

[A]

次の英文は Bill Bryson による *At Home* (2010) からの抜粋に基づいている。  
これを読んで以下の設問に答えなさい。

The ancient Greeks were devoted bathers. They loved to get naked—‘gymnasium’ means ‘the naked place’—and work up a healthful sweat, and it was their habit to conclude their daily workouts with a communal bath. But these were primarily hygienic plunges. For them bathing was a brisk business, something to be got over quickly. Really serious bathing—languorous bathing—starts with Rome. Nobody has ever bathed with as much devotion and precision as the Romans did.

The Romans loved water altogether—one house at Pompeii had thirty taps—and their network of aqueducts provided their principal cities with a superabundance of fresh water. The delivery rate to Rome worked out at an intensely lavish three hundred gallons per head per day, seven or eight times more than the average Roman needs today.

To Romans the baths were more than just a place to get clean. They were a daily refuge, a pastime, a way of life. Roman baths had libraries, shops, exercise rooms, barbers, beauticians, tennis courts, snack bars and brothels. People from all classes of society used them. ‘It was common, when meeting a man, to ask where he bathed,’ writes Katherine Aschenburg in her sparkling history of cleanliness, *The Dirt on Clean*. Some Roman baths were built on a truly palatial scale. The great baths of Caracalla could take sixteen hundred bathers at a time.

A bathing Roman sloshed and gasped his way through a series of variously heated pools—from the *frigidarium* at the cold end of the scale to the *calidarium* at the other. En route he or she would stop in the *unctorium* (or *unctuarium*) to be fragrantly oiled and then forwarded to the *laconium*, or steam room, where, after working up a good sweat, the oils were scraped off with an instrument called a *strigil* to remove dirt and other impurities. All this was done in a ritualistic order, though historians are not entirely agreed on what that order was, possibly because the specifics varied from

place to place and time to time. There is quite a lot we don't know about Romans and their bathing habits—whether slaves bathed with free citizens, or how often or lengthily people bathed or with what degree of enthusiasm. Romans themselves sometimes expressed disquiet about the state of the water and what they found floating in it. <sup>(1)</sup> This suggests that they were not all necessarily as keen for a plunge as we generally suppose them to have been.

It seems, however, that for much of the Roman era the baths were marked by a certain rigid decorum, which assured a healthy rectitude. But as time went on, life in the baths—as with life in Rome generally—grew increasingly frisky, and it became common for men and women to bathe together and, possibly but by no means certainly, for females to bathe with male slaves. No one really knows quite what the Romans got up to in there, but whatever it was it didn't sit well with the early Christians. They viewed Roman baths as licentious and depraved—morally unclean if not hygienically so.

Christianity was always curiously ill at ease with cleanliness anyway, and early on developed an odd tradition of equating holiness with dirtiness. When St Thomas à Becket died in 1170, those who laid him out noted approvingly that his undergarments were 'seething with lice'. Throughout the medieval period, an almost sure-fire way to earn lasting honour was to take a vow not to wash. Many people walked from England to the Holy Land, but when a monk named Godric did it without getting wet even once he became, all but inevitably, St Godric.

Then in the Middle Ages the spread of plague made people consider more closely their attitude to hygiene and what they might do to modify their own susceptibility to outbreaks. Unfortunately, people everywhere came to exactly the wrong conclusion. All the best minds agreed that bathing opened the epidermal pores and encouraged deathly vapours to invade the body. The best policy was to plug the pores with dirt. For the next six hundred years most people didn't wash, or even get wet, if they could help it—and in consequence they paid an uncomfortable price. Infections became part of everyday life. Boils grew commonplace. Rashes and blotches were routine. Nearly everyone itched nearly all the time. Discomfort was constant, serious illness accepted with resignation.

Devastating diseases arose, killed millions and then, often, mysteriously vanished. The most notorious was plague (which was really two diseases: bubonic plague, named for the swollen buboes that victims got in the neck, groin or armpit, and the even more lethal and infectious pneumonic plague, which overwhelmed the respiratory system), but there were many others. The English sweating sickness, a disease about which we still know almost nothing, had epidemics in 1485, 1508, 1517 and 1528, <sup>(2)</sup> killing thousands as it went, before disappearing, never to return (or at least not yet). It was followed in the 1550s by another strange fever—‘the new sickness’—which ‘raged horribly throughout the realm and killed an exceeding great number of all sorts of men, but especially gentlemen and men of great wealth’, as one contemporary noted.

The worst disease of all, because it was so prevalent and so devastating, was smallpox. For survivors, smallpox was a cruelly fickle disease, leaving many of its survivors blinded or dreadfully scarred, but others unscathed. It had existed for millennia, but didn’t become common in Europe until the early sixteenth century. Its first recorded appearance in England was 1518. As a young woman, Queen Elizabeth was nearly killed by smallpox, but recovered completely and without scars. Her friend Lady Mary Sidney, who nursed her, was not so lucky. ‘I left her a full fair lady,’ wrote her husband, ‘... and when I returned <sup>(3)</sup> I found her ( ) could make her.’ The Duchess of Richmond, who modelled for the figure of Britannia on the English penny, was similarly disfigured a century later.

