

英語問題

(平成25年度)

【注意事項】

1. この問題冊子は「英語」である。
2. 試験時間は90分である。
3. 試験開始の合図まで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。ただし、表紙はあらかじめよく読んでおくこと。
4. 試験開始後すぐに、以下の5および6に記載されていることを確認すること。
5. この問題冊子の印刷は1ページから8ページまでである。
6. 解答用紙は問題冊子中央に3枚はさみこんである。
7. 問題冊子に落丁、乱丁、印刷不鮮明な箇所等があった場合および解答用紙が不足している場合は、手をあげて監督者に申し出ること。
8. 試験開始後、3枚ある解答用紙の所定の欄に、受験番号と氏名を記入すること（1枚につき受験番号は2箇所、氏名は1箇所）。
9. 解答は必ず解答用紙の指定された箇所に記入すること。解答用紙の裏面に記入してはいけない。
10. 問題番号に対応した解答用紙に解答していない場合は、採点されない場合もあるので注意すること。
11. 問題冊子の中の白紙部分は下書き等に使用してよい。
12. 解答用紙を切り離したり、持ち帰ってはいけない。
13. 試験終了時刻まで退室を認めない。試験中の気分不快や用便等、やむを得ない場合には、手をあげて監督者を呼び指示に従うこと。
14. 試験終了後は問題冊子を持ち帰ること。

[I] 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

The bathing machine that protected the considerable modesty of Queen Victoria has been returned to the beach at her seaside residence on the Isle of Wight.

The “machine”, in effect a large cabin on wheels, had a changing room, a plumbed-in lavatory and a covered veranda surrounded by curtains to shield the royal personage from prying eyes until she had entered the water. It is believed to have been used by Victoria for more than 50 years before being converted into a chicken house after her death.

The beach at Osborne House, which was built by Victoria and her husband, Prince Albert, as their seaside residence, has also been restored and opened to the public for the first time. In her journals she described the beach as her “perfect paradise”, and the Royal Family spent much of their summer there from the mid-1840s until her death at Osborne House in 1901. Osborne House was given to the nation by Edward VII in 1904 and was later used as a naval college and convalescent home. The beach and bathing machine have been restored by English Heritage as part of a £500,000 (\$780,000) refurbishment.

The bathing machine once ran down grooves in a concrete slip that led into the sea. It would go in up to its axles and only then would Victoria open the veranda door and venture out. Screened by the curtains, she would descend a short flight of steps into the water. When she had finished and clambered back into the bathing machine it would be winched back up the beach with a steel cable.

Andrew Hann, an English Heritage historian, said: “Although the beach was private, the Solent was a public shipping lane and owners of small boats would approach quite close with binoculars. The Royal Family were celebrities then, as they are now, and we know they were annoyed by it.”

On July 30, 1847, Victoria recorded the bathing machine’s maiden voyage and her first dip in the sea. She wrote in her journal: “Afterwards drove down to the sea with my maids—went into the bathing machine, where I undressed and bathed in the sea (for the 1st time in my life). A very nice bathing woman attended me. I thought it delightful until I put my head under water, when I thought I should be stifled.”

During July and August, Victoria would swim as often as once a day. She continued to use the machine after she was widowed in 1861 until infirmity made it impossible for her to climb stairs, let alone swim.

(出典 *The Times* より)

Notes

plumb: to install a toilet and connect to water and drainage pipes in (a building or room).

lavatory: toilet.

prying: inquisitive, curious.

convalescent: someone who is spending time recovering after an illness.

refurbishment (*n.*) < refurbish (*v.*): to repair a building.

groove: a deep line cut into a surface.

clamber: to climb or move in an awkward and laborious way.

winch (*v.*) < winch (*n.*): a machine with a rope for lifting heavy objects.

binoculars: an optical instrument with a lens for each eye, used for viewing distant objects.

stifle: to make (someone) unable to breathe properly; suffocate.

infirmity: physical or mental weakness.

- (1) 女王がこの bathing machine を使用した期間・時期を、本文中のデータに基づいて詳しく述べなさい。
- (2) bathing machine の使用目的を、本文に即して簡潔に説明しなさい。
- (3) 女王が使用する際の目的に適合した bathing machine の構造上の工夫を本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

〔Ⅱ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

The source of every new idea is the same. There is a network of neurons in the brain, and then the network shifts. All of a sudden, electricity flows in an unfamiliar pattern, a shiver of current across a circuit board of cells. But sometimes a single network isn't enough. Sometimes a creative problem is so difficult that it requires people to connect their imaginations together; the answer arrives only if we collaborate. That's because a group is not just a collection of individual talents. Instead, it is a chance for those talents to exceed themselves, to produce something greater than anyone thought possible. When the right mixture of people come together and when they collaborate in the right way, what happens can often feel like magic. But it's not magic. There is a reason why some groups are more than the sum of their parts.

