

令和5年度入学試験問題

外国語

英語

150点満点

《配点は、一般選抜学生募集要項に記載のとおり。》

(注意)

1. 問題冊子および解答冊子は監督者の指示があるまで開かないこと。
2. 問題冊子は表紙のほかに6ページある。
3. 問題は全部で4題ある(1～6ページ)。
4. 試験開始後、解答冊子の表紙所定欄に学部名・受験番号・氏名をはっきり記入すること。表紙には、これら以外のことを書いてはならない。
5. 解答は、すべて解答冊子の指定された箇所に記入し、解答欄におさめること。
6. 解答に関係のないことを書いた答案は無効にすることがある。
7. 解答冊子は、どのページも切り離してはならない。
8. 問題冊子は持ち帰ってもよいが、解答冊子は持ち帰ってはならない。

I

次の文章を読み、下線をほどこした部分(1)~(3)を和訳しなさい。 (50点)

Of course, one of the features of modern life, mostly thanks to the internet, is that we all have to constantly make choices about what to pay attention to — what to spend our time on, even if it is for just a few minutes. Many of us today have instant access to far more information than we can ever hope to process, which has meant that our average attention span is getting shorter. The more ‘stuff’ we have to think about and focus on, the less time we are (1) able to devote to each particular thing. People are quick to blame the internet for this reduced attention span, but while social media certainly plays its part, it is not entirely to blame. This trend can be traced back to when our world first started to become connected early in the last century as technology gave us access to an ever-increasing amount of information.

Today we are exposed to twenty-four-hour breaking news and an exponential rise in the amount of produced and consumed information. As the number of different issues that form our collective public discourse continues to increase, the amount of time and attention we are able to devote to each one inevitably gets compressed. It isn’t that our total engagement with all this (2) information is any less, but rather that as the information competing for our attention becomes denser our attention gets spread more thinly, with the result that public debate becomes increasingly fragmented and superficial. The more quickly we switch between topics, the more quickly we lose interest in the previous one. We then find ourselves increasingly engaging only with those subjects that interest us, leading us to become less broadly informed — and potentially less confident in evaluating information outside of the spheres with which we are most familiar.

I am not advocating that we should all devote more time and attention to every topic we encounter, whether we are exposed to information through our

family, friends or work colleagues, or by reading books and magazines, the mainstream media, online or on social media, as that would be impossible. But we must learn how to discriminate between what is important, useful and interesting, what is deserving of our attention and time, and what is not. As Feynman so emphatically pointed out, in his response to the journalist's request for a pithy summary of his Nobel Prize work, the topics we do choose to spend more time thinking about and digesting will inevitably require a certain level of commitment. In science, we know that to truly understand a subject requires time and effort. The reward is that concepts which may at first have seemed impenetrable turn out to be comprehensible, straightforward, sometimes even simple. At worst, we acknowledge that they are indeed complicated — not because we are unable to think them through thoroughly and make sense of them, but because they just are complicated.

So, this is the takeaway for us all in daily life. Do you need a PhD in climate science to know that recycling your rubbish is better for the planet than throwing it all in the ocean? Of course not. ⁽³⁾ But taking some time to dig a little deeper into a subject and weighing up the evidence, the pros and cons about an issue, before making up your mind can help you make better decisions in the long run.

Most things in life are difficult to begin with. But, if you're prepared to try, you can cope with far more than you imagine.

II

次の文章を読み、下線をほどこした部分(1)~(3)を和訳しなさい。

(50点)

What are we trying to understand when we try to understand consciousness? Not only do philosophers have no agreed-upon definition of consciousness, some think that it can't be defined at all, that you can understand conscious experiences only by having them. Such philosophers see ⁽¹⁾ consciousness as Louis Armstrong purportedly saw jazz: if you need to ask what it is, you're never going to know. Indeed, the task of explaining consciousness to someone who professes not to know—and there are philosophers who do profess this—is much more challenging than that of explaining jazz to the uninitiated. If you don't know what jazz is, you can at least listen to music that is classified as jazz and compare it to its precursor ragtime, its cousin the blues, and its alter ego classical music. Presumably, such an exercise will give you a sense of jazz. But with consciousness, there is nothing to compare it to, since when you are not conscious, you are not aware of anything. Furthermore, jazz has been highly theorized since Armstrong's time, so a trip through the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts may very well provide some insight into the nature of jazz for those who do not know.

