

(平 20 前)

# 外 国 語

英 語

(問題部分 1～12 ページ)

注意 解答はすべて答案用紙の指定のところに記入しなさい。

外国語 (英 語) 125 点

I 次の文章を読んで、問1～4に答えなさい。(配点35点)

Everyone agrees that one of the biggest problems among people and nations is communication. We try to improve communication by talking things out, by being “honest.” But if the problem is caused by differences in ways of talking, doing more of it is not likely to solve the problem. Honesty is not enough — and often not possible.

Most of us genuinely try to be honest and considerate and to communicate, but we sometimes end up in knots anyway, first, because communication is indirect and undetermined by nature, and second, because ( A ) inevitable differences in conversational style. Seeing things go ( B ), we look for explanations in personality, intentions, or other psychological motivations.

A psychotherapist\* who heard me talk at a Sunday evening lecture later told me that she put her new understanding of conversational style to use the very next morning. Her Monday-at-ten appointment arrived and began to talk. The therapist offered her interpretations and strategic questions as they were relevant. ( C ) time, the client considered and discussed her comments, then returned to his account. He was a good patient. But her next client, Monday-at-eleven, was different. When she began making her comments, in ( D ) words, doing her job, he asked her not to interrupt. This therapist said that if she hadn't heard my talk, she would have concluded that Monday-at-eleven was resisting her interpretations. Recalling my lecture, however, she reserved judgment. Sure enough, after he finished what he had to say, he was just ( E ) eager to hear and consider the comments as Monday-at-ten. What was simply a style difference would have led her to unwarranted psychological evaluation.

Therapists, then, must consider the possibility of conversational-style differences before making psychological interpretations. And in personal rather than professional settings, it may be more effective to talk in ( F ) of

conversational style even when psychological motives are correctly observed.

Psychological motives are internal and formless; talk is external and concrete. If you tell others they were hostile or insecure, they may feel accused and may not know what you are reacting to. But if you say you reacted to how they said what they did, and you can pinpoint which aspect of the way they spoke you reacted to, they can see what was there and address it. If you begin by assuming that what you felt and what they intended are not necessarily the same, they are less likely to feel accused and to discount your reaction in self-defense.<sup>(5)</sup>

Conversational style is normally invisible but not unconscious. People often say, spontaneously, "It's not what you said but the way you said it," even if they can't tell just what it was about the way you said it that they reacted to. Knowing about conversational style gives names to what were previously felt as<sup>(6)</sup> vague forces. Once pointed out, they have a ring of familiarity and truth.

注 psychotherapist 心理療法医

問 1 下線部(1), (2), (4), (5)の意味として最も適切なものを, (a)~(d)のうちから選び, 記号で答えなさい。

(1) talking things out

- (a) 徹底的に話をする
- (b) 外に向かっておしゃべりを続ける
- (c) 大声を出して叫ぶ
- (d) のどの奥から声を絞り出すようにしゃべること

(2) end up in knots

- (a) なぞを解く
- (b) 争う
- (c) 嘘をつく
- (d) 混乱する

(4) reserved judgment

- (a) 意見を述べた
- (b) 判断を保留した
- (c) 相談の予約をした
- (d) 判決を言い渡した

(5) discount your reaction

- (a) あなたの反発を弱める
- (b) あなたの反応を無視する
- (c) あなたの指令を受ける
- (d) あなたの対抗手段を奪う

問 2 下線部(3)を, Monday-at-eleven が何を意味するかを明らかにして, 日本語に訳しなさい。

問 3 下線部(6)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 4 空所( A )～( F )に入る最も適切な語を, 下からそれぞれ一つ選び記号で書きなさい。ただし, 大文字で始まる語も小文字になっています。また, 同じ語は一度しか使ってはいけません。

- |           |           |           |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (ア) as    | (イ) of    | (ウ) each  |
| (エ) other | (オ) terms | (カ) wrong |

Ⅱ 次の文章を読んで、問1～3に答えなさい。(配点35点)

A hundred years ago, the only signs of elephants at Kruger National Park in northeastern South Africa, which had just opened, were a few tracks in a dry riverbed. Game hunters of the 19th century had hunted the creatures almost to extinction. Conservation efforts were so successful that by 1967 the authorities (1) decided they had to start culling elephants to keep their populations between 6,000 and 8,000, considered to be the park's "carrying capacity." (2) Few people questioned the policy, but it was dropped in 1995. Since then the elephant population has soared to 14,000. Conservationists now fear that this herd might devastate\* vegetation, threatening many life forms with extinction.