Furthermore, there's evidence that group creativity is becoming more necessary. Because we live in a world of very hard problems—all the low-hanging fruit is gone—many of the most important challenges exceed the capabilities of the individual imagination. As a result, we can find solutions only by working with other people.

But how should we work together? What's the ideal strategy for group creativity? Brian Uzzi, a sociologist at Northwestern, has spent his career trying to answer these crucial questions, and he's done it by studying Broadway musicals. Although Uzzi grew up in New York City and attended plenty of productions as a kid, he doesn't exactly watch *A Chorus Line* in his spare time. "I like musicals just fine, but that's not why I study them," he says. Instead, 彼はそのような芸術形式が集団的創造性のモデルであると考えて、何千もの古いミュージカルを分析することに5年を費やした。 "Nobody creates a Broadway musical by themselves," Uzzi says. "The production requires too many different kinds of talent."

Uzzi wanted to understand how the relationships of these team members affected the end result. Was it better to have a group composed of close friends who had worked together before, or did total strangers make better theater? What is the ideal form of creative collaboration? To answer these questions, Uzzi undertook an epic study of nearly every musical produced on Broadway between 1877 and 1990, analyzing the teams behind 2,258 different productions. He charted the topsy-turvy relationships of thousands of different artists, from Cole Porter to Andrew Lloyd Webber.

The first thing Uzzi discovered was that the people who worked on Broadway were part of an extremely interconnected social network. Uzzi then came up with a way to measure the density of these connections for each musical, a designation he called *Q*. In essence, the amount of *Q* reflects the "social intimacy" of people working on the play, with higher levels of *Q* signaling a greater degree of closeness. For instance, if a musical was being developed by a

team of artists who had worked together several times before—this is common practice on Broadway—that musical would have an extremely high Q . In contrast, a musical created by a team of strangers would have a low Q .

This metric allowed Uzzi to explore the correlation between levels of Q and the success of the musical. “Frankly, I was surprised by how big the effect was,” Uzzi says. “I expected Q to matter, but I had no idea it would matter this much.” According to the data, the relationships between collaborators was one of the most important variables on Broadway. The numbers tell the story: When the Q was low, or less than 1.7, the musicals were much more likely to fail. Because the artists didn’t know one another, they struggled to work together and exchange ideas. “This wasn’t so surprising,” Uzzi says. “After all, you can’t just put a group of people who have never met before in a room and expect them to make something great. It takes time to develop a successful collaboration.” However, when the Q was too high (above 3.2) the work also suffered. The artists were so close that they all thought in similar ways, which crushed theatrical innovation. According to Uzzi, this is what happened on Broadway during the 1920s. Although the decade produced many talented artists—Cole Porter, Richard Rodgers, Lorenz Hart, and Oscar Hammerstein II—it was also full of theatrical failures. The problem, he says, is that all of these high-profile artists fell into the habit of collaborating with only their friends. “Broadway [during the 1920s] had some of the biggest names ever,” says Uzzi. “But the shows were too full of repeat relationships, and that stifled creativity. All the great talent ended up producing a bunch of mediocre musicals.”

What kind of team, then, led to the most successful musicals? Uzzi’s data clearly demonstrates that the best Broadway shows were produced with *intermediate* levels of social intimacy. A musical produced at the ideal level of Q (2.6) was two and a half times more likely to be a commercial success than a musical produced with a low Q (< 1.4) or a high Q (> 3.2). It was also three times more likely to be lauded by the critics. This led Uzzi to argue that creative collaborations have a sweet spot: “The best Broadway teams, by far, were those with a mix of relationships,” Uzzi says. “These teams had some old friends, but they also had newbies. This mixture meant that the artists could interact efficiently—they had a familiar structure to fall back on—but they also managed to incorporate some new ideas. They were comfortable with each other, but they weren’t *too* comfortable.”

(出典 Jonah Lehrer, *Imagine* より)

Notes

neuron: a special cell transmitting nerve impulses.

sociologist: a person who studies sociology.

Northwestern: Northwestern University.

epic: grand in scale.

topsy-turvy: in a state of confusion.

designation: name.

metric: a system of measurement.

stifle: to prevent.

mediocre: average.

laud: to praise.

newbie: newcomer.

