Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

When strangers meet they often have to decide where to sit or stand in relation to each other. This is not something that they need to discuss, nor is it something they need to consider consciously — they don't, for example, have to ask themselves whether they should try to be friendly and stand close, or be formal and keep their distance. They simply assume a distance that 'feels right' in those circumstances. What feels right to people depends to a very large extent on the culture to which they belong. When two individuals are members of the same culture, the issue of how close they should stand seldom presents a problem. However, when they are from cultures with different ideas of proxemics, all kinds of problems can arise.

European societies can be divided, very roughly, into three geographical zones, depending on how close people position themselves. The first is what Desmond Morris calls the 'elbow zone', where people stand so close that they can touch each other with their elbows. This zone includes countries like Spain, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey. The second zone covers most of Eastern Europe, including countries like Poland, Hungary and Romania. In this zone, the 'wrist zone', people position themselves so that, if they wanted to, they could touch each other with their wrist.

Finally there is what Morris calls the 'fingertips zone', which includes Britain, Belgium, Germany and the Scandinavian countries. In this zone people like to keep others at arms length, and they are quite content to give up the opportunity to touch each other.

The most striking thing about these different proxemic zones is the way they are arranged, with the 'elbow zone' located in the warmest part of Europe, the 'fingertips zone' in the coolest, and the 'wrist zone' roughly in between. There are several possible reasons for this. The first and most obvious explanation is climate. It is well known that the surrounding temperature affects people's comfort levels and their sense of well-being. The other thing about a warm climate is that it can affect people's social habits through the opportunities that it provides for contact in the open air. All along the Mediterranean the summers are dry and warm, and even the winter days can be fairly nice. This enables people to spend much more time talking to each other out of doors. It is quite possible that these frequent contacts tie people closer together, and that this in turn encourages them to stand and sit much closer to each other.

①When strangers meet they often have to decide where to sit or stand in relation to each other. This is not something that they need to discuss, nor is it something they need to consider consciously — they don't, for example, have to ask themselves whether they should try to be friendly and stand close, or be formal and keep their distance. They simply assume a distance that 'feels right' in those circumstances. What feels right to people depends to a very large extent on the culture to which they belong. When two individuals are members of the same culture, the issue of how close they should stand seldom presents a problem. However, when they are from cultures with different ideas of proxemics, all kinds of problems can arise.

②European societies can be divided, very roughly, into three geographical zones, depending on how close people position themselves. The first is what

Desmond Morris calls the 'elbow zone', where people stand so close that they can touch each other with their elbows. This zone includes countries like Spain, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey. The second zone covers most of Eastern Europe, including countries like Poland, Hungary and Romania. In this zone, the 'wrist zone', people position themselves so that, if they wanted to, they could touch each other with their wrist.
③Finally there is what Morris calls the 'fingertips zone', which includes Britain, Belgium, Germany and the Scandinavian countries. In this zone people like to keep others at arms length, and they are quite content to give up the opportunity to touch each other.
④The most striking thing about these different proxemic zones is the way they are arranged, with the 'elbow zone' located in the warmest part of Europe, the 'fingertips zone' in the coolest, and the 'wrist zone' roughly in between. There are several possible reasons for this. The first and most obvious explanation is climate. It is well known that the surrounding temperature affects people's comfort levels and their sense of well-being. The other thing about a warm climate is that it can affect people's social habits through the opportunities that it provides for contact in the open air. All along the Mediterranean the summers are dry and warm, and even the winter days can be fairly nice. This enables people to spend much more time talking to each other out of doors. It is quite possible that these frequent contacts tie people closer together, and that this in turn encourages them to stand and sit much closer to each other.

※第二段落から第三段落への段落は意味上は必ずしも必要なない。したがって解答例は3段落にまとめた。
※第四段落の後半は3つの proxemic zones のうちの1つだけに関する記述であり，語数に余裕がなければ省いてかまわない。
※100語程度の英文を必ずしも段落に分ける必要はないが，段落単位に語数を数えてメモ書きしておくと，語数調整をしやすく，万一書き直すときも，段落単位で処理できる。

【解答例】

When strangers meet, they unconsciously decide where to sit or stand in relation to each other. They keep a distance that 'feels right'. What feels right depends on their cultures. (30)

Desmond Morris divides European societies into three geographical zones, depending on how close people position themselves: the 'elbow zone', the 'wrist zone' and the 'fingertips zone'. In the first zone, people could touch each other with their elbows. (38)

These proxemic zones are arranged according to [depending on] their climate. The surrounding temperature can affect people's comfort levels, sense of well-being (and their opportunities for contact in the open air). (31 or 22)
(90 or 99 words)

(全訳は次ページ)

