

2020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18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。

The characteristics of symbols in general, and their essential difference from signs, must go on record. A term which is used symbolically and not signally does *not* trigger action appropriate to the presence of its object. If I say: "Napoleon," you do not bow to the conqueror of Europe as though I had introduced him, but (a) think of him. If I mention a Mr. Smith of our common acquaintance, you may be led to tell me something about him "behind his back," which is just what you would *not* do in his presence. Thus the symbol for Mr. Smith — his name — may very well initiate an act appropriate (b) to his absence. Raised eyebrows and a look at the door, interpreted as a *sign* that he is coming, would stop you in the midst of your narrative; *that* action would be directed toward Mr. Smith in person.

Symbols are not proxy for their objects, but are ⁽¹⁾vehicles for the conception of objects. To conceive a thing or a situation is not the same thing as to "react toward it" (c), or to be aware of its presence. In talking *about* things we have conceptions of them, not the things themselves; and *it is the conceptions, not the things, that symbols directly "mean."* Behavior toward conceptions is what words normally encourage; this is the typical process of thinking.

Of course, a word may be used as a sign, but that is not its primary role. Its signaling character has to be indicated by some special modification — by a tone of voice, a gesture (such as pointing or staring), or the location of a placard bearing the word. In itself it is a symbol, associated with a conception, not directly with a public object or event. The fundamental difference between signs and symbols is this difference of association, and consequently of their *use* by the third party to the meaning function, the subject; signs (A) their objects to him, whereas symbols *lead him to* (B) their objects. The fact that the same item — say, the little mouthy noise we call a "word" — may serve in either capacity, does not obliterate the cardinal distinction between the two functions it may assume.

The simplest kind of symbolic meaning is probably that which belongs to proper

names. A personal name evokes a conception of something given as a unit in the subject's experience, something concrete and therefore easy to recall in imagination. Because the name belongs to a notion so obviously and unequivocally derived from an individual object, it is often supposed to "mean" that object as a sign would "mean" it. This belief is reinforced by the fact that ⁽²⁾a name borne by a living person is at once a symbol by which we think of the person, and a call-name by which we signal him. Through a confusion of these two functions, the proper name is often deemed the bridge from animal language, or sign-using, to human language, which is symbol-using. Dogs, we are told, understand names — not only their own, but their masters'. So they do, indeed; but they understand them *only in the capacity of call-names*. If you say "James" to a dog whose master bears that name, the dog will interpret the sound as a sign, and *look for* James. Say it to a person who knows someone called thus, and he will ask: "What about James?" ⁽³⁾That simple question is forever beyond the dog; signification is the only meaning a name can have for him — a meaning which the master's name shares with the master's smell, with his footfall, and his characteristic ring of the door-bell. In a human being, however, the name evokes the *conception* of a certain man so called, and prepares the mind for further conceptions in which the notion of that man figures; therefore, the human being (d) asks: "What about James?"

(Source: Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*)

問1 空欄(a)～(d)に入れるのもっとも適切な副詞を次の①～④から選び、その番号を書きなさい。ただし、同じ番号を繰り返して用いないこと。

- ① merely ② naturally ③ overtly ④ particularly

問2 下線部(1)が表している symbols の特徴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3 論旨を踏まえて、空欄(A)と空欄(B)に入れるのもっとも適切な語の組み合わせを次の①～④からひとつ選び、その番号を書きなさい。

- ① A: imply B: mention ② A: indicate B: arrange
③ A: define B: imagine ④ A: announce B: conceive

問4 下線部(2)を和訳しなさい。

問5 下線部(3)のように言えるのはなぜか。その理由を30字以内の日本語でまとめなさい。

2

次の英文を読んで以下の間に答えなさい。

“A leader is best when people barely know he exists,” surmised the Chinese philosopher Lao-tzu. Yet no modern prime minister or president would run things from the back room. Today’s figureheads are lauded for having eccentricities of character that set them apart from the crowd—such as the superior charisma and intelligence of Churchill or Lincoln.

Our obsession with the personalities of great leaders is not consistent with the scientific basis of social hierarchies, according to two books. In *The New Psychology of Leadership*, psychologists A. Haslam, S. Reicher and M. Platow propose that successful stewardship (a) more to the good relationship between a leader and his or her followers than to an individual’s character. In *Selected*, psychologist M. van Vugt and journalist A. Ahuja take an evolutionary approach, suggesting that leadership emerged to aid the survival of small communities on the African plains.

Haslam, Reicher and Platow maintain that effective leadership is about (b) the hearts and minds of others rather than about good decision-making or management. “It is not about getting people to do things. It is about getting them to *want* to do things,” they remark. The authors cite laboratory studies which show that members who embody and promote a group’s shared values are more likely to emerge as (I). Leaders must be seen to be both typical of their group and acting in its collective interests.

Influential leaders such as Churchill, Lincoln, John F. Kennedy and Sonia Gandhi worked hard to build this shared identity, which they enhanced using their rhetoric and creative skills. The book’s examples are drawn mainly from politics, but the principle applies to others whose rank is socially (c), such as captains of sports teams, expedition leaders and army generals.

