

平成 19 年度 入学試験問題(前期日程)

英 語

試験時間 90 分 (13:30~15:00)

医学部 (医学科)

問題冊子…問題：□Ⅰ～□Ⅱ， ページ：1～3

解答用紙…2 枚 (問題冊子に折り込まれています)

この表紙をよく読んでください。ただし、試験開始の合図があるまではこの冊子を開いてはいけません。

注 意 事 項

1. 受験票を机の上に置いてください。
2. 問題冊子・解答用紙の印刷不鮮明， ページの落丁・乱丁および汚れ等により解答に支障がある場合には，手を挙げて監督者に知らせてください。
3. 各解答用紙の右上に受験番号を記入する欄があります。2 枚の解答用紙のそれぞれに受験番号を記入してください。
4. 解答は，必ず解答用紙の指定された箇所に記入してください。裏面には解答または解答の続きを書いてはいけません。なお，解答用紙には，必要事項以外は記入してはいけません。
5. 日本語で答える問題と英語で答える問題があります。問題をよく読んで解答してください。
6. 配付された解答用紙は，持ち帰ってはいけません。
7. 試験終了後，解答用紙を回収します。問題冊子は持ち帰ってください。
8. 試験終了時刻までに解答が終了しても，途中退室は認めません。

I 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。(140点)

You can't get much more conventional than the conventional wisdom that kids today would be better off spending more time reading books, and less time in front of their video games. The latest edition of Dr. Spock has this to say of video games: "The best that can be said of them is that they may help promote eye-hand co-ordination in children. The worst that can be said is that they support, and even promote aggression and violent responses to conflict. But what can be said with much greater certainty is this: most computer games are an enormous waste of time." But where reading is concerned, the advice is quite different: "I suggest you begin to foster in your children a love of reading and the printed word from the start. . . . What is important is that your child be an enthusiastic reader."

In the middle of 2004, the National Endowment for the Arts released a study that showed that reading for pleasure had declined steadily among all major American age groups. The writer Andrew Solomon analyzed the consequences of this shift: "People who read for pleasure are many times more likely than those who don't to visit museums and attend musical performances, almost three times as likely to perform volunteer and charity work, and almost twice as likely to attend sporting events. Readers, in other words, are active, while nonreaders — more than half the population — have settled into apathy. There is a basic social divide between those for whom life is a gradual accumulation of fresh experience and knowledge, and those for whom maturity is a ceasing of mental development. The shift toward the latter category is frightening."

The intellectual nourishment of reading books is so deeply rooted in our assumptions that it's hard to contemplate a different viewpoint. But as McLuhan famously observed, the problem with judging new cultural systems on their own terms is that the presence of the recent past inevitably colors your vision of the emerging form, highlighting the flaws and imperfections. Games have historically suffered from this syndrome, largely because they have been contrasted with the older conventions of reading. To get around these prejudices, try this experiment. Imagine an alternate world identical to ours save one techno-historical change: video games were invented and popularized before books. In this alternate universe, kids have been playing games for centuries — and then these page-bound texts come along and suddenly they're all the rage. What would the teachers, and the parents, and the cultural authorities have to say about this frenzy of reading? I suspect it would sound something like this:

Reading books chronically slows down the senses. Unlike the longstanding tradition of gameplaying — which engages the child in a vivid, three-dimensional world filled with moving images and musical backgrounds, navigated and controlled with complex muscular movements — books are simply a barren string of words on the page. Only a small portion of the brain devoted to processing written language is activated during reading.

Books are also tragically isolating. While games have for many years engaged the young in complex social relationships with their peers, building and exploring worlds together, books force the child to separate him or herself in a quiet space, shut off from interaction with other children. These new "libraries" that have arisen in recent years to facilitate reading activities are a frightening sight: dozens of young children, normally so lively and socially interactive, sitting alone in small compartments, reading silently,

forgetting their peers.

But perhaps the most dangerous property of these books is the fact that they follow a fixed linear path. You can't control their narratives in any fashion — you simply sit back and have the story dictated to you. For those of us raised on interactive narratives, this property may seem astonishing. Why would anyone want to embark on an adventure utterly planned and plotted by another person? But today's generation embarks on such adventures millions of times a day. This risks implanting a general passivity in our children, making them feel as though they're powerless to change their circumstances.

Reading is not an active, participatory process; it's an obedient one. The book readers of the younger generation are learning to “follow the plot” instead of learning to lead.