【全訳】見知らぬ者同士が出会うと，相手との関係の中で座る位置や立つ位置を決めなければならないことがよくある。これは話し合う必要のあることではないし，意識して考えなければならないことでもない----たとえば，親近感を示そうと相手の近くに立つべきか，それとも馴れ馴れしくならないように離れているべきかどうか自問する必要はない。そうした状況で「正しいと感じられる」距離を取るにすぎない。人々にとって適切だと感じられる［人々が適切だと感じる］距離は，その人が属する文化によって著しく左右される。二人の人間が同じ文化の構成員であるときは，どのくらい相手の近くに立つべきかという問題で困ることはめったにない。しかし彼らが他者との間に必要とする空間について異なる考えを持つ文化の出身だと，様々な問題を生じることがある。

ヨーロッパの社会は，人々がどのくらい他人の近くに自分の位置を取るかによって，おおよそではあるが，三つの地域に分けることができる。ひとつは，デズモンド・モリスが「エルボー・ゾーン」と呼ぶ地域で，この地域では人々は肘でお互いの体に触れることができるほど接近する。この地域にはスペイン，フランス，イタリア，ギリシャ，トルコのような国々が含まれる。二つ目の地域は東欧の大半に及んでいて，ポーランド，ハンガリー，ルーマニアなどの国が含まれる。「リスト・ゾーン」と呼ばれるこの地域では，人々はそうしたいと思えば，自分の手首で相手の体に触れることができるように自分の位置を取る。

最後に，モリスが「フィンガーチップ・ゾーン」と呼ぶ地域がある。この地域には，イギリス，ベルギー，ドイツ，スカンジナビア諸国が含まれる。この地域では，人々は他人を腕の長さより近づけたがらず，お互いの体に触れる機会を持てなくてもまったく不満を感じない。

こうした他者との近接空間が異なるに地域に関して最も目立つのは，その地理的な配置である。「エルボー・ゾーン」はヨーロッパで最も温暖な地域に位置し，「フィンガーチップ・ゾーン」は最も冷涼な地域に位置している。そして「リスト・ゾーン」は，ほぼその中間に位置している。これにはいくつかの理由が考えられる。第一の，そして最も明白な理由は気候である。周囲の気温が人々の快適度や幸福感に影響を与えることはよく知られている。温暖な気候についてはもうひとつ言えることは，気候が温暖だと人々が野外で触れ合う機会が生まれるために，人々の社会的な習慣に影響を及ぼすことがあるのだ。地中海沿岸はどこも夏は雨が少なく暖かいし，冬の日でさえかなり過ごしやすい。そのため人々は，屋外でおしゃべりをして過ごす時間が他の地域の人たちよりもはるかに長い。こうした頻繁な接触が（他の地域の人たちよりも）人々をより密接に結びつけ，このことが，今度は人々をずっと相手の近くに立ったり座ったり気にさせる［するように促す］ことは大いにありえる。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

The most famous case of an animal said to be capable of counting is that of a horse in Germany which was called Clever Hans. The events occurred at the beginning of the 19th century. The horse's owner believed that animals could think and reason as we can and that this faculty could be brought out by training the animals. He trained Clever Hans to give the answers to problems of arithmetic; the horse gave the correct answer by tapping the right number of times with its forefoot. Clever Hans was taught to tap units with one forefoot and tens with the other. The animal gave the correct answers; not only to additions but to other processes of arithmetic. It gave the right answers too when the questions were not spoken but shown to it written on a card.

This case was so much talked about in the newspapers that a committee of scientists was formed to investigate the astonishing powers of the horse. The committee, after a careful investigation, found that the owner and trainer of Clever Hans was an honest man, that he had not purposely trained his horse to stop tapping and so to give a correct answer, by giving it a slight hint, as is done with performing circus animals. The absence of any such trickery was proved by the fact that members of the committee themselves got the right answers from Hans even when the owner was not present.

It looked as if the horse really could think and count. But soon after this another scientist discovered what really was the truth of the matter. He found that if the horse was asked questions to which none of the people present knew the answers, then the animal never gave a correct answer. It could not even answer the simplest question. The questions were asked by showing the horse a card which the questioner himself had not read. This biologist soon discovered that, when the horse gave correct answers, what really occurred was this: the horse responded to very slight movements of head or body made by a questioner who knew the answer. These movements were quite unconscious, and the questioner did not know that he made them. But the questioner, of course, was aware of the number of taps that the horse should make. He counted the taps to himself, and when the horse arrived at the right number, the questioner's tension would be relieved by a very slight, unconscious movement of his head or body. It was to this movement that the horse responded by stopping the tapping of its foot. Questioners who did not know the answer made no such movements, so the horse was confused. The horse had really taught itself to answer these very small movements during its training; it was always trained to try its best by rewards of corn or sugar.

①The most famous case of an animal said to be capable of counting is that of a horse in Germany which was called Clever Hans. The events occurred at the beginning of the 19th century. The horse's owner believed that animals could think and reason as we can and that this faculty could be brought out by training the animals. He trained Clever Hans to give the answers to problems of arithmetic; the horse gave the correct answer by tapping the right number of times with its forefoot. Clever Hans was taught to tap units with one forefoot and tens with the other. The animal gave the correct answers; not only to additions but to other processes of arithmetic. It gave the right answers too when the questions were not spoken but shown to it written on a card.

