

I 次の文章の下線をほどこした部分(1)~(3)を和訳しなさい。

(50点)

Telling stories is an activity that has been with human beings from the beginning of time. We might go so far as to say we are story-telling animals born with narrative instinct. We go to work in the morning, see our officemates, and tell them what happened on the previous night; we go home in the evening, see our family, and tell them what happened during the day. We love to tell stories and we love to listen to them. Narrative is everywhere: news, gossip, dreams, fantasies, reports, confessions, and so on and so forth.

In particular, we spend a deal of time consuming all kinds of fictional narratives, such as novels, cartoon stories, movies, TV serials. Surely it will be of some use to ponder whether fiction is good for us or not. Indeed, this is a problem with a long history going back to ancient philosophers. Plato famously excluded poets from his ideal republic, for he thought their creations were ultimately untrue. Put in the simplest terms, he regarded poems as lies. He did not believe something offered as fiction could justify itself. His brightest pupil Aristotle thought differently. One major point of Aristotle's theory is said to be: while history expresses the particular, concentrating on specific details (1) as they happened, poetry can illuminate the universal, not allowing the accidental to intervene. Hence the justification.

As the debate continues to the present time, researchers in psychology have shown us a new way of dealing with this old problem. From various experiments, it emerges that fiction has the power to modify us. Reportedly, "when we read nonfiction, we read with our shields up. We are critical and (2) skeptical. But when we are absorbed in a story, we drop our intellectual guard. We are moved emotionally, and this seems to make us rubbery and easy to shape." This might sound rather simplistic, but importantly, researchers are attempting to tell us that reading fiction cultivates empathy. When a reader is immersed in the fictional world, she places herself in the position of characters

in the narrative, and the repeated practice of this activity sharpens the ability to understand other people. So, nurturing our interpersonal sensitivity in the real world, fiction, especially literary fiction, can shape us for the better.

Although this is not exactly news, it is surely comforting to have scientific support for the importance of fiction. Nevertheless, a careful distinction is in order here. It may be true that fiction actually makes one behave with better understanding towards the people around one. Empathy, however, does not necessarily lead to social good. A recent article on the topic points out: “Some of the most empathetic people you will ever meet are businesspeople and lawyers. They can grasp another person’s feelings in an instant, act on them, and clinch a deal or win a trial. The result may well leave the person on the other side feeling anguished or defeated. Conversely, we have all known bookish, introverted people who are not good at puzzling out other people, or, if they are, lack the ability to act on what they have grasped about the other person.” (Here bookish people are, we are meant to understand, keen readers of fiction.) Empathetic understanding and sympathetic action are different matters — how and why they are so, in connection with reading fiction, will be further explored by future research, we hope.

II

次の文章を読み、下の設問(1)~(3)に答えなさい。

(50点)

One of the early significant responses to Charles Darwin's thinking came from a highly-talented journalist, George Henry Lewes. Having read a piece by Lewes, Darwin wrote to a friend, saying that the author of that article is "someone who writes capitably, and who knows the subject." Indeed, as a modern scholar states, "apart from Thomas Huxley, no other scientific writer dealt with Darwin's theory with such fairness and knowledge as Lewes" at that time. Here is what Lewes wrote (with modification) about the background of Darwin's most famous book:

The Origin of Species made an epoch. It proposed a hypothesis surpassing all its predecessors in its agreement with facts, and in its wide reach. Because it was the product of long-continued research, and thereby gave articulate expression to the thought which had been inarticulate in many minds, its influence rapidly became European; because it was both old in purpose and novel in conception, it agitated the schools with a revolutionary excitement. No work of our time has been so general in its influence. This extent of influence is less due to the fact of its being a masterly work, enriching science with a great discovery, than to the fact of its being a work which clashed against one and chimed with the other of the two great conceptions of the world that have long ruled, and still rule, the minds of Europe. One side recognized a powerful enemy, the other a mighty champion. It was immediately evident that the question of the "origin of species" derived its significance from the deeper question which loomed behind it. What is that question?

