

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

What is science? The word is usually used to mean one of the three things, or a mixture of them. Science sometimes refers to a special method of finding things out. Sometimes it means a body of knowledge arising from discoveries. Finally, it is used to represent all the new capabilities and methods that emerge from those discoveries. This last domain is usually called technology. But if you look at the science section of newspapers and magazines, you will find that advances in theoretical research and their practical application receive just about equal attention.

This is not surprising, for the most obvious characteristic of science is its usefulness, the power it gives us to do things. One dramatic example is the Industrial Revolution, which would surely have been impossible without the development of science. The human capacity to control disease, to produce quantities of food adequate for the world's greatly expanded population, and to achieve full production without resorting to slave labor reflects the development of technological know-how.

Now this power to do things carries with it no instructions on how to use it, either for good or for evil. Such is determined solely by how inventions are used and by our own priorities. Here most of us understandably have ambivalent feelings.

On the one hand, we are pleased with improved production; on the other, we worry about the effects of automation. We are happy with the development of medicine but then worry about the birthrate and the fact that no one dies from the diseases we have eliminated. We rejoice that the microscope has revealed the realm of the bacterium and the virus, but then we are beset with fears that evil scientists will use their knowledge to create incurable diseases. We are delighted about the great advances in transportation and communications but then express concern about the loss of cultural diversity. We eagerly take to the Internet and then fear the power of super computers to monitor us. We look to nuclear power as an enduring source of energy and yet greatly fear the risks inherent in its use.

I was once taken to see a Buddhist temple, where I was told: "every man is given the key to the gates of heaven. The same key opens the gates to hell." And it is so with science. Lacking any instructions as to which gate is which, some of us may be inclined to throw the key away. Others, however, will choose to struggle to make the best judgment possible. The value of science lies in the hope that it will indeed open the gates to a better world.

①What is science? The word is usually used to mean one of the three things, or a mixture of them. Science sometimes refers to a special method of finding things out. Sometimes it means a body of knowledge arising from discoveries. Finally, it is used to represent all the new capabilities and methods that emerge from those discoveries. This last domain is usually called technology. But if you look at the science section of newspapers and magazines, you will find that advances in theoretical research and their practical application receive just about equal attention.

②This is not surprising, for the most obvious characteristic of science is its usefulness, the power it gives us to do things. One dramatic example is

the Industrial Revolution, which would surely have been impossible without the development of science. The human capacity to control disease, to produce quantities of food adequate for the world's greatly expanded population, and to achieve full production without resorting to slave labor reflects the development of technological know-how.

③ Now this power to do things carries with it no instructions on how to use it, either for good or for evil. Such is determined solely by how inventions are used and by our own priorities. Here most of us understandably have ambivalent feelings.

④ On the one hand, we are pleased with improved production; on the other, we worry about the effects of automation. We are happy with the development of medicine but then worry about the birthrate and the fact that no one dies from the diseases we have eliminated. We rejoice that the microscope has revealed the realm of the bacterium and the virus, but then we are beset with fears that evil scientists will use their knowledge to create incurable diseases. We are delighted about the great advances in transportation and communications but then express concern about the loss of cultural diversity. We eagerly take to the Internet and then fear the power of super computers to monitor us. We look to nuclear power as an enduring source of energy and yet greatly fear the risks inherent in its use.

⑤ I was once taken to see a Buddhist temple, where I was told: "every man is given the key to the gates of heaven. The same key opens the gates to hell." And it is so with science. Lacking any instructions as to which gate is which, some of us may be inclined to throw the key away. Others, however, will choose to struggle to make the best judgment possible. The value of science lies in the hope that it will indeed open the gates to a better world.

【解答例】

"Science" means a method of finding things out, knowledge arising from discoveries or the capabilities and methods emerging from those discoveries. This last domain [field], technology, gives us the power to do things. (32)

But this power provides us with no instructions on how to use it. Such [This] is determined by how we use inventions. We are pleased with the development of technology, while [and yet] we worry about it. (34 or 35)

Some may give up making a judgment about [of/on] its use; others will struggle to make the best judgment [decision]. The value of science lies in the hope(, not in the fear). (25 or 30) (91 or 97 words)

※この passage も、読んで内容を理解する分にはけっこう難しい英文ではないが、要約するとなると話は別。指定の語数が少なければ、第一段落の science の定義を Science means (one of the) three things (or a mixture of them). 程度で済ませることも考えられるが、その場合も、この passage の subject である technology に触れずに済ませることは出来ない。それを第二段落にどうつなげていくか、文章構成力が問われる。

※第四段落は第三段落最後の (most of us understandably have) ambivalent feelings の具体例の列挙であり、出来るだけ簡潔にまとめていきたい。on the one hand と on the other に始まって、but then/and then/and yet 等の接続語および、be pleased with/be happy with と worry aboutを始め、rejoice と be beset with fears, be delighted about と express concern about, take to/look to と fear] 等の動詞(句)が典型的な対比の表現であることは容易に掴めるので、

そのうちの一つを用いて、対象を the development of technology としてまとめ
しまえばよい。しかし、この発想が浮かばないと、かなり語数を要することになる。
※上記の2点をクリア出来ても、この要約が手強いのは、結論に当たる第5段落の処
理である。この fiction の部分はいくまでも例え話であり、そのまま拾ってもス
トレートに technology には結びつかない。補足して結びつけていくには相当な語
数を要する。ここも大胆に省いて、science and technology の話に持っていく必
要がある。

