

令和6年度

英語

問題冊子





I 次の文章を読んで、問1～問5に答えなさい。\*の付された語句については下に注がある。

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries did three things in medicine — shattered authority, laid the foundation of an accurate knowledge of the structure of the human body and demonstrated how its functions should be studied intelligently — with which advances, as illustrating this period, may be associated the names of Paracelsus, Vesalius\* and Harvey\*.

Paracelsus roused men against the dogmatism of the schools, and he stimulated enormously the practical study of chemistry. These are his great merits, against which must be placed a flood of hermetical\* and transcendental medicine, some his own, some foisted in his name, the influence of which is still with us.

“With what judgement you judge you shall be judged again” is the verdict of three centuries<sup>(1)</sup> on Paracelsus. In return for unmeasured abuse of his predecessors and contemporaries he has been held up to censure as the biggest quack doctor of history. We have taken a cheap estimate of him from a host of foul-mouthed scribblers who debased or perverted his writings. One critic picked him out as exemplifying the drunken quack, whose body was a sea wherein the tide of drunkenness was ever ebbing and flowing. Francis Bacon, too, says many hard things of him.

To the mystics, on the other hand, he is Paracelsus the Great, the divine, the most supreme of the Christian magi, whose writings are too precious for science, the monarch of secrets, who has discovered the Universal Medicine. This is illustrated in a well-known poem “Paracelsus”,<sup>(2)</sup> than which there is no more pleasant picture in literature of the man and of his aspirations. His was a “searching and impetuous soul” that sought to win from nature some startling [ A ]—“...a tincture of force to flush old age with youth, or breed gold, or imprison moonbeams till they change to opal shafts!” At the same time with that capacity for self-deception which characterizes the true mystic he sought to cast light on a darkling race.

Much has been done of late to clear up his story and his character. Suffice it here to say that he was born in 1493, the son of a physician, from whom he appears to have had his early training both in medicine and in chemistry. After working in the mines he began his wanderings, during which he professes to have visited nearly all the countries in Europe and to have reached India and China. Returning to Germany he began a triumphal tour of practice through the German cities, always in opposition to the medical faculty, and constantly in trouble. He undoubtedly performed many important cures, and was thought to have found the supreme secret of alchemy. So [ B ] was his reputation that in 1527 he was called to the chair of physic in the University of Basel\*. Embroiled in quarrels after his first year he was forced to leave secretly and again began his wanderings through German cities, working, quarrelling, curing, and dying prematurely in 1541 — one of the most tragic figures in the history of medicine.

Paracelsus is the very incarnation of the spirit of revolt. At a period when authority was <sup>(3)</sup>paramount, and men blindly followed old leaders, when to stray from the beaten track in any field of knowledge was a damnable heresy, he stood out boldly for independent study and the right of private judgement. After election to the chair at Basel he at once introduced a startling novelty by lecturing in German. He attached a program of his lectures to the black-board of the University inviting all to come to them. It began by greeting all students of the art of healing. He proclaimed its lofty and serious nature, a gift of God to man, and the need of developing it to new importance and to new renown. <sup>(4)</sup>This he undertook to do, not retrogressing to the teaching of the ancients, but progressing where nature pointed, through research into nature, where he himself had discovered and had verified by prolonged experiment and experience. He was ready to [ C ] obedience to old lights as if they were oracles from which one did not dare to differ. Illustrious doctors might be graduated from books, but books made not a single physician. Neither graduation, nor fluency, nor the knowledge of old languages, nor the reading of many books made a physician, but the knowledge of things themselves and their properties.

(Sir William Osler, *The Evolution of Modern Medicine* 適宜改変)

[注]

Vesalius : Andreas Vesalius, 1514-1564, Belgian anatomist

Harvey : William Harvey, 1578-1657, English physician

hermetical : of alchemy

Basel : a city in North Switzerland

問 1 下線をほどこした部分(1)を和訳しなさい。

問 2 下線をほどこした部分(2)を 'This' の内容を明らかにしながら和訳しなさい。

問 3 下線をほどこした部分(3)を和訳しなさい。

問 4 下線をほどこした部分(4)を 'This' の内容を明らかにしながら和訳しなさい。

問 5 空所 [ A ] ~ [ C ] にはいるもっとも適切な単語を、それぞれ(ア)~(エ)の中から選び、記号で答えなさい。

[ A ] (ア) equilibrium (イ) explicit (ウ) sacrifice (エ) secret

[ B ] (ア) complementary (イ) constituent (ウ) dependent (エ) dominant

[ C ] (ア) evoke (イ) oppose (ウ) recourse (エ) sustain

II 次の文章を読んで、問1～問6に答えなさい。

In 1950, any notion of English as a true global language was but a dim, shadowy, theoretical possibility, and lacking any clear definition or sense of direction. Fifty years on, and World English exists as a political and cultural reality. How could such a dramatic linguistic shift have taken place? Why has English, and not some other language, achieved such a status? In the first place, we take up the following question: What makes a global language?

