

福島県立医科大学

平成 25 年 度
医学部前期入学試験問題

英 語

(時間：100 分)

注 意 事 項

- 1 試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子の中を見てはいけません。
- 2 試験中に問題冊子の印刷不鮮明、ページの落丁・乱丁および解答用紙の汚れ等に気付いた場合は、手を挙げて監督者に知らせなさい。
- 3 解答は、すべて解答用紙の所定の欄に記入しなさい。
- 4 試験終了後、解答用紙のみを回収します。

[1] 次の文章を読み、問いに答えよ。[*印の付いた語句には註あり。]

People outside linguistics often ask me, “Don’t you agree that the language we happen to speak affects the way we think?” This is a strong and widespread concept, and it seems ⁽¹⁾at odds with the view I’ve been pushing here — that the same thought can be equally expressed in different languages. The most extreme version of this idea, often called “linguistic relativity,” or “linguistic determinism,” or the “Sapir-Whorf hypothesis” ((A) the early 20th-century linguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf), is that your thought is deeply structured by the structure of your language, and that (B) speakers of different languages may not just *talk* in mutually incomprehensible fashion, but may also *think* in mutually incomprehensible fashion. It isn’t that (①) is a mirror of (②), but rather that (③) is a mirror of (④).

A popular story connected with linguistic relativity is that the Eskimos have lots of words for different kinds of snow, so probably they think about snow differently than we do. But even if it’s true, this doesn’t show that their language determines the way they think. (C), the influence goes the other way: they have to deal with snow more than we do, so they invent more words. (D), I would guess that we have more words than they do that have to do with software — and certainly more than we ourselves did fifty years ago. Our vocabulary is mostly shaped by human interests and needs, ⁽⁴⁾not the other way around.

I don’t want to deny that vocabulary affects thought. Having a word for something can affect both what we notice and the way we divide objects and events into categories. Sometimes this is good: it might be important to recognize such a thing as **genocide*. And sometimes it’s bad, such as when it makes us insist on sharp lines where there aren’t any (“How many people do you have to kill in order to call it **genocide*?”) ⁽⁵⁾—it’s either genocide, in which case we apply sanctions, or it’s not, in which case it’s not so serious and we can ignore it.

Some languages have a collection of words for primary colors different from English. (E), Japanese has a single word that covers both green and blue, and Russian has completely different words for what we call light blue and dark blue. It turns out that even without using words, speakers of these languages classify colors differently. This is (F) showing that their thought is incomprehensible to English speakers.

If we’re looking for radical differences in the way people think, a much more fruitful place to look is culture, not language. We can even keep the language identical. Compare the thought processes of Americans on the liberal **left* and the religious **right*. We find huge differences on matters like morality, foreign policy, economics, and education. These differences are far more significant than the subtle little things (G) language that have been discovered experimentally.

(Ray Jackendoff, *A User’s Guide to Thought and Meaning*, modified)

註 genocide: (民族などの)大量虐殺 left: 左派, 改革派 right: 右派, 保守派

問 1 下線部(1)を 2 語で言い換えた場合、最も適切なものを下のア～エのうちから 1 つ選び、記号で答えよ。

ア. apart from イ. different from ウ. independent of エ. shared with

問 2 下線部(2)の空欄①～④にそれぞれ language または thought を入れて適切な文を完成せよ。

問 3 下線部(3)を日本語に訳せ。

問 4 下線部(4)によって表わされている内容を本文に即して日本語で具体的に述べよ。

問 5 下線部(5)を it の指すものを明確にして日本語に訳せ。

問 6 下線部(6)を日本語に訳せ。

問 7 (A)～(G)に入る最も適切な語句をそれぞれ下のア～キのうちから選び、記号で答えよ。ただし、同じ語句を2回以上選んではならない。なお、文頭に入る語句も小文字で始めてある。

- | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| ア. after | イ. due to | ウ. far from | エ. for instance |
| オ. if anything | カ. likewise | キ. therefore | |

〔 2 〕 (1)～(4)の文を英語に訳せ。

- (1) 1日に必要な脂肪の上限は、年齢、体の大きさ、活動の程度によって変わる。
- (2) 私が考えていたことはただ一つ、最善を尽くし、この機会を最大限に利用することだった。
- (3) はっきりとした成果がでるには少なくとも1年はかかるということを考えに入れて、研究計画を立てた。
- (4) 携帯電話で話しながら運転する人は、運転に集中している人よりも事故を起こす可能性が約4倍高いと言われている。

〔 3 〕 次の文章を読み、問いに答えよ。〔*印の付いた語句には註あり。〕

Dogs are smart when it comes to learning about things, people, and other dogs. Nevertheless, they have their limitations. Their lack of self-awareness, their lack of awareness that we have minds different from their own, and their inability to reflect on their own actions all restrict their capacity to comprehend the world in the same way that we humans do. Furthermore, because of such limitations, dogs' emotional lives are likely to be much more straightforward than our own, meaning that they may not be capable of feeling many of the subtler emotions that we ourselves take for granted. Nevertheless, dogs share our capacity to feel joy, love, anger, fear, and anxiety. They also experience pain, hunger, thirst, ⁽¹⁾ and sexual attraction. It is thus perfectly possible for humans to both understand and share what they are feeling. Yet this facility is also a trap. ⁽²⁾ It can tempt us into presuming that dogs' emotional lives are identical to ours — that in any given situation they are feeling what we would feel. In such instances we are drawn into acting accordingly, treating our dogs as if they had exactly the intelligence and emotional capacities that we do. Since this is not the case, ⁽³⁾ our actions may be (A) to the dog — or, indeed, may mean something quite different from what we intended. Hence a thorough understanding of the full emotional capacities of dogs, and which of these capacities are (B) than our own, is essential to their well-being and to the correctness of our relationships with them.

