

札幌医科大学 一般

英語問題紙

令和2年2月25日

自 9:00

至 10:20

答案作成上の注意

1. 英語の問題紙は1から13までの13ページである。
2. 解答用紙は①から②までの2枚である。
3. 解答はすべて解答用紙の指定された箇所を書くこと。
4. 問題紙は持ち帰ること。

問題訂正

「英語」

5 ページ

1

上から 10 行目

(誤)

Marcus Weeks. *What would Nietzsche do?* Cassell. 2017. 一部改変.

(正)

Marcus Weeks. *What would Nietzsche do?* Cassell. 2017. 一部改変.

7 ページ

1

問 8. 上から 1 行目

(誤) Nietzche のアドバイスを本文の……

(正) Nietzsche のアドバイスを本文の……

11 ページ

2

問 5. 一番下の行

(誤) 得点は両方を正しく 回答 した場合に……

(正) 得点は両方を正しく 解答 した場合に……

1

次の英文を読み問いに答えよ。

Q. How do I mend a broken heart?

A. You're in a bad place right now. The person you cared about more than anything else in the world has left you. Of course, the world hasn't come to an end — it just seems that way. Nothing else matters. You don't want to feel so down, but you can't see an end to the misery, or any point in trying to get over it. To be honest, you can't see the point in anything at the moment. How are you supposed to get on with your life when your whole world has been shattered? And what's the point of all the pain you're going through right now?

Well, this is a serious problem. Not a matter of life or death, maybe, especially when looked at from the outside, but for the person going through it, it can seem that way. It's a universal experience too, so you'd expect most philosophers to have some good advice on the subject. Just as they do on almost every other subject, philosophers have some widely differing opinions on dealing with a broken heart. These can be divided into three main camps: the "snap out of it and get on with life", the "grin and bear it" and the "this will make you a better person".

A good person to turn to for guidance, particularly if you're a woman, might be the French philosopher **Simone de Beauvoir** (1908–86). As well as being a straightforward, no-nonsense feminist, and a down-to-earth* *existentialist**, she had plenty of personal experience in matters of the heart. She would probably tell you that there are plenty more fish in the sea.

So, you shouldn't expect too much sympathy from her. She would more likely tell you to get a grip and take control of the situation, instead of letting it control you. Male or female, she'd get you thinking about how you let yourself get into this miserable state. You made a romantic relationship

the main source of meaning in your life, and now it's gone. . . what do you expect? There are other things in life, just as important, and you have the choice to pursue them. In the end, it's up to you to make your own happiness or misery, and not rely on other people to provide you with a purpose. Simply put, she'd tell you to get over it, and make sure you don't get hurt again. Her advice might seem a bit harsh while you're nursing⁴⁾ your wounds. You want to know what to do now to go about treating them.

The Greek philosopher **Epicurus** (341–270 BCE), a couple of thousand years de Beauvoir's senior, might broadly agree with her. His guiding principle was to minimize pain (not, as is popularly thought, simply to seek pleasure), so he wouldn't have much sympathy with you for bringing all that suffering on yourself. Rather than dwelling on it and prolonging the agony,⁵⁾ he'd recommend finding ways to ease the pain, and in particular calming the desires that got you into the mess in the first place. Then you can start looking for things that genuinely give you pleasure, and know how to avoid those that will hurt you.

Well meaning though Epicurus's advice might be, it probably won't help you much in coming to terms with your current situation.⁶⁾ If you're looking for more practical ways of getting through it, maybe one of the Stoics* could help. Another Greek, **Zeno of Citium** (c.* 334–262 BCE), the founder of the Stoic school of philosophy, reckoned he had the answer to achieving peace of mind, so he might be a good choice. He was, however, realistic and virtuous to the point of being stern and austere* — so his advice might be a bit hard to swallow. He would tell you that the way to get through life is to live in harmony with nature, and that means come rain or come shine. You mustn't let the bad stuff get you down,⁷⁾ and you should not get over-excited by the good stuff. Above all, you'll just get frustrated and upset if you try to change things over which you have no control.

If you're angling for* sympathy, you might be better off seeking it from

a more spiritual source such as from **Buddha** (born c. 6th–4th century BCE). He even looks more sympathetic, with that beatific* smile. Yes, he would sympathize; he was only too aware that the world is full of suffering, but he knew a way to get over it. He would tell you he knows how awful it is, all that suffering, but that it [be, cannot, comes, desires, from, having, satisfied, that].⁸⁾ Yes, you've lost the love of your life, but, even if you still had it, you wouldn't be content. If you want an end to the suffering, you must stop getting attached to stuff and people.

Long before it became fashionable with hippies* in the West, the German philosopher **Arthur Schopenhauer** (1788–1860) was fascinated by Indian philosophy, and borrowed from it to form his own world view. Unless you want just to wallow* in your despondency,⁹⁾ he's maybe not a great person to turn to. He was quite possibly the gloomiest, most [A] philosopher of all time, and was bad-tempered with it. Like Buddha, he recognized that there is suffering everywhere, all the time, but he would make a point of [avoiding, is, no, of, telling, that, there, way, you]¹⁰⁾ that. You're trying to mend a broken heart? Don't bother. The world is full of misery, and there's nothing you can do about it, except maybe lose yourself in philosophy or music. Whatever you do, it will all end in tears. Get used to it — it's the human condition.

