wake up and it's fifty years later, the year 1920. Your standard of living is in the process of rapid and dramatic improvement. The electrification of America is well underway, reaching close to half of American households. If you are lucky enough to have electricity, the lighting it provides is ten times brighter than the kerosene lamps that preceded it and a hundred times brighter than the candles that preceded those. People are beginning to use telephones, which enable instant communication. Mass-produced cars are beginning to replace horses, with nearly a third of the population owning a car. Life expectancy is now sixteen years greater, at fifty-five years. The routine disinfection of drinking water has led to an improvement in public health. Skyscrapers are beginning to rise in New York City.

Next, suppose you wake up fifty years later again, in 1970. As a typical US inhabitant, you again see an enormous difference in your life. Most households finally have an indoor flush toilet. You live in a spacious suburban home with a gas stove, a refrigerator, and central heating. Your household owns two cars, and if you want you can fly around the world on an airplane. You have a television, and on this TV you just watched a man land on the moon. You

have penicillin and new vaccines, such as those against polio; life expectancy is sixteen years longer again, at seventy-one. Your work is probably much less exhausting, and with a forty-hour workweek, vacations, and retirement, you have ample leisure time.

Finally, imagine waking up fifty years later again, in 2020. Comparatively speaking, this time your life is not all that different. Among your household appliances, the only difference is that you now have a microwave. Your television is bigger and higher definition, and you have a wider range of shows to watch. You still use cars to get around, though they are now safer and easier to drive. Life expectancy has increased but more moderately, by only eight years, to seventy-nine years. Of course, there has been a revolution in information and communication technologies—you now have computers and the internet, tablets and mobile phones. But technological progress that meaningfully impacts your life has been confined nearly exclusively to those spheres.

From 1870 to 1970, there were extraordinary advances made in a wide number of different industries. This included information and communication technologies such as the telephone, radio, and television, but it also included advances in many other industries, such as transportation, energy, housing, and medicine. Since 1970, there's been substantial progress in information and communication technologies, but in all those other industries, progress has been comparatively gradual. Since 1970, the pace of progress seems to have slowed.

(Adapted from William MacAskill, *What We Owe the Future*)

For Questions 1 to 4, write the correct letter (A~D) in the box on the answer sheet.

Question 1 By how many years did life expectancy increase between 1870 and 1970?

A. 16

B. 32

C. 39

D. 55

Question 2 Which of the following was true of the United States in 1920?

A. Horses were no longer used for transportation.

B. More than half of the population owned a car.

C. Most homes finally had electric lighting.

D. Water was safer to drink than in the 1870s.

Question 3 What change had occurred in the working lives of Americans by 1970?

A. Employees had more time for themselves.

B. People only worked four days a week.

C. Retirement was no longer necessary.

D. Vacations had become shorter.

Question 4 What is the main point of the text?

A. Life expectancy is closely linked to advances in technology.

B. Technological advances are not always beneficial to society.

C. Technological progress seems to be constantly accelerating.

D. The rate of technological progress has decreased in the last 50 years.

Question 5 Many people say that technological progress has made our lives better. Do you agree or disagree? Give two reasons for your opinion. Write your answer in English in the space provided.

4 次の英文を読んで以下の問に答えなさい。

We form some conception—however vague—of what food is whenever we eat or identify something as food. Different conceptions can have real consequences for our health, the environment, and the economy. Let us examine the very notion of what food is and what property or properties make something food. The answers to questions concerning the nature of food are not at all obvious. Nor are the answers to other philosophical questions about the difference between natural and artificial food, the identity of food (a) time (from raw to cooked to spoiled), the difference between food and an animal, or the difference between food and other edible things, such as water, minerals, or drugs. Predictably, there is no consensus among philosophers about the nature of food, but there are several good [I].

Food as [ア]. Food is a substance or material that originates in the environment in plants, animals, or water. It is made up of naturally occurring substances metabolized by an organism to sustain, grow, and repair vital life processes. The primary function of food is to provide nourishment to an organism. Nourishment is furnished by carbohydrates, fats, fibers, protein, vitamins, and minerals. These and other chemical compounds are essential for basic bodily functioning. Food on this model has objective properties (that are really present) that are not open to interpretation.

Food as nature. Nature is not only objective but also normative. It is often perceived to have intrinsic value distinct from its instrumental value satisfying human ends. In this sense, food not only comes from nature but it is good when it does and bad when it does not. The more natural food is, the better it is. When viewed holistically as a part of a food chain, food production and consumption are seen as belonging to interdependent ecological relationships. The more we live (b) accordance with natural processes, the healthier and more "balanced" our lives will be. Harmony with nature is good; disharmony, bad.

Food as [イ]. Food has social meaning and significance beyond its nutritive function; it is also expressive. Each society determines what is food, what is permissible to eat, and how and when particular things are consumed. Food laws, for example, specify what is intended to be, and can reasonably be expected to be, ingested by humans. There are good and bad foods, legal and illegal foods, appropriate and inappropriate foods, basic and celebratory foods, ritualistic and symbolic foods, and so on. Food preparation and consumption are bound (c) the beliefs, practices, and laws of nations.

Food as [ウ]. Food is a basic thing that humans want and need in order to live together in societies. As such, it is the subject of social justice. Governments play a role in the distribution of food according to some conception of justice. Food, on this model, is something people can use, supply, and exchange in a way that is consistent (d) the meanings societies give to it. Food distribution concerns the basic institutions of society and the principles of justice that regulate how this good is shared.

This list is far (e) exhaustive. Other philosophical conceptions of food include food as diet (inevitably connected with a lifestyle and often a tradition); food as commodity (an economic good with value relative to the market); food as veganism (no animal flesh or animal products); and, less commonly, food as technology (a manufactured and processed social reality, more akin to a drug than to nature). [II], often more than one at the same time.

(Adapted from David M. Kaplan, *The Philosophy of Food*)

問1　空欄（　a　）～（　e　）に入れるのに最も適切な前置詞を次の1～5から選び、番号で答えなさい。ただし、同じものを繰り返して用いないこと。

1. from　　2. in　　3. over　　4. to　　5. with

問2　空欄［　I　］に入れるのに最も適切な語を次の選択肢から1つ選び、番号で答えなさい。

1. candidates　2. cares　3. characters　4. classes　5. conditions

問3　文中の［ア］～［ウ］に入れるのに最も適切な語を次の選択肢から1つずつ選び、番号で答えなさい。ただし、同じものを繰り返して用いないこと。

1. artistic expression　2. culture　3. environment
4. nutrition　5. social good

問4　前後関係を踏まえて、空欄［　II　］に入れるのに最も適切な表現を次の選択肢から1つ選び、番号で答えなさい。

1. Food can convincingly take none of these roles
2. Food can plausibly be any of these things
3. Food can't be multiple things at any given time
4. Food can't represent more than one quality at a time