※この最後の段落の処理を思いつかないと、日本語で要約する東大型の要約問題であ
っても相当に苦勞する。読むことと書くことの間にはやはり相当な隔りがあるよ
うだ。

【全訳】 科学とは何か。この言葉はふつう三つのことのうちの一つ、またはその三つ
が混ざり合ったものを意味するために用いられる。科学は、ときには物事を発見する
特別な方法を指す。ときには発見から生じる一連の [多くの] 知識を意味する。最後
に、科学という言葉は、そうした発見から生まれるすべての新しい能力や方法を表す
ために用いられる。この最後の分野はふつうテクノロジー (科学技術) と呼ばれる。
しかし新聞や雑誌の科学欄を見れば、理論的研究の進歩とその実用化 [実際のな応
用] がちょうど同じくらいの注目を受けていることがわかる。

このことは驚くにあたらない。なぜなら、科学の最も明白な特徴はその有用性、(つ
まり) 科学が私たちに与えてくれる、物事を行なう力だからである。そのめざましい
一例が産業革命であり、(というのも) もし科学の発展がなかったなら、産業革命は
きっとありえなかっただろう。病気の蔓延を防ぎ、著しく増大した世界の人口に十分
なだけの大量の食糧を生産し、そして奴隷労働に頼ることなく [奴隷労働という手段
に訴えることなく] 十分な生産を達成する人間の能力は、科学技術上の専門知識の発展
を反映している。

ところで、物事を成し遂げるこの能力は、それをいかに利用するか、善用するかそ
れとも悪用するかについての指示 [使用説明書] をまったく持ち合わせていないので
ある。こうしたことはもっぱら、発明されたものがどのように使われるかによって、
また私たち自身が何を優先するかによって決まるのである。そうすると、たいいていの
人たちが矛盾した感情を抱くのは、もっともなことである。

一方では、私たちは生産の改良を喜ぶが、他方では、自動化の影響を心配する。私
たちは医学の発達に満足しているのに、しかしその一方、出生率や、私たちが駆逐し
てきた病気のために死ぬ人が一人もいなくなったことを心配している。顕微鏡がバク
テリアとウイルスの世界 [領域/分野] を解明したことを喜ぶのに、しかしその一方
では、悪い科学者がその知識を利用して不治の病を生み出すのではないかという不安
につきまといわれている。輸送とコミュニケーションの著しい進歩を喜ぶのに、しかし
その一方では、文化の多様性が失われるのではないかという懸念を表明する。インタ
ーネットに夢中になりながら、同時にスーパーコンピューターが私たちのことを詮索
[監視] する能力を恐れる。永続的なエネルギー源として原子力を当てにする [に期
待する] が、それでいて原子力の利用に内在する [固有の] 危険をひどく恐れるので
ある。

私はかつて仏教寺院を見に連れて行かれたことがあるが、そこで、「すべての人に
天国への扉の鍵が与えられる。その同じ鍵が地獄への扉も開けるのである」という話
を聞かされた。そして科学に関しても同じことが言えるのである。どの扉がどちらの
扉なのかについての指示がいっさいないために、なかにはその鍵を捨てたくなる者も
いるかもしれない。しかし、考えられる [可能な] 最善の判断を下そうと努力するこ
とを選ぶ者もいるだろう。科学の価値は、科学がよりよい世界への扉を確かに開いて
くれるだろうという期待にあるのだ。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

All that we can say with certainty about this life is that each of us is born to die. When, where, or how our journey will end we cannot say — even this one certainty is covered in uncertainty — but we are all travelers on the road to death. And yet, how many of us live with this ultimate destination firmly in sight? We create routines to rule our lives, to give them a surface permanence. We get up, wash and eat at regular times each day; we dress according to a certain style; we move around with a particular circle of friends. Each of us creates a pattern of existence, however fragile, which gives our finite lives an appearance of infinity.

We do not deny that death occurs. On the contrary, we are eager to read about it in novels or watch it in films, where it can be experienced at a safe distance. We can even stand real deaths, as long as they are far enough away to remain safely confined to newspaper photographs or the television news. In fact the more we see, the less we feel; the greater the number of deaths, the more likely they are to become faceless statistics. As human beings, we are so self-centered that one death which touches us personally — even the thought that someone whom we love might die — upsets us more deeply than the deaths of any number of people whom we do not know.

Death is something which happens to other people. As long as this is so, we can deny its reality, ignore the fact that we too are candidates. When ‘a loved one’ does die, we try to avoid any mention of death, but talk of their ‘passing away’ or ‘going to a better place’. Such deaths are surrounded by solemn ceremonies, patterns of routine for the event which threatens to make a mockery of all our routines.

In the countries of the developed world, where child mortality rates are low and life expectancy is high, we try to avoid all contact with death in the flesh. While old age is celebrated in traditional societies, and the elderly treated with respect, we consider old age to be a social problem and think of the old with pity and horror. Worshipping youth, we search for ways to remain young, hiding our wrinkles with face-lifts or make-up, and disguising the color of our graying hair. The dying are shut away in hospitals so that few experience death at close hand. The only dead body I have ever seen belonged to my father, and even that I saw — and touched — only by choice.