Perhaps the most [B] advice you could get would be from **Friedrich Nietzsche** (1844–1900). Having been through the horrible early death of his father, a crisis of faith and the rejection of his lover, he knew only too well what it's like to be heartbroken. Despite these tragedies, he found a way to turn them into a positive philosophy. Where many philosophers with a religious conviction would turn to their faith for comfort, Nietzsche rejected the idea that we should accept that suffering is somehow part of God's purpose for us. Instead, he'd agree with Schopenhauer that we're doomed* to some misery in our lives, but that we should look on this

as an opportunity rather than a setback. He would sympathize with you to a certain extent, and let you know that your suffering is an inevitable part of being human, and he would advise you not just to get over the suffering, but to find meaning in it. In his experience, he would say, the pain is necessary and can be life-affirming. The things we strive to do, if they are worth doing, involve the risk of failure, and the suffering that they bring helps us to appreciate our achievements all the more. If we approach it with the right attitude, every period of suffering in life serves to make us stronger, more able to live the life we want to lead.

Marcus Weeks. *What would Nietzsche do?* Cassell. 2017. 一部改変.

NOTES*

down-to-earth: practical and sensible

existentialist: a person who agrees with the philosophy of existentialism
(= the theory that humans are free and responsible for their own actions in a world without meaning)

Stoics: a group of ancient Greek philosophers who believed that wise people should not allow themselves to be affected by painful or pleasant experiences

c.: (= *circa*) about or approximately

austere: strict and serious in appearance and behavior

angle for: to try to get something you want without asking directly for it

beatific: expressing happiness and calmness, especially in a holy way

hippie: someone in the 1960s who was opposed to war and the traditional attitudes of society, and who showed this by having long hair and wearing very informal clothes

wallow: to spend a lot of time feeling a negative emotion, especially because you want sympathy from other people

doomed: certain to fail or be destroyed

問 1. 下線部 1), 2) について, 本文に即して, それぞれの表現を分かりやすく日本語で述べよ。

問 2. 下線部 3) について, 本文の内容に即して分かりやすく日本語で述べよ。

問 3. 下線部 4), 7) が本文と同じ意味で使われているものを以下から選べ。

4) nurse

- a. He nursed the car up the steep hill.
- b. She had been nursing a secret desire to see him again.
- c. She nursed the crying child on her lap.
- d. She was nursing her hurt pride.

7) get down

- a. His lack of social life was beginning to get him down.
- b. I knew I'd feel better once I'd got some food down.
- c. It's important to get things down on paper.
- d. She got down on her hands and knees on the floor.

問 4. 下線部 5), 9), 11) について, それぞれの定義として最もふさわしいものを以下から選べ。ただし, それぞれの選択肢は 1 回しか使えない。

- a. a problem that delays or stops progress, or that makes a situation worse
- b. a strong feeling of unhappiness
- c. extreme physical or mental pain

問 5. 下線部 6) について, 本文の内容に即して分かりやすく日本語で述べよ。

問 6. 下線部 8), 10) について, 本文の内容に即して [] 内の語を意味が通るように並べ替えよ。

問 7. [A]と[B]に入る組み合わせとして、最もふさわしいものを以下から選べ。

- | A | B |
|----------------|-------------|
| a. optimistic | pessimistic |
| b. optimistic | optimistic |
| c. pessimistic | optimistic |
| d. pessimistic | pessimistic |

問 8. Nietzsche のアドバイスを本文の内容に即して 30 語以上 50 語以内の英語で要約せよ。本文の語句は何度使用しても構わない。ただし、連続した語句を引用する場合は 4 語以内に限る。句読点は語数に含めない。

2 以下の英文を読み問いに答えよ。

Despite the complexity and variety of the universe, it turns out that to make one¹⁾ you need just three ingredients. Let's imagine that we could list them in some kind of cosmic cookbook. So what are the three ingredients we need to cook up a universe? The first is matter — stuff that has mass. Matter is all around us, in the ground beneath our feet and out in space. Dust, rock, ice, liquids. Vast clouds of gas, massive spirals of stars, each containing billions of suns, stretching away for incredible distances.

The second thing you need is energy. Even if you've never thought about it, we all know what energy is. Something we encounter every day²⁾. Look up at the Sun and you can feel it on your face: energy produced by a star ninety-three million miles away. Energy permeates* the universe, driving the processes that keep it a dynamic, endlessly changing place.

So we have matter and we have energy. The third thing we need to build a universe is space. Lots of space. You can call the universe many things — awesome, beautiful, violent — but one thing you can't call it is cramped³⁾. Wherever we look we see space, more space and even more space. Stretching (A) all directions. It's enough to make your head spin. So where could all this matter, energy and space come from? We had no idea until the twentieth century.

