

早稲田大学 教育学部
2024 年度 入試問題の訂正内容

<一般選抜>

【英語】

●問題冊子 1 2 ページ : III 4

選択肢の記述に不適切な部分があったため、適切な解答
に至らないおそれがあると判断しました。当該箇所設問
につきましては、解答の有無・内容にかかわらず、受験生
全員に得点を与えることといたします。

以上

英 語

(問 題)

2024年度

〈2024 R06180015 (英語)〉

注 意 事 項

1. 試験開始の指示があるまで、問題冊子および解答用紙には手を触れないこと。
2. 問題は2～13ページに記載されている。試験中に問題冊子の印刷不鮮明、ページの落丁・乱丁及び解答用紙の汚損等に気付いた場合は、手を挙げて監督員に知らせること。
3. 解答はすべて、HBの黒鉛筆またはHBのシャープペンシルで記入すること。
4. マーク解答用紙記入上の注意
 - (1) 印刷されている受験番号が、自分の受験番号と一致していることを確認したうえで、氏名欄に氏名を記入すること。
 - (2) マーク欄にははっきりとマークすること。また、訂正する場合は、消しゴムで丁寧に、消し残しがないようによく消すこと。

マークする時	● 良い	○ 悪い	○ 悪い
マークを消す時	○ 良い	○ 悪い	○ 悪い

5. 解答はすべて所定の解答欄に記入すること。所定欄以外に何かを記入した解答用紙は採点の対象外となる場合がある。
6. 問題冊子の余白等は適宜利用してよいが、どのページも切り離さないこと。
7. 試験終了の指示が出たら、すぐに解答をやめ、筆記用具を置き解答用紙を裏返しにすること。
8. いかなる場合でも、解答用紙は必ず提出すること。
9. 試験終了後、問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

I. Read the following passage and answer the questions.

[1] Pre-school children learn the meanings of more than ten new words each day, and they understand the meanings of those words well enough to use them in fluent communication. They use these words to express a welter of opinions on what they think is good or bad, right or wrong, and all too readily wail “It’s not fair!”. But how can a young child—and the rest of us—really know what these words mean? After all, the most brilliant thinkers across millennia have found that these everyday notions—goodness, the difference between right and wrong, the nature of fairness—are ⁽¹⁾sunk in conceptual quicksand. How can young children master concepts that philosophers struggle to analyse?

[2] The answer is that philosophers wrestle with the challenge of providing a general theory of “deep” concepts—[2]—to explain the fundamental meaning of such notions as *good*, *fair*, *cause*, *mind* and so on. But children and adults only have to get meaning sufficiently clear to deal with the specific communicative challenge of the moment.⁽³⁾ To communicate successfully, a cry of “It’s not fair!” must express the outrage a child feels when given a smaller slice of cake or made to wait in a queue. But this communication does not require the child (or the unfortunate parent) to have a general theory of fairness in mind. Indeed, the “meaning” that allows us to get by successfully is often [A] shallow.

[3] Consider, for example, how children use *alive* and *dead*. Susan Carey, a developmental psychologist at Harvard, had the following instructive and rather delightful interchanges with her daughter Eliza on the subject. When someone is shot on a TV programme, Eliza (three years and six months) explains: “He’s dead—I can tell because he’s not moving.” This seems [B] similar to how we adults define *dead*. But then, Carey asks about Eliza’s toy bear:

E: ... She’ll always be alive.

S: Is she alive?

E: No — she’s dead. HOW CAN THAT BE?

S: Is she alive or dead?

E: Dead.

S: Did she used to be alive?

E: No, she’s middle-sized in between alive and dead. She moves sometimes.

And then comes the astonishing question:

E: How do dead people go to the bathroom?

S: What?

E: Maybe they have bathrooms under the ground.

S: Dead people don’t have to go to the bathroom. They don’t do anything; they just lie there. They don’t eat or drink, so they don’t have to go to the bathroom.

E: But they ate or drank before they died—they have to go to the bathroom from just before they died.

Eliza doesn’t, surely, have a clear and distinct concept of *alive* and *dead*. Her toy bear is not alive; but then again, her bear moves sometimes, so it must be alive, or perhaps it’s in some intermediate state. And dead people are, it seems, still carrying on with normal bodily functions. On a separate occasion (aged three years and eight months) she exclaims: “Isn’t it funny—statues aren’t alive, but you can still see them?” Her grandfather is not alive, and you can’t see him, she notes.