②This case was so much talked about in the newspapers that a committee of

scientists was formed to investigate the astonishing powers of the horse. The committee, after a careful investigation, found that the owner and trainer of Clever Hans was an honest man, that he had not purposely trained his horse to stop tapping and so to give a correct answer, by giving it a slight hint, as is done with performing circus animals. The absence of any such trickery was proved by the fact that members of the committee themselves got the right answers from Hans even when the owner was not present.
③It looked as if the horse really could think and count. But soon after this another scientist discovered what really was the truth of the matter. He found that if the horse was asked questions to which none of the people present knew the answers, then the animal never gave a correct answer. It could not even answer the simplest question. The questions were asked by showing the horse a card which the questioner himself had not read. This biologist soon discovered that, when the horse gave correct answers, what really occurred was this: the horse responded to very slight movements of head or body made by a questioner who knew the answer. These movements were quite unconscious, and the questioner did not know that he made them. But the questioner, of course, was aware of the number of taps that the horse should make. He counted the taps to himself, and when the horse arrived at the right number, the questioner's tension would be relieved by a very slight, unconscious movement of his head or body. It was to this movement that the horse responded by stopping the tapping of its foot. Questioners who did not know the answer made no such movements, so the horse was confused. The horse had really taught itself to answer these very small movements during its training; it was always trained to try its best by rewards of corn or sugar.

【解答例】

Clever Hans in Germany was said to be capable of counting. The owner trained the horse to give the correct answers to arithmetic problems by tapping the right number of times with its forefoot. (34)

A committee of scientists proved that there was no trickery; even when the owner was not present, they got the right answers from Hans. (24)

However, a biologist discovered that if the questions were asked [the questions asked] by showing cards the questioners had not read, Hans never gave correct answers. It responded, by stopping tapping, to unconscious movements of the questioners knowing the answers. (35 or 37) (93 or 95 words)

※この英文を100語以内で要約するのは相当にきつい。本文の段落構成に従いつつ，本文の内容を思い切り良く省いていかないと，間違いなく語数オーバーになる。具体例をできるだけ省くのは，英文を日本語で要約する場合の原則だが，英語で要約する場合にも同じことが言える。指定語数が150語程度だとだいぶ楽になるはずだ。本当は最後のセンテンスの内容を拾いたかったが，割愛した。

※つまり100語というまとまった量の英文を書くのは一見，大変のように思われるが，実際に書いてみると，100程度はたちまち消費してしまう。したがって100語前後の自由英作文など，英文を書き慣れてくれば，語数が多いどころか少なすぎると感じるようになる。

・最初に Clever Hans と固有名詞を用いたのは，後で Hans と書くほうが the horse とするよりも語数の節約になるからで，しかも it や he を多用するよりも読みやすいからである。

【全訳】計算能力があると言われる動物の最も有名な事例は，クレヴァー・ハンスと呼ばれたドイツの馬の例である。この出来事は今世紀の初めに起こった。この馬の飼い主は，動物も人間と同じように考えたり推論したりすることができ，そしてこうした能力は動物を訓練することによって引き出すことができると信じていた。彼は，算数の問題に答えを出せるようにクレヴァー・ハンスを訓練した。ハンスは前足で正しい回数を叩くことによって正解を出した。ハンスは，1桁の数を一方の前足で叩き，10の位の数をもう一方の前足で叩くように教えられた。この馬は，足し算だけでなく他の計算にも正しい答えを出した。問題が口頭で尋ねられるのではなく，カードに書かれて見せられたときにも正しい答えを出した。

この事は新聞紙上で大いに話題になったので，この馬の驚異的な能力を調べるために科学者による委員会がつくられた。委員会は，慎重な調査の後，クレヴァー・ハンスの飼い主兼調教師は正直な男であること，つまり，芸をするサーカスの動物にするように，ハンスにちょっと暗示を与えることによって叩くのを止めさせ，その結果正解が出るように意図的に訓練してはいないことを知った。そうしたごまかしがいっさいないことは，飼い主がいないときでも，委員会のメンバー自身がハンスから正しい答えを得るという事実によって証明された。

この馬はほんとうに考えたり数を数えたりできるかのように思われた。しかしその後まもなく，別の科学者が事の真相を発見した。その場にいる人間が誰も答えを知らない問題を出されると，この馬はまったく正解を出せないことを，その科学者は発見した。馬はごく簡単な問題に答えることさえできなかった。質問者自身がまだ見ていないカードを馬に見せることによって問題を出したのだ。この生物学者はじきに，ハンスが正しい答えを出したとき実際に起こったことは次のとおりであることを発見した。ハンスは，答えを知っている質問者が見せる頭や体のわずかな動きに反応したのである。こうした動きはまったく無意識のもので，質問者は自分が頭や体を動かしていることを知らなかった。しかし，もちろん質問者はハンスが（前足で）叩くべき回数を意識していた。質問者は頭の中で馬が叩く回数を数え，そして馬が正しい数まで叩くと，緊張が緩んで頭や体がごくわずか無意識のうちに動いた［頭や体をごくわずか無意識のうちに動かして緊張を和らげた］のだ。ハンスが足を叩くのを止めて反応したのは，こうした動きに対してであった。答えを知らない質問者はこうした動きを見せなかったので，ハンスは混乱したのだ。ハンスは，実際には，こうしたごくわずかな動きに反応することを訓練中に学んでいたのだ。ハンスはいつも，トウモロコシや砂糖の褒美によって最善を尽くすように訓練されていたのである。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

