

F-1

後期日程

令和7年度入学者選抜学力検査問題

小論文（文学部人文学科）

行動科学コース

1ページ～8ページ

歴史学コース

9ページ～14ページ

注意事項

1. この冊子は、監督者から解答を始めるよう合図があるまで開いてはいけません。
2. 監督者から指示があったら、解答用紙の上部の所定欄に受験番号、座席番号を、また、下部の所定欄には座席番号をそれぞれ記入しなさい。その他の欄に記入してはいけません。
3. 解答は横書きとします。
4. 解答用紙は、記入の有無にかかわらず、持ち帰ってはいけません。
5. この冊子は持ち帰りなさい。
6. 落丁、乱丁または印刷不備があれば申し出なさい。

行動科学コース

以下の文章は、Darwin が生物の形態や行動だけでなく感情(emotion)も進化したと考えた背景と、その後の時代における感情に関する理論について論じている。この中で、特に、感情表出(感情を表していると思える行動や身体反応)と、感情経験(感情を意識的に感じる事)が議論されている。この文章を読み、問1～6に日本語で答えなさい。ただし、固有名詞は英語で表記しても構わない(その場合は1マスにつきアルファベット2字とすること)。なお、*のついた語については文末に語注がある。また、文中の[...]は中略を示す。

問 1 下線部①の考えの根拠について、本文中で挙げられている3つのことを100字以内にまとめて説明しなさい。

問 2 下線部②にあるように、Darwin は行動を重視したが感情経験を無視したわけではなかった。それでは、Darwin は行動と感情経験の関係をどのように捉えていたのか。本文中の「恐怖」の例を使いながら80字以内で説明しなさい。

問 3 下線部③の理由を、humanize the brute(獣を人間化する)に関する本文中の具体例を示したうえで、150字以内で記述しなさい。

問 4 下線部④について、primary emotions(一次的感情)の特徴を secondary emotions(二次的感情)との違いに触れながら100字以内で説明しなさい。

問 5 下線部⑤は basic emotions theory(基本感情理論)をどのように批判しているのか。things that do not actually exist が指していることを明確にして、100字以内で説明しなさい。

問 6 動物が「喜び」の感情を感じていると思える行動について、これまでにあなたが観察した事例を記述しなさい。そのうえで、その動物が喜びを感じていたと言えるかどうか、そして、動物の喜びが進化したものと言えるかどうかについて、その理由を含めて、あなたの考えを 600 字以内で記述しなさい。なお、あなたの考えと本文の主張は同じでなくてもよい。

The modern version of the idea that ① primitive human emotions are inherited from our animal ancestors was born on November 26, 1872, the date that Charles Darwin's book *The Expression* of the Emotions in Man and Animals* was published. Darwin had earlier advanced his revolutionary theory that species evolve through a process of natural selection*, and in this new work he argued that emotional “states of mind” evolve the same way.

Darwin's theory was inspired by his observations of what he called expressive actions: behavioral and physiological responses that occur in connection with emotions. He noted that “the chief expressive actions, exhibited by man and by the lower animals, are innate or inherited — that is, have not been learnt by the individual.” As evidence for innate emotional responses in humans, Darwin noted that certain expressions of emotion, especially in the face, are similar in people around the world, regardless of their racial origins or cultural heritage and regardless of their isolation from other races or cultures. He also noted that the same emotional expressions occur in individuals who are born blind and had no opportunity to learn what these look like. [...]

Darwin also noted that a number of emotional expressions are similar across species: “Some of the expressive actions of monkeys are ... closely analogous* to man.” He cited expressions of pleasure, grief*, anger, and fear, among others, and also cited the commonness of freezing* and flight* as a response to danger in many animals.