If we trace the history of opinion from the dawn of science in Greece ^(a) through all succeeding epochs, we shall observe many constantly-reappearing indications of what may be called an intuitive feeling rather

than a distinct vision of the truth that all the varied manifestations of life are but the flowers from a common root — that all the complex forms have been evolved from pre-existing simpler forms. This idea about evolution survived opposition, ridicule, refutation; and the reason of this persistence is that the idea harmonizes with one general conception of the world which has been called the monistic because it reduces all phenomena to community, and all knowledge to unity. This conception is irreconcilable with the rival, or dualistic, conception, which separates and opposes force and matter, life and body. The history of thought is filled with the struggle between these two general conceptions. I think it may be said that every man is somewhat by his training, and still more by his constitution, predisposed towards the monistic or the dualistic conception. There can be little doubt that the acceptance or the rejection of Darwinism has, in the vast majority of cases, been wholly determined by the monistic or dualistic attitude of mind.

And this explains, what would otherwise be inexplicable, the surprising ease and passion with which men wholly incompetent to appreciate the evidence for or against natural selection have adopted or “refuted” it. Elementary ignorance of biology has not prevented them from pronouncing very confidently on this question; and biologists with scorn have asked whether men would attack an astronomical hypothesis with no better equipment. Why not? They feel themselves competent to decide the question from higher grounds. Profoundly convinced of the truth of their general conception of the world, they conclude every hypothesis to be true or false, according as it chimes with, or clashes against, that conception.

So it has been, so it will long continue. The development hypothesis is an inevitable deduction from the monistic conception of the world; and will continue to be the battle-ground of contending schools until the opposition

between monism and dualism ceases. For myself, believing in the ultimate triumph of the former, I look on the development hypothesis as one of the great influences which will by its acceptance, in conjunction with the spread of scientific culture, hasten that triumph.

Darwin seems to have liked Lewes's observations on his work, for when he read this and other related pieces, he wrote to the journalist and encouraged him to publish them in a book form. Although from the point of view of today's science what he says may be dated, Lewes remains a highly interesting writer.

- (1) 文章全体から判断して、『種の起源』が大きな影響力を持った要因として Lewes が最重要視しているものを、第2パラグラフ(*The Origin of Species* から What is that question? まで)から選び、日本語で書きなさい。
- (2) 下線部(a)を和訳しなさい。
- (3) 下線部(b)を和訳しなさい。

Ⅲ

次の文章を英訳しなさい。

(25 点)

言うまでもなく、転ばぬ先の杖は大切である。しかし、たまには結果をあれこれ心配する前に一步踏み出す勇気が必要だ。痛い目を見るかもしれないが、失敗を重ねることで人としての円熟味が増すこともあるだろう。あきらめずに何度も立ち上がった体験が、とんでもない困難に直面した時に、それを乗り越える大きな武器となるにちがいない。

IV Noah と Emma の次の会話を読んで、下線部(1)~(4)に入る適当な発言を()内の条件に従って記入し、英語 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)

Noah: I went to that new restaurant yesterday.

Emma: How was it?

Noah: I ate a plate of pasta but it was horrible. All the food that restaurant offers must be awful.

Emma: But you have only been there once, haven't you? I think it's too much to say that all dishes are terrible at that restaurant. Maybe you found that pasta terrible because (1) _____. (8 語以上 12 語以下で)
Another possibility is that (2) _____. (12 語以上 16 語以下で)

Noah: Maybe you are right.

Emma: The other day, I learned from a book that this is called a hasty generalization, which means drawing an overly generalized conclusion from one or a few examples. It's so easy for us to make a hasty generalization in everyday life. We often do this not just when we purchase something, but in other situations too. For example, (3) _____. (if を用いて 20 語以上 28 語以下で)

Noah: I totally understand what you mean. I'll (4) _____. (8 語以上 12 語以下で) That way, I will be able to test whether my claim about that restaurant is true or not.

Emma: Good! I think we should try not to overgeneralize.

問題は、このページで終わりである。