For most of human history, creativity was regarded as the power of supreme beings. All religions are based on origin myths in which one or more gods shaped the heavens, the earth, and the waters. Somewhere along the line they also created men and women — weak, helpless things subject to the anger of the gods. It was only recently in the history of the human race that the tables were turned: men and women were now the creators, and gods the products of their imagination. Whether this started in Greece or China 2,500 years ago, or in Florence 2,000 years later, does not matter much. The fact is that it happened quite recently in the long history of the race.

In other words, our views of the relationship between gods and humans have been reversed. It is not so difficult to know how such a thing happened. When the first myths of creation arose, humans were indeed helpless, at the mercy of cold, hunger, wild beasts, and one another. They had no idea how to explain the great forces around them — the rising and setting of the sun, the wheeling stars, the alternating seasons. They struggled in vain to make sense of this mysterious world. Then, slowly at first, and with increasing speed in the last thousand years or so, we began to understand how things work — from bacteria to planets, from the circulation of the blood to ocean tides. Humans no longer seemed so helpless after all. Great machines were built, energies exploited, and the entire face of the earth transformed by human craft and appetite. It is not surprising that as we ride the wave of evolution we have taken over the title of creator.

Whether this transformation will help the human race or cause its decline is not yet clear. It should help if we realized the immense responsibility of this new role. The gods of the ancients, like Shiva, like Jehovah, were both builders and destroyers. The universe endured in a delicate balance between their mercy and their anger. The world we inhabit today is also on the edge of becoming either the rich paradise or the barren desert that our contrary impulses are capable of realizing. The desert may prevail if we ignore our own capacity for destruction and go on blindly abusing our newly-won powers.

While we cannot foresee the eventual results of creativity — of the attempt to impose our desires on reality, to affect the destiny of every form of life on the planet — at least we can try to understand better what human creativity is and how it works. For, for better or for worse, our future is now closely tied to this force.

①For most of human history, creativity was regarded as the power of supreme beings. All religions are based on origin myths in which one or more gods shaped the heavens, the earth, and the waters. Somewhere along the line they also created men and women — weak, helpless things subject to the anger of the gods. It was only recently in the history of the human race that the tables were turned: men and women were now the creators, and gods the products of their imagination. Whether this started in Greece or China 2,500 years ago, or in Florence 2,000 years later, does not matter much. The fact is that it happened quite recently in the long history of the race.

②In other words, our views of the relationship between gods and humans have been reversed. It is not so difficult to know how such a thing happened. When the first myths of creation arose, humans were indeed helpless, at the mercy

of cold, hunger, wild beasts, and one another. They had no idea how to explain the great forces around them — the rising and setting of the sun, the wheeling stars, the alternating seasons. They struggled in vain to make sense of this mysterious world. Then, slowly at first, and with increasing speed in the last thousand years or so, we began to understand how things work — from bacteria to planets, from the circulation of the blood to ocean tides. Humans no longer seemed so helpless after all. Great machines were built, energies exploited, and the entire face of the earth transformed by human craft and appetite. It is not surprising that as we ride the wave of evolution we have taken over the title of creator.

③Whether this transformation will help the human race or cause its decline is not yet clear. It should help if we realized the immense responsibility of this new role. The gods of the ancients, like Shiva, like Jehovah, were both builders and destroyers. The universe endured in a delicate balance between their mercy and their anger. The world we inhabit today is also on the edge of becoming either the rich paradise or the barren desert that our contrary impulses are capable of realizing. The desert may prevail if we ignore our own capacity for destruction and go on blindly abusing our newly-won powers.

④While we cannot foresee the eventual results of creativity — of the attempt to impose our desires on reality, to affect the destiny of every form of life on the planet — at least we can try to understand better what human creativity is and how it works. For, for better or for worse, our future is now closely tied to this force.

