平成20年度入学試験問題

英　　語

注　意

1. 問題冊子は，指示があるまで開かないこと。
2. 問題冊子は7ページ，解答紙は2枚である。
   「始め」の合図があったら，それぞれページ数および枚数を確認すること。
3. 「始め」の合図があったら，すべての解答紙それぞれ2ケ所に受験番号を記入すること。
4. 解答は，黒色鉛筆(シャープペンシルも可)を使用し，すべて所定の欄に記入すること。欄外および裏面には記入しないこと。
5. 試験終了後，監督者の指示に従って，解答紙の順番をそろえること。
6. 下書き等は，問題冊子の余白を利用すること。
7. 解答紙は持ち帰らないこと。

〔1〕 次の英文を読んで，文中の（ ア ）～（ コ ）に入れるのに最も適当な英語一語をそれぞれ書きなさい。

One day last summer, when I was working behind the counter at the bookstore, a young boy came in and (ア) stealing books. There were a lot of customers in (イ) at the cash register just then, so I didn't notice him (ウ) first. But when I noticed what he was doing, I started to shout. He dashed for the door, and by the time I got out from behind the counter, he was already running down the street. I chased him for a hundred meters, and then I (エ) up. He had dropped something along the way, and since I didn't (オ) like running anymore, I bent down to see what it was.

It turned out to be his wallet. There wasn't any money inside, but his identity card was there, along with three or four photographs. I suppose I could have (カ) the police and had him arrested, but I felt sorry for him, and when I (キ) at those pictures in his wallet, I couldn't feel angry at him. In (ク), he had his arm around his mother or grandmother. In another, he was sitting there, about age nine or ten, wearing a baseball uniform and with a big (ケ) on his face. I didn't have the heart to track him down. He was probably just some poor kid from Brooklyn,* and maybe he would (コ) a few things from the books he had stolen.

—*Auggie Wren's Christmas Story*, by Paul Auster (originally published in *The New York Times*, December 25, 1990) (2004) Henry Holt and Company, New York, pp. 17–21 より抜粋，一部改変。

〔注〕 Brooklyn：米国 New York 市の 5 つの区のひとつ

〔問題２〕は３ページから始まります。

〔2〕 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

One day, late for a meeting in midtown Manhattan,* I was looking for a shortcut* to my destination. I walked through the entrance on the ground floor of a skyscraper,* planning to use an exit* door I had spotted on the other side that would give me a faster route through the block, but as soon as I reached the building's lobby a uniformed guard rushed toward me, waving his arms and shouting, "You can't walk through here!"

"Why not?" I asked, puzzled.

"Private property! It's private property!" he shouted. I could easily see that he was angry.

I seemed to have accidentally stepped into an unmarked security zone. "It would help," I (1) suggested reasonably, "if there were a sign on the door saying, 'Do Not Enter.'"

My remark made him even angrier. "Get out! Get out!" he screamed.

Feeling upset, I quickly reversed my direction, his anger making me feel angry inside for the next several blocks.

When people direct their toxic* feelings at us — explode in anger or threats, show disgust or contempt — they activate in us our own circuitry* for those very same negative emotions. Their act has strong psychological consequences: emotions are contagious.* We "catch" strong emotions in much the same way as we catch a virus — and so can come down with the emotional version of a cold.

Every interaction has an emotional aspect. Along with whatever else we are doing, we can make each other feel a little better, or even a lot better, or a little worse — or a lot worse, as happened to me. Beyond what happens in the moment, we can retain a mood that stays with us long after the direct encounter ends — an emotional residue.*

These unspoken parts of communication drive what amounts to an emotional economy, with emotional gains and losses we experience with a given person, or in a given conversation, or on any given day. By evening, the total balance of feelings we have exchanged largely determines what kind of day — "good" or "bad" — we feel we've had.

We participate in this interpersonal economy (2) whenever a social interaction results in a transfer of feeling — which is virtually always. Such interpersonal judo has countless variations, but they are all related to our ability to change another person's mood, and their ability to change ours. When I make you frown, I cause you to feel a touch of worry; when you make me smile, I feel happy. In this silent exchange, emotions pass from person to person, from outside to inside — hopefully for the best.

A negative side of emotional contagion comes when we receive a toxic state simply by being around the wrong person at the wrong time. I was a random victim of that security guard's anger. Like secondhand smoke,* one person's expression of negative emotions can cause harm to another, innocent person.

In moments like my experience with that guard, as we confront someone's anger, our

brain automatically checks to see if it signals some further danger. The resulting alertness* is driven largely by the amygdala,* an almond-shaped area in the midbrain that triggers* the fight, flight,* or freeze response to danger. Of the entire range of feelings, fear is the one that arouses the amygdala most powerfully. (3)

When it is driven by alarm, the amygdala's extensive circuitry takes control of key points throughout the brain, leading our thoughts, attention, and perception toward whatever has made us afraid. We instinctively become more attentive to the faces of the people around us, searching for smiles or frowns that give us a better sense of how to interpret signs of danger or that might signal someone's intentions.

This increased amygdala-driven alertness heightens our ability to understand emotional signals in other people. That intense focus then makes us feel another person's feelings more powerfully, making contagion easier to happen. In result, our moments of fear make it easier for us to be affected by another person's emotions.