- (1) 下線部 (ア) を和訳しなさい。
- (2) 下線部 (イ) はどのような状況を表しているのか日本語で説明しなさい。
- (3) 下線部 (ウ) を英訳しなさい。
- (4) Q の値の高・中・低によってそれぞれどのような結果が生じるのかとその理由を本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

〔Ⅲ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

One evening at the end of the first century AD, Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus (the man known to future readers as Pliny the Younger) left the house of a friend in Rome in a state of righteous anger. As soon as he reached his study, Pliny sat down and, in order to collect his thoughts (and perhaps with an eye to the volume of letters he would one day assemble and publish), wrote about that night's events to the lawyer Claudius Restitutus. "I have just left in indignation a reading at a friend of mine's, and I feel I have to write to you at once, as I can't tell you about it personally. The text that was read was highly polished in every possible way, but two or three witty people—or so they seemed to themselves and a few others—listened to it like deaf-mutes. They never opened their lips or moved a hand, or even stretched their legs to change from their seated postures. What's the point of all this sober demeanour and scholarship, or rather of this laziness and conceit, this lack of tact and good sense, which makes one spend an entire day doing nothing but causing grief and turning into an enemy the man one came to hear as one's dearest friend?"

It is somewhat difficult for us, at a distance of twenty centuries, to understand Pliny's dismay. In his time, authors' readings had become a fashionable social ceremony and, as with any other ceremony, there was an established etiquette for both the listeners and the authors. The listeners were expected to provide critical response, based on which the author would improve the text—which is why the motionless audience had so outraged Pliny; he himself sometimes tried out a first draft of a speech on a group of friends and then altered it according to their reaction. Furthermore, the listeners were expected to attend the entire function, whatever its length, so as not to miss any part of the work being read, and Pliny felt that those who used readings as mere social diversions were little better than hoodlums. "Most of them sit around in the waiting-rooms," he fumed to another friend, "wasting their time instead of paying attention, and ordering their servants to tell them every so often if the reader has arrived and has read the introduction, or if he has reached the end. Only then, and most reluctantly, do they straggle in. And they don't stay long but leave before the end, some trying to escape unnoticed, others walking out with no shame.... More praise and honour are due to those whose love of writing and reading out loud is not affected by the bad manners and arrogance of their audience."

The author too was obliged to follow certain rules if his reading was to be successful, for there were all sorts of obstacles to overcome. First of all, an appropriate reading-space had to be found. Rich men fancied themselves poets, and recited their work to large crowds of acquaintances at their opulent villas, in the *auditorium*—a room built specially for that purpose.

Some of these wealthy poets, such as Titinius Capito, were generous and lent their *auditoria* for the performances of others, but mostly these recital-spaces were for the exclusive use of their owners. Once his friends had gathered at the appointed place, the author had to face them from a chair on a dais, wearing a new toga and displaying all his rings. According to Pliny, this custom doubly hindered him: “he is at a great disadvantage by the mere fact of sitting down, even though he may be as gifted as speakers who stand” and he had the “two main aids to his delivery, i.e., eyes and hands” occupied with holding his text. Oratorical skills were therefore essential. Praising one reader for his performance, Pliny noted that “he showed an appropriate versatility in raising or lowering his tone, and the same dexterity in going from loftier subjects to baser ones, from simple to complex, or passing from lighter subjects to more serious ones. 彼の非常に心地よい声はもう一つの強みであり、彼のつつましさ、恥じらい、緊張感が一層その良さを高めた。そしてそれらは常に朗読会を引き立てるものである。 I don't know why, but shyness suits an author better than confidence.”

(出典 Alberto Manguel, *A History of Reading* より, 一部改変)

Notes

righteous: morally acceptable or fair.

posture: a particular position of the body.

sober: serious and sensible.

demeanour: behaviour or manner.

conceit: too much pride.

tact: sensitivity or consideration.

diversion: entertainment or relaxation.

hoodlum: a hooligan or gangster.

fume: to feel, show, or express great anger.

straggle: to move slowly.

fancy oneself: to regard oneself, often wrongly, as something.

opulent: luxurious.

villa: a large and luxurious country house.

auditoria (plural) / auditorium (singular)

dais: a low stage or platform to make a speech.

toga: a piece of clothing worn by the ancient Romans.

oratorical: connected with the art of public speaking; rhetorical.

versatility (*n.*) < versatile (*adj.*): able to adapt or be adapted to many different functions or activities.

dexterity: skill in performing tasks, with the hands or mind.

lofty: noble, sublime or advanced.

(1) Pliny が怒って友人の家を出た理由を、本文に即して、日本語で簡潔に述べなさい。

(2) 下線部 (ア) を和訳しなさい。

(3) 下線部 (イ) の表す具体的な内容を、本文に即して、日本語で簡潔に述べなさい。

(4) 下線部 (ウ) を英訳しなさい。