It should probably go without saying, but it probably goes better with saying, that I don't agree with this argument. But neither is it exactly right to say that its assertions are untrue. The argument relies on a kind of amplified selectivity: it highlights certain isolated properties of books, and then projects worst-case scenarios based on these properties and their potential effects on the “younger generation.” But it doesn't bring up any of the clear benefits of reading: the complexity of argument and storytelling offered by the book form; the stretching of the imagination kindled by reading words on a page; the shared experience you get when everyone is reading the same story.

A comparable trick is at work any time you hear someone lamenting today's video game obsessions, and their terrible effects on tomorrow's generations. Games are not novels, and the ways in which they harbor novelistic aspirations are invariably the least interesting thing about them. You can judge games by the criteria designed to evaluate novels: Are the characters believable? Is the dialogue complex? But inevitably, the games will come up wanting. Games are good at novelistic storytelling the way Michael Jordan was good at playing baseball. Both could probably make a living at it, but their world-class talents lie elsewhere.

Before we get to those talents, let me say a few words about the virtues of reading books. For the record, I think those virtues are immense ones — and not just because I make a living writing books. We should all encourage our kids to read more, to develop a comfort with, and an appetite for, reading. But even the most enthusiastic reader in this culture is invariably going to spend his or her time with other media — with games, television, movies, or the Internet. And these other forms of culture have intellectual virtues in their own right — different from, but comparable to, the rewards of reading.

(Steven Johnson, *Everything Bad is Good for You*, Allen Lane, 2005 年より一部改変)

設問 1 下線部①, ②を日本語に直しなさい。

設問 2 筆者の主張においてプロバスケットボールの選手である Michael Jordan とビデオゲームはどのように関連しているのか。日本語で述べなさい。

設問 3 次の質問に英語で答えなさい。

- (A) What kind of techno-historical change does the author imagine in his alternate world? In this alternate world, what are some of the criticisms made about reading in comparison with playing video games?
- (B) What does the author feel are the benefits of reading?
- (C) What does the author think about judging video games?

II 次の文を読んで設問に答えなさい。(60点)

結婚式のスピーチでちょっと言い過ぎてしまったとか、忌みことばをつかってしまったとかいう「失言」であれば、私なんかはしょっちゅう失言している。結婚式で「離れていても」とか「切れる男です」という類の忌み言葉をついうっかりつかって、後で女房から厳重な注意を受けることもしばしばである。

だが私は性格的に、失言を気にしていつまでもクヨクヨすることはない。これは大事なことだと思っている。

「公の席での失言はたくさんの方が聞いているから、大問題ですよ」と言う人もいるだろうが、案外そんなことはないものだ。

「人の噂も七十五日」と言うように、他人は人の言ったことを、いつまでも覚えていないものである。それどころか、スピーチにいたっては真剣に聞いていない人も少なくない。

だから、「しまった」と思うようなことを言ったとしても、誰も気づかないことがある。それを、一人で「マズかったな、どうしよう」と、いつまでもクヨクヨしては、精神衛生上、はなはだよろしくない。

こんな話がある。

アメリカの大統領だったフランクリン・D・ルーズベルト(Franklin D. Roosevelt)が、「社交の席では、人はそれほど他人の言うことに関心を示さないため、少々驚くようなことを発言しても、誰もその内容を気にしない」という話がのっている本を読んだ。

たとえば、パーティーの席でホステスが客に、「いらしていただいて、ひどい目にあいましたわ。もう二度とこないでくださいね」と言ったとしても、相手は自分の挨拶をどう言おうかというだけで頭が一杯になっているので、彼女の言ったことなど聞いていない、というのであった。

ルーズベルトは、この説が本当かどうか確かめることにした。

ある日、ホワイトハウス主催のある大きなパーティーで、大統領に挨拶する人たちが1マイルにもおよぶ列をつくっていた。ルーズベルトはその一人一人と握手しながら、「100万ドルの微笑み」を浮かべて、「私は今朝、祖母を殺しました」とつぶやいてみた。すると、誰一人として、大統領のこの「殺人の告白」に気がつく者はいなかったという。

公の席での話というのは、だいたいこんなものである。「失言した」と思うのは自分一人だった、ということが往々にしてある。あまり深刻に考えなくてもいいのである。

(斉藤茂太『口のきき方 私の人間学』三笠書房、1990年より一部改変)

設問 1 下線部を英語に直しなさい。

設問 2 大統領は本で読んだ説をどのようにして確かめたのか。英語で答えなさい。

設問 3 筆者はどのようにして公の席で失言してもあまり悩む必要はないと考えるのか。英語で答えなさい。