

I 次の英文を読んで設問に答えよ。

If a successful treatment for extending life were to emerge suddenly out of all the new developments of medical science, adding extra decades or even centuries to our lives, the results could be disastrous. It might very well be a case of the cure's being worse than the disease.

This would be true even for the individuals lucky enough to receive the treatment. Presumably any treatment that extended life would keep people generally healthy, but the extra years would be a kind of medical balancing act, similar to the performers who dash about keeping plates spinning on top of poles. It would be nerve-racking* at best.

What if the treatments did little or nothing to help one's memory? This is an important point that is often overlooked in discussions of long life. The brain is by far the most complex organ known to us, and the workings of memory are not really understood. Keeping the body alive might be possible before we could do anything to strengthen memories. Even the ordinary lifetime often seems too much for human memory to hold or recall, and if decades were added, the long middle years of a life might be substantially forgotten, leaving only dim memories of childhood and recent events. If that were the case, the whole point of the exercise would be lost, for it is memory that makes us human. An ancient animal, ⁽²⁾ unable to hold onto memories or relationships or a sense of self or purpose, would not be a creature to envy.

Meanwhile, human society would be badly damaged by the presence of this growing population of semi-amnesiac* superelderly. Our demographic* balance depends on the number of births being only slightly larger than that of deaths, and a treatment for lengthening life would drastically alter that balance. A total of 6 billion people already tests the Earth's carrying capacity; to add lots of the elderly could crash the whole system. A lower birthrate would have to be enforced, as in China during its one-child-per-couple years. With fewer of the young and many

more of the elderly, the people in the middle would have to take on an incredible burden.

And any conceivable treatment for extending life would be expensive, meaning it would tend to be given first to prosperous people in prosperous nations. This would lead to a kind of formation of class, in which the rich and poor exist not only at radically different levels of comfort, but also for remarkably different lengths of time. It would be another step on the path toward a divided species. In such circumstances, who could blame the poor for starting a revolution? They would have little to lose and many extra decades of life to gain. Introducing treatments for extending life into the world as it stands now would be like lighting a match in a room filled with barrels of gasoline.

And yet, can we really give up on such a beautiful idea? I don't think so, despite the many problems I have sketched. Why? Because I think of human history as a ⁽³⁾collective struggle to make life easier for ourselves and our descendants. In that context I regard the struggle of life to extend itself as the most natural thing in the world. And the truth is, a successful treatment for extending life is unlikely to appear suddenly on its own and create all the problems described above. It can happen only when we find ways of curing or preventing the diseases that are now incurable, and so it will necessarily be part of the long process of improving medical science. A treatment for extending life should not be regarded as merely a desire to escape death, but rather the desire to promote and preserve (A). It is a sign of health even to think about it.

*nerve-racking 神経をすりへらす

*semi-amnesiac 半記憶喪失の

*demographic 人口の

問 1 下線部(1)を和訳せよ。

問 2 下線部(2)に相当する語を本文中から抜き出せ。

問 3 下線部(3)の指す内容を本文中から 3 点取り上げ、日本語で簡潔に述べよ。

問 4 空所(A)に入れるのに最も適当な語を次の中から選び番号で答えよ。

1. treatments 2. medical science 3. life 4. diseases

II 次の英文を読んで設問に答えよ。

At what time language developed and how it evolved are not known. What we see is the end product of a long and complex series of evolutionary steps. Along with tool making, language is one of the extension systems that is most characteristic of human beings — regardless of their stage of economic and political development.

However, the gradual evolution of language was one thing, the realization that
⁽¹⁾language is a system another. The knowledge that humans not only talk but also
have grammatical rules for talking is taken for granted today. Yet when we first became aware of the fact that we talked, a dramatic revolution was set in motion. Language became separable from humans and took on a life of its own; it became a system in its own right. From this came writing and writing systems as well as the ability to play with ideas — logic and philosophies. All these developments explain in part why intelligence is so closely connected in people's minds with verbal capability. Possibly because language plays such a prominent part in our lives, other intellectual systems have been pushed aside. Our problems in education are made worse by educational systems and philosophies that stress verbal capability at the expense of other important parts of our minds, which are either ignored or looked down on. The result is an enormous waste of talent and dreadful damage to an unknown but significant portion of our population.

Beginning with the establishment of schools, intelligence and education have become totally linked in our minds. People who couldn't make it in schools were thought to be dull. Their lack of performance was invariably associated with the failure to master either word or number systems or both. Yet what do intelligence,
⁽²⁾verbal skills, and education amount to when we take a hard look at our past as well
as our closest relatives in the animal world, apes, who do not talk?

Intelligence, after all, did not begin with humans, nor did the mammalian* brain begin with schooling. It evolved over a period of millions of years of problem

solving in real, life-and-death struggles. What is more, the common belief that you can't think unless you can put it into words has yet to be demonstrated. In fact, many examples of nonverbal brain activity in both animals and people lead us to reject it. The study of our past can teach us a lot about how our intelligence has evolved from that of animals. For as anyone who has dealt with animals knows, there are smart and less smart members of any species.

Konrad Lorenz, the father of ethnology*, shows that what we call intelligence is not limited to humans but has its origins in lower life forms. It is widely shared and has played a very prominent part in the survival of many species. For example, the brain-to-body weight ratio (the biologist's basic measure of intelligence) of dolphins and whales is comparable to that of humans. Dolphins are highly intelligent, but since we have not been able to understand their communication system, there is no way of telling exactly how intelligent they are. Much of what we know of dolphins comes from observations in very limited and artificial environments. Therefore we have never really been able to observe dolphins long enough and in enough detail in their natural setting to get to know them well. Techniques may never be developed that will make possible years of study of sea life in the detail now customary when studying land animals.

*mammalian 哺乳動物の

*ethnology 民族学

問 1 下線部(1)を和訳せよ。

問 2 下線部(2)を和訳せよ。

問 3 下線部(3)の指す内容を日本語で答えよ。

問 4 下線部(a)と(b)が指すものをそれぞれ本文中から抜き出せ。

問 5 本文の内容と一致するものを一つ選んで記号で答えよ。

- ア. 言語は人間の特性をよく表しており、それがどのように発達してきたかは次第に明らかになってきている。
- イ. 言語は書く行為や考える行為と密接に関わっており、人間の知性そのものである。
- ウ. 学校で成績が悪かったからと言って知性が低いわけではない。
- エ. 人間は言語を使用することによって最もよく考えることができる。
- オ. 陸上の生物の生態を探ることは海の生物の生態を探るのと同じくらい困難だ。

Ⅲ 下線部(1), (2)を英訳せよ。

ことわざというものがどうして生まれるのか、考えてみると、なかなかおもしろ⁽¹⁾い。それが、どこの国にもあるのがいっそうおもしろい。さらにまったく関係のないような 国と国とのことわざが不思議と符合する。同じではなくとも似たものが外国にないのを探すのが難しいくらいである。もし、よその国に対応するよう⁽²⁾なものが見出されないようなら、そのことわざは、民族、社会に特有な文化をあらわしていることになる。人間にはある程度の共通する心理があつて世界中でことわざを生み出してきたのであろう。