

令和6年度入学試験問題

外国語

(コミュニケーション英語Ⅰ・Ⅱ・Ⅲ・英語表現Ⅰ・Ⅱ)

注意事項

1. 試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子の中を見てはいけません。
2. 解答はすべて別紙解答用紙に記入下さい。
3. 解答用紙は5枚です。
4. 各解答用紙には受験番号を記入する欄がそれぞれ2箇所あります。
2箇所とも記入下さい。
5. 試験終了後、問題冊子は持ち帰り下さい。

I 次の英文を読み、以下の間に特に指示のない限り日本語で答えよ。

Eyes play a prominent role in our daily social encounters and are sometimes *metaphorically referred to as windows to our souls. There now is compelling evidence to support the notion that much information about another person's mind can be *gleaned from his or her eyes. In one proof of concept, the Reading the Mind in the Eye Test (RMET), developed by Simon Baron-Cohen and his group at Cambridge University in the UK, has documented our ability to identify inner states from the eyes and the region surrounding the eyes. The extent of information that eyes communicate about other minds might be somewhat limited, yet evidence argues against the long-held view of philosophers in the *skeptical tradition that the contents of other minds cannot be directly observed. Instead, human eyes form a bridge between self and other by providing direct access to another person's inner state.

The phenomenon is unique to humans alone. Indeed, after comparison with nearly half of all *primate species, the human eye has been shown to be *morphologically and responsively unique. Humans not only show the greatest horizontal *elongation of the eye outline and the largest amount of exposed tissue (called *sclera) around the eyeball, but are also the only species with sclera that is white. When compared with our closest living primate relatives, chimpanzees, we humans focus more steadily on the eye region when scanning faces. By 14 months of age, the human gaze follows eyes almost exclusively whereas other ((2)) rely more on head direction.

The sensitivity to eyes emerges early in human development. From birth, newborn infants show a preference for faces, despite their poor visual *acuity. Human infants prefer to look at faces that have eyes open versus eyes closed. Newborns exhibit a preference for faces only with naturally appearing eyes, including black *iris and white sclera, versus control faces with white iris and black sclera. And infants appear to glean emotional information about other

minds by gazing at eyes, literally recruiting brain regions that, in adults, are involved in understanding another person’s mental state. Strikingly, by seven months of age, infants detect emotional cues and distinguish between direct and *averted gaze solely on the basis of the eye whites.

The *attachment neurohormone *oxytocin modulates our response to eye cues. When the hormone is *administered through nasal passages during studies, subjects viewing faces show increased fixation on eyes. Oxytocin also significantly enhances the recognition of emotional and mental states from eye cues.

Reduced sensitivity to eyes and eye cues has been described as one of the earliest identifiable warning signs in the development of *autism spectrum disorder. Recent studies show that, along the autism spectrum, orientation to eyes is initially present in young infants but later declines between two and six months of age. Characteristic differences in the brain responses to eye-gaze cues recorded at age 6 to 10 months predicted autism diagnosed at 36 months.⁽³⁾ Furthermore, older children with autism display enhanced brain responses to eye cues after *intranasal oxytocin administration. The connection between oxytocin and mind-reading is nuanced indeed: research shows that genetic variations affecting oxytocin release and breastfeeding experience impact infants’ emotional response to eyes as early as seven months of age.

All in all, the ability to read other minds develops early in human infancy, and is deeply influenced by cues from the eyes. The phenomenon requires no explicit, conceptual grasp of other minds, but rather relies on direct experience of others’ emotional and mental states.

Of course, humans read others through a variety of modes — the sense of touch, for instance, or vocal cues. But eye cues have always been invaluable during close-range interactions lacking physical contact. Early in our evolution, eye cues were vital for cooperative hunting and *foraging, truly essential for groups hoping to avoid predators and catch prey. Today such cues help us

negotiate the world, whether passing through crowds or functioning on the job. Communicating through eyes is an aid to cooperation, helping us identify and coordinate with the best partners by gaining access to their minds. Eyes as windows into other minds can be considered a hallmark feature of human social functioning with deep biological roots.