A new proposal to cull the creatures has created a dilemma for the national parks authority, South African National Parks. As a responsible custodian, (3) it has urged that "decisive action is required" to safeguard the survival of the rich diversity of life forms in South African wildlife reserves. The culling of elephants, it argues, is needed as a precautionary\* measure to avert local species' extinctions in future. "A decision on the use of culling as a legitimate option for management of elephants," the park managers said back in 2005, "should not be delayed beyond March 2006." (4) What has delayed this action is fierce disagreement over whether it is a morally responsible choice — a debate that didn't exist in 1967.

What's changed? Scientists have told us in recent years that elephants and other higher mammals, (5) such as chimpanzees, gorillas, dolphins, whales and dogs, have aspects of consciousness, feelings and intelligence that until recently most people thought was the province of humans alone. The debate over ( A ) Kruger's elephants — like similar debates over the ethics of animal testing and the treatment of animals raised for food — is challenging us to reflect on how we treat other living beings.

The elephant is a fitting object of this dilemma because it has more ( B ) humans than it appears. Elephants typically live for 65 years, spending their first 14 years growing up in a social group. Females teach them about the

geography and vegetation of their range\*, the social hierarchies of their species and how to raise their young. <sup>(6)</sup>

The understanding that science gives us about what these animals experience—their capacity for emotion and awareness—supports the contention of some animal-rights activists that we must treat such creatures ( C ) we did in the past. There are some simple ways of going cautiously down this path. We could start by extending anti-cruelty laws to include a few legal rights for higher mammals. For example, laws could prevent us from killing higher mammals except in self-defense, or from limiting their freedom without good reasons. We could forbid people to harm such special beings without sufficient justification. What constitutes good reasons and sufficient justification would be left to judges.

Where does that leave Kruger's elephants? The South African government's minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism got involved in these disputes by holding an Elephant Round Table in 2006, composed of eminent elephant scientists from universities and conservation authorities, to advise him on policies for elephant management. They found that culling is an acceptable option if scientific experts confirm an overpopulation of elephants that will seriously threaten biodiversity\* in a specific region, and if all else fails. To be sure, other options won't be easy to come up with. One alternative—capturing elephants and moving them to other parks—is expensive, and most parks in southern Africa have ( D ) them. Instead, South African authorities are negotiating a combined conservation area that includes land from nearby Zimbabwe and Mozambique ( E ) Kruger's elephants will slowly migrate there.

Many elephant scientists and animal-welfare groups claim that there's no convincing evidence that the park is overpopulated with elephants. The destruction of vegetation, they say, falls within the acceptable impact elephants should have on African savanna ecosystems. Their robust feeding patterns, in fact, create opportunities for successful survival for many other species. When a bull\* pushes over a tree, the log provides protected spaces for young plants to escape the browsers\* and grazers\* of the savanna. Natural ecological

processes, many experts say, must be allowed to play themselves out without human intervention.

The crucial issue for conservation authorities now is whether they can  
(7) convincingly show that elephant numbers have increased up to a point where the  
survival of other life forms will be threatened in the near future. If so, then culling will go forward, and that would be acceptable. Nations resist going to war with other nations unless no alternative is available. Resisting the killing of elephants until all alternatives have been exhausted would accord these creatures the respect they deserve.

注 devastate 荒らす； precautionary 用心のための；  
range 縄張り； biodiversity 生物多様性； bull 雄の象；  
browser 新芽などを食べる動物； grazer 草を食べる動物

問 1 空所( A )～( E )に入れるのに最も適切なものを、下の(あ)～(お)からそれぞれ一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。ただし、同じ語句は一度しか使えませ  
ん。

- (あ) in hopes that
- (い) no room for
- (う) what to do about
- (え) with more respect than
- (お) in common with

問 2 下線部(1), (2), (3), (5), (6)の語の本文中での意味として最も近い表現をそれ  
ぞれ(ア)～(エ)から一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (1) extinction
  - (ア) narrow survival
  - (イ) utter destruction
  - (ウ) close encounter
  - (エ) easy escape

(2) culling

(ア) feeding

(イ) driving

(ウ) killing

(エ) whipping

(3) custodian

(ア) spectator

(イ) hunter

(ウ) protector

(エ) farmer

(5) mammals

(ア) animals without lungs

(イ) animals that lay eggs

(ウ) cold-blooded animals

(エ) animals that feed babies on milk

(6) hierarchies

(ア) systems

(イ) events

(ウ) backgrounds

(エ) balances

問 3 下線部(4), (7)を日本語に訳しなさい。

Ⅲ 次の文章を読んで、問1～4に答えなさい。本文に出てくるKathyは、盲目のジャーナリストです。(配点30点)

Kathy's radio show was one of the most popular shows on the station. She would interview people in the news and deal ( A ) serious issues. As well as the usual politicians and businessmen, she often spoke to artists, writers and scientists. The shows got more interesting for the listeners when Kathy questioned her guests, especially when the guests said things that Kathy found hard ( B ). That really made things exciting.