①All that we can say with certainty about this life is that each of us is born to die. When, where, or how our journey will end we cannot say — even this one certainty is covered in uncertainty — but we are all travelers on the road to death. And yet, how many of us live with this ultimate destination firmly in sight? We create routines to rule our lives, to give them a surface permanence. We get up, wash and eat at regular times each day; we dress according to a certain style; we move around with a particular circle of friends. Each of us creates a pattern of existence, however fragile, which gives our finite lives an appearance of infinity.

②We do not deny that death occurs. On the contrary, we are eager to read about it in novels or watch it in films, where it can be experienced at a safe distance. We can even stand real deaths, as long as they are far enough away to remain safely confined to newspaper photographs or the television news. In

fact the more we see, the less we feel; the greater the number of deaths, the more likely they are to become faceless statistics. As human beings, we are so self-centered that one death which touches us personally — even the thought that someone whom we love might die — upsets us more deeply than the deaths of any number of people whom we do not know.

③Death is something which happens to other people. As long as this is so, we can deny its reality, ignore the fact that we too are candidates. When ‘a loved one’ does die, we try to avoid any mention of death, but talk of their ‘passing away’ or ‘going to a better place’. Such deaths are surrounded by solemn ceremonies, patterns of routine for the event which threatens to make a mockery of all our routines.

④In the countries of the developed world, where child mortality rates are low and life expectancy is high, we try to avoid all contact with death in the flesh. While old age is celebrated in traditional societies, and the elderly treated with respect, we consider old age to be a social problem and think of the old with pity and horror. Worshipping youth, we search for ways to remain young, hiding our wrinkles with face-lifts or make-up, and disguising the color of our graying hair. The dying are shut away in hospitals so that few experience death at close hand. The only dead body I have ever seen belonged to my father, and even that I saw — and touched — only by choice.

【解答例】

We are all born to die, but so uncertain about this ultimate destination that we create routines to rule our lives to give them a surface permanence [an appearance of infinity]. (27 or 28)

Though eager to experience others’ deaths at a safe distance, we are upset by one death touching us personally. If deaths occur, we hold solemn ceremonies, patterns of routine, but death mocks [makes meaningless] all our routines. (35 or 36)

In traditional societies, old age is celebrated, while we treat [regard] it as a social problem with pity and horror. We try to avoid personal contact with death; few experience death at close hand. (33) (95 or 97 words)

※本文の第一段落から第三段落まではストーリー（論旨）の大きな展開はないが、第四段落の改行段落がないと読者は違和感を覚えるだろう。解答例は3段落構成にしたが、内容からすると2段落構成でも構わないし、要約文である以上、1段落にまとめもこともできる。

※第三段落の下線を引いた箇所は、solemn ceremonies と patterns of routine が言い換えで「葬式」のことであり、the event=death が掴めないと、この箇所の重要性が理解できない。

(全訳は次ページ)

【全訳】人生について確実に言えることは、私たちの誰もが死ぬために生まれてきた [生まれてきてそして死ぬ] ということである。いつ、どこで、どのようにして、私たちの旅路が終わるのかは私たちには分からない。つまりこのひとつ確実なことでさえも、不確実性に覆われているのだ。しかし、私たちはみな死への旅路を旅する旅人なのである。それでいながら、私たちのうちの何人が、この究極の目的地をしっかりと見極めて [見すえて/視野に入れて] 生きているだろうか。私たちは、人生に表面的な永続性を与えるために、人生を支配する型にはまった行為 (日課) を作り出す。毎日決まった時間に起床し、洗顔し、食事をする。一定のスタイルに従って服を着る。特定の範囲の友人と行動を共にする。私たちの誰もが存在 [生存/生活] の様式 [型] を作り出し、どんなにはかないものであっても、その様式が有限の人生に無限の外見を与えるのである。

私たちは死が訪れることを否定しない。それどころか、小説で死について読んだり映画の中で死を観たりしたが、そこでは、死は安全な距離において体験できるのである。私たちは本物の死に耐えることもできるが、そうした死が (自分からは) 十分に遠く離れた出来事で、新聞の写真やテレビのニュースの中に安全に閉じ込められている限りのことである。実際、人は目にすればするほど、それだけ感じることは少なくなる。死者の数が多ければ多いほど、それは顔のない統計的数値になる可能性がいっそう高くなる。人間として、私たちは非常に自己中心的であるために、個人的に自分の心に触れる一人の人間の死が----それどころか愛する者が死ぬかもしれないと考えるだけでも----自分の知らないどんなに多くの人間の死よりも私たちを深く動揺させるのである。

死とは他人に起こる出来事なのだ。そうである限り、私たちはその現実性を否定し、そして自分もまたその候補者なのだという事実を無視することができる。「愛する人」が実際に死ぬと、私たちは死を口にすることをいっさい避けて、彼らは「亡くなった」とか「天国に召された [黄泉(よみ)の国に行かれた/他界された]」などと言う。こうした死は厳粛な儀式、つまり私たちの型にはまった行為をすべてあざ笑うおそれがある死という出来事のための、型にはまった様式に囲われているのだ。

子供の死亡率が低く平均余命が長い、先進世界の諸国では、人は死と直に接することをすべて避けようとする。伝統的な社会では長寿が祝福され、年配者が敬意をもって遇されるにもかかわらず、私たち (先進国の人間) は老齢を社会問題と見なし、哀れみと恐怖をもって老人のことを考える。若さを崇拜するので、私たちは若くいられる方法を探し求め、美容整形や化粧でしわを隠し、白くなっていく髪の色を偽るのだ。死にゆく者は病院に閉じ込められるので、死を身近に経験する者はほとんどいない。私がこれまで見たことのある唯一の死体は父のものであり、その父の死体でさえも、私がそれを望んだからこそ、見ることに、そして触れることに、できたのだ。

Summarize the following passage within 150 words.

