福島県立医科大学

平　成　26　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。

While most of our face is important in helping us to communicate, it is our *eyes* that are the most crucial: our ability to "read" faces — to interpret people's intentions or to sense what they might be thinking — is largely a matter of observing what they do with their eyes. This is made easy by the fact that we have a large, highly distinctive white area in our eyes, the [1]sclera, a feature shared with no other [2]primate species.

The adults of most primates have a brown sclera that blends with the color of the [3]iris, which is usually brown also. (1)The large white area in human eyes makes it easy for us to see the direction of other people's gaze, and this helps us to recognize the focus of their attention and to anticipate how they are likely to act. One suggestion is that the evolution of cooperative behavior in our early human ancestors — behavior such as hunting and searching for food — relied on members of the group being able to coordinate their actions with others. If so, this in turn may have favored efficiency in communication: individuals whose gaze could be seen and followed more easily may have been understood better than those whose eyes were less revealing. [4]Stealth and silence are often key elements of successful hunting, and silent communication that used gaze direction and eye movements to indicate one's own intentions and to direct others may have made all the difference between getting meat for dinner or going hungry.

If this is true, it suggests that (2)the reverse may be true for our primate cousins. In their case the dark sclera may have developed to disguise their gaze, thereby making it difficult for other animals to know where they were looking, particularly when the head was turned to one side, since gaze direction and head direction are usually matched. Among primate species for whom facing and staring at another animal constitutes a threat, (3)this kind of "eye [5]camouflage" would be an advantage: if it is difficult to see where an animal is looking when the head is turned to the side, there is less chance of being caught looking and having that look interpreted as a threat. Eye camouflage is likely to be most useful at a distance: at very close range gaze direction can be detected more easily, even with dark sclerae.

[6]Baboons provide an interesting case. In the social life of monkeys there is a delicate balance to be maintained between being able to detect another's gaze and making sure your own gazing isn't misunderstood, and the brown sclerae help to maintain this balance. Adult males can get very excited suddenly; the degree to which they will tolerate another individual close to them, especially while they are feeding, is not predictable. If young [7]juvenile baboons have to walk past an adult male and (A)put themselves in arm's reach, (4)they monitor the eyes of the adult male closely and are careful not to let him catch them in the act in case their own gaze is interpreted as a challenge. The slightest shift of a male's gaze toward them, even in the absence of any head movement, leads juveniles to (B)jump right out of the adult's way. With the head turned away, a juvenile may glance stealthily toward the adult male: the adult will find it difficult to tell where the juvenile is looking because the iris and the sclera are similar in color and because little of the juvenile's eyes will be visible. If the juvenile had white sclerae, this would (C)give the game away — looking away would appear light, whereas (5)direct eye contact would look dark.

(David Perrett, *In Your Face,* modified)

註 [1]sclera (複数形: sclerae): 強膜 (眼球の外層を形成する膜)
[2]primate: 霊長目の；霊長類の動物
[3]iris: 虹彩 (眼球の前面にあって瞳孔をかこむ円盤状の膜；色素を有する。)
[4]stealth: こっそりやること
[5]camouflage: カムフラージュ
[6]baboon: ヒヒ
[7]juvenile: 若年の；若年のもの

問 1 下線部(1)を日本語に訳せ。

問 2 下線部(2)によって表わされている内容を，reverse の意味することが分かるように，日本語で具体的に述べよ。

問 3　下線部(3)によって表わされている内容を日本語で具体的に述べよ。

問 4　下線部(4)を日本語に訳せ。they と him が示すものと the act の内容を明らかにすること。

問 5　下線部(5)によって表わされている内容を本文に即して日本語で説明せよ。

問 6　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．be under the adult's protection
イ．get permission from the adult
ウ．keep a close relationship with the adult
エ．get very close to the adult

(B)
ア．be much surprised at the adult's behavior
イ．escape away from the adult's control
ウ．move aside quickly from the adult
エ．show a courageous attitude toward the adult

(C)
ア．make the situation complicated
イ．reveal something hidden accidentally
ウ．ruin many things completely
エ．solve the problem clearly

〔2〕 次の文章を読み，問いに答えよ。

When you look closely at how we use language, you find that a lot of what we say is [1]metaphorical — we talk about certain things as though they were other things. We describe political campaigns as horse races: "[2]Senator Jones has *pulled ahead*." [3]Morality is [4]cleanliness: "That was a *dirty* trick." And understanding is seeing: "New finding [5]*illuminates* the structure of the universe."

