E—1

平成30年度入学者選抜学力検査問題

英　　語

注　意　事　項

1. この冊子は，監督者から解答を始めるよう合図があるまで開いてはいけません。
2. 監督者から指示があったら，解答用紙の上部の所定欄に受験番号と座席番号を，また，下部の所定欄には座席番号をそれぞれ記入しなさい。その他の欄に記入してはいけません。
3. 解答用紙は，記入の有無にかかわらず，持ち帰ってはいけません。
4. この冊子は持ち帰りなさい。
5. 落丁，乱丁または印刷不備があったら申し出なさい。

千葉大学

E－1

平成３０年度個別学力検査等（前期日程）問題

問題冊子配付時の補足説明
（著作権処理後）

英語

著作権者から得た出典表記は以下になります。

大問 Ⅰ

Making Sense, by David Crystal, Profile Books, 2017

大問 Ⅱ

Be Careful ! Your Mind Makes Accidents Inevitable, Joshua Rothman, The New Yorker (c) Condé Nast

上記補足説明は，著作権者からの要請により行うものです。

I 次の文章は，著者の娘スージーが話し始めたころについて書いたものです。本文を読んで，問1～問6の設問に答えなさい。＊が付いている表現には本文の後に注があります。また，本文中[. . .]とあるのは，原文を中略していることを示しています。

All of Suzie's early words were ambiguous* in one way or another. If she said *gone*, I had to note the situation where she used the word in order to work out what she was talking about. It might be something dropped on the floor, or someone leaving the room, or the TV being turned off. *Down* could mean that something had fallen down or she wanted to get down (from her high chair). *More* sometimes meant 'I do want some more' (food) as well as 'I don't want any more'. Even when she named things — and over half her early vocabulary consisted of names of people or objects — there was ambiguity. A dog was *dog*, but so were a cat and a bird, for a while.

And yet, (1) despite this lack of grammatical sophistication, these utterances were still sentences, not just isolated words. Suzie was saying them with a definite rhythm and melody, and everyone responded to them as if they were real sentences.

Dada, said with a rising intonation, meant 'Is that Daddy?' Said with a falling intonation it meant 'There's Daddy'. Said with a level intonation (and arms stretched out) it meant 'Pick me up, Daddy'. (2) The different intonation patterns made them sound like a question, a statement, and a command — even though there was no sign of the grammar we associate with these three types of sentence. This was a clear contrast with the rather random vocalizations* Suzie had been making a few months before, when she was babbling* away, and nobody could work out what she was saying. Old grammar books used to say that 'a sentence expresses a complete thought'. Suzie certainly sounded as if she was expressing her first complete thoughts.

'First words', then, are really 'first sentences' — but sentences without any

internal structure. Suzie also said something that sounded like 'awgaw', in a sing-song way. It was a childish pronunciation of what we often said to her at the end of a meal — *all gone*. To us, that sentence contained two separate words, but Suzie used it as if it were just one: *allgone*. This happened a lot. *Up and down* (a bouncing game) became *upandown*. For a while, she thought our dog's name was *gudaw* — 'good dog'.

Linguists have devised a technical term* for these primitive one-word sentences. They call them *holophrases*.(3) They are a universal feature of language acquisition* at this age. Regardless of the language children are learning, between twelve and eighteen months they will all go through a holophrastic stage. [. . .]

What Suzie did between twelve and eighteen months is what we all have to do when we begin to explore English grammar — or the grammar of any language. Grammar is the study of the way we bring words together in order to make sense. These combinations of words make up larger grammatical constructions that we call phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, etc., and grammar studies all of this: how they are constructed, and the meanings and effects that the various constructions convey.

Suzie needed grammar to make sense of her words. And so do we all.(4) Isolated words don't usually make sense. If I suddenly come out with 'Thursday' or 'Indefatigable*' or 'Sausages', my listeners will have no idea what I'm talking about. They will look around for some context that might help to explain what's in my mind, and if they don't find any they will conclude that there's something wrong with me — for indeed, speaking in isolated words can be a sign of mental disturbance.