Latin, sometimes called the mother tongue of the civilized world, was the language of the ancient Romans. From its modest beginnings as the speech of an insignificant sheep-herding people, Latin grew to dominate the western world. In time it became the means of communication for a vast number of peoples in Europe, Asia, and Africa, as well as the language of government, trade, and literature in the ancient world.

Originally Latin was the speech of the Latins, a sheep-herding people who lived on the Latium Plain in the central part of Italy almost a thousand years before the time of Christ. People from this ancient tribe founded the city of Rome, and their language, therefore, became the language of the Romans. As time passed, Rome became more powerful, and all Italy was gradually brought under her control. Her conquests were continued, until the tramp of her victorious soldiers was heard on three continents. Everywhere the Romans went, they brought their language with them, and in many of the conquered lands, Latin became the language of the people. It was spoken from the shadow of the Egyptian pyramids to the dense forests of the Rhineland, and from the valley of the Tigris River on the east to the Atlantic Ocean on the west. People of many different races, religions and degrees of civilization were familiar with the tongue.

Long after Rome declined in power and the Roman empire collapsed, Latin continued to live as the daily language of the people in many parts of Europe. In time, though, because there was no longer much contact among the different groups of Latin speakers, differences slowly emerged. Eventually the differences became so great that the people of one region could not understand the speech of the people from another region. These different types of Latin are known today as the Romance languages: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Rumanian.

The Latin from which the Romance languages developed was known as "vulgar" Latin, the language spoken by the common people. The great writers of ancient Rome, however, employed what is known as literary Latin, which was more graceful and elegant than the Latin of everyday use. This literary Latin continued to be spoken and written throughout the Middle Ages. University teachers lectured in Latin. Scholars and poets wrote in Latin. Latin continued to be the language of government and law. It was said that during the Middle Ages a person familiar with Latin could travel the length of Europe without needing to know another language, for in every community he could find men of learning who spoke Latin.

Even today Latin continues to extend its influence. Through conquests by people speaking them, the Romance languages have been carried far and wide. Spanish, for instance, is the language of Central America as well as much of the Caribbean and South America. French, likewise, is the common tongue of many African nations. English, the international language of the modern world, is spoken and understood on every continent. Although it is not a "daughter" of Latin as the Romance languages are, nevertheless more than half of its vocabulary is taken from Latin. Further, new words for use in the rapidly expanding fields of science and technology are constantly being created from Latin roots. Thus Latin, the language which was probably old when the ancient herdsmen of Latium were speaking it, continues to live today.

①Latin, sometimes called the mother tongue of the civilized world, was the language of the ancient Romans. From its modest beginnings as the speech of an insignificant sheep-herding people, Latin grew to dominate the western world. In time it became the means of communication for a vast number of peoples in Europe, Asia, and Africa, as well as the language of government, trade, and literature in the ancient world.

②Originally Latin was the speech of the Latins, a sheep-herding people who lived on the Latium Plain in the central part of Italy almost a thousand years before the time of Christ. People from this ancient tribe founded the city of Rome, and their language, therefore, became the language of the Romans. As time passed, Rome became more powerful, and all Italy was gradually brought under her control. Her conquests were continued, until the tramp of her victorious soldiers was heard on three continents. Everywhere the Romans went, they brought their language with them, and in many of the conquered lands, Latin became the language of the people. It was spoken from the shadow of the Egyptian pyramids to the dense forests of the Rhineland, and from the valley of the Tigris River on the east to the Atlantic Ocean on the west. People of many different races, religions and degrees of civilization were familiar with the tongue.

③Long after Rome declined in power and the Roman empire collapsed, Latin continued to live as the daily language of the people in many parts of Europe. In time, though, because there was no longer much contact among the different groups of Latin speakers, differences slowly emerged. Eventually the differences became so great that the people of one region could not understand the speech of the people from another region. These different types of Latin are known today as the Romance languages: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Rumanian.

④The Latin from which the Romance languages developed was known as "vulgar" Latin, the language spoken by the common people. The great writers of ancient Rome, however, employed what is known as literary Latin, which was more graceful and elegant than the Latin of everyday use. This literary Latin continued to be spoken and written throughout the Middle Ages. University teachers lectured in Latin. Scholars and poets wrote in Latin. Latin continued to be the language of government and law. It was said that during the Middle Ages a person familiar with Latin could travel the length of Europe without needing to know another language, for in every community he could find men of learning who spoke Latin.

