

I 次の英文を読んで以下の設問に答えなさい。

The stories about my childhood, the ones that got told and retold at dinner tables, to my own children by my father later on, are stories of running away. Some are stories of events I can't remember, that I see and feel only in the retelling: the young child who wandered down the street while her mother was occupied with yet another baby and was driven home by the police; the little girl who was seen by a neighbor walking down the alley a block north of her family's home; the child who appeared on her grandparents' doorstep and wasn't quite sure whether anyone knew she'd come so far on her own.

Other times, I remember myself. <sup>1</sup> ( A ) because, like Everest, it was there, an urban wonderland so other from the quiet flat streets of the suburbs where we lived. I remember riding my bicycle for miles to the neighborhood where my aunt and uncle lived, a narrow avenue of brick houses. I remember going to the airport with my parents when I was thirteen and reading the destinations board, seeing all the places I could go: San Juan, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, London. I remember watching trains go by, and wishing I was aboard.

The odd thing about all this is that I had a lovely childhood in a lovely place. This is the way I remember it; this is the way it was. The neighborhood where I grew up was the sort of place in which people dream of raising children — pretty, privileged but not rich. We walked to school, wandered wild in <sup>2</sup> the summer, knew everyone and all their brothers and sisters, too. ( B ), one or two in the houses that their parents once owned.

Yet there was always in me, even when I was very small, the sense that I ought to be somewhere else. And wander I did, although, in my everyday life, I had nowhere to go and no imaginable reason on earth why I should want to leave. The buses went to distant places without me; the trains sped by. So I wandered the world through books. I went

to Victorian England in the pages of such books as *Middlemarch* and *A Little Princess*, and to Saint Petersburg before the Russian Revolution with Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*.

When I read such a book, it never seemed to me like a book, but like a place I had lived in, had visited and would visit again, just as all the people in the books I read were more real than the real people I knew. My home was in that pleasant place outside Philadelphia, but I really lived somewhere else. I lived within the covers of books and those books were more real to me than any other thing in my life.

Perhaps only a truly discontented child can become as tempted by books as I was. Perhaps discontentedness is a necessary condition that goes along with developing a love of reading.

In my mind, I am always sitting in a comfortable chair and reading. "It's a beautiful day," my mother is saying; she said that always, often, autumn, spring, even when there was a fresh snowfall. "All your friends are outside." It was true; they always were. Sometimes I went out with them, into the street, out into the fields, down by the stream, by the lure of what I knew intuitively was normal childhood, by the promise of being what I knew instinctively was a normal child, one who lived unruly in the world.

In the years since those days I have learned that I was not alone in this, although at the time I surely was, the only child I knew, or my parents knew, or my friends knew, who preferred reading to playing kick-the-can or ice-skating. In books I have traveled, not only to other worlds, but into my own. I learned who I was and who I wanted to be, what I might aspire to, and what I might dare to dream about my world and myself.

More powerfully and persuasively than from the sayings in the Bible, I learned the difference between good and evil, right and wrong in the books I have read. One of my favorite childhood books described that evil, that wrong, existing in a different dimension from our own.

But I felt that I, too, existed much of the time in a different dimension from everyone else I knew. There was waking, and there was sleeping. And then there were books, a kind of parallel universe in which anything might happen and frequently did, a universe in which I might be a newcomer but was never really a stranger. My real, true world. My perfect island.

#### 設問 1

(1) 下線部 1 の言い換えとして次のどれがもっとも適切か。その番号を書きなさい。

- ① according to her plan                      ② all by herself  
③ from her home                              ④ on foot

(2) 下線部 2 の言い換えとして次のどれがもっとも適切か。その番号を書きなさい。

- ① attractive and aristocratic but not wealthy  
② beautiful, prosperous but not successful  
③ pleasing and enjoying advantages but not upper income  
④ rather prosperous but not wealthy

#### 設問 2

(1) ( A )に入るように、「下町へ汽車で行ったことを憶えている」という意味の英文を書きなさい。

(2) ( B )に入るように、「一緒に学校に行った友達の何人かはまだそこに住んでいる」という意味の英文を書きなさい。

設問 3 下線部 3 を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問 4 下線部 4 を日本語に訳しなさい。

## II

次の英文を読んで、設問に答えなさい。

Definitions of bilingualism cover a very broad range of linguistic abilities. Perhaps the broadest definition of the bilingual is “a speaker of one language who can speak in another language.” Clearly this definition fits the person who speaks two languages equally fluently. It would, ( A ), also fit the person who has finished less than a single term of study of a second or foreign language. Language learners may be able to construct complete and meaningful sentences in the new language but they may do so in much the same way as they follow recipes or assemble a new bicycle according to written instructions. That is to say, a person who has not yet acquired a full grammar for a language may still be able to construct meaningful sequences of words in that language. ( B ), the person who is able to read another language fluently with native-like comprehension may not have learned to *produce* meaningful sentences in that language. This person would not be considered a bilingual by the broad definition above. A stricter definition of *bilingual*, “a person with native-like control of two languages,” would of course exclude the beginning language student. Such a definition would still exclude the person who easily comprehends but cannot speak in a second language. It would also exclude the fluent speaker who had a “foreign accent.”