Because Darwin emphasized the outward expression of emotions, he is sometimes said to have not been concerned with their subjective aspects. ② Although

he certainly devoted more ink to behavioral characteristics than feelings*, it is not the case that he ignored the latter. For him, as for many people then and now, emotional behaviors are fundamental signs (expressions) of emotional feelings. He explained his position this way: “Certain actions expressive of certain states of mind are the direct results of the constitution of the nervous system. ... Trembling* under the influence of fear ... is an example.” The key phrase in this quote is “*actions expressive of certain states of mind.*” What he is implying here is that these mental states are the basis for innate behaviors: Threats elicit innate feelings of fear, and fear in turn elicits freezing, trembling, and flight. Darwin argued that because these emotional mental states give rise to behaviors that help organisms adapt and survive, the mental states were preserved in the nervous system via natural selection, passed on within species, and conserved as new species evolved. In Darwin’s view, we feel fear when in danger because some prototype of fear present in our animal ancestor helped them survive, and it continues in us because it has been helpful to the survival of our species as well.

In contemporary psychology and neuroscience, as we’ve seen, terms like “mental” or “mind” do not necessarily refer to conscious* processes. Perceiving, remembering, attending, thinking, planning, and deciding involve nonconscious processes that do much of the mental work and actually make conscious awareness possible. But in Darwin’s time, “mental” was synonymous* with “conscious.” Darwin was clearly implying that conscious emotional states of mind (feelings) underlie emotional expressions.

Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection was one of the greatest intellectual achievements in history. But his belief that our emotional feelings themselves are inherited from animal ancestors and are represented in essentially prepackaged* form in the brains of all humans, although consistent with everyday folk wisdom* and useful in daily life, takes us down the wrong path, in my opinion, in terms of understanding emotions and their underlying brain mechanisms.

Darwin’s interest in emotional behavior reflected a deeper interest in the

evolution of the human mind. He believed that “there is no fundamental difference between man and the higher mammals* in their mental faculties.” But as one psychological historian pointed out, “Darwin bestowed* a mental life upon man’s cousins with a very open hand, without the self-critical zeal* that marked his biological endeavors.” Darwin went so far as to proclaim* that worms “deserve to be called intelligent, for they ... act in nearly the same manner as a man under similar circumstances.” He often argued for such human qualities in animals, commonly characterizing their expressive behaviors with terms like “affectionate*,” “cheerful,” “savage*,” “pleased by being caressed*,” “jealous,” and so on. He likewise made generous* use of anthropomorphically* based anecdotes*: “What a strong feeling of inward* satisfaction must impel* a bird, so full of activity, to brood* day after day over her eggs.” [...]

Like Darwin, Romanes is often criticized for treating anecdotes about animal behavior as scientific data. (On the basis of largely innate behaviors triggered by innate stimuli, for example, he described earwigs* as affectionate to their offspring* and fish as jealous and angry.) Such arguments based on analogy with human behavior are now viewed as on par with commonsense intuitions and should not, on their own, be taken as scientific evidence for mental state consciousness in other animals. (Common sense is often a starting point in scientific research, but scientific conclusions require more.)

But Romanes was not alone in such theorizing. The tendency to attribute mental states — typically human like mental states — to animals on the basis of behavioral responses was so rampant* in the waning* years of the nineteenth century that one researcher, Lloyd Morgan, warned that ③ scientists should resist the temptation to “humanize the brute.” He argued that just because scientists necessarily start their exploration of animal behavior from their own subjective experiences does not justify the attribution of similar experiences to other animals. This kind of attribution is desirable, he argued, when we interact socially with other humans, but is questionable when trying to understand animal behavior. Morgan famously wrote that we should

not call upon human mental states to account for animal behavior if a simpler, nonmental state explanation is available. This position is now known as Morgan's Canon. It is so difficult to resist the pull of folk wisdom, though, that even Morgan himself transgressed, using the phrase "coalescence of mental problems in a conscious situation*" in a description of his dog's ability to open the garden gate. Still, he acknowledged that although animals have intelligence, they lack reason — they think but "do not think the therefore." [...]

Darwin was correct in stating that certain behaviors are innately wired in the brain. But his view that emotional feelings cause behavior because conscious feelings and emotional responses are innately coupled in the brain demands further consideration.