⑤Even today Latin continues to extend its influence. Through conquests by people speaking them, the Romance languages have been carried far and wide. Spanish, for instance, is the language of Central America as well as much of the Caribbean and South America. French, likewise, is the common tongue of many African nations. English, the international language of the modern world, is spoken and understood on every continent. Although it is not a "daughter" of Latin as the Romance languages are, nevertheless more than half of its vocabulary is taken from Latin. Further, new words for use in the rapidly expanding fields of science and technology are constantly being created from Latin roots. Thus Latin, the language which was probably old when the ancient herdsmen of Latium were speaking it, continues to live today.

【解答例】

Latin, the language of the ancient Romans, became the means of communication on three continents. After the Roman empire collapsed, Latin remained the daily language of the people in many parts of Europe. However, the differences in the speech among the different groups of speakers emerged, and eventually they could not understand each other. (55)

These various [different] types of Latin are called the Romance languages: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and Rumanian. The Latin from which they developed was "vulgar" Latin, the language of daily use by the common people, while the Latin the great writers of ancient Rome used was literary Latin. This elegant type of Latin was still spoken and written throughout the Middle Ages. (61)

Though English is not among the Romance languages, more than half of its vocabulary is taken from Latin; moreover, new words in certain fields are frequently created from Latin roots. (30) (146 words)

※今回は本文が長めであり、しかも内容は事実の記述のみと言ってよい。削ることを常に意識していないと150語でも語数はまず間違いなくオーバーする。日本語で要約する場合や説明する場合と同様、字数（語数）は多めであればあるほど、楽である。したがって、少なめの字数（語数）でまとめる練習は欠かせない。いかに思い切りよく省けるかで勝負は決まる。

※第三段落と第四段落を重視したのは、the Romance languages, "vulgar" Latinと literary Latin が出てくるので当然である。第二段落は第一段落で述べたことの補足、詳述に当たる内容なので、軽く扱った。第五段落は、冒頭の even today が理解し難い。この箇所の内容は第二次世界対戦以前の話であり、違和感を覚える。逆に英語の話を持ったのは、今日、かつてのラテン語の地位に相当する(?)のは英語だからである。

(全訳は次ページ)

【全訳】ラテン語は、文明世界の母国語と呼ばれることもあるが、古代ローマの言語だった。取るに足りない牧羊民族の話し言葉として慎ましく誕生したラテン語は、発達して西欧世界を支配するようになった。やがてラテン語は、古代世界の政治と交易と文学の言語になっただけではなく、ヨーロッパ、アジア、アフリカの無数の民族のコミュニケーションの手段にもなった。

そもそもラテン語は、紀元前10世紀ころイタリア中央部のラティウム平原に住んでいた牧羊民族であるラテン人の話し言葉であった。この古代の種族の子孫がローマの都市を建設し、したがって彼らの言語がローマ人の言語になったのだ。時が経つにつれて、ローマはいっそう強力になり、次第にイタリア全土がローマに支配されるようになった。ローマによる征服は続き、ついには勝利を収めた兵士の足音が3つの大陸で聞かれるまでになった。ローマ人は、行く先々に自分たちの言語を持ち込み、征服された土地の多くで、ラテン語がその土地の人々の言語となった。エジプトのピラミッドの陰からラインランドの深い森に至るまで、東はチグリス川の流域から西は大西洋に至るまで、ラテン語が話された。人種と宗教と文明の程度が様々に異なる人々が、この言語に通じていた。

ローマの権力が衰えてローマ帝国が崩壊した後もずっと、ラテン語はヨーロッパの多くの地域で人々の日常語として生き続けた。けれども、やがて、ラテン語を話す異なる集団の間の接触はもはやあまりなくなったために、徐々に相違が生じてきた。ついには、その相違がたいへん大きくなったために、ある地域の人々は別の地域から来た人々の言葉を理解できなくなったのだ。こうした異なる種類のラテン語は、今日ロマンス語として知られている。フランス語、スペイン語、ポルトガル語、イタリア語、そしてルーマニア語がそうである。

ロマンス語に発達したラテン語は、一般大衆が話す言語である「平俗」ラテン語として知られていた。しかし、古代ローマの優れた著述家は文語的なラテン語として知られるものを使っていたが、これは日常使用されるラテン語よりも優雅で格調が高かった。この文語的なラテン語は中世を通じて話され書かれ続けた。大学の教師はラテン語で講義をし、学者や詩人はラテン語で物を書いた。ラテン語は政治と法律の言語であり続けた。中世には、ラテン語に通じている人間は、別の言語を知る必要なしにヨーロッパの端から端まで旅行することができた。というのも、あらゆる土地で、ラテン語を話す学識のある人間に出会えたからだ。

今日でさえ、ラテン語はその影響を広げ続けている。ロマンス語を話す人々による征服を通じて、ロマンス語はあちこちに持ち込まれてきた。たとえば、スペイン語はカリブ海と南米の多く地域だけではなく中央アメリカの言語でもある。同様に、フランス語はアフリカの多くの国の共通の言語である。現代世界の国際言語である英語は、すべての大陸で話され理解されている。英語は、ロマンス語のようにラテン語から「派生」したものではないが、それにもかかわらず英語の語彙の半数以上はラテン語から来ている。さらには、科学技術という急速に拡大しつつある分野で使用される新しい単語は、絶えずラテン語を元に作られている。したがって、古代ラティウムの羊飼いが話していたころはおそらく古い言語であったラテン語が、今日も生き続けているのである。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

The most striking difference between an American and an European is the difference in their attitudes towards money. Every European knows, as a matter of historical fact, that in Europe wealth could only be acquired at the expense of other human beings, either by conquering them or by exploiting their labor in factories. Further, even after the Industrial Revolution began, the number of persons who could rise from poverty to wealth was small; the vast majority assumed that they would not be much richer nor poorer than their fathers. In consequence, no European associates wealth with personal merit or poverty with personal failure.