Of all the constructions that we can make, the one that dominates the history of grammar is the sentence. Sentences make sense. That is their job. When we hear or see a sentence, the way it is constructed should convey a meaning that makes sense without having to ask for help. Sentences stand on

their own two feet. They have a certain independence. (5)This is the basis of the notion that a sentence needs to feel complete.

＜中略＞

There *is* a feeling of completeness when we reach the end of a sentence, but it is a completeness that comes from the way the sentence is constructed, not from the thoughts that are in it. Sentences are said to be 'grammatically complete'. [. . .] The following aren't:

a very large tree
walking down the road
I saw a car and

To make them grammatical, we need to add some structure, such as:

A very large tree was blocking the road.
Walking down the road, we sang songs.
I saw a car and a bus.

We show this completeness in writing by using a mark of final punctuation, such as a (6)full stop. We show it in speech using patterns of definite intonation. Say one of those complete sentences aloud, and you will say it with an intonation pattern that tells your listener your sentence has come to an end. This was the very first feature of English that Suzie learned: how to make a sentence sound finished, so that a listener will respond to it.

出典：Crystal, David. *Making Sense: The Glamorous Story of English Grammar.* Profile Books, 2017. 抜粋の上，一部変更。

(注)

ambiguous　複数の意味にとれる

vocalizations　発音された音

babbling　(乳児などが)バブバブ言っている

technical term　専門用語

acquisition　習得

indefatigable　疲れを知らない

問 1　下線部(1)の理由を日本語で説明しなさい。

問 2　下線部(2)が具体的にどのようなことを指しているかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 3　下線部(3)の用語が何を指すかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 4　下線部(4)を，指示語の指すものを明らかにする英語に書き換えなさい。

問 5　下線部(5)を，指示語の指すものを明らかにして和訳しなさい。

問 6　下線部(6)を英単語一語に書き換えなさい。

Ⅱ 次の文章は，スティーヴ・キャスナー(Steve Casner)の著書 *Careful: A User's Guide to Our Injury-Prone Minds* について書いたものです。本文を読んで，問1～問6の設問に答えなさい。＊が付いている表現には本文の後に注があります。また，本文中[...]とあるのは，原文を中略していることを示しています。

Casner argues we're in the midst of a safety crisis. In 1918, one in twenty people died in an accident of some kind; by 1992, that number had been reduced to one in forty, through regulations, innovations, and public-awareness campaigns. But then the decline in the accidental-death rate stopped — and, since 2000, it has actually risen. [...] We are now, Casner says, about as safe as we were thirty years ago. Casner has some theories about why this is happening. One is "risk homeostasis"(1) — our tendency, once we're safer, to take more risks (bicyclists who wear helmets, for example, tend to ride closer to cars than those who don't). New inventions play a role — smartphones that distract us, medications* that confuse us; so does the new popularity of adventure sports, such as rock climbing. [...] Another significant factor is that people are living longer, into frail, accident-prone* old age.

＜中略＞

Accidents come in many forms. Annually, three hundred and thirty-three thousand Americans cut themselves so badly with kitchen knives that they have to go to the emergency room.(2) Twenty-one thousand people hurt themselves with food processors; twenty-eight thousand injure themselves with hammers; forty thousand are wounded, somehow, by their washing machines. In 2010, fifty-one thousand car crashes and four hundred and forty deaths resulted from objects, such as mattresses, falling off automobile roof racks and into traffic. [...]

Casner finds the word "accident" misleading; he distinguishes between "mistakes" and "errors."(3) A mistake is "the flawless execution* of a mostly dumb* idea" — it's what happens when you should have known better. Many

of the hundred and forty thousand people who fall off ladders every year do so because they stand on the rung* that says "Not a step." That's a mistake. But errors are inevitable: even a competent and well-trained pilot will, eventually, glance at a lever in the "On" position and think that it is actually "Off." [...] The core problem is that minds wander. A French psychologist surveyed emergency room patients who had been in car accidents; he found that half of them were lost in thought at the moment of the crash.