Darwin's views are alive and well today in the theory of *basic emotions*, which originated in the writings of Silvan Tomkins in the 1960s. Building on Darwin, Tomkins proposed that several *primary* (or *basic*) *emotions* are genetically built into the human brain by natural selection and expressed identically in everyone, regardless of racial or cultural background. Each of these innate emotions was said to be wired into an *affect program**, a hypothetical subcortical* neural structure assumed to somehow involve the limbic and arousal systems*. In the presence of a trigger stimulus* for a given emotion, the affect program would be activated, and the bodily responses characteristic of that emotion would be expressed. The primary emotions that Tomkins identified were surprise, interest, joy, rage*, fear, disgust, and anguish*. ^④These primary emotions were contrasted with *secondary emotions*, such as guilt, shame, embarrassment*, empathy, and so on, all of which are culturally determined. Like Darwin, Tomkins focused on universal expressions but used mental state (emotion) words to name the expressions and their underlying affect program. [...]

The psychologists Lisa Barrett and James Russell have been especially strong critics of basic emotions theory, questioning one of its implicit* assumptions — namely, that emotions are "natural kinds," or biologically prepackaged psychological states. They and others argue that emotions such as fear, which are assumed to be

basic emotions, are in fact not singular entities* with a biological existence established through natural selection and inherited from other animals. Instead, they propose that the states of mind called basic emotions are psychologically constructed concepts that are labeled using culturally learned words. ⑤ Words are indeed powerful dictators of beliefs, sometimes giving an existence to things that do not actually exist. Although I don't accept all of Barrett and Russell's arguments, I agree with their overall conclusions that the conscious feelings labeled with basic emotion terms are *not* prepackaged innate states that are unleashed* by external stimuli but instead are cognitively assembled* in consciousness.

出典：Joseph Ledoux, “Chapter 5: Have we inherited emotional states of mind from our animal ancestors?” *Anxious* (Oneworld Publications, 2015). eBook edition. 一部
改変

語注

expression：感情の行動的表出。例えば、脅威に対する顔表情 (facial expression) や、闘争や逃走のための咄嗟の動き、身体の硬直など (behavioral expression)。

natural selection：自然淘汰／自然選択

analogous：類似した

grief：悲しみ

freezing：凍結。脅威に対峙したときに身体が硬直すること。

flight：逃走

feeling：感情の主観的経験。例えば、脅威に対して怖いという感情を感じること。

trembling：震え

conscious：意識的な

synonymous：同義の

prepackaged：あらかじめ組み込まれた

folk wisdom：俗説

mammal：哺乳類

bestow：～を与える

zeal：熱意

proclaim：～を公言する

affectionate：愛情深い

savage：野蛮な

caress：撫でる

generous：寛大な

anthropomorphically：擬人化して

anecdote：逸話

inward：内面的な

impel：～を駆り立てる

brood：(卵を)抱く

earwig：ハサミムシ

offspring：子

rampant：蔓延した

waning：終わり近くの

coalescence of mental problems in a conscious situation：意識的状況における精神的問題の集合。問題解決に関する表現。

affect program：感情プログラム。生得的感情それぞれに特有の身体反応を作り出すと仮定される脳の機能。

subcortical：大脳皮質下の

limbic and arousal systems：大脳辺縁系および覚醒系。感情的な情報を処理して、身体を興奮状態にする機能をもつ脳の神経構造。

trigger stimulus：誘発刺激。反応を生じさせる情報や出来事のこと。

rage：怒り

anguish：苦しみ

embarrassment：恥ずかしさ, 気まずさ

implicit：暗黙の

entity : 実体

unleash : ～を解き放つ

assemble : ～を構築する

歴史学コース

- 1 次の文章はフランスの歴史学者フェルナン・ブローデルがリセ(日本の高等学校に相当するフランスの後期中等教育機関)の最終学年向けに執筆した書物の一部である。筆者の考えに対する意見を述べながら、あなたの考える歴史の教え方、学び方について600字以内で述べなさい。