[4] Eliza is clearly a very observant reasoner. And she is also an astute player of verbal charades. People throw around the words *alive* and *dead*, but what are they getting at? Well, dead things don't seem to move; and you can't go to see dead people. But the idea that *alive* and *dead* only apply to biological organisms—which seems so central from an adult perspective—seems to be absent or perhaps only [4] for Eliza. What is really astonishing is that, in most of our interactions with pre-school children, we mostly don't have the faintest inkling that their understanding of words is so [C] different from ours. Just as with the interpretation of actions and gestures in charades, children learn to understand words well enough to make sense of the current, specific context in which they hear a word used. The motionless person who has been shot is called *dead*. Relatives and pets—who are no longer seen—are also described as dead. Young children can create their own charades for the adults around them, using those same words remarkably well—in fact, well enough that huge conceptual contradictions (such as toy bears being both alive and dead) almost never show up in daily conversation.

[5] But the same issues arise when adults communicate. What is it, precisely, to be *alive*? Typical biology textbooks can do no better than a descriptive list: living things grow, reproduce, eat and excrete, regulate their internal chemistry and temperature, are composed of one or more cells, pass on their traits through their genes and so on. But this leaves tricky cases such as viruses (not composed of cells, not able to reproduce independently), viroids (circular RNA strands that replicate autonomously inside a host plant), prions (infectious proteins), and even the androids of the future (could a machine be conscious without being alive?). The definition of *life*, like the definitions of *good*, *justice*, *right* and *wrong*, has been the subject of endless and unresolved debates for millennia. And our conception of *life* is full of contradictions. Wouldn't an afterlife be a type of life? And if so, should the biological criteria be mostly thrown out? The people in an imagined afterlife aren't actually dead, are they? And what about cryogenic freezing—is suspended animation a form of life, or death, or does it fall somewhere in between?

[6] These types of questions are mostly irrelevant in the vast majority of linguistic charades we play in everyday communication—the tricky cases just don't arise much in ordinary conversation. What matters is that we can get along well enough when dealing with the situations that actually occur in daily life. We no more need a mental definition of *life* to talk about living relatives or dead pets than we need a ⁽⁵⁾biological definition of gorillas to mime King Kong.

[7] Both pre-school children and adults use words as players use gestures in charades—in creative, contradictory ways that are good enough to get through the language games of the moment. In learning a language, we are learning to play creative conversational games with words. And playing those conversational games requires paying attention to likely communicative objectives, the contents of the environment, and past linguistic usage—⁽⁶⁾the hidden parts of the communication iceberg are just as important as the words themselves.

※出典は下記に記載しております。

1. Underline (1) means that

- a. these ideas are extraordinary.
- b. ordinary ideas are difficult to define.
- c. common ideas do not have universal meanings across cultures.
- d. it is quite uncommon to find these ideas in everyday conversation.

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

From The Language Game by Morten H Christiansen and Nick Chater published by Penguin.
Copyright © Morten H. Christiansen and Nick Chater 2022. Reprinted by permission of Penguin Books Limited.

2. Choose the best answer that fits in blank [2].
- a. concepts that are supposed to work in every possible case and context
 - b. concepts that children cannot understand or recognize
 - c. concepts that allow people to meaningfully connect with others
 - d. concepts that involve the darker side of the human mind
3. Based on the context, which of the following is **NOT** an example of underline (3)?
- a. Expressing what one wants
 - b. Explaining a theory of fairness
 - c. Finding the right word to communicate one's feelings
 - d. Asking for a bigger piece of cake
4. How do the authors define *fairness* in paragraphs [1]-[2]?
- a. Everyone receiving an equal portion of cake
 - b. Just treatment without favouritism
 - c. Pre-schoolers waiting in line one by one
 - d. No clear definition is offered
5. What is the reason for the example of Eliza and her observations?
- a. To talk about children's grasp of the meaning of life
 - b. To indicate cultural understandings of death
 - c. To illustrate contradictions in children's conceptual understanding
 - d. To explore children's relationship with the natural world
6. Which statement would best fit Eliza's understanding of life and death?
- a. Statues are alive when you do not look at them.
 - b. Things that do not move or cannot be seen are not alive.
 - c. People who are shot on TV are not real, and cannot die.
 - d. Life and death are the same thing.
7. Blank [4] can be best filled by:
- a. elementary
 - b. primary
 - c. secondary
 - d. necessary
8. What is meant by the word "charades" in this passage?
- a. language changes
 - b. language games
 - c. sign languages
 - d. language signs
9. Choose the combination of words that best fits in blanks [A], [B], and [C].
- a. [A] promisingly [B] unexpectedly [C] radically
 - b. [A] promisingly [B] radically [C] unexpectedly
 - c. [A] unexpectedly [B] promisingly [C] radically
 - d. [A] unexpectedly [B] radically [C] promisingly
 - e. [A] radically [B] unexpectedly [C] promisingly
 - f. [A] radically [B] promisingly [C] unexpectedly