But why are there leaders at all? In *Selected*, Ahuja and van Vugt propose that among early humans, those who had the cognitive capacity to follow others sought safety in numbers. At the same time, leaders made survival more likely for everyone by binding groups together and (d) expertise—for example, on which foods could be safely

eaten.

Rather than promoting an individual to rule in all eventualities, our early ancestors looked to different people to lead in varying circumstances. A group would follow one leader when hunting, another during war and a third during times of sickness. "If you were to meet a tribesman and ask him to 'Take me to your leader,' he would be bewildered by your request," the authors note. This changed with the development of agriculture 13,000 years ago, which led to an increase in the size and complexity of societies.

Ahuja and van Vugt argue that our brains are still hard-wired for the savannah. Our psychology remains suited to the dynamics of (A) groups, not to the hierarchies of (B) populations that are common in the political systems and organizations of today. Leadership structures would do better to reflect the constraints of our evolutionary history, they suggest. This points to informal, decentralized systems that are limited to 150 members, a size at which people can know each other by name.

Undemocratic leaders are a recent phenomenon, according to van Vugt and Ahuja. They claim that the agricultural revolution unleashed "our primal tendency to dominate and exploit others," as it allowed leaders to stockpile food and use it to exert control. *The New Psychology of Leadership* barely touches on this negative side of governance, beyond warning that leaders who think individual character is most important will believe that \mathcal{A} [alone, any, due, is, success, them, to], and will consider themselves above the group.

A greater challenge would be to ask how leaders who have gained their followers' confidence might use it to (e) their group's interests with those of others, as Nelson Mandela managed to do in South Africa.

(Source: Michael Bond, "The Makings of Great Leaders," *Nature*)

3

Read the following text and answer the questions.

If you were to travel through West Africa, going from Senegal in the northwest to Cameroon in the southeast — an area smaller than the United States — you would encounter more than 700 distinct languages, some as different from one another as Chinese and English. Cameroon, with a population of 12 million, is home to 275 languages; tiny Togo has about 50. This plentitude of tongues has puzzled linguists. The inhabitants, after all, are not mutually isolated by massive mountains as are the peoples of Papua New Guinea, the only place in the world with a linguistic diversity exceeding West Africa's.

Now Daniel Nettle, a linguistic anthropologist at Oxford, has a new theory that may explain how such a Babel evolved. Nettle has been studying the distribution of West African languages for four years, comparing ecological maps with maps showing the ranges of various languages, something no one had done before. He noted, as have others, that languages become more numerous toward the equator. But Nettle noticed something else: a direct correlation between the length of the rainy season and the number of languages in a region. In his study, Nettle divided the West African countries into squares — each several thousand square miles in area — and counted the number of speakers of each language per square. He then compared this with the rainfall on each square.

In the south, where the rainy season lasts 11 months, he found the greatest concentration of languages — in some places as many as 80 per square. 1 Farther north, in dry savanna lands with less than four months of rain, the number of languages fell, dropping to an average of three per square near the Sahara.

Thus Niger, a vast, arid country, has only 20 languages; while farther south, equally large but wetter Nigeria has 430. Languages with the tiniest range — such as Horom, spoken by 500 people in northern Nigeria — may be restricted to a single village. Villagers typically are multilingual or speak a lingua franca that enables them to trade with a neighboring clan. 2 Skeptics might object that the south's linguistic diversity merely reflects the region's greater population density. But Nettle points out that

in one of the most populous areas — northern Nigeria — a single language, Hausa, dominates.

Nettle now believes he knows how these languages developed. ‘If you have abundant rainfall year-round, then you can pretty much produce all the food you need,’ he says. 3 But in areas with more seasonal crops, where failures can bring famine, relations with other groups become crucial. ‘If you have six dry months, you can’t produce food for that period,’ says Nettle. ‘So you need to form a social network, which can bring in the food.’ And the larger the network, the greater the likelihood of a common language.

West African societies largely conform to Nettle’s theory. In the south, yams, sweet potatoes, and cassavas are the staple crops. Though they need almost constant rain, they are reliable crops that can be harvested throughout the year. Thus their growers can live in small groups and speak a language that no outsider understands. In northern Nigeria or Ghana, where the rain falls for only six months, the staples are cereals like millet and sorghum. 4 Although these can be stored during the dry season, shortfalls do occur, so trade — and a common language — becomes important. The trend continues even farther north, near the Sahara, where Fulani cattle herders range over vast distances.

This linguistic richness may not last. ‘I suspect that in a couple of hundred years in Nigeria, you are not going to find 400-odd languages,’ Nettle says. ‘You might find 40.’ If you can understand Hausa, spoken by 20 million people, ‘you can watch TV, you can get hold of currency, which can give you medicine and fertilizer,’ he says. ‘The big languages have become much more attractive because what they offer now is access to the whole industrial economy.’