"The U.S. airline crash rate over the past ten years is approaching 0 percent," Casner writes, in large part because pilots, in addition to training themselves not to make mistakes, also employ various systems designed to combat error. Every commercial flight has two pilots, two air-traffic controllers, and even two flight computers. The pilots rely on checklists to make sure no steps are skipped; they use "callouts*" — "Gear down, flaps fifteen" — to ensure that everyone is paying attention. Pilots never multitask*: if a pilot finds that she has to look at a map, she tells her co-pilot, "It's your airplane," and waits for an affirmative* response — "I've got the jet" — before shifting focus.(4)

Casner thinks we should act like pilots in our own homes. Parents watching kids at a swimming pool should utilize a "water-watcher" card(5) to make attentional handoffs official: the person holding the card watches the kids, and must pass the card on to someone else before looking away from the pool and communing with his phone. [...] Casner writes that around sixty thousand kids get their fingers caught in doors each year; around a thousand suffer amputation*. "Why not make everybody call out 'Hands clear' when closing a door?" he asks. "There is never perfect compliance* with these procedures, but it brings the chaos down to a more manageable level."

To an extent, we are accident-prone because we are imaginative. We are determined to use familiar tools in novel ways — we might use a knife handle, say, to break up ice in the freezer, or a screwdriver to pry open* a stuck

drawer. The problem is that we imagine how things will go right but not how they will go wrong. [. . .] Casner worries that our optimism about our own plans might be an insurmountable* part of our evolutionary heritage*. Recalling the time he fell off a chair while trying to replace the batteries in his smoke detector — he should have used a ladder — Casner reflects that, in our primate* past, it was (6)the climbers who ate.

出典：Rothman, Joshua. "Be Careful! Your Mind Makes Accidents Inevitable." *The New Yorker*, June 14, 2017. 抜粋の上，一部変更。

(注)

medications　薬物

accident-prone　事故を起こしがちな

flawless execution　落ち度のない遂行

dumb　愚かな

rung　はしごの横木

callouts　声に出して言うこと

multitask　同時に複数のことをする

affirmative　肯定の

amputation　切断

compliance　遵守

pry open　こじ開ける

insurmountable　克服できない

heritage　受け継いだもの

primate　霊長類の

問 1　下線部(1)とはどのようなことかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 2　下線部(2)を和訳しなさい。

問 3　下線部(3)の原因が何であると述べられているかを日本語で答えなさい。

問 4　下線部(4)が具体的にどのようなことを指しているのかを日本語で答えなさい。

問 5　下線部(5)がどのようにして使うものであるのかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 6　下線部(6)は，どのようなことをする傾向をもつものたちのことを指すかを，この段落の趣旨から判断して日本語で説明しなさい。

Ⅲ　A・Bの問題に答えなさい。

A．1～5の上下の英文が同様の意味になるように，太字で書かれた単語を含む2～4語の単語を空欄に入れなさい。

例) The party was a success because everybody remembered to bring a present.

forgot

The party was a success because no one forgot to bring a present.

1. The table was too heavy for Charles to lift.

strong

Charles was _____ to be able to lift the table.

2. I think my hair needs cutting. I'll go to the hairdresser's tomorrow.

my

I think I ought to _____. I'll go to the hairdresser's tomorrow.

3. Roy and I enjoy each other's company a lot.

get

Roy and I _____ really well.

4. Provided that you listen to Theresa carefully, you'll understand.

as

As _____ you listen to Theresa carefully, you'll understand.

5. It is ten years since I last smoked.

for

I _____ ten years.

B．1～3の文を指示に従って書き換えなさい。

例）同様の意味になるように，与えられた出だしに続けて文を完成させなさい。

My father refused me permission to go to the party.

My father wouldn't let me go to the party.

1. 同様の意味になるように，主語を Laura とする文に書き換えなさい。

People think that Laura paid too much.

2. 同様の意味になるように，引用符(“　”)を用いないで発言内容を伝える文に書き換えなさい。

“I'll probably see you later,” said William to Mary.

3. 同様の意味になるように，与えられた出だしに続けて文を完成させなさい。

I'd prefer you not to smoke in this room.

I'd rather _____.