People have known about metaphor for a long time. Until the end of the 20th century, almost everyone agreed on one particular explanation, neatly [6]articulated by Aristotle. Metaphor was seen as a strictly linguistic device — a kind of catchy turn of phrase — in which you call one thing by the name of another thing it's similar to. This is probably the definition of metaphor you learned in high school English. According to this view, you can metaphorically say that "Juliet is the sun" if, and only if, Juliet and the sun are similar — for instance, if they are both particularly [7]luminous.

But in their 1980 book *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson proposed an explanation for metaphorical language that [8]flouted this received wisdom(1). They reasoned that if metaphor is just a [9]free-floating linguistic device based on similarity, then you should be able to metaphorically describe anything in terms of anything else it's similar to. But Lakoff and Johnson observed that real metaphorical language, as actually used, isn't badly organized at all. Instead, it's systematic and [10]coherent(2).

It's systematic in that you don't just metaphorically describe anything as anything else. Instead, it's mostly abstract things that you describe in terms of concrete things. Morality is more abstract than cleanliness. Understanding is more abstract than seeing. And you can't reverse the metaphors. While you can say "He's clean" to mean he has no [11]criminal record, you can't say "He's moral" to mean that he bathed recently. Metaphor moves in a single direction.

Metaphorical expressions are also coherent with one another. Take the example of understanding and seeing. There are lots of [12]relevant metaphorical expressions: for example, "I see what you mean," and "Let's shed some light on the issue," and "Put his idea under a [13]microscope and see if it actually makes sense." And so on. While these are totally different metaphorical expressions — they use completely different words — they all coherently describe certain aspects of understanding in terms of specific aspects of seeing. You always describe the understander (the one who understands) as the seer (the one who sees), the understood idea as the seen object, the act of understanding as seeing, and so on.

These observations led Lakoff and Johnson to propose that there was something going on with metaphor that was deeper than just the words. They argued that the metaphorical expressions in language are really only surface [14]phenomena, organized and generated by mappings in people's minds. For them, the reason metaphorical language exists and is systematic and coherent is that people think metaphorically. You don't just talk about understanding as seeing; you think about understanding as seeing. You don't just talk about morality as cleanliness; you think about morality as cleanliness(3). And it's because you think metaphorically — because you systematically map certain concepts onto others in your mind — that you speak metaphorically. The metaphorical expressions are merely (so to speak) the tip of the iceberg.

(Benjamin Bergen, "Metaphors Are in the Mind," modified)

註 [1]metaphorical: 隠喩的(な)(隠喩：比喩の一種)
[2]Senator: 上院議員
[3]morality: 道徳心
[4]cleanliness: 清潔さ
[5]illuminate: 明らかにする
[6]articulate: 明確化する
[7]luminous: 光り輝いている
[8]flout: 従わない
[9]free-floating: 方向性のない
[10]coherent: 整合性のある
[11]criminal: 犯罪にかかわる
[12]relevant: 関連する
[13]microscope: 顕微鏡
[14]phenomena: phenomenon(現象)の複数形

問 1 下線部(1)にある this received wisdom とは何か。本文にある具体的な事例を挙げて，200 字以内(句読点も含める)の日本語で述べよ。

問 2 下線部(2)にある systematic と coherent について，本文にある具体的事例を挙げて，それぞれ 200 字以内(句読点も含める)の日本語で述べよ。

問 3 下線部(3)を日本語に訳せ。

〔3〕 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。

When David Beckham moved to [1]Real Madrid in 2003, there was a lot of guessing about why he'd chosen to play in the number 23 shirt. It was（ **1** ）choice, many thought, since he'd being playing in the number 7 shirt for England and [2]Manchester United. The trouble was that at Real Madrid the number 7 shirt was already being worn by Raúl, and the Spaniard wasn't about to move over for this handsome boy from England.