To a European, money means power, the freedom to do as he likes, which also means that, consciously or unconsciously, he says: "I want to have as much money as possible myself and others to have as little money as possible."

In the United States, wealth was also acquired by stealing, but the real exploited victim was not a human being but poor Mother Earth and her creatures who were ruthlessly plundered. It is true that the Indians were driven out or killed, but this was not, as it had always been in Europe, a matter of the conqueror seizing the wealth of the conquered, for the Indian had never realized the potential riches of his country. It is also true that, in the Southern states, men lived on the labor of slaves, but slave labor did not make fortunes for them; what made slavery in the South all the more unforgivable was that, in addition to being morally wicked, it didn't even pay off handsomely.

Thanks to the natural resources of the country, every American could reasonably look forward to making more money than his father, so that, if he made less, the fault must have been his; he was either lazy or inefficient. What an American values, therefore, is not the mere possession of money, but his power to make it as a proof of his manhood; once he has proved himself by making it, it has served its function and can be lost or given away. In no society in history have rich men given away so large a part of their fortunes. A poor American feels guilty at being poor, but less guilty than a wealthy American who has inherited a fortune but is doing nothing to increase it; what can the latter do but take to drink?

① The most striking difference between an American and an European is the difference in their attitudes towards money. Every European knows, as a matter of historical fact, that in Europe wealth could only be acquired at the expense of other human beings, either by conquering them or by exploiting their labor in factories. Further, even after the Industrial Revolution began, the number of persons who could rise from poverty to wealth was small; the vast majority assumed that they would not be much richer nor poorer than their fathers. In consequence, no European associates wealth with personal merit or poverty with personal failure.

② To a European, money means power, the freedom to do as he likes, which also means that, consciously or unconsciously, he says: "I want to have as much money as possible myself and others to have as little money as possible."

③ In the United States, wealth was also acquired by stealing, but the real exploited victim was not a human being but poor Mother Earth and her creatures

who were ruthlessly plundered. It is true that the Indians were driven out or killed, but this was not, as it had always been in Europe, a matter of the conqueror seizing the wealth of the conquered, for the Indian had never realized the potential riches of his country. It is also true that, in the Southern states, men lived on the labor of slaves, but slave labor did not make fortunes for them; what made slavery in the South all the more unforgivable was that, in addition to being morally wicked, it didn't even pay off handsomely.

④Thanks to the natural resources of the country, every American could reasonably look forward to making more money than his father, so that, if he made less, the fault must have been his; he was either lazy or inefficient. What an American values, therefore, is not the mere possession of money, but his power to make it as a proof of his manhood; once he has proved himself by making it, it has served its function and can be lost or given away. In no society in history have rich men given away so large a part of their fortunes. A poor American feels guilty at being poor, but less guilty than a wealthy American who has inherited a fortune but is doing nothing to increase it; what can the latter do but take to drink?

【解答例】

Americans and Europeans are different in their attitudes towards money. Europeans acquired wealth at the cost of others. Most Europeans expected to be neither richer nor poorer than their fathers; personal merit or failure does not count. (37)

Americans acquired wealth by exploiting nature, not the Indians unaware of the potential riches of their land, while [and] slavery in the South did not bring it enough fortune (28)

Natural resources allowed Americans to become richer, so Americans do not value money itself but their power to make it. Poor Americans feel less guilty than rich Americans who cannot increase their inherited fortune. (34)

(99 words)

- *Americans don't value money itself but their power to make it=Americans value not money itself but their power to make it
- *personal merit or failure doesn't count=personal merit or failure is not important
- *Natural resources allowed Americans to become richer≡Natural resources enabled Americans to become richer

※本文中の語句を拾ってつなぎ、英語の要約文を作るパターンにある程度慣れてきたら、早稲田の文化構想学部や文学部のように in your own words という指定がある問題にも対処できるように、多少の言い換えを取り入れていこう。もっとも、こうした指定がなくても、完全な継ぎ接ぎだけでしっかりした英文を書くほうがかえって高等技術を要する場合もある。

※The most striking difference between an American and an European is ... という書き出しにもかかわらず an European's attitude towards money のほうが先に述べられている理由はすぐに分かったはずだ。つまり本当の主題はあくまでも an American's attitude towards money のほうである。したがって、第二段落の内容は省いて、第三、第四段落の要約に語数を費やした。

※American Indians と slavery in the Southern states に関する記述は、ある程度の背景知識（と想像力）がないと一読して理解するのは難しいかもしれない。この passage には先住民と黒人奴隷に対するアメリカ人の考え方の一面が出ているので、頭に入れておいて損はない。

