

平成 29 年度医学科入学試験問題

英 語

(注意事項)

- 1 監督者の指示があるまで、この冊子を開いてはいけない。
- 2 解答用紙に受験番号と氏名を必ず記入すること。
- 3 この問題冊子の本文は、15 ページからなっている。落丁、乱丁及び印刷不鮮明な箇所等があれば、手をあげて監督者に知らせなさい。
- 4 この問題冊子の白紙と余白は、適宜下書きに使用してもよい。
- 5 解答は、すべて別紙「解答用紙」の指定された場所に記入すること。
- 6 この問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

**I** Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

This book has been bounding from topic to topic, person to person, across the globe and three millennia like a package tour gone mad. But nobody has been introduced to philosophy until they have seen, in at least one case, a little more deeply into some one philosopher's mind. This book has also covered two famous works by John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism* and *On Liberty*. The first told us that the Good was happiness, the second that happiness requires individual freedom. His almost equally famous essay *The Subjection of Women* (1869) tells us that that means everyone, not just adult males.

The practical politician in Mill takes aim at a quite specific and (in theory at least) easily remedied abuse: 'the legal subordination of one sex to the other is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement;... it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality'. Present family law, he argued, amounted to the enslavement of wives. He meant the word quite literally, as his account of the legal position shows. What he wants changed, however, is the entire package of practices and opinions which deny women equal educational opportunities and then equal access, on merit, to all occupations and positions of influence.

Any major philosophy needs potential beneficiaries, even in cases where the benefit may be imaginary. In seeking to improve the condition of women, Mill has plenty of beneficiaries to appeal to. But he believes that the potential audience for his views is 100 percent of mankind, not just 50. He writes about the injustice to women and the damage done to their lives by existing conditions, but he writes almost as much about the loss to everybody. The suppression of women's talents is 'a tyranny to them and a detriment to society'. History tells us a good deal about what women can do, because women have done it. It tells us nothing about what they can't do, and it never will until they are routinely given the opportunity. (As I write, 130-something

years later, a young woman is in the lead in the closing stages of a single-handed round-the-world sailing race, an event that must make demands on mental and physical stamina beyond anything I can imagine.)

Mill also believes that men are damaged as individuals, often in ways that they are not likely to notice (which is itself part of the damage). For it is not good for anyone to be brought up to believe themselves superior to others, especially when it happens, as it frequently does, to be others whose faculties are in fact superior to theirs. On the other hand, harsh though it may sound, living one's life around a close relationship with someone of inferior 'ability and cultivation' is detrimental to the superior party. Yet many men find themselves in just this situation, married to women whose limitations are no less real just<sup>(4)</sup> because they are an enforced artificial product of a thoroughly harmful system. Those men may think that they are winning, but the truth is that everyone's a<sup>(5)</sup> loser.

Thank goodness things have improved a bit since 1869, in some parts of the world, for the time being.

Given our topic, it would be strange to draw attention only to something written by a man. But there is an obvious, indeed almost obligatory, place to turn. Simone de Beauvoir's massive *The Second Sex* (1949) has been the inspiration of so much feminist writing ever since. Were I allowed a brief return to life in about 200 years' time, I would not be surprised to find it rated one of the most influential books of the twentieth century.

Like Mill, Beauvoir is concerned with the liberty of women; unlike Mill, she is not particularly concerned with the connection between liberty and happiness. She denies that there are any interesting general statements about what women are like, for what they are like is a response to their circumstances, some of which are social and therefore highly variable. Mill appeared to think that there might be some such generalizations, but denied that any were known. Besides, Beauvoir stands in the existentialist tradition

and holds that how we react to our circumstances is a free decision for each of us—to pretend that we are wholly determined by our circumstances is *inauthenticity*, an abdication of responsibility.

I have space enough only to touch one of the themes of this long and constantly lively book. Earlier, I spoke of the enormous influence of Hegel, and mentioned his doctrine of self-knowledge: it arises when one meets aspects of oneself in something else, or one's 'Other'. Seizing on the psychological truth in this, whilst completely ignoring Hegel's grand metaphysics, Beauvoir develops her most characteristic doctrine: woman is man's Other, and the self-understanding of both depends on it.

