

# 信州大学

経法学部・医学部保健学科・医学部医学科

前期日程

## 平成28年度入学試験問題

### 英 語

#### 注 意 事 項

1. この問題冊子は、試験開始の合図があるまで開いてはいけません。
2. この問題冊子は、全部で8ページあります。
3. 解答用紙は、全部で4枚あります。
4. 解答は、解答用紙の該当欄に記入してください。
5. 受験番号は、解答用紙の指定された箇所に記入してください。決して氏名を書いてはいけません。
6. 解答用紙は、試験終了後回収します。
7. この問題冊子は、持ち帰ってください。

1

次の英文を読んで以下の間に答えなさい。

Somebody conducted a poll of college students recently to find out why they had come to college, and a vast number of them, I think the actual figure was 80 percent, said that the reason they had enrolled in college was to learn how to make money. Now money is a very important commodity, and (1)if you had lived through the Great Depression as I did as a young man, it would have been burned deep into you. You'd never forget just how important it is to have some money.

Nevertheless, if your motive for going on to further college work is only to make money, you're not interested in a college education. What you're really after is a training school. There's nothing wrong with training schools. Whether you are eager to be a first-rate artisan, or a good carpenter, or a mason, or to get into one of the learned professions like medicine, training is essential. But this is only one side of college life and in some ways not the most important side. The sad thing is that we live in a society that is in danger of losing the very concept of a liberal education.

Why liberal? What is "liberal" about it? Some knowledge of our language can help us here. A liberal education originally ( a ) the sort of education that you gave to a free man. A slave needs to ( b ) only certain skills. That is true not merely of a chattel slave but of the wage slave and even of the wealthy man who is completely enslaved to his business. Our democracy proudly insists that all its citizens are, or ought to be, free men. If so, each of us ( c ) a liberal education — one that helps us not merely to make a living but to live a fully satisfactory life.

How does a liberal education do that? Well, one of the ways in which it liberates us is by providing us with (2)much ampler living room. Each of us is born in one little corner of this world and in one narrow segment of time. It doesn't matter too much whether it's in Hicksville, Nebraska, in 1901 or in Flatbush, Brooklyn, New York, in 1843. Either will prove rather cramped quarters if that is all we ever know. But history and literature can liberate us: they can make us acquainted with the rest of the world and with all of the experience of humanity itself.

I'm well aware that the jet plane has allowed us to ( d ) space and has given us at least a tourist's view of the rest of the globe. But all airports are alike and all luxury hotels are alike, and if you know nothing of ( A ), all the palaces, all the cathedrals, and all the castles soon come to look very much alike; just scampering around the globe does not give you much further information or ( e ) the imagination. It is the opening up of the past that is really important, telling you about human beings of thousands of years ago and providing you with a valuable perspective on our own age. We are not the only superpower to arise. The story of mankind is rich and interesting and can contain wisdom.

(Adapted from C. Brooks, *Community, Religion, and Literature*)

問1 文中の( a ) ~ ( e )に入れるのに、もっとも適切な語を下から選び、文法的に正しい形で記入しなさい。ただし、同じものを繰り返して用いないこと。

acquire      conquer      deserve      mean      stir

問2 下線部 (1) を和訳しなさい。

問3 下線部 (2) の内容を10字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

問4 文中の( A )に入れるのに、もっとも適切な語を本文中から1語抜き出しなさい。

2

次の英文を読んで以下の問に答えなさい。

There are about 50 isolated indigenous societies across lowland South America with limited to no contact with the outside world. Despite displacements, epidemics, and hostile interactions with outsiders, such tribes still manage to survive. How can we ensure the well-being of humanity's last known isolated peoples under such enormous and mounting pressure from external threats?

Generally, the current policy of governments, primarily those of Brazil and Peru, and supported by the United Nations, is (1) a "leave them alone" strategy. There are two implicit assumptions in a no-contact approach, however: that isolated populations are viable in the long term; and that they would choose isolation if they had full information (i.e., if they were aware that contact would not lead to massacre and enslavement).

The first assumption is ( A ). Ethnohistorical accounts reveal the real risk of severe depopulation or extinction during intermittent hostile and sporadic interaction with the outside world. Miners, loggers, and hunters penetrate into the homelands of isolated tribes despite government "protection." Unless protection efforts against external threats and accidental encounters are drastically increased, the chances that these tribes will survive are slim. Disease epidemics, compounded by demographic variability and inbreeding effects, make the disappearance of small, isolated groups very probable in the near future.