【全訳】 アメリカ人とヨーロッパ人の最も著しい違いは、お金に対する態度の違いである。歴史的な事実として、ヨーロッパ人なら誰でも知っていることだが、ヨーロッパでは富は他の人間を犠牲にして——他の人間を征服するか、さもなければ工場で彼らの労働を搾取することで——はじめて獲得することができた。そのうえ、産業革命が始まってからでさえ、貧困から身を起こして裕福になれる者の数は少なかった。大多数の人間が、自分は父親に比して著しく金持ちになることもなければ、著しく貧乏になることもないと思いきこんでいたのだ。したがって [その結果]、富を個人の功績に、貧困を個人の失敗 [怠慢] に結びつけて考えるヨーロッパ人は一人もいない。

ヨーロッパ人にとって、お金とは力、つまり自分の好きな通りにする自由を意味するが、このことはまた、意識的であれ無意識的であれ、ヨーロッパ人が次のように言うことを意味している。「私自身はできるだけ多くのお金を持ちたいが、他人にはできるだけ少ないお金しか持ってもらいたくない」。

合衆国では、富はまた盗むことによっても獲得されたが、搾取された本当の犠牲者は人間ではなく、情け容赦なく略奪された哀れな母なる大地と、そこに生きる生き物であった。たしかに [なるほど]、インディアンは追い立てられたり殺されたりしたが、しかしヨーロッパでは常にそうであったのとは異なり [ヨーロッパでは常にそうであったように]、このことは、征服者が被征服者の富を強奪するというものではなかった。というのは、インディアンは自分の国の潜在的な富をまったく理解していなかったからである。またたしかに [なるほど]、南部諸州では人々は奴隷の労働に依存して生活していたが、しかし奴隷労働は彼らに富をもたらさなかった。南部の奴隷制度がなおさら許しがたいのは [南部の奴隷制度をそれだけいっそう許しがたいものにしたことは]、道徳的にひどく間違っていたことに加えて、十分に利益をもたらさなかったことである。

この国の天然資源のおかげで、アメリカ人は誰でも、父親よりも余計に金を稼ぐことを当然期待できたので、もし父親より稼ぎが少なければ、その責任は必然的に本人にあった。つまり、本人が怠惰であるか無能であるどちらかだったのだ。したがって、アメリカ人が高い価値を置くのは [置くものは]、単に金を持っていることではなく、男らしさの証(あかし)として金をもうける力なのである。いったん金をもうけて自分の男らしさ [価値] を証明してしまえば、金はその役割を果たしたことになり、(その後は) なくしてしまおうと他人にやっつけてしまおうとかまわないのである。アメリカほど、金持ちが自分の財産の多くを他人に与えた社会は歴史上他にひとつもない。貧しいアメリカ人は自分が貧しいことに後ろめたさを感じるが、(親から) 財産を相続したのに、それを増やすために何もしていない裕福なアメリカ人ほどの後ろめたさは感じない。後者は、酒におぼれる以外に何ができるだろうか。

Summarize the following passage within 100 words.

Facial expressions are a major factor in communication. The face is usually the first part of the body that is observed in social interaction. But correct facial interpretation is an extremely difficult and complicated task even among those people who share a common system of facial meanings. The problem becomes more conspicuous in an encounter with people from a different culture.

Scholars agree that normal expressions of ten basic emotions (happiness, sorrow, anger, fear, contempt, disgust, bewilderment, interest, determination, and surprise) are fairly easily interpreted in similar ways across cultures. Difficulty multiplies when people try to mask their true feeling. Masking is the use of one facial expression in an effort to conceal another facial expression.

People employ an interesting set of masking techniques. They modulate* their facial message by controlling its intensity and duration. They falsify their true emotion by not expressing it or expressing it differently (feeling angry but looking happy). They also modify their facial expression by adding another one,

In social interaction, Japanese people generally are expected to restrain, if not suppress, the strong or direct expression of emotion. Those who cannot control their emotion are considered to be immature as human beings. Strong expression (verbal or nonverbal) of such negative emotions as anger, disgust, or contempt could embarrass other people. Direct expression of sorrow or fear could cause feelings of insecurity in other people. Expression of happiness even should be controlled so that it does not displease other people.

The best way to comply with this social code of behavior is to utilize masking techniques. Thus, Japanese people, although unaware, frequently display apparent lack of a meaningful facial expression, often referred to as inscrutable by Western people. It is an attempt to neutralize strong emotions to avoid displeasure or embarrassment on the part of other people.

The mysterious Japanese smile should be understood in the context of the social situation. When a Japanese commuter misses a bus, he smiles if there are other people on the site, but he does curse if there is nobody around. He has to hide his embarrassment in public, but he can let out his emotion in private. Similarly, a TV interviewer may keep smiling while he is asking a politician harsh questions in an effort to show that however cruel he may sound, he does not mean to be.

(注) modulate: vary the strength or nature of

①Facial expressions are a major factor in communication. The face is usually the first part of the body that is observed in social interaction. But correct facial interpretation is an extremely difficult and complicated task even among those people who share a common system of facial meanings. The problem becomes more conspicuous in an encounter with people from a different culture.