Clearly not all of these dreadful maladies were directly related to washing, but people didn’t necessarily know that or even care. Although everyone knew that syphilis was spread through sexual contact, which could of course take place anywhere, it became indelibly associated with bathhouses. Prostitutes generally were banned from coming within a hundred paces of a bathhouse and eventually Europe’s bathhouses were closed altogether. <sup>(4)</sup> With the bathhouses gone, most people got out of the habit of washing—not that many of them were entirely in it to begin with. Washing wasn’t unknown, just a little selective. ‘Wash your hands often, your feet seldom, and your head never’ was a common English proverb. Queen Elizabeth, in a much-cited quote, faithfully bathed once a month ‘whether she needs it or no’.

( I ) 下線部 ( 1 ) を日本語に訳しなさい。

( II ) 下線部 ( 2 ) を本文の内容に即して言い換えた場合に、最もふさわしいものを以下の中から選び、その記号を答えなさい。

(A) the disease has since abated but might come back in the future.

(B) thousands killed at least will no longer come back again.

(C) it is impossible to know completely about past epidemics at least for now.

(D) another epidemic was to strike again but people didn't know it at that time.

( III ) 下線部 ( 3 ) I found her ( ) could make her. が「天然痘で醜くなるとしたら、これ以上はないというくらいに彼女は醜い女性になっていた」という意味になるように、以下の七語を並べ替えなさい。

foul, a, as, as, lady, smallpox, the

( IV ) 下線部 ( 4 ) を日本語に訳しなさい。

( V ) 入浴の習慣が廃れていった理由について、本文中から 3 つを挙げて100字から120字までの日本語で書きなさい。

[B]

次の英文は Michael Tomasello による *Why We Cooperate* (2009) からの抜粋に基づいている。これを読んで以下の設問に答えなさい。

One of the great debates in Western civilization is whether humans are born cooperative and helpful and society later corrupts them, or whether they are born selfish and unhelpful and society teaches them better. As with all great debates, both arguments undoubtedly have some truth on their side. Here I defend a thesis that mainly sides with the former view.

From around their first birthdays—when they first begin to walk and talk and become truly cultural beings—human children are already cooperative and helpful in many, though obviously not all, situations. And they do not learn this from adults; it comes naturally. But later in the process of growing up, <sup>(1)</sup> children's relatively indiscriminate cooperativeness becomes moderated by such influences as their judgments of likely mutual benefit and their concern for how others in the group judge them. And they begin to understand many social norms for how we do things, how one ought to do things if one is to be a member of this group.

All living things must have a selfish streak; they must be concerned about their own survival and well-being, ( ア ) they will not be leaving many offspring. Human cooperativeness and helpfulness are, as it were, laid on top of this self-interested foundation.

As a simple example, infants of eighteen months of age confront an unrelated adult they have met just moments previously. The adult has a trivial problem, and the infants help him solve it—everything from fetching out-of-reach objects to opening cabinet doors when the adult's hands are full. In one study, of the 24 eighteen-month-old infants tested, 22 helped at least once, and they did so basically immediately.

Each of these situations has a corresponding control condition\*. For example, instead of dropping his clothespin accidentally, the adult throws it down on purpose. Or instead of bumping into the cabinet with his hands full, he bumps into the cabinet while trying to do something else. <sup>(2)</sup> In these cases the infants do nothing, showing that they do not just like fetching clothespins and opening cabinets in general.

The ways in which infants help are also remarkably varied. In the study, they helped the adult solve four different kinds of problems: fetching out-of-reach objects, removing obstacles, correcting an adult's mistake, and choosing the correct behavioral means for a task. All of the scenarios were very likely novel for the infants. <sup>(3)</sup> To help others flexibly in these ways, infants need, first, to be able to perceive others' goals in a variety of situations, and second, to have the altruistic motive to help them.

\* control condition = a standard against which other conditions can be compared in a scientific experiment

( I ) 下線部 ( 1 ) をわかりやすい日本語で説明しなさい。30字以内で答えよ。

( II ) 空所 ( ア ) にもっとも適切と思われる語を以下の語群から選び、その番号で答えなさい。

( 1 ) but                      ( 2 ) as                      ( 3 ) or                      ( 4 ) so

( III ) 下線部 ( 2 ) に関連して、幼児が大人を助けるか助けないかの基準は何か？  
30字以内で答えよ。

( IV ) 下線部 ( 3 ) を日本語に訳しなさい。

[ C ]

次の日本語を英語に訳しなさい。

当時の人々は、疫病の原因を知ることができなかったので、感染を防ぐ方法について意見が完全に一致することはなかった。