The second assumption is also ( A ). Interviews indicate that contacted groups had mainly chosen isolation out of fear of being killed or enslaved, but they also wanted outside goods and innovations and positive social interactions with neighbors.

Controlled contact with isolated peoples is a better option than a no-contact policy. This means that governments should initiate contact only after conceiving a well-organized plan. In the past, there have been many poorly planned contacts with isolated Amazonian tribes by both missionaries and government agencies. The absence of health care professionals and health monitoring led to many deaths among these vulnerable peoples. One of us was on site within weeks of the first peaceful contacts with Aché, Yora,

Mascho-Piro, and Matsiguenga communities in Paraguay and Peru when they were extremely isolated and suffering from new contact-related epidemics (from the late 1970s to mid-1980s), even though intermittent contact (mostly accidental) had occurred for 25 years. The most important lesson learned from these experiences is that mortality can be reduced to near zero if the contact team is prepared to provide sustained, (2)around-the-clock medical treatment, as well as food. A well-designed contact can be quite safe, compared to the disastrous outcomes from accidental contacts.

Given that isolated populations are not viable in the long term, well-organized contacts are today both humane and ethical. We know that soon after peaceful contact with the outside world, surviving indigenous populations rebound quickly from population crashes, with growth rates over 3% per year. Once a sustained peaceful contact occurs, it becomes much easier to protect native rights than it otherwise would be for isolated populations. (3)Leaving groups isolated, yet still exposed to dangerous and uncontrolled interactions with the outside world, is a violation of governmental responsibility. By refusing authorized, well-planned contacts, governments are simply guaranteeing that accidental and disastrous contacts will take place instead.

(Adapted from R. S. Walker & K. R. Hill, "Protecting Isolated Tribes," *Science*)

問1 下線部(1)と同じ内容の語句を本文中から抜き出さない。

問2 二つの(A)には同じ語が入る。もっとも適切な語を①～⑤の中から選び、その番号を書きなさい。

① correct    ② costly    ③ practical    ④ similar    ⑤ unlikely

問3 下線部(2)の意味を15字以内の日本語で書きなさい。

問4 下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。

3

*Read the following text and answer the questions below in full English sentences.*

Among many other chimpanzee skills, primatologists have learned that our closest evolutionary cousins fashion spears to hunt for prey and play with dolls. The latest discovery is that chimps have all the cognitive abilities necessary for the uniquely human behavior of cooking. They don't do it in the wild because they've never learned to control fire. But aside from that, chimps' brains are pretty much fully equipped to take the great culinary leap our direct human ancestors did in the dim past.

"I love it," says Harvard evolutionary biologist Richard Wrangham, who has long argued that the transition from raw to cooked food spurred a dramatic increase in the brain capacity of our ancestors nearly two million years ago. The idea is that cooked meat and vegetables are far easier to digest than the raw versions, thus providing more available calories for our energy-hungry grey matter.

The archaeological evidence for cooking, however, dates back only about a million years — long after the human brain's great leap forward — so this new study would be a much-needed boost for Wrangham's idea. If chimps had most of the mental equipment in place to make cooking possible, early humans presumably would have had it too.

The mental processes involved in cooking are far too complex to be tested in a single experiment. "It requires patience, future-oriented cognition — it's tied up in how animals make decisions about time and value," says Alexandra Rosati, a Harvard evolutionary biologist. In the end, Rosati and co-author Felix Warneken, a Harvard psychologist, did nine experiments to assess different aspects of cooking-related thinking. For example, they confirmed that, offered the choice, chimps prefer cooked vegetables over raw. They also showed that chimps comprehend that cooking is a process — that food is transformed into a tastier form when it goes into an oven for a few minutes. (The 'oven' was a container with cooked food hidden in a secret compartment; researchers shook the container to signal to the chimps that some process transformed raw vegetables into cooked forms.)

Not all of the animals got it immediately. Rosati remembers a large adult male named Maya who liked cooked veggies well enough, but didn't quite comprehend the "cooking"

process. Finally, she says, the chimp cautiously put some raw food into the container, almost as if he was thinking “well, I’ll just go for it.” When Warneken started shaking the container, she says, “Maya got really excited. He started vocalizing and jumping up and down. You could practically see the light bulb turn on in his head with the insight that his food was now being ‘cooked.’”