私はつねづね子どもたちに対しては、やさしい物語を話して聞かせたり、絵やテレビ番組や映画を見せたりするのがよいとすすめてきた。つまり、大ざっぱに言えば、伝統的な歴史学を手直しして、子どもたちがなれ親しんでいるさまざまなメディアに合わせたものを見せよう、というわけである。私は万事心得たうえでいっているのだが、それというのも、私自身、同世代の大学教師がみんなそうであるように、ずっと長いあいだリセの教師を勤めてきたからである。自分が担当する最終学級やグラン・ゼコール準備学級のほかに、第6学級、すなわち10才から12才の子どもたちのクラスを受け持たせてほしいといつも要求したものだ。この年頃の子どもたちというのはかわいらしく率直に感嘆を表わすのでとても話がやすく、こういう聞き手を前にしてなら、魔法のランプでも使ったように歴史を次から次へと呼びだせるからである。大きな問題は、そういうふうにしなから子どもたちに発見をうながすことができるかどうか、ということだ。つまり、これまで人間が生きてきた時代を一望のもとにおいてその現実を見いださせ、そういう時代に含まれるさまざまな方向や意味がどのようなものか、そしてそうした時代を画し、それとすぐにわかるような特徴を与える連続性が何であるのか、そのようなものを子どもたちに発見させることができるかどうかというわけである。それなのに、ごく普通のときの生徒が、ルイ14世をナポレオンと、ダンテをマキャヴェリと、それぞれ関連させて位置づけることができないのであれば、それ自体が忌まわしいことだと私は思う。時代というものは、少しずつ認識してゆくならば、混乱をまねくことなどめったにあるものではない。それに、やさしく物語をすれば、それはまるでひとりでに広がってゆくように情景や風景や全体像へと開かれていって、私たちはヴェネツィアやボルドーやロンドンやいろいろな場

所に連れて行かれることになるのである。こうして時代について勉強するかたわら、語彙の習得も必要なものとなってくる。つまり、抽象的なものであれ、具体的なものであれ、言葉を正確に使えるよう学ぶのである。社会、国家、経済、文明といった鍵となる概念も同じことだ。こうしたことをこのうえなく単純におこなえばよい。基本的な年代の知識を必須のものとして課し、傑出した重要な人物を、憎むべき人物でも、時間のなかに位置づける。要するに、しかるべく位置づけるのである。

出典：フェルナン・ブローデル(松本雅弘訳)『文明の文法 I』(みすず書房 1995年),
18～19頁より抜粋。

2 次の英文を読み、以下の設問に答えなさい。*がついている語には、ページ下に注がある。また、文中の[...]は、文章の一部を省略したことを示す。

The story of the Russian noblewoman, as told in literature and historical narrative, has been one of paradox. She appears in each telling as both formidable and powerless, performing by turns the role of tyrant and victim in the patriarchal* family. In the historical record her prominence in public life rises and falls, peaking in the eighteenth century but dwindling* after the reign of Catherine the Great*. In the tales of nineteenth-century novelists her moral superiority guides the feckless* nobleman who grapples with* the evils of serfdom* and autocracy*. Neither account, however, explains how the formidable woman emerged alongside her more familiar powerless counterpart, or why the experience of Russian women has been imagined as one of such stark* contradictions.

The legal status of Russian women was rife* with similar incongruities*. Women of all social estates were obliged to live with their husbands, and they could neither work nor travel without their permission. Divorce was virtually unattainable in the Orthodox Church, even for wives who suffered physical abuse, and legal separation became prevalent only at the end of the nineteenth century. Yet, while the burden of gender tutelage* seemed to weigh more heavily on women in Russian society, Russian noblewomen enjoyed one advantage virtually unknown to their counterparts in Western Europe: from the mid-eighteenth century married women could own and dispose of property separately from their husbands.