【解答例】

Creativity was regarded as the power of gods: Gods created men and women. Quite recently in the history of the human race, humans became the creators, and gods (became) the products of their imagination. (33 or 34)

We began to understand how things work. We transformed the entire face of the earth. We have taken over the title of creator. (23)

This may help the human race or cause its decline; like gods, we are both builders and destroyers. Though unable to foresee its eventual results, we can better understand (human) creativity, to which our future is closely tied. (37 or 38) (93 or 95 words)

※今回は比較的まとめやすい内容である。
※第三段落と第四段落をまとめて1段落にしたが，第一段落と第二段落もまとめて，全体を2段落構成にすることも，また全体を1段落構成にすることも可能である。
※解答例はあくまでも解答例であり，解答のヴァリエーションの幅はかなり広いと考えてよいが，create, creation, creator, creativity という key words を中心に，gods と human beings の関係の逆転に触れてから，第四段落の内容を結論としてまとめるという大まかな流れは無視することができないだろう。

(全訳は次ページ)

【全訳】人間の歴史の大部分において，創造力は至高の存在である神々が持つ力と見なされていた。あらゆる宗教は，この世の起源に関する神話に基づいているが，そうした神話では，一人あるいは複数の神が天と地と海を形作ったとされている。この天地創造の過程のどこかで，神々は人間の男と女も創ったのだが，人間は神々の怒りに触れやすい，弱く無力な存在だった。人類の歴史上，最近になってはじめて形勢が逆転した。いまや人間が創造主であり，そして神々は人間の想像力の産物であった。この逆転が2500年前にギリシャか中国で始まったのか，それともその2000年後にフィレンッェで始まったのかどうかはそれほど重要ではない。実は，この逆転は人類の長い歴史の中でごく最近，生じたのである．

言い換えると，神々と人間の関係に対する私たち人間の見方が逆転したのだ。どうしてこういうことが起きたか知るのは，そう難しいことではない。天地創造に関する最初の神話が生まれたころ，人間は確かに無力で，寒さ，餓え，野獣，そして人間同士に対して抗(あらが)う術を持たなかった。当時の人間には，自分たちの周りに存在する偉大な力----日の出や日没，回転する天体，移り変わる季節----をどう説明したらいいのかわからなかったのだ。彼らはこの不可思議な世界を理解しようと努力したが無駄だった。それから，最初のうちはゆっくりと，そしてこの1000年かそこらになると速度を増して，バクテリアから惑星，血液の循環から潮の干満に至るまで，さまざまな事物がいかに働いているかを私たちは理解し始めた。結局，人間はもうそれほど無力には思われなくなったのだ。とてつもない機械が造られ，さまざまなエネルギーが開発［利用］され，そして地球の表面全体が人間の技術と欲望によって変えられてしまったのだ。私たちが進化の波に乗りながら，創造主という称号を引き継いだのは，驚くことではない。

こうした変化が人類を助けるのか，それとも人類の衰退を招くのかはまだわからない。もし私たちがこの新たな役割の責任の大きさ理解すれば，役に立つはずだ。シバやエホバのような，古代人の神々は，建設者であると同時に破壊者でもあった。世界は，神々の慈悲と怒りの微妙な均衡の中で持ちこたえてきたのである。私たちが今日住んでいる世界も，豊かな楽園と不毛の砂漠のどちらかになりかけている［今まさになろうとしている］が，私たちが持っている正反対の衝動はそのどちらも実現することができるのだ。もし私たちが自分自身が持つ潜在的な破壊の能力を無視して，新たに獲得した力をやみくもに乱用し続ければ，砂漠が広がる［勝る］ことになるかもしれない。

私たちは創造力というものが最終的に行き着く先［最終的にもたらす結果］を----自分の欲望を現実に押しつけようとする試み，地球上のあらゆる種類の生物の運命に影響を及ぼそうとする試みが最終的に行き着く先を----予見すことはできないものの，少なくとも人間の創造力という力がどのようなものであり，そしてどのように働くのかをもっと理解しようとすることはできる。なぜならば，よかれあしかれ，私たち人間の将来は，いまやこの創造力という力と密接に結びついているからである。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

One of the divisions of the contemporary world is between those who are prepared to dress their age and those who regard clothes as a means to fight off age. At my American university, there are professors teaching in deliberately unlaced gym shoes. I know of school principals who never wear neckties. They believe they are staying young.

Clothes have played a large part in bringing about the drift away from grown-up to youth culture. In part, dress in America — and not America alone — has changed owing to an increase in informality throughout all generations and social classes in contemporary life. As a boy, I have no memory of my father or any of his friends owning any casual clothes. They wore suits everywhere, even sitting around on a Sunday afternoon; they never left the house without a serious hat. Much of the time, men now dress like boys, in jeans, sports shirts, gym shoes and baseball caps. Meanwhile, little girls dress like grown women, in short shorts, bikinis and platform shoes, The result is to erase the line between the youthful and mature, though it doesn't really work. Instead it gives a tone of formlessness to the society that adopts it.

Why should I care about any of this? Is it my business if people wish to appear younger than their true age? If seeming youthful is pleasing to them, why not wish these people good luck, however hopeless their endeavor? I really ought to be more open-minded. But, alas, I cannot. The United States, if not the Western world, has been on a great youth binge for at least thirty or forty years now. My guess is that the praise of youth, as an American phenomenon, began with the election of John F. Kennedy. Suddenly, to be young was very heaven! At forty-two, Kennedy was the youngest man ever elected president. He was the first president not to wear a hat. He had an athletic build, a beautiful wife. and a low hairline. The unspoken part of Kennedy-inspired youth worship was a reduction in admiration for anyone older. To be beyond fifty was to be a little too old for anything. "As we grow older," wrote a poet, "we must guard against a feeling of lowered respect."