Both extremes in definition yield unsatisfactory results, perhaps because each relies on degree of control of the language as the definitional criterion. A more intuitively appealing definition of *bilingualism* considers the most relevant factor to be the regular *use* of two languages. Regular use of two languages implies a system — or two — of rules for interpreting and possibly producing word sequences in both languages. The system for each language may be quite close to the grammar of a monolingual speaker of that language or it may be somewhat different, but surely it is governed by its own set of internally consistent rules.

The one aspect of bilingualism most commonly noted is the relative ease with which a child acquires two languages simultaneously (or a second language in early childhood). ( C ), adults often struggle to learn the language of a new speech community. The most usual case is for children who learn two languages early in life to sound like native speakers in each of their languages. For adults, the more usual case is for the learners of a second language to always be distinguishable from native speakers. These differences may be found in any or all aspects of the linguistic system.

設問 1 文中で試みている, bilingual(ism)の 3 通りの定義を日本語で書きなさい。

設問 2 ( A )( B )( C )に最も当てはまる言葉を選んで, その記号を書きなさい。

- |                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| A (a) but          | (b) however           |
| (c) in fact        | (d) meanwhile         |
| (e) therefore      |                       |
| B (a) As a result  | (b) Consequently      |
| (c) Indeed         | (d) On the other hand |
| (e) While          |                       |
| C (a) All the same | (b) By comparison     |
| (c) For instance   | (d) In any case       |
| (e) Not to mention |                       |

設問 3 第二言語について, 子供が早い時期に学ぶ場合と, 大人が学ぶ場合とでもっとも違う点はどこに現れると言っていますか, 句読点を含めて 30 字以内で説明しなさい。

III 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

Everybody loves dolphins, those playful models of animal wisdom, celebrated for protecting shipwrecked sailors and spending their days doing playful tricks happily in the waves. Movies, television and water shows feature their playful activities. Nowadays, thousands of tourists swim with dolphins, captive and wild, with more people coming all the time to commune with their animal intelligence. A variety of organizations have sprung up that offer tours to places like the Florida Keys, the Azores and New Zealand, where participants can swim with wild dolphins and, PR materials proclaim, experience emotional healing and spiritual awakening. But scientists, following a path of bloody clues, are discovering that dolphins are far from the happy, peaceful creatures that humans think they know.

Growing evidence shows that the big animals, up to 3.6 meters long, are killing fellow mammals in large numbers, using their beaks as clubs and attacking with rows of sharp teeth. Dolphins have been found to beat porpoises to death by the hundreds. Unlike most animal killers, which eat their prey, dolphins seem to have murderous urges unrelated to the need for food. They have even been observed in recurring acts of killing their own infants. Off Scotland, a scientist watched in shock for nearly an hour as an adult dolphin repeatedly picked up a baby in its mouth and hit it against the water, over and over, until it sank from view. Off Virginia, researchers found at least nine baby dolphins killed, their ribs broken, their skulls and backbones smashed. One small body bore puncture marks matching the pattern of adult dolphin teeth. "We have such a kindly image of dolphins," said a prominent dolphin doctor. "So finding evidence of violence is disturbing."

More widely, scientists and government officials worry about dolphins' injuring or even killing humans, especially given the rise in watching, feeding and swimming programs. "Wildlife can be dangerous," said Trevor Spradlin, a dolphin expert. "But people see marine mammals differently, particularly dolphins. There's this misconception that they're friendly, that they want to play with people."

Officials at the government service where Mr. Spradlin works have begun an educational campaign that sends educational materials to marinas, schools and fairs in coastal areas where people and dolphins interact. The campaign is urging caution and warning of peril. "Dozens of bites have been reported," says one publication. "And people have been pulled under water." A woman who fed a pair of dolphins and then jumped into the water to swim with them was bitten. "I literally ripped my left leg out of its mouth," she said during her one-week stay in the hospital. A scientist who studies interactions between dolphins and people, said injuries had been relatively minor so far. But the scientist added, "Just because dolphins have a smile doesn't mean they're nonaggressive."

U.S. rules on how to handle captive dolphins, ( a ) last year, were ( b ) after swim centers ( c ) to some of them. Revised rules are not ( d ) until next year. Many experts say tourist attractions will remain largely ( e ) until a major accident occurs. "They're big, wild animals," said a biologist who studies dolphin attacks. "And people should respect them as such."