Many different theories were put forward to（ **2** ）for Beckham's choice, and the most popular was the Michael Jordan theory. Real Madrid wanted to break into the American market and sell lots of replica shirts to the huge US population. But football (or 'soccer', as they like to call it) is not a popular game in the States. Americans like basketball, which can end with scores like 100-98, and baseball, where there is almost always（ **3** ）. They can't see the point of a game that goes on for 90 minutes and can end 0-0 with no side scoring or winning.

According to this theory, Real Madrid had done their research and found that the most popular basketball player in the world was（ **4** ）Michael Jordan, the [3]Chicago Bulls' top scorer. Jordan wore the number 23 shirt for the whole of his career. All Real Madrid had to do was put 23 on the back of a football shirt, cross their fingers and hope that the Jordan（ **5** ）would work its magic and they would break into the American market.

But as soon as I saw Beckham's number, a more mathematical（ **6** ）immediately came to mind. 23 is a prime number. A prime number is a number that can be divided only by itself and 1. 17 and 23 are prime because they can't be written as two（ **7** ）numbers multiplied together, whereas 15 isn't prime because $15 = 3 \times 5$. Prime numbers are the most important numbers in mathematics because all other whole numbers are built by multiplying primes together.

When I started looking a little closer at Real Madrid's football team, I began to（ **8** ）that perhaps they had a mathematician on the bench. A little（ **9** ）revealed that at the time of Beckham's move, all the *Galácticos*, the key players for Real Madrid, were playing in prime number shirts: Carlos (the key of the defense) number 3; Zidane (the heart of the midfield) number 5; Raúl and Ronaldo (the foundations of Real's strikers) 7 and 11. So perhaps it was（ **10** ）that Beckham got a prime number, a number that he has become very attached to. When he moved to [4]LA Galaxy he insisted on taking his prime number with him in his attempt to gain popularity among the American public with the beautiful game.

(Marcus Du Sautoy, *The Number Mysteries*, modified)

註 [1]Real Madrid: スペインのサッカーチーム名　[2]Manchester United: イギリスのサッカーチーム名
[3]Chicago Bulls: アメリカのバスケットボールチーム名　[4]LA Galaxy: アメリカのサッカーチーム名

(1)
ア. an offensive
イ. a limited
ウ. a reasonable
エ. a strange

(2)
ア. account
イ. consider
ウ. judge
エ. prove

(3)
ア. an advantage
イ. a gain
ウ. a player
エ. a winner

(4)
ア. definitely
イ. reasonably
ウ. particularly
エ. likely

(5)
ア. solution
イ. connection
ウ. name
エ. picture

(6)
ア. agreement
イ. compromise
ウ. realization
エ. solution

(7)
ア. larger
イ. smaller
ウ. similar
エ. even

(8)
ア. wonder
イ. recognize
ウ. suspect
エ. doubt

(9)
ア. research
イ. suggestion
ウ. guessing
エ. experimenting

(10)
ア. probable
イ. comfortable
ウ. inevitable
エ. incredible

〔4〕 (1)~(4)の文を英語に訳せ。

(1) ボランティア活動に参加すると，人はしばしば違った環境に身を置くことになり，普段の生活では出くわさないような人々や状況に触れる経験をする。

(2) もし古代にさかのぼってソクラテス(Socrates)と話せるとしたら，何を尋ねてみたいですか。

(3) この新しい携帯音楽プレーヤーは，私たちみんなの音楽の聴き方を変えただけでなく，音楽業界全体を変えた。

(4) 日本では当たり前の物事が米国の生活では当てはまらないことも多い。