One notable difference between dogs' emotional lives and our own is that their sense of time is much less sophisticated. Their ability to think back into their past, to reflect on what has happened — even quite recently — and make sense of it, seems to be almost lacking. Dogs are therefore much more inclined than we are to draw cause-and-effect ^(a) conclusions based on the occurrence of two events one immediately after the other — even when a moment's reflection, if ⁽⁴⁾ only they were capable of such a thing, would make it obvious that such a connection was unlikely. ⁽⁵⁾ Dogs don't "do" self-reflection.

But the mere fact that dogs lack the level of consciousness that we have does not mean they lack rich emotional lives. The science of ^{*}canine consciousness is still in flux, ^(b) but the current consensus is that dogs possess some degree of consciousness. In other words, they are probably aware of their emotions, but to a lesser extent than humans are. Scientists generally agree that our consciousness is much more complex than that of other mammals — in part, owing to the massively larger ^{*}neocortex in the human brain as compared to that of mammals like dogs. Indeed, we humans are able not only to experience emotions but also to examine them calmly, to ask ourselves questions such as "Why was I so anxious last week?" Dogs seem to be incapable of this kind of self-awareness. ⁽⁶⁾ All of the available evidence suggests that their emotional reactions are confined to events in the here-and-now and involve little, if any, retrospection. ^(c)

(John Bradshaw, *Dog Sense*, modified)

註 canine: イヌ科の neocortex: (大脳)新皮質

問 1 下線部(1)によって表わされている内容を本文に即して日本語で具体的に述べよ。

問 2 下線部(2)に関して、なぜ trap と言えるのかを本文に即して日本語で具体的に説明せよ。

問 3 下線部(3)によって表わされている内容を本文に即して日本語で具体的に述べよ。

問 4 下線部(4)と(5)を日本語に訳せ。

問 5 下線部(6)の this kind of self-awareness とはどのようなものかを本文に即して日本語で簡潔に説明せよ。

問 6 (A)と(B)の部分に入る最も適切な語句をそれぞれ下のア～エのうちから1つずつ選び、記号で答えよ。

- (A) {
ア. common
イ. meaningless
ウ. necessary
エ. similar

- (B) {
ア. clearer
イ. more active
ウ. more complete
エ. simpler

問 7 下線部(a)～(c)が表す内容として最も適切なものをそれぞれ下のア～エのうちから1つずつ選び、記号で答えよ。

- (a) {
ア. express
イ. judge
ウ. remember
エ. understand

- (b) {
ア. complex
イ. changing
ウ. not familiar
エ. reliable

- (c) {
ア. capacity to experience emotions
イ. predicting humans' real intension
ウ. thinking about past events
エ. understanding humans' feelings

[4] 次の文章を読み、(1)～(10)の部分に入る最も適切な語句をそれぞれ下のア～エのうちから1つずつ選び、記号で答えよ。[*印の付いた語句には註あり。]

When CO₂ builds up in Earth's atmosphere, whether it's from natural causes or human activity, the greenhouse effect makes the temperature start rising. In other words, the globe warms — which is where the term “global warming” comes from. (Other natural causes can trigger global warming — and for that matter global cooling — but here we're talking about the effect of CO₂.)

But the (1) of a rise in temperature isn't just a slightly warmer version of the world we have now. Mountain *glaciers will start to melt, so the rivers they feed will flow differently. More water will evaporate from both land and oceans, (2) more rain and snow in some places and more drought in others. As the oceans warm, major currents may speed up or slow down — which would (3) weather patterns.

The temperature differences between the equator and the poles may change as well, because greenhouse warming isn't likely to be spread (4) across Earth. Since differences in temperature are what makes the wind blow, the direction and force of the wind could change, thus altering weather patterns. Animals and plants that are comfortable in a particular geographic location might have to move somewhere else to find the conditions they are (5), or they might die out.

Those are just a few of the changes a warmer world is likely to experience. Beyond that, a buildup of CO₂ in the atmosphere would lead to another effect (6) warming. Some of that extra carbon dioxide would be absorbed by the oceans, turning the water slightly more acid than it is now. That could also have a major effect on plants and animals that live in the seas.

Since many of the disruptions that could come from adding greenhouse gases go (7) just warmer temperatures, many scientists prefer to talk about climate change rather than global warming. That doesn't mean “global warming” is incorrect. It's just that “climate change” gives a more complete idea of what's (8).

Even then, there's a chance of (9), because the climate has changed many times over Earth's history, for purely natural reasons. So to be technically correct, you have to distinguish between natural climate change and human-caused climate change (or “anthropogenic” climate change, from the ancient Greek words for “man” and “caused”).

Nobody but a scientist is going to use the term “anthropogenic climate change,” though. For most people, either “global warming” or “climate change” is about as technical as you need to get, and either term is (10). In common use, they both mean essentially the same thing.

(Climate Central, *Global Weirdness*, modified)

註 glacier: 氷河

- (1) {
ア. absence
イ. cause
ウ. possibility
エ. result

- (2) {
ア. coinciding with
イ. compared to
ウ. getting rid of
エ. leading to

- (3) {
ア. affect
イ. follow
ウ. reflect
エ. show

- (4) {
ア. evenly
イ. further
ウ. gradually
エ. quickly

- (5) {
ア. adapted to
イ. confronted with
ウ. responsible for
エ. sensitive to

- (6) {
ア. besides
イ. of
ウ. on
エ. through

- (7) {
ア. against
イ. beyond
ウ. through
エ. toward

- (8) {
ア. actually protected
イ. available now
ウ. generally taught
エ. going on

- (9) {
ア. achievement
イ. agreement
ウ. confusion
エ. protection

- (10) {
ア. examined
イ. fine
ウ. misused
エ. vague