When the Other is itself a subject, a person, the situation becomes more complicated and potentially very damaging. I'm watching you watching me watching you. . . . How A sees B affects B, so it alters what A finds in B. And this (recall the doctrine about self-knowledge) alters A's perception of A, which then affects A, both of which affect how A sees B. . . . Just once get something badly wrong, as when man enslaved woman, thinking that that was good for him, and woman accepted enslavement, thinking that was the only choice for her, and all relations between the sexes are going to get entangled in a net of error and artificiality. Now 'whatever he does. . . he feels tricked and she feels wronged'. The reciprocity of the relationship means that neither party alone can put it right: Beauvoir appeals simultaneously to men to recognize the independence and equality of women, and to women to become just that, by realizing that it is indeed the truth about themselves.

So on the very last page comes a sentence which, whilst completely characteristic of Beauvoir, could almost have been written by Mill: 'when we abolish the slavery of half of humanity, together with the whole system of hypocrisy that it implies, then the "division" of humanity will reveal its genuine significance and the human couple will find its true form'. He, coming from the empiricist and utilitarianism tradition, and she, against the totally

different background of Hegel plus existentialism, end up remarkably close together. It almost makes you think they might be right. . . .

(Adapted from: *Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*, by Edward Craig, 2002, Oxford University Press.)

## QUESTIONS

Underlined 1: Explain in Japanese the reason(s) why the author says “like a package tour” here.

Underlined 2: Explain the details of the meaning here in Japanese by clarifying what the word “that” refers to and by giving the reason(s) why the issue is “not just adult males”.

Underlined 3: Explain in Japanese the reason(s) why the author says “a detriment to society”.

Underlined 4: Explain the details of the meaning here in Japanese specifically by clarifying what “a thoroughly harmful system” is.

Underlined 5: Explain in Japanese the reason(s) why “everyone’s a loser”.

Underlined 6: Explain in Japanese what responsibility would be abdicated.

Underlined 7: Translate the underlined part into Japanese specifically by making clear what “both” and “it” refer to.

8: According to the passage, in order for men and women to be truly equal, which of the following are NOT necessary conditions? Choose as many appropriate answers as possible. Write the letter(s) of the answer.

- (A) Both men and women must realize that both need to change their attitudes.
- (B) Men must accept a less enjoyable married life.
- (C) Men must be given fewer educational opportunities.
- (D) Men must give up wealth.
- (E) Men must realize that sacrificing women's talents is not good for society.
- (F) Women must be given more educational opportunities.

**II**

Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

Havana knew me by my shoes. This became obvious my first morning in (1) Cuba's capital. I was staying at the Lido, a respectable small hotel on Consulado Street between Trocadero and Animas. That part of town, called Centro Habana (the center of Havana), was crowded and lively, with kids playing on narrow sidewalks, and parked cars blocking one-way streets. Centro was in urgent need of street sweepers and a paint job. I was anxious to get over to the Malecón, the seafront boulevard that separates the city from the water. On this sweltering midsummer day a stroll on the Malecón would be exhilarating. In two brief previous visits, I had come to appreciate its (2) around-the-clock procession of Havana society. You have not truly set foot in Cuba until you've paraded yourself along its wide sidewalk, felt the sea breeze stroke your cheeks, and traded friendly nods with passers-by. "The shortest line between two points," wrote Guillermo Cabrera Infante in *Three Trapped Tigers*, "is the curve of the Malecón." It is a no-man's-land between the devilish city and the bluest deep sea.

For generations the Malecón has been a meeting place for wholesome families and lovers. From its ledge, early-morning anglers cast for small fish, and late-night followers of Afro-Cuban religions toss offerings into the water. Exiles in Madrid, Miami, and Mexico City dream of it. From Havana's harbor (3) the Malecón sweeps around to Paseo, on past the hotel district, ending at the tunnel that links the Vedado and Miramar neighborhoods. I took a cold-water shower—the only kind at the Lido—and pulled on a T-shirt, jeans, and a brand new pair of white Air Nikes. I tripped over some European backpackers in the lobby and turned left to the curve of the Malecón.

I passed a half dozen housewives filling buckets from a tap on the side of a large blue water truck. Every few minutes young men would approach me (4) and say something in thick Cuban Spanish that I couldn't quite comprehend. I

flashed the silly smile a foreigner wears when he doesn't understand what surrounds him, and kept on walking. After a few blocks a pattern emerged — young men would glance at my shoes and then, although I wore no watch, ask the time. On hearing a foreign accent they'd pretend surprise and ask where I came from. Finally came the proposal "*¿Cambio? Seis por uno.*" ("Exchange? Six for one.") It was the money changer's standard offer; they wanted to give me six Cuban pesos for one U.S. dollar. I shook my head and moved on. "*¿Siete?*" ("Seven?") I must have looked like a naive person just off the boat.