(出典：Tobias Grossmann, “How we learn to read another’s mind by looking into their eyes” *Aeon*. July, 2017. 一部改変)

*注 metaphorically 比喩的に glean 探り出す
skeptical tradition 懐疑派 primate species 霊長類
morphologically 形態学的に elongation 伸長部
sclera 強膜(眼球の外側の白眼部分) acuity 鋭敏さ iris 虹彩
avert そらす attachment neurohormone 愛着を促す神経ホルモン
oxytocin オキシトシン administer 投与する
autism spectrum disorder 自閉スペクトラム症 intranasal 鼻腔内の
forage 食糧を得る

問 1 下線部(1)の比喩表現はどのようなことを言っているのか、本文に即して簡潔に説明せよ。

問 2 空欄(2)に当てはまる語を、以下の(i)~(v)から選べ。

- (i) great apes (ii) infants (iii) adults
(iv) chimpanzees (v) mammals

問 3 下線部(3)を訳せ。

問 4 eye cues の特徴は何か、本文に即して簡潔に説明せよ。

問 5 下線部(4)の内容を本文に即して簡潔に説明せよ。

II 次の英文を読み、以下の間に特に指示のない限り日本語で答えよ。

A law school professor I knew dressed casually for his classes, often in sandals and a T-shirt. However, the semester Steve co-taught a class, he wore traditional law school professor *attire: a long-sleeve collared shirt, *bowtie, and dark jacket. Why the wardrobe change? Because his co-teacher was female, he said. “To be taken seriously by the students, she couldn’t dress casually. I had to dress up since she couldn’t dress down.” In the short story “*The Czar’s Soliloquy”, Mark Twain writes:

“[One] realizes that without his clothes a man would be nothing at all; that the clothes do not merely make the man, the clothes are the man. . . . There is no power without clothes. It is the power that governs the human race. Strip its *chiefs to the skin, and no State could be governed; naked officials could exercise no authority. . . . A policeman in plain clothes is one man; in his uniform he is *ten. . . . No great title is efficient without clothes to support it.”

Twain wasn’t completely right. “Law professor” is a prestigious (i), yet Steve was not only *tenured but also respected by his students. Perhaps today Twain would revise his observation by noting that clothes are more important in making the woman than the man. The global organization Dress for Success, for example, is aimed at low-income women. As stated by Dr. Diane M. Turner-Bowker, “Clothing plays a role in impression formation and may affect poor women’s ability to obtain a good job.” There are similar programs for men, but they are on a much smaller scale.

Although men may have more flexibility in what they can wear, their choices are also *circumscribed. Just think how there is a greater variety of clothing in a women’s shop than in a men’s shop—a greater choice of color, style, and

patterns. A female executive may wear a red blazer but not a male executive, for example. The point is that dress functions as a form of non-verbal communication. It signals a person's identity that is a combination of cultural imperatives or prohibitions (somber clothes for a funeral), group identity (leather jacket and jeans for bikers), or personal choices (skirt or slacks). Wardrobes — and hairstyles — matter. In 1967, I wasn't considered suitable teacher material because my beard said to my interviewers that I was counter-cultural. Today the *semiotics of facial hair is more complicated. Times change, attitudes shift, and culture *morphs. What remains stable is that how we present ourselves is a mix of cultural conformity, group (ii), and personal expression.

Dress codes are instituted to enforce group norms, whether in schools or businesses. When the dress rule is challenged, often courts are called on to determine whether the codes are within the (iii) of the law. What we wear is a matter of identity. But which identity are we to assume? What happens when a person's gender or racial identity — two core social identities — is at odds with a school or employer's dress code? For example, a *binary-identifying student who otherwise presents as a male decides to wear a dress in school. Is identity as a student more important than that of gender?⁽²⁾ Or say a *white-shoe lawyer decides to wear *locs to work. Is their identity as a corporate lawyer more important than their identity as a Black person?

As stated by Seattle University Professor of Law Janet Ainsworth in her (iv) “What's Wrong with Pink Pearls and Cornrow Braids? Employee Dress Codes and the Semiotic Performance of Race and Gender in the Workplace,” conflict between employers and employees over dress codes serves both as an arena for worker resistance to employer assertions of control over the construction and performance of their “true selves”⁽³⁾ and as a prime site for cultural contests over the meaning and *instantiation of race and gender identities more generally in the modern world.

Ainsworth points out that courts most often side with employers, thereby asserting the primacy of the identity of “worker” over that of racial or gender identity. Dress codes in school are more hotly contested and complex legal cases, with courts sometimes siding with students and sometimes with school administration. The *American Civil Liberties Union writes, “What this boils down to is that public schools’ authority to impose dress codes is not unlimited.”

Cultural, institutional, and personal concerns are evident in matters of what we wear. A good society provides much (v) for individual choice; an ethical person acknowledges the legitimate limitations society imposes upon individuals. What we wear is the manifestation of shifting around of what we mean by
(4) identity in a quickly changing modern world.

(出典：Arthur Dobrin. “What You Wear Can Signal a Part of Your Identity”
Psychology Today. October 17, 2022.)