The answer came from the insights of one man, probably the most remarkable scientist who has ever lived. His name was Albert Einstein. Sadly I never got to meet him, since I was only thirteen when he died. Einstein realised something quite extraordinary: that two of the main ingredients needed to make a universe — (B) and (C) — are basically the same thing, two sides of the same coin if you like. His famous equation $E = mc^2$ simply means that mass can be thought of as a kind of energy, and vice versa*. So instead of three ingredients, we can now say that the universe has

just two: energy and space. So where did all this energy and space come from?

The answer was found after decades of work by scientists: space and energy

4) were spontaneously* invented in an event we now call the Big Bang.

At the moment of the Big Bang, an entire universe came into existence, and with it space. It all inflated*, just like a balloon being blown up. So where

5) did all this energy and space come from? How does an entire universe full of energy, the awesome vastness of space and everything in it, simply appear out of nothing?

For some, this is where God comes back into the picture. It was God who 6) created the energy and space. The Big Bang was the moment of creation. But science tells a different story. At the risk of getting myself into trouble, I think we can understand much more the natural phenomena that terrified the Vikings. We can even go beyond the beautiful symmetry of energy and matter discovered by Einstein. We can use the laws of nature to address the very origins of the universe, and discover if the existence of God is the only way to explain it.

As I was growing up in England after the Second World War, it was a time of austerity*. We were told that you never get something for nothing. But now, after a lifetime of work, I think that actually you can get a whole universe for free.

The great mystery at the heart of the Big Bang is to explain how an entire, fantastically enormous universe of space and energy can materialise* out of nothing. The secret lies in one of the strangest facts about our cosmos. The laws of physics demand the existence of something called 'negative energy'.

To help you get your head around this weird but crucial concept, let me draw on a simple analogy. Imagine a man wants to build a hill on a flat piece of land. The hill will represent the universe. To make this hill he digs a hole in the ground and uses that soil to dig his hill. But of course he's not just

making a hill — he's also making a hole, in effect a negative version of the hill. The stuff that was in the hole has now become the hill, so it all perfectly balances out. This is the principle behind what happened at the beginning of the universe.

When the Big Bang produced a massive amount of positive energy, it simultaneously produced the same amount of negative energy. In this way, the positive and the negative add up to zero, always. It's another law of nature.

So where is all this negative energy today? It's in the third ingredient in our cosmic cookbook: it's in space. This may sound odd, but according to the laws of nature concerning gravity and motion — laws that are among the oldest in science — space itself is a vast store of negative energy. Enough to ensure that everything adds up to zero.

Stephen Hawking. *Brief Answers to the Big Questions*. London:

John Murray (Publishers). 2018.

NOTES*

permeate: 行き渡る

vice versa: 逆もまた同じ(前文の逆を略形で言い表す文句)

spontaneously: 自然に, 自然発生的に

inflate: 膨張する

austerity: 耐乏生活, 窮乏生活

materialise: 突然現れる

問 1. 下線部 1) について, この語が指すものを下記の a. ~ c. から 1 つ 選
べ。

a. a universe

b. the universe

c. universe

問 2. 下線部 2) について、この句の前に省略されていると考えられるものはどれか。下記の a. ~ d. から当てはまるものをすべて選べ。(得点は選択肢をすべて正しく選んだ場合にのみ与えられる)

- a. Energy is
- b. It is
- c. We all know that
- d. We all know what is

問 3. 下線部 3) の最後の語 cramped について、文脈からその語の説明として適切と考えられるものを下記の a. ~ e. からすべて選べ。(得点は選択肢をすべて正しく選んだ場合にのみ与えられる)

- a. confined
- b. enormous
- c. roomy
- d. small
- e. the opposite of being vast

問 4. 空欄 (A) について、入る最も適切な語句を下記の a. ~ e. から一つ選べ。

- a. at
- b. in
- c. to
- d. toward
- e. under

問 5. 空欄 (B) と (C) について、文意に照らして最も適切な語を一つずつ入れよ。(得点は両方を正しく回答した場合にのみ与えられる)

問 6. 下線部 4) の were invented と置き換えて文意を損ねないものを下記の

a. ~ e. からすべて選べ。(得点は選択肢をすべて正しく選んだ場合にのみ与えられる)

- a. appeared
- b. came into being
- c. emerged
- d. were discovered
- e. were found

問 7. 下線部 5) のあとに省略されている語句について、本文中から抜き出して書け。

問 8. 下線部 6) について、some のあとにつけても文意の変わらないものを下記の

a. ~ e. からすべて選べ。(得点は選択肢をすべて正しく選んだ場合にのみ与えられる)

- a. individuals
- b. people
- c. reason
- d. things
- e. time

問 9. 著者の意見に沿うものを下記の a. ~ e. からすべて選べ。(得点は選択肢をすべて正しく選んだ場合にのみ与えられる)

- a. Space is a divine creation.
- b. We essentially need two things to create a universe.
- c. Energy can be thought of as a kind of mass.
- d. Albert Einstein played a remarkable role in science because he proposed the Big Bang theory.
- e. The existence of negative energy holds the key in the explanation of the beginning of the universe.