It was getting towards the end of her morning show and her final guest was coming on. He was an American scientist, Dr. Woodrow Percival, who was an expert in eye surgery. He interested Kathy because he had said that he could replace damaged eye nerves with tiny computer chips that would work just as well as real nerves, perhaps even better. Kathy took a personal interest in this. He had said, in fact, that he could make the blind see.

What's more, he had said that he could make *her* see.

Kathy had come across other "experts" before. Sometimes they were more interested in getting publicity for themselves than in telling the truth. If this guy <sup>(1)</sup> had any real doubts about his method, Kathy thought, she would know it. It was wrong to raise the hopes of people who might otherwise have accepted their disability and got on with their lives. If he was offering false hope to people, he should be found out — and she was just the person to do it.

She introduced Dr. Percival to her listeners and began.

"Dr. Percival, you're going to give a talk <sup>(2)</sup> later today about your new treatment. Could you, in simple language, explain how this treatment works?"

"( C )."

And that was exactly what he did. Kathy was waiting for any little changes <sup>(3)</sup> in his voice that might suggest that he was not sure about what he was saying. His voice was calm. It was not the voice of an old man — he was forty — but it

had a quality that suggested strength of character. She questioned him at frequent intervals, listening carefully for any signs that might show his answers to be false. There were none. Everything Dr. Percival said was said in a way that suggested he was being completely truthful. All of his answers were clear and open. Kathy could find no fault ( D ) the man's voice or his reasoning. Finally, she asked the question she knew all her listeners were waiting for.

"Dr. Percival, you said that you could give *me* the means to see. That was a very personal thing to say. Were you being serious?"

Kathy listened. He had been good so far. If he was going to show weakness, it would surely be now.

"Miss Page, let me apologize..."

"This is it!" thought Kathy. "He's going to weaken! He knows he can't seriously support the things he says he can do!"

"... for ( E ) the papers reported. They named you in particular when, in fact, I had only used you as an example. What I actually said was that people whose nerves had been damaged — in the way yours had, for example — could be helped by my treatment."

But Kathy, though she heard no sign of doubt in his voice, wanted him to be  
<sup>(4)</sup>very exact with his answer. She knew her listeners expected no less.

"Dr. Percival, are you saying that you could make me see?"

"Well, I'd have to see your medical records in more detail, but I think so. Yes. Yes, I could."

It was time for the end of her program. Kathy thanked her guests and the closing music was played. She felt excited, yet guilty for feeling that way. She had always thought that even if she had been given the chance to see she would choose not to, not after a lifetime without sight. But at that time there had been no hope. There had been no point in hoping. Hope was like a door shut and with no key to open it. Ever.

But now, this doctor sounded sure of himself. She was certain of that.

For the first time since she was a girl she allowed herself the hope of sight. She found that she *did* want to see. She wanted to see those pictures in the museums, the faces of her friends, the sky at dawn and the stars at night. She realized she wanted it very much indeed.

Dr. Woodrow Percival had to rush off to his talk. He thanked her and left.

問 1 下線部(1)および(2)の言い換えとして最も適当なものを一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

(1) this guy

(ア) the blind

(イ) experts

(ウ) Kathy

(エ) Dr. Woodrow Percival

(2) give a talk

(ア) have a dialog

(イ) deliver a lecture

(ウ) gossip

(エ) chat

問 2 空所( A )～( E )を補うのに最も適当なものをそれぞれについて一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- |                 |                     |                  |               |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|
| (A) (ア) for     | (イ) as              | (ウ) with         | (エ) on        |
| (B) (ア) believe | (イ) to believe      | (ウ) believing    | (エ) believed  |
| (C) (ア) No way  | (イ) On the contrary | (ウ) For any sake | (エ) Certainly |
| (D) (ア) with    | (イ) to              | (ウ) at           | (エ) for       |
| (E) (ア) which   | (イ) where           | (ウ) what         | (エ) who       |

問 3 下線部(3)および(4)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 4 下線部(5)で Kathy が「興奮を覚えた」のはなぜか。30 字以内の日本語で答えなさい。ただし、句読点も 1 字に数えます。

IV 次の文章の下線部(1)と(2)を英語に訳しなさい。(配点 25 点)

1950年代の前半には、東京で育った男が、パリで暮らすようになって、少く  
(1)とも日常生活において、大きな相違を感じることはなかった。私の場合も、フラン  
(2)スで初めて地下鉄を見たのではなく、東京で乗り慣れた交通機関がパリではもう少し  
便利にできていると思ったにすぎない。制度上の根本的な相違におどろいたの  
ではなく、同じような制度の運営の仕方に、いくらかの相違を認めたにすぎない。珈  
琲は珍しい飲み物ではなく、寝台に寝るのは、本郷の病院以来の習慣であった。私  
の第一印象は、彼我の相違ではなく、相似であった。