10. All of the questions in paragraph [5] are best described as:
- a . questions with no clear answers available.
 - b . questions that no philosophers have considered.
 - c . questions that only scientists can answer.
 - d . questions with clear spiritual and religious answers.
11. What is the authors' main message in paragraph [6]?
- a . Most people need not be concerned by philosophical questions of meaning.
 - b . We need to memorize the definitions of words that other people use.
 - c . People have numerous reasons to negotiate the meanings of life and death.
 - d . Children's games are an important part of learning about life and death.
12. Which of the following could best replace underline (5) to create a similar analogy?
- a . an understanding of the planet Mars to study the sun
 - b . the classification of pipes to play the videogame Super Mario Brothers
 - c . the meaning of gorillas to say that they are 200 kilogram primates
 - d . a scientific knowledge of flight mechanics to make a paper airplane
13. What is meant by underline (6)?
- a . the differences in mother tongue that are a titanic obstacle to communication
 - b . the large amount of communication that remains unseen and unknown
 - c . the communication between children and adults that is often deep, cold, and damaging
 - d . the true intentions that are not revealed in intergenerational communication
14. Which statement best summarizes this article?
- a . People are able to communicate clearly using words because we already share a common understanding.
 - b . We are constantly negotiating the meaning of different concepts even in daily interactions.
 - c . Young children play charades because they are not good at using language the same way as adults.
 - d . People in different countries use different nonverbal strategies to communicate when they lack the vocabulary to speak.

II. Read the article and answer the following questions.

[1] Modern historians count 1967 as an especially busy year: the six-day war¹, the summer of love², Sgt Pepper³, the first recorded deaths of American astronauts, the founding of the suburban utopia of Milton Keynes. And also, half-forgotten in the crush, perhaps the most consequential event of all: the invention of the first device ever that permitted us to henceforward stop using a part of our brains.

[2] A young Dallas engineer named Jerry Merryman and his team gave us, courtesy of his employers, Texas Instruments, the Cal-Tech electronic calculator. For \$400 you could own a shirt-pocket-sized plastic box with buttons and symbols that, if pressed, would answer in an instant, and with impeccable accuracy, any simple arithmetical question you might ask it. And most important, it performed its work invisibly. The abacus and the slide rule might have been mental labour-saving devices, but they still required you to make some use of your grey matter⁽²⁾; the Cal-Tech freed you up entirely, removing all mathematical tedium from your daily life.

[3] It was semiconductors and algorithms that helped make Merryman's magic, and for the 60 years since, and in the hands of other similarly blessed engineers, they have continued to do so, relentlessly.

[4] Their gifts have been all we might ever have wished for. Our brains can now relax. Whatever cerebral nooks and crannies we employed, for instance, to read paper maps, or to use sextants and compasses and chronometers to find out where we were, have now been put into cold storage: GPS has given us all the direction we might ever need. Not sure how to spell a word or how best to compose a sentence? From the 1980s onward there has been no urgent further need for an OED⁴ or a copy of Fowler's Modern English Usage: Commodore's WordCheck and its successors have such matters taken care of.

[5] And after the presentation in April 1998 at a conference in Brisbane by two (now very rich) young Americans named Page and Brin, of their paper The Anatomy of a Large-Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine, we had Google, which, for the past quarter-century, has been able to answer all our questions about just about anything in microseconds. OpenAI is currently inventing even more advanced things that promise to blow out of the water whatever still remains of the requirement to do mental work.

[6] This has in recent months led to widespread hand-wringing. Our minds, it is said, will inevitably fall out of use, atrophying, or distending, whichever is worse.

[7] The nightmare model — for our bodies — is a movie like Wall-E⁽⁴⁾, that dystopian vision from 2008 in which humans, having abandoned their polluted and garbage-choked world, live out their lives in cocoons suspended in suborbital space. Here they have evolved into flaccid slob⁵s, marooned in recliners, fed on high-calorie mush from squeeze-packs while gazing glassily at telescreens.

¹ six-day war : 第三次中東戦争

² summer of love : アメリカを中心とする愛と平和を求めるヒッピー・ムーブメント

³ Sgt Pepper : ビートルズのアルバム (Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band) の名称

⁴ OED : Oxford English Dictionary

⁵ flaccid slob : 筋力が衰えた無気力な人々

[8] So now there comes a similarly dire vision for our minds. With machines doing all our daily mental tasks for us, our brains will become literally thoughtless, our minds a haven for endless daydreaming. We will become spiritually moribund. As inherent knowledge vanishes, no longer much needed since it is now always on tap at the slightest brush of a touch-glass surface, the concept of human wisdom, which is after all a mix of knowledge and experience, will evaporate. Society will slowly flounder and decay, body, mind and soul.