"Look," I said, "six or seven, I'm not interested. This is my first day here. Give me a break." The excuse worked, but it had a shelf life of only twenty-<sup>(5)</sup>four hours. I knew that officially one dollar was slightly more than eighty centavos. They were offering almost ten times <sup>(6)</sup>that. The amiable black marketeers backed off, glancing from my face to my tennis shoes. Everyone looked at them as if they were laced with gold.

The sea breeze I had counted on must have stayed at sea that day. The rainy season was only a few weeks away, and the clouds had the dry heaves. I walked westward on the shadeless side of the street directly into the tropical afternoon sun; even my sweat sweated. Only a newcomer would brave such foolishness, and only a bold street hustler would venture over to try to exchange money. Soon a tall, thin fellow in shorts and sandals stopped me to trade six pesos for one dollar. Gustavo was his name. <sup>(7)</sup>"Forget the money," I replied. <sup>(8)</sup>"What is it with my sneakers?"

<sup>(9)</sup>"They're Nikes, aren't they?" He said this more as a statement than a question as he eyed my sneakers. "That's how we can spot you as a foreigner. The sneakers we get here?" He breathed out loudly like a horse. "They're thin, they don't give you any support, and they fall apart in three months. They come from China and you have to wait a year to get another pair — *if* they have them in stock." <sup>(10)</sup>My feet felt self-conscious as I walked away. "Seven for one?" he called over his shoulder as he returned to a game of



dominoes on the shady side of the street.

(Adapted from: *Trading with the Enemy*, by Tom Miller, 1992, Perseus Books,  
L. L. C.)

### QUESTIONS

Underlined 1: What does the underlined part mean? Complete the following sentence by using one word from the story.

From his shoes, the people in Havana knew the author was  
a/an \_\_\_\_\_.

Underlined 2: Explain in your own English words what is meant by “around-the-clock procession of Havana society.”

\_\_\_\_\_

Underlined 3: What does “it” refer to here? Write your answer in English.

\_\_\_\_\_

Underlined 4: Write the LETTER of the answer which best completes the following sentence.

Young men would approach the author because

\_\_\_\_\_

- (A) they wanted to buy his sneakers
- (B) they wanted to exchange money with him
- (C) they wanted to persuade him to come to their shop
- (D) they wanted to sell him a bottle of water

Underlined 5: Which of the following has the closest meaning to the underlined part? Write the LETTER of the answer.

- (A) Come back later.
- (B) Give me a better rate.
- (C) Leave me alone.
- (D) Let me have some rest.
- (E) Take me on a trip.

Underlined 6: Which of the following has the closest meaning to the underlined part? Write the LETTER of the answer.

- (A) It would not be useful after the following morning.
- (B) It would need to be repeated every day.
- (C) It would not be on sale the next day.
- (D) It would only be misunderstood for a short time.

Underlined 7: What does "that" refer to here? Write your answer in English.

---

Underlined 8: What does the underlined part mean? Write your answer in English.

---

Underlined 9: What does the underlined part mean? Write your answer in English.

---

Underlined 10: Which of the following has the closest meaning to the underlined part? Write the LETTER of the answer.

- (A) Why are my sneakers better than yours?
- (B) Why are my sneakers hard to find?
- (C) Why do my sneakers attract such attention?
- (D) Why doesn't anyone have sneakers like mine?

Underlined 11: Write the LETTER of the answer which best completes the following sentence.

The author's "feet felt self-conscious" because

- \_\_\_\_\_.
- (A) they were in sneakers with shiny laces
  - (B) they were in objects of envy
  - (C) they were in new sneakers from China
  - (D) they were sweating

12. According to the passage, which of the following statements is NOT true?

- (A) The author was in Cuba before.
- (B) The center of Havana was dirty.
- (C) The Lido was a luxury hotel.
- (D) The Malecón was a popular place for meeting.

**III**

Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

In most advanced industrial countries, marriage is occurring at a much later age than was the case in the last century. There are a number of reasons why young people delay marriage. These include greater opportunities for economic self-sufficiency for women, more liberal social attitudes toward partnerships outside legal marriage, and advances in birth control that allow experimentation with potential partners.

Two years ago, a psychologist from Northwestern University, Eli Finkel, suggested that the institution of marriage was undergoing polarization. The best marriages today are better; the worst marriages now are worse; over all, the average marriage is weaker than the average marriage was in the past. Because expectations about marriage have now risen, people demand that marriage should satisfy their financial, emotional and spiritual needs. But while some people spend a lot of time together working on their marriage, most people spend less time and their marriage slowly decays in Finkel's analysis.