(1) Why a language becomes a global language has little to do with the number of people who speak it. Latin became an international language throughout the Roman Empire, but this was not because the Romans were more numerous than the peoples they subjugated. They were simply more powerful. And later, when Roman military power declined, Latin remained for a millennium as the international language of education, thanks to a different sort of power — the ecclesiastical power of Roman Catholicism.

There is the closest of links between language dominance and economic, technological, and cultural power, too. Without a strong power-base, of whatever kind, no language can make progress as an international medium of communication. Language has no independent existence, living in some sort of mystical space apart from the people who speak it. When they succeed, on the international stage, their language succeeds. When they fail, their language fails.

(2) This point may seem obvious, but it needs to be made at the outset, because over the years many popular beliefs have grown up about why a language should become internationally successful. It is quite common to hear people claim that a language is a model of excellence, on account of its perceived aesthetic qualities, clarity of expression, literary fertility, or religious standing. Greek, Latin, and French are among those which at various times have been lauded in such terms, and English is no exception. It is often suggested that there must be something inherently beautiful or logical about the structure of English, in order to explain why it is now so widely used. In 1848, a reviewer in a British periodical wrote:

In its easiness of grammatical construction, in its rareness of inflection, in its almost total disregard of the distinctions of gender excepting those of nature, not less than in the majesty, vigor and copiousness of its expression, our mother-tongue seems well adapted by organization to become the language of the world.

Such arguments are [ 4 ]. Latin was once a major international language, despite its many inflectional endings and gender differences. French, too, has been such a language, despite its nouns being masculine or feminine; and so have the heavily inflected Greek and Spanish. Ease of learning has nothing to do with it. Children of all cultures learn to talk over

more or less the same period of time, regardless of the differences in the grammar of their languages.

This is not to deny that a language may have certain properties which make it internationally appealing. For example, learners sometimes comment on the ‘familiarity’ of English vocabulary, deriving from the way English has over the centuries borrowed thousands of new words from the languages with which it has been in contact. And there have been <sup>(5)</sup> comments made about other structural aspects, too, such as the absence in English grammar of a system of coding social class differences, which can make the language appear more ‘democratic’ to those who speak a language that does express an intricate system of class relationships. But these supposed traits of appeal are incidental, and need to be weighed against linguistic features which would seem to be internationally much less desirable — notably, in the case of English, the accumulated irregularities of its spelling system.

A language has traditionally become an international language for one chief reason: the power of its people. Why did Greek become a language of international communication in the Middle East over 2,000 years ago? Not because of the intellects of Plato and Aristotle: the answer lies in the swords and spears wielded by the armies of Alexander the Great. Why did Latin become known throughout Europe? Ask the legions of the Roman Empire. The history of a global language can be traced through the successful expeditions of its soldier/sailor speakers. And English has been no exception.

But international language dominance is not solely the result of military might. It may take a militarily powerful nation to establish a language, but it takes an economically powerful one to maintain and expand it. This has always been the case, but it became a particularly critical factor in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The growth of competitive industry and business brought an explosion of international marketing and advertising. The power of the press reached unprecedented levels, soon to be surpassed by the broadcasting media, with their ability to cross national boundaries with electromagnetic ease.

Any language at the center of such an explosion of international activity would suddenly <sup>(6)</sup> have found itself with a global status. And English was apparently ‘in the right place at the right time’. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Britain had become the world’s leading industrial and trading country. By the end of the century, the population of the USA was larger than that of any of the countries of western Europe, and its economy was the most productive and the fastest growing in the world. British political imperialism had sent English around the globe, during the nineteenth century. During the twentieth century, this world presence was maintained and promoted almost single-handedly through the economic supremacy of the new American superpower. And the language behind the US dollar was English.