[9] This is one vision of our future doom. But I am not a doomsayer — not so far as our minds are concerned, at least. I challenge the notion that all is now going to intellectual [5 A]. Rather I see ample reason for [5 B]. And I draw this [5 C] from the sextet of Ancient Greeks who laid the foundations for and defined the very idea of knowledge: Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus and Euclid.

[10] These figures, rightly revered and sanctified by time, had minds essentially little different from the finest of our own today — except in one important respect: there was, in the centuries in which these men lived, so much less for them to know.

[11] Karl Popper’s droll and much-quoted remark that “knowledge is finite but ignorance is infinite” is objectively true, of course — and yet the amount of knowledge in our contemporary mental universe is immeasurably more vast than that in which the intellectual elite of classical times existed. These six and their like travelled little (Aristotle excepted), existing in a world necessarily circumscribed by so little known geography, by very much less history, by the existence of so little written prior description.

[12] Their minds, though steeped in the totality of contemporary knowledge, were thus almost *tabulae rasae* — nearly empty, [6], ready to think, primed for purpose.

[13] Which is why our modern minds, once they have been purged of all that today’s algorithms might now deem *unnecessary* information, will be as ready as theirs were to think, to inquire, to wonder, to contemplate, to imagine, to create.

[14] So I see today’s algorithmic revolution as a necessary cleansing, a movement by which we rid ourselves of all the accumulated bricolage of modern intellectual life, returning us to a more reasonable sound-to-noise ratio, gifting us with a renewed innocence, filled with potential.

[15] Fanciful though it may sound, this new-made post-AI society could even see the emergence of a new Euclid, a new Plato, a new Herodotus. Such figures may now be waiting in the wings, ready to rise from the ashes of whoever created Milton Keynes, maybe to write us a new edition of the Ethics, or teach us afresh the true worth of human happiness, as Aristotle did so impeccably, 2,500 years ago.

[16] If that is the true benefit of clearing our minds of the busywork that is perhaps best left to electronic others, then I can hardly wait.

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。
Copyright Guardian News & Media Ltd 2024
Simon Winchester, The big idea: Will AI make us stupid?,
theguardian.com, 19 June 2023.

1. The author discusses underline (1) in so much detail because
 - a. he feels nostalgic about the year 1967.
 - b. he is impressed by its impeccable accuracy.
 - c. he thinks it was the first device that enabled us to stop using parts of our brains.
 - d. he wants to stress that electronic calculators have made our lives easier in the past 60 years.
2. Underline (2) can be best replaced by:
 - a. arithmetical instinct
 - b. brain cells
 - c. vague ideas
 - d. electronic calculator
3. Who are showing the “widespread hand-wringing” in underline (3)?
 - a. People who worry about their hands because of the amount of busywork they do every day
 - b. People who worry about the exhausting mental work they need to perform
 - c. People who worry that dystopian visions will cause us to abandon our polluted world
 - d. People who worry that we will stop using our brains the way we are using them now
4. The author mentions underline (4) because
 - a. he wants to warn people that the movie presents a dystopian vision of the future which might cause nightmares.
 - b. he is worried that in the future people might really end up spending day after day inside their homes in front of telescreens while feeding themselves with high-calorie jellies.
 - c. he is trying to convince the reader that something similar to what has happened to human bodies in this movie will happen to human minds in the future.
 - d. he wants to compare a pessimistic view of the future of the human body with a pessimistic view of the future of the human mind.
5. Choose the combination of words that best fits in blanks [5 A], [5 B], and [5 C].
 - a. [5 A] hell [5 B] optimism [5 C] hope
 - b. [5 A] heaven [5 B] optimism [5 C] hope
 - c. [5 A] hell [5 B] pessimism [5 C] despair
 - d. [5 A] heaven [5 B] pessimism [5 C] despair
6. Use the five choices below to fill in blank [6] in the best way. Indicate your choices for the FOURTH and FIFTH positions.
 - a. in
 - b. it all
 - c. ready
 - d. take
 - e. to
7. Underline (7) is used by the author because
 - a. he anticipates criticism of his vision of intellectual life in post-AI society.
 - b. he has doubts about the emergence of a renewed innocence in post-AI society.
 - c. he is not sure whether people will be aware of the relevance of Aristotle in post-AI society.
 - d. he thinks AI may trigger the emergence of new philosophers in post-AI society.
8. Which of the following statements is **NOT** in line with the content of the article?
 - a. Compared to the ancient Greeks, our minds are almost empty.
 - b. GPS has largely replaced sextants, compasses, and chronometers.
 - c. Thanks to AI technology, intellectual life may return to a more reasonable sound-to-noise ratio.
 - d. The first electronic calculator invented in 1967 was very different from an abacus.

