

大阪大学

英語

問題

2017年度入試

- 【学部】 文学部、人間科学部、外国語学部、法学部、経済学部、理学部、医学部、歯学部、薬学部、工学部、基礎工学部
- 【入試名】 前期日程
- 【試験日】 2月25日



「過去問ライブラリーは、（株）旺文社が刊行する「全国大学入試問題正解」を中心とした過去問、研究・解答（解答・解説）を掲載しています。本サービスに関する知的財産権その他一切の権利は、（株）旺文社または各情報提供者に帰属します。本サービスに掲載の全部または一部の無断複製、配布、転載、譲渡等を禁止します。各設問に対する「研究・解答」は原則として旺文社が独自に作成したものを掲載しています。掲載問題のうち★印を付したものは、著作権法第67条の2第1項の規定により文化庁長官に裁定申請を行った上で利用しています。

裁定申請日 【2017年】 8/1 【2018年】 4/24、9/20 【2019年】 6/20

1 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) The advantage of the scientific approach over other ways of knowing about the world is that it provides an objective set of rules for gathering, evaluating, and reporting information, such that our ideas can be refuted or replicated by others. This does not mean that intuition and authority are not important, however. Scientists often rely on intuition and assertions of authorities for ideas for research. Moreover, there is nothing wrong with accepting the assertions of authority as long as we don't accept them as scientific evidence.
- (B) Animals that are active at night usually have large eyes that let them make use of any available light. With owls, the eyes are so big in comparison to the head that there is little room for eye muscles, meaning owls can't move their eyes. Instead, owls must move their entire head to follow the movement of prey. However, having fixed eyes gives owls better focus with both eyes looking in the same direction. And even though it seems that owls can twist their head completely around, most owls turn their head no more than 270 degrees in either direction.

2 著作権等の都合で問題掲載を見合わせております。

3 (外国語学部志願者のみ)

次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

There was a reason English food was so awful: the English were not bothered enough about how it tasted to demand it be any better. When John Cleese was taken out for a meal by his parents in the 1950s, the priorities were clear-cut. His father had worked in India, Hong Kong and Canton. ① Yet for all the breadth of vision that the Empire gave that generation, they retained the very clearest sense of themselves. 'You'd think it might have opened their palates,' he told me. 'But they were completely uninterested in food. My parents used to choose a restaurant not because of the food on offer but because the plates were hot.'

The style of restaurants patronized by this middle class reflected their approach to life. They were dark, wood-beamed, furnished with a lot of leather. They were masculine places. There was a right piece of cutlery for each stage of the meal, and a right and wrong way to use it. You drank soup out of the side of the spoon by sitting with a straight back and tilting the spoon on to your lower lip; you did not insert the spoon into your mouth. ② And, although the language changed from one social class to another, you showed your satisfaction at the end of the meal by words to the effect of 'delightful meal. I'm quite full': satisfaction was a matter of quantity. If you were offered second helpings you accepted with an apology for enjoying the food: 'I really shouldn't, you know, but perhaps a little.'

And yet there was always plenty to celebrate about English food. Historically, English cooking, for the privileged few, at least, could have held its own with any in Europe. Richard II is said to have employed 2,000 cooks to manage his entertaining. Edward III's son, the Duke of Clarence, threw a banquet for 10,000 with thirty courses, while Henry V celebrated his coronation by having the conduit of Palace Yard run with claret. No creature was too great or small to escape the dinner plate. Cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, deer and boar are unremarkable enough (although not — as frequently happened at medieval banquets — in the same meal). But then there were the fowl: chickens, swans, peacocks — often served in their feathers — pheasants, partridges, pigeons, larks, mallard, geese, woodcock, thrushes, curlews, snipe, quail, bitterns, to say nothing of cygnets, herons and finches. There were fish, from salmon and herring to tench and eels, shellfish from crabs to whelks, all finished off with custards and purées, curds, fritters, cakes and tarts.

Even in the midst of the food rationing which accompanied the Second World War, George Orwell was able to produce a list of delicacies that were nearly unobtainable abroad. He included kippers, Yorkshire pudding, Devonshire cream, muffins and crumpets, Christmas pudding, treacle tart and apple dumplings, potatoes roasted under the joint, minted new potatoes, bread, horseradish, mint and apple sauce, numerous pickles, Oxford marmalade, marrow jam and bramble jelly, Stilton and Wensleydale cheeses and Cox's orange pippins. We could all add to it. ③ But the English failed to see food as an art form. The word 'restaurant' is French and the reason menus appears in French is that the English language never developed the vocabulary to describe cooking properly. The commanding heights of English *cuisine* have been occupied by French *chefs*.

The ideal Englishman and -woman had not, in the immortal words, been put on earth to enjoy themselves. ④ Throughout English history the elite has told the rest of the country that too much interest in food is somehow immoral. The seventeenth-century Puritans, with their firm belief that plain food was God's food, cast a long shadow. Once the Industrial Revolution had drawn workers into the towns, knowledge of country cooking died. Certainly it ranked very low in the priorities of empire-builders. 'Roast beef and mutton are all they have which is good', said the German poet Heinrich Heine after a visit early in the nineteenth century. 'Heaven keep every Christian from their gravies... And heaven guard everyone from their naïve vegetables, which, boiled away in water, are brought to the table just as God made them.'