Nevertheless, there are written accounts of consciousness intended to provide a sense of what consciousness is for those who claim not to know. Consciousness, it is said, is the state you are in when you are awake or dreaming and what you lack when you are in a dreamless sleep, under anaesthesia*, or in a coma. Yet for those who claim not to know what the word 'consciousness' means, such an explanation will fall flat. Which aspect of being awake illustrates consciousness? Without knowledge of the relevant difference between being awake and being in a dreamless sleep, it would be difficult to know. After all, when I'm awake, my brain activity is different from when I'm in a dreamless sleep, but if I had wanted to convey that consciousness is merely a certain form of brain activity, I could have done that

directly. Of course, you may have understood the proffered explanation of consciousness, but I imagine that you understood what consciousness was before you read it.

⁽²⁾ Some of the very same philosophers who think that nothing can be said to enlighten those who claim to not know what consciousness is have found quite a bit to say about what it is to those who claim to already know. And much of their discussion centres on the idea that for you to be conscious there has to be something it is like to be you: while rocks have no inner experiences — or so most presume — and thus there is nothing it is like to be a rock, you know that there is something it is like to be you, something it is like to savour your morning coffee, to feel the soft fur of a kitten, to feel the sting when that adorable kitten scratches you. These experiences are conscious experiences; they have what philosophers refer to as ‘qualitative content’ or ‘qualia’; there is *something it is like* to have these experiences. And that there is something it is like to have the wealth of experiences we have is, according to various philosophers, what makes life worth living. To be sure, whether the meaning of life resides in inner experience or in outward actions aimed at making the world a better place is worth pondering. But in any event, it does seem that without consciousness, something significant about our lives would be missing.

⁽³⁾ The claim that to be conscious is for there to be ‘something it is like to be you’ can be described in terms of having a ‘point of view’, or a ‘perspective’. To have a point of view in this sense is simply to be the centre of conscious experience. Of course, to explain consciousness in terms of having a point of view and then to explain what it is to have a point of view in terms of being conscious is circular. Yet, on the assumption that we cannot explain consciousness in terms of something else (you’re not going to understand it, unless you have it), such a circle is to be expected — whether it is a virtuous or a vicious one, however, can be debated.

* anaesthesia 麻醉

Ⅲ 次の文章を英訳しなさい。

(25 点)

人間、損得勘定で動くところがない。あとで見返りがあるだろうと便宜を図っても、恩恵を受けた方はコロッと忘れてしまうものだ。その一方で、善意で助けた相手がずっと感謝していて、こちらが本当に困ったときに恩に報いてくれることもある。「情けは人のためならず」というが、まさに人の世の真理を突いた言葉である。

IV 次の Jo と Naomi の会話が成立するように、下線部(1)~(4)に入る適当な発言を[]で示した語数で記入し、1文を完成させなさい。解答欄の各下線の上に単語1語を記入すること。カンマ(,)等の記号は、その直前の語と同じ下線に含めることとし、1語と数えない。短縮形(例: don't)は1語と数える。
(25点)

Jo: I was just reading an article about lying. Did you know that most people tell lies every day?

Naomi: What? Is that information accurate? I have some doubts because
(1) _____ . [12語以内]

Jo: Yeah, I had a hard time accepting it at first, too, but then I considered white lies.

Naomi: I'm not sure I understand. What are white lies?

Jo: They are small lies that most people think are harmless. It's like telling someone that their new haircut looks nice even if you liked their hair better before. You tell the lie just to make them feel better.

Naomi: Oh, I get it. So, another example might be
(2) _____ .
[24語以内]

Jo: Right. But white lies are not just used to make people feel better. Any small lies that do not really harm anyone are called white lies. For example, if you forget your homework, you might
(3) _____ . [12語以内]

Naomi: I have to confess that I have told a lie like that before. In fact, I suppose that telling white lies is necessary for society because
(4) _____ . [16語以内]

Jo: Yes, I guess it is important for those reasons.

問題は、このページで終わりである。