(David Crystal, *English as a Global Language* 適宜改変)

問 1 下線をほどこした部分(1)に対する答えを、本文に即して日本語で簡潔に記しなさい。

問 2 下線をほどこした部分(2)を和訳しなさい。

問 3 下線をほどこした部分(3)を和訳しなさい。

問 4 空所[ 4 ]にはいる英単語の意味を、本文に即して日本語で簡潔に記しなさい。

問 5 下線をほどこした部分(5)を和訳しなさい。

問 6 下線をほどこした部分(6)を和訳しなさい。



Ⅲ 次の文章を読んで、問1～問3に答えなさい。

Mrs. Ramsay never wanted James to grow a day older or Camilla either. These two children she would have liked to keep for ever just as they were, demons of wickedness, angels of delight, never to see them grow up into long-legged monsters. Nothing made up for the loss. When she read just now to James, she thought, why should they grow up, and lose all that? He was the most sensitive of her children. But all, she thought, were full of promise. Prue, a perfect angel with the others, and sometimes she took one's breath away with her beauty. Andrew — even her husband admitted that his gift for mathematics was extraordinary. And Nancy and Roger, they were both wild creatures now, scampering about over the country all day long. As for Rose, she had a wonderful [ A ] with her hands. If they had a party, Rose made the dresses. She liked best arranging tables and flowers. Mrs. Ramsay did not like it that Jasper should shoot birds, but it was only a stage. They all went through stages. Why, she asked, pressing her chin on James's head, should they grow up so fast? She would have liked always to have had a baby. She was happiest carrying [ B ] in her arms. Then people might say she was tyrannical, domineering, masterful, if they chose; she did not mind. And, touching his hair with her lips, she thought, he will never be so happy again, but stopped herself, remembering how it <sup>(2)</sup> angered her husband that she should say that. Still, it was true. They were happier now than they would ever be again. She heard them stamping on the floor above her head the moment they woke. They came bustling along the passage. Then the door sprang open and in they came, fresh as roses, staring, wide awake, as if this coming into the dining-room after breakfast, which they did every day of their lives, was a positive event to them; and so on, with one thing after another, all day long, until she went up to say [ C ] to them, and found them netted in their beds like birds among cherries and raspberries still making up stories about something they had heard, something they had picked up in the garden. And so she went down and said to her husband, 'Why must they grow up and lose it all? Never will they be so happy again.' And he was angry. 'Why do you take such a gloomy view of life?', he said, 'It is not sensible.' For it was odd; and she believed it <sup>(3)</sup> to be true that, with all his gloom and desperation, he was happier, more hopeful <sup>(4)</sup> on the whole, than she was. Less exposed to human worries — perhaps that was it <sup>(5)</sup>. He had always his work to fall back on. Not that she herself was 'pessimistic', as he accused her of being. Only she thought life — and a little strip of time presented itself to her eyes, her fifty years. There it was before her — life. She took a look at life, for she had a clear sense of it there, something real, something private, which she shared neither with her children nor with her husband. A sort of transaction went on between them, in which she was on one side, and life was on another, and she was always trying to get the better

of it, as it was of her; and sometimes <sup>(6)</sup>they parleyed when she sat alone; there were, she remembered, great reconciliation scenes; but for the most part, oddly enough, she must admit that she felt this thing that she called life terrible, hostile, and quick to pounce on you if you gave <sup>(7)</sup>it a chance.

(Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse* 適宜改変)

問 1 下線をほどこした部分(1)~(7)の代名詞の指し示す内容を、本文に即して日本語で答えなさい。

問 2 二重下線をほどこした部分 'great reconciliation scenes' とはどのような場面か、日本語で説明しなさい。

問 3 空所 [ A ] ~ [ C ] にはいるもっとも適切な単語を、それぞれ(ア)~(エ)の中から選び、記号で答えなさい。

- |       |               |           |              |                |
|-------|---------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|
| [ A ] | (ア) despair   | (イ) gift  | (ウ) surprise | (エ) weariness  |
| [ B ] | (ア) each      | (イ) her   | (ウ) one      | (エ) what       |
| [ C ] | (ア) goodnight | (イ) hello | (ウ) opinion  | (エ) suggestion |

**IV** 次の文章を読んで、下線をほどこした部分(1)と(2)を英語で表現しなさい。

老人に話しかけるときに猫なで声をだす人がいるが、あれはたまらなく嫌である。

これは、もちろん、老人を自分と対等の存在とみなしていないことを示している。しかし、本人  
<sup>(1)</sup>の意識としては、老人を「大切に」しているつもりなのだから始末におえない。人間を「猫」扱いして  
おいて、「大切に」でもないと思うのだが。

誰かを大切にする、ということは、その人の自主性を中心に据えることである。自分が中心に  
<sup>(2)</sup>なって、「私が老人を大切にしていやる」のだと思うところで、根本がおかしくなってしまう。自分が  
主役になるので、猫をなでて自分になつかせるようにしようということになる。

(河合隼雄『老いのみち』適宜改変)

問題は、このページで終わりである。