Another impressive finding, given that chimpanzees aren’t the most patient of creatures, is that they’ll choose not to eat a chunk of raw potato immediately, deferring gratification for the time it takes to “cook” the food. The scientists showed that chimps will carry raw food across a room to the chef rather than cramming it into their mouths right away. Resisting temptation isn’t easy for us; it’s nearly impossible for chimpanzees.

(Adapted from M. D. Lemonick, “Chimps Can’t Cook, But Maybe They’d Like To,” *National Geographic*)

- Question 1** Besides a preference for cooked food, what other examples of behavior does the article give which make chimps seem similar to humans?
- Question 2** According to Richard Wrangham, what change caused the ancestors of humans to become more intelligent?
- Question 3** Why did the researchers use an “oven” in some of their experiments?
- Question 4** What does Rosati mean when she says that she could “see the light bulb turn on” in Maya’s head?
- Question 5** Why were the researchers so interested in the fact that the chimps would carry raw food to the chef for “cooking” instead of eating it immediately? Choose the correct answer.
- (a) Because chimps have never learned to control fire.
  - (b) Because cooked food spurred a dramatic increase in the brain capacity of their ancestors.
  - (c) Because the chimps got really excited; vocalizing and practically jumping up and down.
  - (d) Because chimps do not like to cram food into their mouths right away.
  - (e) Because chimps usually find it very difficult to defer gratification.

4

次の英文を読んで以下の間に答えなさい。

A mere three percent of our words cause confusion because of their spelling, but they include some doozies, as we used to say. Almost any argument ( a ) defence of English spelling begins to look a trifle weak when you consider such anomalies as *colonel*, a word that clearly contains no *r* and yet proceeds as if it did, or <sup>(1)</sup>*ache*, *bury*, and *pretty*, all of which are pronounced in ways that pay the scantest regard to their spellings, or *four* and *forty*, one of which clearly has a *u* and the other of which just as clearly doesn't. In fact, all the 'four' words — *four*, *fourth*, *fourteen*, *twenty-four*, and so on — are spelled with a *u* until we get to *forty* when suddenly the *u* disappears. Why?

As ( b ) most things in life, there are any number of reasons for all of these. *Colonel* is perhaps the classic example of this orthographic waywardness. The word comes from the old French *coronelle*, which the French adapted from the Italian *colonello* (from which we get *colonnade*). When the word first came into English in the mid-sixteenth century, it was spelled with an *r*, but gradually the Italian spelling and pronunciation began to challenge it. For a century or more both spellings and pronunciations were commonly used, until finally with inimitable illogic we settled ( c ) the French ( ㄟ ) and Italian ( イ ).

The matter of the vanishing *u* from *forty* is more problematic. The poet Chaucer spelled it with a *u*, as indeed did most people until the end of the seventeenth century, and some for half a century or so after that. But then, as if by universal decree, it just quietly vanished. No one seems to have remarked on it at the time. The linguist Bernstein suggests that it may have reflected a slight change in pronunciation — to this day many people aspirate *four* and *forty* in slightly different ways — but this begs the question of why the pronunciation changed for the first word and not for the second. In any case, it would be most unusual for the spelling of a word to change to reflect such a minor adjustment of pronunciation.

Usually in English we strive to preserve the old spelling ( d ) almost any cost to logicity. Take *ache*. The spelling seems desperately inconsistent today, as indeed it is. Up

until Shakespeare's day, *ache* was pronounced *aitch* when it was a noun. As a verb, it was pronounced *ake* — but also, rather sensibly, was spelled *ake*. This tendency to shift between 'ch' and 'k' sounds was once fairly common. It accounts ( e ) such pairs as *speech/speak*, *stench/stink*, and *stitch/stick*. But *ache*, for reasons that defy logic, adopted the verb ( ウ ) and the noun ( エ ).

English spelling has caused problems for about as ア[ as, been, English, have, long, spell, there, to, words ].

(Adapted from B. Bryson, *Mother Tongue: The English Language*)

問1 文中の ( a ) ~ ( e ) に適切な前置詞を入れなさい。

問2 文中の ( ア ) ~ ( エ ) には、① か ②のいずれかが入る。適切な語を選び、その番号を書きなさい。

① pronunciation      ② spelling

問3 下線部 (1) の例で、何を説明しようとしているのか。20字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

問4 文中の ア[                      ] 中の語を文意に沿うように並べかえなさい。なお、English の位置は解答欄に指定してある。