U.S. officials say dolphins pose little threat to people in captive swim programs, where the animals are usually well-trained and closely supervised by experts working in pools and enclosed bays. The danger, experts agree, is when people swim with dolphins in the wild, an increasingly popular, unregulated sport. For instance, Panama City, Florida, has a half-dozen boats offering such adventures. "It's a time bomb waiting to go off," said a spokesperson for the government agency that oversees dolphins in U.S. coastal waters.

U.S. officials say the recent scientific findings about wild dolphins and recent mishaps with the big animals are giving the government warning campaign a new degree of urgency. "We're not trying to prevent people from going to the beach or going on dolphin watches," said Mr. Spradlin, "but they need to do it safely and responsibly. It's like bird watchers or people on safari. That same kind of caution and respect needs to be applied to sea life."

注 mammal 哺乳動物 porpoise (小型でくちばしのない)ネズミイルカ

設問 1 下線部イ, ロ, ハの言い換えとしてもっとも適切な語句を選び, その記号を書きなさい。

- イ (a) misleading report (b) misquotation  
(c) mistaken view (d) mistranslation  
(e) misbehavior
- ロ (a) cut up (b) disrupted  
(c) removed forcibly (d) split up  
(e) tore up
- ハ (a) accidents (b) reversals  
(c) unhappiness (d) ups and downs  
(e) wrecks

設問 2 Growing evidence で始まる段落で述べられている, 他の肉食動物と違うイルカの残虐性の特徴を句読点も含めて 30 字以内でまとめなさい。

設問 3 (a)(b)(c)(d)(e)に入る言葉としてもっとも適切なものを下から選んで, その番号を書きなさい。ただし同じものを二度使ってはいけない。

- ① completed      ② expected      ③ objected  
④ suspended      ⑤ unrestricted

設問 4 文脈から考えて, 下線部 3 の意味を言い換えたものとして次のどれがもっとも適切か。その番号を書きなさい。

- ① It is something with a clear and present danger of exploding.  
② It is bomb so made that it will explode at a predetermined time.  
③ It is something that represents a potentially dangerous situation.  
④ It is a bomb that will explode at a fixed time.  
⑤ It is something that represents no danger at a future time.

IV 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

A definition of poverty is, to a considerable extent, a historically conditioned matter. Indeed, if one wanted to play with figures, it would be possible to prove that there are no poor people in the United States, or at least only a few whose condition is as desperate as that of masses in less developed countries. There is starvation in American society, but it is not a widespread social problem as it is in some of the poorer nations in the world. There are still Americans who actually die in the streets, but their numbers are comparatively small.

This abstract approach toward poverty in which one compares different centuries or societies has very real consequences. For the nineteenth century British conservative, it was a way of ignoring the situation of workers who were living under the most inhuman conditions. The twentieth century conservative would be shocked in an advanced society if there were widespread conditions like those of the English cities a hundred years ago. Our standards of a respectable life, of what a truly human life requires, change, and they should.

There are two main aspects of this change. First, there are new definitions of what man can achieve, of what a human standard of life should be. In recent times this has been particularly true. Because technology has consistently broadened man's potential, it has made a longer, healthier, better life possible. Thus, in terms of what is technically possible, we have higher hopes. ( 2 ) are poor, even though they live better than knights in the Middle Ages or Asian peasants.

Related to this technological advance is the social definition of poverty. The American poor are not poor in Asia or in the sixteenth century; they are poor here and now, in the United States. They are dispossessed in terms of what the rest of the nation enjoys, in terms of what the society could provide if it had the will. They live on the fringe, the margin. They watch the movies and read the magazines of

prosperous America, and these tell them that they are internally separated from their own country.

To some, this description of the feelings of the poor might seem to be out of place in discussing a definition of poverty. Yet if this essay indicates anything about the poverty in America, it is that this sense of exclusion is the source of a pessimism, a defeatism that intensifies the exclusion. To have one bowl of rice in a society where all other people have half a bowl may well be a sign of achievement and intelligence; it may push a person to act and to fulfill his human potential. To have five bowls of rice in a society where the majority have a decent, balanced diet is a tragedy.

This point can be put another way in defining poverty. One of the consequences of our new technology is that we have created new needs. There are more people who live longer. Therefore, they need more. In short, if there is technological advance ( 4 ) social advance, there is, almost automatically, an increase in human misery, in impoverishment.

設問 1 下線部 1 を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問 2 ( 2 ) を Those who で始めて、「可能な生活水準よりもかなり低い状態で生活している人々」の意味になるように、次の単語を並び替えなさい。

(are, below, levels, life, live, of, possible, that, the, well)

設問 3 下線部 3 を代名詞が指しているものが明らかになるよう留意しながら、日本語に訳しなさい。

設問 4 ( 4 ) に入れるのもっとも適した語を以下から選び、その番号を書きなさい。

- ① along with                      ② as well as                      ③ in addition to  
④ in spite of                      ⑤ without