This cult of youthfulness may be the principal legacy of the 1960s. And the cult — more like a national craze — allows a very wide age range for youthfulness. Today one would not think to say that no one over thirty is to be trusted, that sentiment has been replaced by the notion that no one under forty needs to get serious yet about life or work. One of the curious qualities I have noticed about recent generations is the absence of any hurry to get started as early in life as my generation did.

①One of the divisions of the contemporary world is between those who are prepared to dress their age and those who regard clothes as a means to fight off age. At my American university, there are professors teaching in deliberately unlaced gym shoes. I know of school principals who never wear neckties. They believe they are staying young.

②Clothes have played a large part in bringing about the drift away from grown-up to youth culture. In part, dress in America — and not America alone — has changed owing to an increase in informality throughout all generations and social classes in contemporary life. As a boy, I have no memory of my father or any of his friends owning any casual clothes. They wore suits

everywhere, even sitting around on a Sunday afternoon; they never left the house without a serious hat. Much of the time, men now dress like boys, in jeans, sports shirts, gym shoes and baseball caps. Meanwhile, little girls dress like grown women, in short shorts, bikinis and platform shoes, The result is to erase the line between the youthful and mature, though it doesn't really work. Instead it gives a tone of formlessness to the society that adopts it.
③Why should I care about any of this? Is it my business if people wish to appear younger than their true age? If seeming youthful is pleasing to them, why not wish these people good luck, however hopeless their endeavor? I really ought to be more open-minded. But, alas, I cannot. The United States, if not the Western world, has been on a great youth binge for at least thirty or forty years now. My guess is that the praise of youth, as an American phenomenon, began with the election of John F. Kennedy. Suddenly, to be young was very heaven! At forty-two, Kennedy was the youngest man ever elected president. He was the first president not to wear a hat. He had an athletic build, a beautiful wife. and a low hairline. The unspoken part of Kennedy-inspired youth worship was a reduction in admiration for anyone older. To be beyond fifty was to be a little too old for anything. "As we grow older," wrote a poet, "we must guard against a feeling of lowered respect."
④This cult of youthfulness may be the principal legacy of the 1960s. And the cult — more like a national craze — allows a very wide age range for youthfulness. Today one would not think to say that no one over thirty is to be trusted, that sentiment has been replaced by the notion that no one under forty needs to get serious yet about life or work. One of the curious qualities I have noticed about recent generations is the absence of any hurry to get started as early in life as my generation did.

【解答例】

One division of the contemporary world is between those who accept their age and those who regard clothes as a means to stay young. Dress has brought about the drift away from grown-up to youth culture. This gives a tone [an atmosphere] of formlessness to the society. (45)

The praise of youth, as an American phenomenon, began when John F. Kennedy was elected president at forty-two. (19)

As a result of this cult of youthfulness, people of a very wide age range [a very wide age range of people] are considered youthful. Today no one under forty needs to get serious yet about life or work. (30) (94 words)

※第一段落と第二段落を一つにまとめるのに無理はない。ただし二段落の As a boy 以下の具体的な記述は思い切り良く省いて，最後のセンテンスに繋げたい。
※第三段落の前半は筆者の個人的な心情の吐露であり，当然省いてよいが，中段の kennedy の話を具体例だという理由で省くのは見当違いである。これを省くと，この passage の後半は意味を持たなくなる。
※第三段落と第四段落の内容には，論理の飛躍というよりはむしろ逆転があるように思われるが，To be beyond fifty was to be a little too old for anything. の部分を省いてしまえば，一応辻褄は合う。
・第一段落の dress their age と第四段落の allows a very wide age range for youthfulness はあまりポピュラーな表現ではないので，あえて一般的な表現に書き換えた。

【全訳】現代世界を分ける境界線のひとつは，年相応の服装をするのを厭(いと)わない者と，衣服を年に打ち勝つ手段と見なす者との間にある。私が勤務するアメリカの大学では，わざと紐(ひも)を緩めた運動靴を履いて授業をする教授たちがいる。絶対にネクタイをしない校長たちのことも知っている。彼らは，自分たちは若いままでいると信じているのだ。

衣服は，大人の文化から若者の文化への移行をもたらす上で，大きな役割を果たしてきた。アメリカ----アメリカだけではない----の服装が変化してきたのは，ある程度は，現代生活のあらゆる世代と社会階層を通じて，形式張らないやり方が増えたためである。少年のころ，父や父の友人の誰かが何かカジュアルな服（普段着）を持っていたという記憶は私にはない。彼らはどこでもスーツを着ていたが，日曜の午後にぼんやりと座って過ごすときでさえそうだった。きちんとした帽子を被らずに家を出ることは決してなかった。今ではたいていの時間，男たちは少年のように，ジーンズやスポーツシャツや運動靴や野球帽を身につけている。一方，幼い少女たちは，大人の女性のように，ショートパンツやビキニや厚底の靴を身につけている。その結果，若々しさと成熟の間の境界線は消えたが，本当にうまくいっているわけではない。むしろ，そんな風潮を取り入れる社会に，混沌とした雰囲気を与えている。