注 patriarchal 家父長制の / dwindle 縮小する, 衰える /

Catherine the Great エカチェリーナ大帝(エカチェリーナ2世) /

feckless 無能な / grapple with 取っ組み合う / serfdom 農奴制 /

autocracy 専制 / stark まったくの / rife 満ちている /

incongruity 不一致, 矛盾 / tutelage 保護, 監督

This peculiar exception to women's legal servitude* excited comment among foreign visitors to Russia in the nineteenth century; it has also inspired abundant speculation on the part of scholars. No one, however, has explored the significance of property ownership in the lives of Russian noblewomen. ① Many historians have dismissed Russian women's control of their fortunes as *pro forma** and assumed that women could not administer their property within the confines of the patriarchal family. In the words of one scholar, "Noblewomen, unlike their peers in West Europe, were entitled to own and dispose of property, but their right was meaningless in a society where they were bound legally to their fathers' tutelage and, if they married, to a husband chosen or approved by him." ② At the opposite extreme, others have made extravagant* claims for the liberties Russian noblewomen enjoyed vis-à-vis* their European contemporaries. [...]

The stereotype of the downtrodden* Russian woman originated with the narratives of European travelers. Visitors to early-modern* Muscovy* regaled* their audience with tales of wife beating and domestic misery, while depicting* Russian women as ill-mannered and prone to* drunkenness. One of these accounts, written by a Frenchman in 1761, drew the ire* of Catherine II. Women in Russia "enjoy even greater liberty" than women in other European nations, she retorted*, and then cited women's ownership of their dowries as evidence of their superior legal standing. By the end of the eighteenth century, however, lurid* reports of female subjugation* had given way to a new preoccupation*: the power of women in the family and society, which foreigners attributed to Russian women's unusual legal and economic status.

注 servitude 隷属状態 / *pro forma* 形式上 / extravagant 過度の /
 vis-à-vis に対して, と比較して / downtrodden 虐げられた /
 early-modern 近世の / Muscovy モスクワ大公国, モスクワ国家 /
 regale 楽しませる / depict 描く / prone to 傾向がある, しがちである /
 ire 怒り / retort 反論する / lurid 恐ろしい / subjugation 従属 /
 preoccupation 先入観

The observations of a young English traveler at the turn of the nineteenth century are typical of these later accounts. While Catherine Wilmot*, like previous visitors from Europe, exclaimed more than once about the ignorance and vulgar appearance of her female companions in Russia, she also noted that they enjoyed unusually extensive property rights. “You must know that every Woman has the right over her own Fortune totally independent of her Husband and he is as independent of his Wife,” she wrote to her sister Harriet in 1806. “Marriage is therefore no Union of interests whatsoever.... This gives a curious sort of hue* to the Conversations of the Russian Matrons* which to a meek* English Woman appears prodigious* independence in the midst of a Despotic* Government!” Catherine’s sister Martha remarked on this phenomenon in a journal entry from the same year: “The full and entire dominion which Russian Women have over their own fortunes gives them a remarkable degree of liberty and a degree of independence of their Husbands unknown in England.”

Male observers also reported on the prominence* of Russian women at court and in provincial society, albeit* not always with approbation*. Although more concerned with Russia’s political development than with social customs, August von Haxthausen* indulged in several asides on the status of women. “In Russia the female sex occupies a different position from its counterpart in the rest of Europe,” he began. Haxthausen compared the slothful* merchant women he encountered unfavorably* with German housewives, but the privileges of Russian noblewomen did not escape him. “A large part of the real estate is also in the hands of women,” he related, adding that “it is

注 Catherine Wilmot キャサリン・ウィルモット(18世紀後半～19世紀前半のイギリスの旅行家) / hue 特色 / matron 既婚女性 / meek 過度に従順な / prodigious 極めて大きな, 並外れた / despotic 独裁的な / prominence 目立つこと / albeit ではあるが, だけれども / approbation 賛成, 承認 / August von Haxthausen アウグスト・フォン・ハクストハウゼン(18世紀末～19世紀中頃のドイツの学者, 文筆家) / slothful 怠惰な / unfavorably 好ましくなく

easy to understand what a great influence women enjoy in society as a result.”

出典：Michelle Lamarche Marrese, *A Woman's Kingdom: Noblewomen and the Control of Property in Russia, 1700-1861* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 1-5 より抜粋。

問 1 下線部①を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 2 下線部②を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 3 歴史研究者たちによって提示される歴史上のロシア女性像には、どのような相違が認められるか。英文中で紹介される歴史資料からの事例を簡単に挙げながら、300字以内で説明しなさい。