The way we talk about marriage is also polarizing. If you read popular literature on the subject, there are three different, but not mutually exclusive, lenses through which to look at marriage.

The first lens is the psychological lens. It reveals how daunting marriage is. Forty-five percent of all marriages end in divorce and another 10 percent of couples separate but do not divorce. It focuses on thinking more analytically about an institution that is not permanently satisfying for the participants in the marriage contract. In his *The Science of Happily Ever After* Ty Tashiro has written that "agreeableness" is crucial. You want to marry someone who has a high concern for social harmony and who thinks of others. You want to avoid those who are emotionally unstable or quick to anger or who have problems that cannot be shared. Tashiro feels that such traits do not change

very much over time, because they are constant over a lifetime. The belief that one partner can radically change another may be a myth.

The second lens is the romantic lens. The logic of this theory is that you need a few years of passionate love to fuse you together when times get hard. It's a process beautifully described in Louis de Bernières's novel, *Corelli's Mandolin*:

"Love itself is what is left over when being in love has burned away, and this is both an art and fortunate accident. . . . when all the pretty blossoms had fallen from our branches we found that we were one tree and not two." "Loving" is separated from "being in love" which is here described as short-lived. In their book, *The Good Marriage*, Judith Wallerstein and Sandra Blakeslee have concluded that perhaps 15 percent of all couples maintain lifelong romantic marriages.

The third lens through which we examine marriage is the moral lens. In this lens, a marriage does not exist just because it is registered publicly. Nor does it exist to have children and raise a family. In *The Meaning of Marriage*, Tim Keller has argued that marriage introduces you to yourself. You realize that you are not as noble and easy to live with as you had thought when single. In many marriages, there is an unspoken agreement not to talk about what you do not admire in the other because the truth from a loved one can be so painful. But in most good marriages you identify your own selfishness and other faults — occasionally humorously — and treat them more seriously than your partner's faults. Marriage becomes a way of learning about yourself and laughing at yourself as you go along. In this lens, marriage is not really about two individuals trying to satisfy their own needs; it is a partnership of mutual self-giving for the purpose of moral growth which makes their corner of the world a little better.

It is probably best to use all three lenses when entering into or living in a marriage. But there are differences among them, to be sure. The

psychological lens emphasizes that people do not change much over a lifetime. Especially after age 30, people may get a little more conscientious and agreeable, but improvements are likely to be modest and short-term. In the romantic view, the heart is transformed by love (which could occur at any age). It is potentially an optimistic lens, but it has long-term risks. In the moral view, people are empowered to go against their own natures and uplift their partners by showing a willingness to change and at the same time by supporting their life-time journey from an old, defective self to a new self.

The three lenses are operating at different levels: personality, emotions, and virtues and vices. The first two lenses are common in bookstores (as self-help books) and in popular music. But the moral lens, with its view of marriage as a lifetime moral project, is less common because it is neither pessimistic nor optimistic but is something built over time as a commitment. The fact that it is less acknowledged in popular culture may be one of the reasons for the polarization of marriage as an institution.

(Adapted from: Opinion “Three views of marriage”. The *International New York Times*. Wednesday, February 24th, 2016.)

## QUESTIONS

According to the content of the passage, write T for True, F for False or N for Not mentioned in the text for each statement. Answer a question with “N” only if the statement is either not present in the text or cannot be inferred from the information in the text.

1. Eli Finkel thinks that there is a direct connection between people in the industrialized world getting married at a later age and the polarization of marriage.

2. The polarization of marriage means that the best marriages are better, the worst marriages are worse, and the marriages in the middle have remained about the same over time.
3. Ty Tashiro's book suggests that the ability of one partner to radically change a marital partner's traits over time is unlimited.
4. The "romantic lens" suggests that a couple of years of passion is necessary for a marriage to create the bonds to overcome future difficulties.
5. In the "moral lens," marriage becomes a way of coming to know yourself: you learn things about yourself of which you may have been previously unaware.
6. Both the "psychological" and "moral lenses" hold that old partners are likely to make significant and enduring changes to their behavior.
7. The disregard of the "moral lens" in our popular culture may be one reason for the polarization of marriage.

**IV** Read the following lines and answer the question in about 150 English words.

Each of us has had some conflict with a school, an organization, a friend, or a family member. Describe in detail a specific conflict that you experienced in your life, how it was resolved (or not), and what you learned about conflict resolution in the process.