どうして私がこんなことを少しでも気にしなければならないのだ。人々が本当の年より若く見られたがるとして，それが私と関係があるのだろうか。若く見えることがこうした人々にとって嬉しいのであれば，彼らの努力がどんなに見込みのないものであろうと，彼らに幸運を願ってやればよいではないか。私は本当にもっと広い心を持つべきなのだ。しかし，悲しいかな，私にはそれができない。西欧世界（全体）ではないとしても，アメリカ合衆国は，少なくともこの30年から40年の間，若さをもてはやしてひどく浮かれ騒いできた。私の推測では，アメリカ的現象としての若さの賛美は，ケネディを大統領に選んだ［ケネディが大統領に選ばれたこ］とから始まった。突然，若いということがこの上なく幸せなことになったのだ。42歳のケネディは，それまで大統領に選ばれた最年少の人間だった。彼は帽子を被らない最初の大統領だった。運動選手のような体格と，美しい妻を持ち，額の生え際も後退していなかった。ケネディがもたらした若さ崇拝の暗黙の（うちに理解された）部分は，誰であろうと年上の人間に対する敬意が薄れたということである。50歳を過ぎるということは，何をするにもちよっと年を取り過ぎているということになったのだ。「年を取るにつれて，私たちは，次第に尊敬されなくなるという気持ちにならないように用心しなければならない」とある詩人は書いた。

こうした若さの崇拝は，1960年代の主な遺産かもしれない。そしてこの崇拝----というよりはむしろ全国的な大流行----では，非常に広い年齢層が若いとされている。人は今日では，30歳以上の人間は誰も信用できない，と言おうとは思わないだろう。そうした心情は，40歳以下の者は誰も人生や仕事についてまだ真剣になる必要はない，という考えに取って代わられたのだ。最近の世代について私が気づいている奇妙な特質のひとつは，私の世代のように早く世の中に出ようと急いでなどいないことである。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

Consider what happens when we enter a dark room and turn on the electric-light switch. As far as we are able to tell, the light coming from the light bulb hits our eyes instantly. But if we investigate what happens, we must agree that the source of the light is the light bulb itself, that is, the light that floods the room first must come from the bulb. Hence, we are forced to conclude that the light travels from the light bulb to our eyes to give us the sensation of light. But our senses seem to tell us that we see the light the very instant we throw the switch. We now know that the speed of light is so great as to make it appear to travel instantaneously from one place to another.

The battle over whether the velocity of light was infinite or finite raged with full fury during the Middle Ages, with no less eminent a scientist than Descartes (1596-1650) claiming it to be infinite, while Galileo (1564-1632), another great scientist of the day, claimed the velocity to be finite.

In an effort to prove that he was right, Galileo attempted to measure the velocity of light. One dark night he stationed an assistant,equipped with a lighted lantern covered with a pail,on a hilltop 3 miles away from him. Galileo also had a lantern covered with a pail. When both were ready, Galileo lifted his pail, thus permitting the light rays from his lantern to travel towards his assistant with the velocity of light. Galileo's assistant, upon seeing the light, also lifted his pail, and the light rays from his lantern in turn traveled back to Galileo — again with the velocity of light. Galileo measured the total time from when he first lifted his pail to when he received the light rays from his assistant's pail and, having measured the distance between the two positions as accurately as possible beforehand, Galileo then computed the velocity of light.

Each time Galileo did the experiment he obtained a different value for the velocity, and so the results of the experiment were inconclusive. We now know the reason the experiment failed: the time it took Galileo and his assistant to notice each other's lanterns and then act, that is, their reaction time, was so long in comparison with the travel time of light that the light rays from their lanterns could travel completely around the earth fourteen times if we assume their reaction time was one second each. We see that although the method Galileo used appeared sound at the time, it was as futile as for a snail to try to catch a fly.

①Consider what happens when we enter a dark room and turn on the electric-light switch. As far as we are able to tell, the light coming from the light bulb hits our eyes instantly. But if we investigate what happens, we must agree that the source of the light is the light bulb itself, that is, the light that floods the room first must come from the bulb. Hence, we are forced to conclude that the light travels from the light bulb to our eyes to give us the sensation of light. But our senses seem to tell us that we see the light the very instant we throw the switch. We now know that the speed of light is so great as to make it appear to travel instantaneously from one place to another.