(Source: Josie Glausiusz, *The Ecology of Language*)

Question 1 What does the article say about Papua New Guinea? Choose the correct answer.

- (a) Communities in Papua New Guinea are separated from one another by mountains.
- (b) Linguists are puzzled by the number of languages found in Papua New Guinea.
- (c) Linguists have not studied the languages of Papua New Guinea because it is so isolated.
- (d) Papua New Guinea has a greater number of distinct languages than any other region in the world except West Africa.
- (e) Papua New Guinea has fewer languages than West Africa.

Question 2 What new discovery did Nettle make? Choose the correct answer.

- (a) More languages are spoken in areas which have higher rainfall.
- (b) The further south one goes, the fewer languages there are.
- (c) The further south one goes, the more languages there are.
- (d) More languages are concentrated around the equator.
- (e) It is likely that West Africa will continue to have many different languages.

Question 3 Look at the sentence below, which has been removed from the text.

Contact with the outside world is not essential to survival.

In what position – should it appear? Choose the correct number.

Question 4 Would a world with one language be better than a world with many? Give two reasons to support your opinion. Write your answer in English in the space provided.

4

次の英文を読んで以下の間に答えなさい。

Do you ever have trouble seeing the big picture when you are trying to solve a problem? ⁽¹⁾If so, you're not alone. In fact, psychologist Alison Gopnik, PhD, has found that when it comes to problem-solving, adults are wired to find a solution rather than create a solution.

Gopnik, author of “The Philosophical Baby,” has found that “grown-ups are more focused on making things happen and getting things done, so we tend to have a somewhat narrow, focused view. We weed out everything else.”

Because of this emphasis on (a), she argues, babies and young children sometimes have the advantage when it comes to discovery and (b). Unlike adults, babies and young children are not as focused on planning or decision-making; instead, “ア[everything, figuring, going, is, on, out, that, they're] around them,” Gopnik says. “Kids are much, much smarter than you think.”

“There are times when it's very helpful to put yourself in that baby mode of being open to lots of possibilities and not being so focused on the thing you need to do next,” she says.

Gopnik's findings are challenging traditional beliefs about the minds of babies and young children, for example, ⁽²⁾the notion that very young children do not understand the perspective of others — an idea philosophers and psychologists have defended for years.

Gopnik and colleague Betty Repacholi, PhD, conducted an experiment more than 10 years ago to counter this belief. In the “broccoli-goldfish study,” the psychologists gave 14- and 18-month-old babies bowls of raw broccoli and Pepperidge Farm® goldfish crackers. The babies tasted the food and made faces or gestures indicating whether they liked or did not like the vegetable or crackers.

The psychologists then tasted food from each bowl and made either a disgusted or happy face. Half of the time the researchers matched the babies' reactions to the food; the other half of the time, the experimenters demonstrated opposite reactions. Gopnik and Repacholi found that when the experimenter put her hand out to the babies and asked for

some, (I)

According to Gopnik, this simple experiment demonstrated that these children were capable of doing something difficult even for adults — recognizing that someone else has a different perspective and taking that perspective into account when deciding how to deal with them.

Babies and young children have a very different way of interacting with the world than adults. They're much worse at focusing on just one thing and better at paying attention to new or unexpected things. While this broad view of the world may not be the most efficient approach to getting things done, Gopnik's research suggests there are times that adults should change their (c) — during brainstorming sessions, for example — and enter into baby mode and open up to new possibilities.

Whether or not adults begin to take in the world through the perspective of young children, Gopnik suggests that society should give babies more (d) for their intelligence.

“Parents should appreciate that babies and young children are incredibly smart, but the way that their intelligence expresses itself is through their everyday (e) and interactions with the people around them and with everyday objects, not through being in structured classes or having (A) kinds of teaching,” says Gopnik.

(Source: PSYCHOLOGY: Science in Action. American Psychological Association)

問1 下線部 (1) の内容を 20 字以内の日本語でまとめなさい。

問2 空欄(a)～(e)に入れるのにもっとも適切な語を次の①～⑤から選び、その番号を書きなさい。ただし、同じ番号を繰り返して用いないこと。

① creativity ② credit ③ efficiency ④ exploration ⑤ framework

問3 文中ア[] 中の語を文意に沿うように並べかえなさい。

問4 下線部(2)の反証となる実験結果が空欄(I)に入る。その実験結果として、もっとも適切なものを次の(a)~(d)から選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (a) the 18-month-old babies would give her the food that the experimenter liked, rather than the food that the babies liked.
- (b) the 18-month-old babies would give her the food that the experimenter liked, rather than the food that the babies disliked.
- (c) the 18-month-old babies would give her the food that the experimenter disliked, rather than the food that the babies liked.
- (d) the 18-month-old babies would give her the food that the experimenter disliked, rather than the food that the babies disliked.

問5 論旨を踏まえて、空欄(A)に入れるのもっとも適切な語を次の①~⑤から選び、その番号を書きなさい。

- ① dubious ② explicit ③ imprecise ④ indefinite ⑤ radical