9. Which of the following statements best reflects the opinion of the author?
- a. The author is afraid that AI will turn future human beings into lazy daydreamers.
 - b. The author is not against AI, but he is worried about its possible negative effects.
 - c. The author thinks that AI will enable us to exercise our intellectual capacities more fully.
 - d. The author thinks that AI algorithms will surpass the ingenuity of ancient Greek philosophers.
10. What is the most appropriate title for this article?
- a. Will our brains be able to relax?
 - b. Aristotle and Karl Popper were right
 - c. The algorithmic evolution is a nightmare
 - d. Will AI make us stupid?

III. Read the article and answer the following questions.

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

1. Blank [α] can be best filled by:
a. gleaming b. common c. profound d. rare
2. Choose the combination of words that best fits in blanks [β] and [γ].
a. [β] abnormal [γ] disease
b. [β] afterlife [γ] exceptional
c. [β] disease [γ] abnormal
d. [β] exceptional [γ] afterlife
3. The four blanks [A], [B], [C], and [D] show where the next sentence could be inserted. Choose the best choice.
Nevertheless, research into this phenomenon is still in its early phases.
4. According to paragraphs [1]-[5], which of the following claims is **NOT** consistent with the description of terminal lucidity?
a. Terminal lucidity gives us clues to comprehend what is happening in the patient's brain.
b. Terminal lucidity occurs when neural networks that were regarded as damaged are restored.
c. Terminal lucidity is explained as the sudden recovery of cognitive abilities.
d. Terminal lucidity enables the patients to unexpectedly recollect their relationship with other people.
5. Which of the following is **NOT** mentioned in the description of the experiments using rats in paragraph [6]?
a. Brain activity was observed after poison was administered.
b. Gamma-wave activity was observed when deprived of oxygen.
c. A surge of organized brain activity was observed in the last few days of life.
d. They may have been more alert in the moments after their hearts stopped.

6. Which of the following claims is **NOT** consistent with Jimo Borjigin's assertions in paragraphs [7] and [8]?
- a. In experiments including both humans and animals, the brain activity of the subjects decreased after a sudden drop in oxygen levels.
 - b. The areas of the brain near the back of the skull are involved in the out-of-body experiences of dying individuals.
 - c. The comatose patients' gamma-wave activation patterns resemble those seen in healthy individuals who recognize a familiar image.
 - d. The brain's attempt to restore biological balance when it notices a lack of oxygen may be the cause of terminal lucidity.
7. How can we best describe the relationship between paragraph [8] and the previous two paragraphs?
- a. Paragraph [8] provides additional evidence supporting the previous paragraphs.
 - b. Paragraph [8] summarizes the results of the previous paragraphs.
 - c. Paragraph [8] criticizes the statements of the previous paragraphs.
 - d. Paragraph [8] deepens the discussion provided in the previous paragraphs.
8. Which one of the following statements is **NOT** appropriate for the description of the AWARE II study?
- a. Several seconds before cardiac arrest, brain activity was found to disappear.
 - b. Researchers monitored the brain activities of critically ill people.
 - c. Patients' memory of the resuscitation process was explored.
 - d. Researchers observed an unexpected spike in brain activity during CPR.
9. Underline (1) can be best paraphrased as:
- a. unusual
 - b. mistaken
 - c. reasonable
 - d. psychological
10. Which is the closest in meaning to underline (2)?
- a. promising
 - b. incomplete
 - c. overwhelming
 - d. significant
11. What does Jason Karlawish think about people with dementia?
- a. Their consciousness remains incredibly active.
 - b. Their consciousness fades away gradually.
 - c. Their consciousness is permanently impaired.
 - d. Their consciousness partly exists unchanged.
12. It can be reasonably inferred from the article that the author
- a. questions the idea that cognitive decline is a one-way process.
 - b. holds superstitious beliefs about death based on scientific ways of thinking.
 - c. has established a new technology to examine the dying process.
 - d. supports investment in the treatment of cardiac disease.
13. What is the most appropriate title for this article?
- a. What happens in people's brains when they undergo cardiac arrest?
 - b. What Alzheimer's patients experience when they are dying
 - c. How does brain science explain life and death?
 - d. Why dying people often experience a burst of lucidity

[以 下 余 白]