②The battle over whether the velocity of light was infinite or finite raged

with full fury during the Middle Ages, with no less eminent a scientist than Descartes (1596-1650) claiming it to be infinite, while Galileo (1564-1632), another great scientist of the day, claimed the velocity to be finite.
③In an effort to prove that he was right, Galileo attempted to measure the velocity of light. One dark night he stationed an assistant,equipped with a lighted lantern covered with a pail,on a hilltop 3 miles away from him. Galileo also had a lantern covered with a pail. When both were ready, Galileo lifted his pail, thus permitting the light rays from his lantern to travel towards his assistant with the velocity of light. Galileo's assistant, upon seeing the light, also lifted his pail, and the light rays from his lantern in turn traveled back to Galileo — again with the velocity of light. Galileo measured the total time from when he first lifted his pail to when he received the light rays from his assistant's pail and, having measured the distance between the two positions as accurately as possible beforehand, Galileo then computed the velocity of light.
④Each time Galileo did the experiment he obtained a different value for the velocity, and so the results of the experiment were inconclusive. We now know the reason the experiment failed: the time it took Galileo and his assistant to notice each other's lanterns and then act, that is, their reaction time was so long in comparison with the travel time of light that the light rays from their lanterns could travel completely around the earth fourteen times if we assume their reaction time was one second each. We see that although the method Galileo used appeared sound at the time, it was as futile as for a snail to try to catch a fly.

【解答例】

We now know the speed of light is so great as to make it appear to travel instantaneously from one place to another. The battle over whether the velocity of light was infinite or finite raged during the Middle Ages. (40)

Claiming it to be finite, Galileo attempted to measure it with his assistant. However, the experiment failed because the reaction time it took them was too long in comparison with the travel time of light. The method Galileo used was as futile [useless] as for a snail to try to catch a fly. (52) (92 words)

※今回は，内容を読み取るの簡単だが，限られた語数で要約するのはたいへん難しい。第一段落は冗長で回りくどいので最後のセンテンスだけを拾ったが，第二段落は逆に間単にまとめられるので，第一段落とつなげた。ところが Galileo が行なった experiment の内容を述べた第三段落になると，これだけで要約するのに相当な語数を要する。50語程度ではとてもまとまらない。したがって，思い切って省略し，第四段落につなげた。

※本文の場合，具体例だからと言って Galileo を省いて a famous scientist などとする必要はまったくない。一方，第四段落の最後のセンテンスは，通常は The method Galileo used was completely futile [useless]. くらいにするところを，第三段落の内容を大幅に省いた分，語数に余裕があるので，あえてそのまま拾ったが，この部分は具体例といっても比喩表現であり，文意を明確にする上でむしろ効果的な場合もある。

【全訳】部屋に入って電灯のスイッチを入れたときに何が起こるか考えてみよう。私たちが分かる限りにおいては，電球の発する光は即座に私たちの目に飛び込んでくる。しかし，起こっていることをよく調べれば，光源は電球そのものである，つまり最初に部屋に溢れる光は電球が発しているに違いないことを認めざるをえない。それゆえ，光は電球から私たちの目に伝わって光の感覚を与えるのだと結論を下さざるをえない。しかし私たちの感覚は，スイッチを入れたまさにその瞬間に光を見ているのだと告げているように思われる。今では私たちは，光の速度が非常に速いので，光はある場所から別の場所へ瞬間的に伝わるように見えることを知っている。

光の速度は無限であるか有限であるかをめぐる論争が，中世に凄まじい勢いでくり広げられた。デカルト(1596-1650) のように著名な科学者が光の速度は無限だと主張する一方，当時の別の偉大な科学者であるガリレオ(1564-1632) は光の速度は有限だと主張した。

自分の説が正しいことを証明しようと，ガリレオは光の速度の測定を試みた。ある闇夜に，彼は自分のいる場所から 3 マイル離れた丘の上に，手桶で覆った，灯の点いているカンテラ（角灯）を持たせた助手を配置した。ガリレオもまた手桶で覆ったカンテラ持った。両者の準備が整うと，ガリレオは手桶を上げ，そうして自分のカンテラから助手に向かって光線を光速で走らせた。助手もまた，光を見ると同時に，自分の手桶を上げた。すると彼のカンテラから出る光が今度はガリレオのところに戻っていった。またもや光速で。ガリレオは，自分が最初に手桶を上げた時から，助手の手桶からの光線を受け取った時までの合計時間を測定した。そして前もって二つの場所の距離をできるかぎり正確に測定しておいて，光の速度を計算した。

ガリレオは，実験を行なうたびに異なる速度の値を得た。だから実験の結果は結論の出ないものとなった。私たちは今では実験がうまく行かなかった理由を知っている。ガリレオと助手がお互いのカンテラに気づいて行動するのに要した時間，つまり彼らの反応時間が，光が伝わる時間と比較してあまりに長かったために，もし二人の反応時間がそれぞれ 1 秒だと仮定すると，二人のカンテラから出た光線は完全に地球を14周できたのである。ガリレオが用いた方法は当時は理に適ったものに見えたにもかかわらず，この方法はカタツムリがハエを捕まえようとするのと同じくらいに無駄だったことがわかっている。