②Scholars agree that normal expressions of ten basic emotions (happiness, sorrow, anger, fear, contempt, disgust, bewilderment, interest, determination, and surprise) are fairly easily interpreted in similar ways across cultures. Difficulty multiplies when people try to mask their true feeling. Masking is the use of one facial expression in an effort to conceal another facial expression.

③People employ an interesting set of masking techniques. They modulate* their facial message by controlling its intensity and duration. They falsify their true emotion by not expressing it or expressing it differently (feeling angry but looking happy). They also modify their facial expression by adding another one,

④In social interaction, Japanese people generally are expected to restrain, if not suppress, the strong or direct expression of emotion. Those who cannot control their emotion are considered to be immature as human beings. Strong expression (verbal or nonverbal) of such negative emotions as anger, disgust, or contempt could embarrass other people. Direct expression of sorrow or fear could cause feelings of insecurity in other people. Expression of happiness even should be controlled so that it does not displease other people.

⑤The best way to comply with this social code of behavior is to utilize masking techniques. Thus, Japanese people, although unaware, frequently display apparent lack of a meaningful facial expression, often referred to as inscrutable by Western people. It is an attempt to neutralize strong emotions to avoid displeasure or embarrassment on the part of other people.

⑥The mysterious Japanese smile should be understood in the context of the social situation. When a Japanese commuter misses a bus, he smiles if there are other people on the site, but he does curse if there is nobody around. He has to hide his embarrassment in public, but he can let out his emotion in private. Similarly, a TV interviewer may keep smiling while he is asking a politician harsh questions in an effort to show that however cruel he may sound, he does not mean to be.

【解答例】

Though facial expressions are an important factor in communication, their correct interpretation is difficult even among the members of the same culture. When people try to mask their true feelings, difficulty increases. (32)

If unable to control their emotion, Japanese people are considered immature as human beings; they are expected to restrain the obvious or direct expression of emotion. Their facial expressions, mysterious to Western people, are attempts to neutralize strong emotions to avoid displeasure or embarrassment of other people. (48)

Japanese people have to hide their feelings in public, while they can display them in private. (16) (96 words)

※第一段落で提示された主題を、ある程度 in my own words でまとめてみた(早稲田文学部と文化構想学部対策)。第二段落から to mask [masking] を拾って、第三段落は完全に省き、Japanese people に話題が限定されてくる第四段落と、その展開に当たる第五段落に語数を使い、第一センテンスで結論が述べられている第六段落から簡潔な表現を拾い、少し変えて結びの文とした。

(全訳は次ページ)

【全訳】顔の表情はコミュニケーションの主要な要素である。顔はふつう、人との交わり〔社会的相互作用〕において最初に観察される身体の部分である。しかし顔の表情を正しく解釈〔理解〕することは、表情の意味の共通の体系を有する人々の間でさえ、きわめて困難で複雑なことである。この問題は異なる文化圏の人々と遭遇した際にいっそう顕著になる。

学者たちは、10の基本的な感情（喜び、悲しみ、怒り、恐怖、軽蔑、嫌悪、当惑、興味、決意そして驚き）の通常の変現が、異文化間でもかなり容易に、同じように理解〔解釈〕されることで意見が一致する。人々が自分の本当の感情を仮面で隠そうとするとときに、困難が増大する。仮面で隠すということは、ある顔の表情を、別の顔の表情を隠そうとして用いることである。

人は仮面で隠す一連の興味深い技巧を用いる。人は顔の表情によるメッセージを、その激しさや持続時間を制御することによって調整する。人は本当の感情を表さなかったり、あるいは違う表し方をする（たとえば、怒りを感じているのに嬉しそうな顔をする）ことで、自分の本当の感情を偽る。人はまた、別の表情を加えることによって顔の表情を変えもする。

人との交わりにおいて、日本人は一般に、感情の強い表現や直接的な表現を、抑圧しないまでも、抑制することを求められている。自分の感情を制御できない人は人間として未熟であると考えられている。怒り、嫌悪あるいは軽蔑といったような否定的な感情の強い表現は（言葉によるよらないにかかわらず）、他人を当惑させるおそれがあるのだ。悲しみや恐怖を直接的に表現することは、他人の心に不安感を引き起こすおそれがあるのだ。喜びの表現でさえも、それが他人を不愉快にしないように、抑制されるべきなのである。

行動のこうした社会的規範に従う最善の方法は、仮面で隠す技巧を利用することである。したがって、日本人は、自分は意識していなくても、一見したところ意味不明な表情を頻繁に見せるが、それはよく西欧人によって不可解と言われるものである。これは他人を不快にしたり当惑させたりするのを〔他人の側の不快感や当惑を〕避けるために、強い感情を緩和する試みのひとつなのである。

不可解な日本人の微笑みは、社会的状況（他者との関係）という文脈の中で理解されるべきである。通勤途中の日本人がバスに乗り遅れると、その場に他人がいれば微笑みを浮かべるが、もしまわりに誰もいなければ実際に悪態をつく。彼は人前では自分の当惑を隠さなければならないが、誰もいないところでは自分の感情を吐き出すことができるのだ。同様に、テレビのインタビュアーは、政治家に厳しい質問をしている間、自分の言うこと〔こうした質問〕がどんなに辛辣に聞こえようと、そんなつもりはないことを示そうとして、微笑み続けるかもしれない。