Among the metropolitan elite it has become fashionable to claim that everything has changed since then and that the English have lost their indifference to food. London, it was being confidently asserted, is the gastronomic capital of the world, food the new rock-'n'-roll. We shall see. While it is true that the country now has an abundance of first-class restaurants, they tend to be concentrated in London and a handful of cities outside, and to be high-price. If you want to eat well in Birmingham or Manchester, you are best advised to head for Chinatown or the Bangladeshi district.

It would be hard to exaggerate the benefit for English cooking of the arrival of a sizeable immigrant community. Although most English people still seem to cite fish and chips as the quintessential English food, the number of fish-and-chip shops in Britain has almost halved: at one time there were 15,000 of them, a figure which has now fallen to 8,500. Testament to the astonishing rise in popularity of food from other cultures is that there are as many Chinese and other oriental restaurants in Britain, and a further 7,300 Indian food outlets. John Koon, the man who invented the Chinese takeaway, built his fortune and career on the discovery that while the English might not know what beansprouts were, they could tell the difference between the letters A and B. ⑤ His Cathay Restaurant, near Piccadilly Circus, would never have taken off had he not found a way of making the exotic mundane through Set Menus.

As Chinese food gained in popularity after World War Two, he was invited to open a kitchen in Billy Butlin's holiday camps, then catering to the British taste for holidays *en masse*. Here, he solved the problem of resistance to funny foreign food by inventing the revolting combination of chicken chop suey and chips. Customers loved it.

The point is not that the general standard of food in England is now superb; it is not. For the majority of people, eating out is to consume fat-filled fast food, and to eat in, to be a victim of something prepackaged in industrial quantities in a factory somewhere. ⑥ But attitudes to food have changed. Every decade serves up a new confection of television chefs who can expect to get very rich from their cookery courses. The kitchen, rather than the drawing room, sitting room or parlour, has become the centre of the house and you are no longer thought degenerate if you confess a liking for good food. It is part of a wholesale broader change.

設問(1) 下線部①について、John Cleese の言葉では具体的にどのように語られているか、日本語で説明しなさい。

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、英語という言語に具体的にどのように現れているか、日本語で説明しなさい。

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の Cathay Restaurant が成功した理由を日本語で説明しなさい。

設問(6) 下線部⑥はどういうことか、全文の内容を踏まえて、日本語で説明しなさい。

4 インターネットの Q&A サイトに中学 2 年生から次のような相談がありました。

私は、はっきり言って勉強が嫌いです。特に嫌いなのが英語と数学です。一生外国に行くつもりなんかないし、日本では日本語が使えれば生きていけるのに、なぜ使う必要もない外国の言葉を、こんなに一生懸命勉強するのかわかりません。数学もそうです。買い物をするのに方程式や図形はいりません。なぜ x や y を長々と書きまくるのか、全然理解できません。他の科目もいっぱいおぼえさせられるので嫌いです。(でも体育や音楽は楽しいから好きです。)

この悩みをお父さんに言っても、ただ勉強しなさいと言うだけです。でも、正月におじさんに聞いたところ、お父さんも中学の時は全然勉強しなかったそうです。なぜ私は勉強しなければならないんでしょうか？

さて、あなたならこの相談者にどのようなアドバイスをしますか。70語程度の英語で相談者へのアドバイスを書きなさい。

5 (外国語学部以外の志願者のみ)

次の日本文(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、文学部以外の学部の志願者は(ロ)を選んで解答しなさい。**

(A) (すべての学部の志願者)

幼稚園でほんとうに自由遊びをさせている幼稚園は、保護者の評判が悪いんです。「先生がなんにもしてくれへん」と言うて。ところが、ほんとうに子どもに自由に遊ばせている先生というのは、すごいエネルギーがいるんです。子どもはいろんなことをするから、危ないと思いながら、ずっと見守っていなければならないでしょう。これは、ある程度、腹がすわってないとできない。

(B) (イ) (文学部の志願者)

いよいよ神様に召されるその時が来て、この世とのお別れの記念にこれまで愛聴してきた数多(あまた)の名曲の中からただ一曲を聞きながら死んでゆけるとしたら、どの曲を自分は選ぶだろうか。

ひとり私に限らず、時間とともに消えてゆくゆえに美しい音楽の愛好者なら一度はこの問いを自らに発して楽しいような切ないような思いに暫(しば)し浸ったことがあるのではないか。

(ロ) (文学部以外の学部の志願者) (省略)

6 (外国語学部志願者のみ)

次の日本文の下線部(1)～(3)の意味を英語で表しなさい。

(1) 人はどういうわけか、年齢を重ねれば重ねてゆくほど、「童心に帰りたい」という本能が強まってくるようで、その本能を満足させるために趣味を持つのではないか。そんなふうにも思えてくる。

(2) 無心になって没頭できるような趣味を持つ人には、若々しい人が多い。たぶん、そうやって、ちよくちよく童心に帰って遊んでいるから老け込むことがないのではないだろうか。

それはともかく、(3) 年をとってから新しいことを始めるよりも、子供の頃に多少なりとも経験していたことを復活させるほうが、抵抗感なく、すーっとその世界に入り込むことができるだろう。また、その趣味を途中で投げだしてしまわないコツになるのではないだろうか。

子どものころ、だれでも、ときを忘れるほど夢中になったものがあるだろう。(いまさら)などと思わずに、あのときの心のドキメキを思い出してみよう。

(斎藤茂太『笑うとなぜいいか?』)

7 (外国語学部志願者のみ リスニング問題・解答) 省略