*注 attire 服装 bowtie 蝶ネクタイ “The Czar’s Soliloquy” 「ロシア皇帝の独白」(マーク・トウェインが1905年に発表した短編小説)
chief 重要な部分 ten 最高の人
tenure (大学教員としての)終身在職権を与える
circumscribe 制限する semiotics 記号論 morph 姿を変える
binary 二つの white-shoe エリートの locs ドレッドヘア
instantiation 具体的に表現すること
American Civil Liberties Union アメリカ自由人権協会

問 1 空欄(i)~(v)に入る最も適切な単語を下の選択肢から選び、(a)~(g)の記号で答えよ。それぞれの単語の意味をイタリックで示す。ただしどこにも当てはまらない選択肢が2つある。

- (a) parameters: *a set of fixed limits that control the way that something should be done*
- (b) solidarity: *loyalty and general agreement between all the people in a group, or between different groups, because they all have a shared aim*
- (c) globalization: *the process of making something such as a business operate in a lot of different countries all around the world, or the result of this*
- (d) empathy: *the ability to understand other people's feelings and problems*
- (e) title: *a name that describes someone's job or position*
- (f) latitude: *freedom to choose what you do or say*
- (g) article: *a piece of writing about a particular subject in a newspaper or magazine*

問 2 下線部(1)はどういう意味か、本文に即して簡潔に説明せよ。

問 3 下線部(2)について、あなた自身の考えを 20~30 語程度の英語で述べよ。

問 4 下線部(3)はどういう意味か、本文に即して簡潔に説明せよ。

問 5 下線部(4)を訳せ。

Ⅲ 次の英文を読み，以下の間に特に指示のない限り日本語で答えよ。

Suppose our language did not have any *syntax, and that what we know⁽¹⁾ really was just a collection of words. Lots of them perhaps, but still a *finite collection. That would mean we were able to talk only about a fixed (if large) range of things — namely, what we happen to have words for. If we did not have a specific word for “the third person in from the *aisle in the front row of the *upper deck,” we could not refer to that specific individual. Of course, if we were actually at the *ballpark, we might be able to say “Person!” and point to the one we meant. But even without special words, given the resources of English I am able to tell you that “the third person in from the aisle in the front row of the upper deck caught *Bonds’s home run ball, but the guy behind him grabbed it away from him.” You can understand that without either of us, or the individuals⁽²⁾ referred to, being present.

What gives us the power to talk about an unlimited range of things even though we only know a fixed set of words at any one time is our capacity for putting those words together into larger structures, whose meaning is⁽³⁾ compositional. That is, the meaning of a combination of words *is in general a function of the meaning of the individual words, along with the way they are put together. Compositionality means that we do not have to learn all the meanings we might need individually, since we can make up new expressions of *arbitrary complexity by putting together known pieces in regular ways.

Furthermore, the system of combination is *recursive. That is, we only need to know how to construct a limited number of different kinds of structures, because those same structures are reused as building blocks. Sentences contain⁽⁴⁾ other sentences as pieces (sentence complements, for example, or relative clauses). The property of recursion allows us to build structures that are unlimited in complexity, while making use of only a limited *range of basic patterns. Language thus makes infinite use of finite means through what *Pinker calls a *discrete combinatorial system.

(出典：Anderson, Stephen R., *Doctor Dolittle's Delusion: Animals and the Uniqueness of Human Language*. 2004.)

*注 syntax 統語(語と語をつないで文を作る際の規則) finite 有限の
aisle 通路 upper deck (野球で)スタンドの最上階
ballpark 野球場
Bonds バリー・ボンズ(米大リーグのホームランバッター)
be a function of... ~によって決まる arbitrary 任意の
recursive 繰り返しのな
Pinker スティーブン・ピンカー(米国の言語学者)
discrete combinatorial system 離散的要素の結合体系(個々の要素の組み合わせによって全体が構成される仕組みのこと)

問 1 下線部(1)で述べられていることが仮に本当だとしたら, どのようなことになると言っているか, 本文に即して説明せよ。

問 2 下線部(2)の意味を, that の内容を明らかにして説明せよ。

問 3 下線部(3)「その意味は構成的(compositional)である」とはどういうことか, 本文に即して説明せよ。

問 4 構成性(compositionality)にはどのような利点があるか, 本文に即して説明せよ。

問 5 下線部(4)の具体例を示す英文を, 自分で考えて一つ挙げよ。

IV Discuss advantages and disadvantages of learning English through literature and give your own opinion within 200 English words.