More generally, the amygdala acts as a radar for the brain, calling attention to whatever might be new, puzzling, or important to learn more about. The amygdala operates the brain's early warning system, observing everything that happens, always looking out for emotionally important events — especially for potential threats. While the amygdala's role as a guard and a trigger for distress* is old news to neuroscience,* its social role, as part of the brain's system for emotional contagion, has been revealed only recently. (4)

— *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships*, by Daniel Goleman (2006) Arrow Books: London, pp. 13–15 より抜粋，一部改変。

〔注〕 Manhattan：米国 New York 市の中心をなす区で同名の島と周辺の小島からなる。
shortcut：近道　skyscraper：超高層ビル　exit：出口
toxic：有毒の，とても不快な　circuitry：電気回路の一部
contagious：伝染性の，うつりやすい　residue：残滓，影響
secondhand smoke：間接喫煙の煙　alertness：警戒心　amygdala：扁桃体
trigger(s)：(動詞)引き起こす，(名詞)誘因　flight：逃げ出すこと，逃避
distress：苦悩　neuroscience：神経科学

〔設　問〕

1. 下線部(1)を日本語に訳しなさい。

2. 下線部(2)が指すことを日本語で書きなさい。

3. 下線部(3)が指すことを日本語で書きなさい。

4. 下線部(4)が指すことを，本文の内容に沿って，150 字程度の日本語で書きなさい。

〔3〕 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

We name our pets, raise them, clothe them, and treat them with much kindness. We describe them as being selfish, sensitive and caring. They are not human, but it is in our nature to think that animals have human characteristics even if they don't really exist. For this reason, in order to be objective observers of nature, scientists have been careful to avoid anthropomorphizing* animals. To talk about a dog's being proud or a cat's being shy would welcome professional criticism.

In recent years, however, evidence has begun to show that animals do have personalities. Chimpanzees, for example, can be conscientious: they think before they act, they plan and they control their impulses.* Research has identified similar personalities in many other species.

These findings have a strong relevance to research on human personality. (1) Scientists can look to animal studies for insight into humans in the same way they now look to animal testing for insight into drugs. Animal research has already begun to reveal how different types of people respond to medicines and treatments. Aggressive and passive rats respond differently to antidepressants,* for example. The hope is that animals can make clear the complex effect of genes* and the environment on people's personality. The research might even allow us to predict what people will do, based on their personalities, when they're stressed out or frightened. Personality testing could uncover a wealth of knowledge about where personality comes from.

Ivan Pavlov* did his famous work with dogs in the early 1900s, but animal-personality studies were then forgotten for decades. Now the field is making a comeback. In one study of fruit flies,* researchers found some flies to be consistently more aggressive than others. Similar research observed differences in rainbow trout* and found some to be consistently bolder in looking for food than others. Observations of more than sixty animal species show the presence of what can only be called personality.

Scientists say that this is not an accident of nature, but part of a complex evolutionary strategy.

Animals have obvious advantages as test subjects. Humans are difficult to study over an entire lifetime and are more complicated than other animals. Psychologists must consider a person's goals, values, abilities and attitudes, as well as physical condition and life story. (2) By putting animals with specific personalities (aggressive or passive, for example) into specific situations (isolation or social setting, for example) and testing them, scientists could help determine how personality influences responses to disease and treatments. Recent research

on stress-related personality disorders like posttraumatic stress,* chronic fatigue* and depression has already begun to rely on animal models. As an example, placing a dominant male rat in a situation of social defeat (by putting it in the territory of a stronger rat) will cause behaviors characteristic of human depression.

The most important results of animal personality research will come in the future, as scientists begin to use animals to understand how genes and environment interact to influence personality. Currently, scientists rely on observations of identical twins* brought up in different environments, which doesn't happen often. Animals, however, can be cloned* in large numbers and raised in systematically varied environments. In experiments on monkeys suffering from the animal equivalent of AIDS, monkeys, which are sociable animals, fared better when they interacted with other monkeys, while those kept in isolation — like humans in a hospital — fared worse. (3)That is the kind of effect that scientists may now be able to study more widely. Perhaps that is the positive aspect of discovering that humans are not the only animals that have personality.

— "Just Like Humans," by Jessica Bennett, *Newsweek*, June 18, 2007, p. 42 より抜粋，一部改変。

〔注〕 anthropomorphizing<anthropomorphize：擬人化する
impulse(s)：衝動　antidepressant(s)：抗うつ剤　gene(s)：遺伝子
Ivan Pavlov：ロシアの生理学者(1849～1936)
fruit flies<fruit fly：ミバエ，ショウジョウバエ　rainbow trout：ニジマス
posttraumatic stress：心的外傷後ストレス　chronic fatigue：慢性疲労
identical twin(s)：一卵性双生児　cloned<clone：～をクローンとして増やす

〔設　問〕

1. 下線部(1)を日本語に訳しなさい。

2. 下線部(2)を日本語に訳しなさい。

3. 下線部(3)が指すことを日本語で書きなさい。

4. 本文の内容に関する次の文(1)～(8)を読み，正しいものには○，間違っているものには×を，それぞれ記入しなさい。

(1) Research in the relation between animals and personality has been conducted continuously for more than a hundred years.

(2) Rats that have different personalities show different medical responses.

(3) The results of animal-personality research have already been put to practical use in investigating human diseases.

(4) Researchers have already started to adopt animal models to predict how twins differ in development when brought up in different circumstances.

(5) Animal-personality research is especially important since it is expected to contribute to discovering how genes and the environment are related to personality.

(6) Animals can be studied over their whole lifetime relatively easily.

(7) Ivan Pavlov found that some flies are aggressive.

(8) Personality in animals is an unexpected result of evolution.

〔4〕 (英作文)次の英文の指示に従って，100 語程度の英語を書きなさい。

What role do you think the English language will play in your future career?