英　語（後　期）　（その1）

Ⅰ　下線部を和訳せよ。

The linguist R. M. W. Dixon, who pioneered the serious study of Australian aboriginal languages, reports in his memoirs about the attitudes he encountered in the 1960s on his first field trips to North Queensland. Not far from Cairns, a white farmer asked him what exactly he was working on. Dixon explained he was trying to write a grammar of the local aboriginal language. 'Oh, that should be pretty easy,' said the farmer. 'Everyone knows that they haven't got any grammar.' In Cairns itself, Dixon was interviewed about his activities on a local radio station. The astonished presenter could not believe his ears: 'You really mean the Aborigines have a language? I thought it was just a few grunts and groans.' When Dixon protested that they had much more than grunts and groans, the presenter exclaimed, 'But they don't have more than about two hundred words, surely?' Dixon replied that on that very morning, he had collected from two informants over five hundred names just for animals and plants, so the overall vocabulary must be much larger. (1) But the greatest shock for the presenter was reserved to the end, when he asked which well-known language the local tongue was most similar to. Dixon replied that some grammatical structures in the aboriginal language he was studying were more similar to Latin than to English.

Even today, there still seems to be a widespread belief on the street that the languages of the Aborigines in Australia, Indians in South America, Bushmen in Africa, and other simple peoples around the world are just as simple as their societies. As folk wisdom would have it, an undeveloped way of life is reflected in an undeveloped way of speaking, primitive Stone Age tools are indicative of primitive grammatical structures, nakedness and simplicity are mirrored in infantile and inarticulate speech.

There is a fairly simple reason why this misconception is so common. Our perception of a language is based largely on our exposure to its speakers, and for most of us the exposure to aboriginal languages of all kinds comes mainly from popular literature, movies, and television. And what we get to hear in such depictions, from *Tintin** to Westerns, is invariably Indians, Africans, and other 'natives' speaking in that rudimentary 'me no come, Sahib**' way. So is the problem simply that we have been misguided by popular literature?

Not quite. Although the popular accounts may not always conform to the highest standard of academic accuracy, their depictions are ultimately based on reality. As it happens, the aborigines do very often use a rough and ungrammatical type of language: 'me sleep here,' 'no money no come,' 'no can do.' All these are authentic examples of 'native speak.'

But have you noticed the problem here? The primitive language that we hear these people speak is always . . . English. And (2) while it is true that when they avail themselves of the English tongue, they use a fragmentary, ungrammatical, unclear—in short, 'primitive'—version of the language, this is simply because English is not *their* language.

When one is trying to speak a foreign language without years of schooling in its grammatical nuances, there is one survival strategy that one always falls back on: strip down to the bare essentials, do away with everything but the most critical content, ignore anything that's not crucial for getting the basic meaning across. (3) The 'natives' who try to speak English do exactly that, not because their own language has no grammar but because the sophistication of their own mother tongue is of little use when struggling with a foreign language that they have not learned properly.

If we define a 'primitive language' as something that resembles the rudimentary 'me sleep here' type of English—a language with only a few hundred words and without the grammatical means of expressing any finer nuances—then it is a simple empirical fact that no natural language is primitive. (4) Hundreds of languages of simple tribes have now been studied in depth, but not one of them, be it spoken by the most 'primitive' people, is on the 'me sleep here' level. Sophisticated grammatical structures are not a prerogative of advanced civilizations, but are found even in the languages of the most primitive hunter-gatherers. As the linguist Edward Sapir memorably put it in 1921, when it comes to the complexity of grammatical structures 'Plato walks with the Macedonian swineherd, Confucius with the head-hunting savage of Assam'.

(出典：Guy Deutscher, *Through the Language Glass: Why the World Looks Different in Other Languages*. Arrow Books. 2011. 一部変更あり)

**Tintin*: a Belgian comic story of a young man called Tintin

***Sahib*: a term used by some people in India to address a man in a position of authority

Ⅱ　下線部を和訳せよ。

What do we mean when we call something a disadvantage? (1) Conventional wisdom holds that a disadvantage is something that ought to be avoided—that it is a difficulty that leaves you worse off than you would be otherwise. But that is not always the case. There are such things as "*desirable* difficulties." That concept was conceived by Robert Bjork and Elizabeth Bjork, two psychologists at the University of California, Los Angeles, and it is a beautiful and haunting way of understanding how underdogs come to excel.

Consider, for example, the following puzzle: A bat and a ball cost $1.10 in total. The bat costs $1.00 more than the ball. How much does the ball cost? What's your instinctive response? I'm guessing that it is that the ball must cost 10 cents. That can't be right, though, can it? The bat is supposed to cost $1.00 *more than* the ball. So if the ball costs 10 cents, the bat must cost $1.10, and we've exceeded our total. The right answer must be that the ball costs 5 cents.

Here's another question: If it takes 5 machines 5 minutes to make 5 widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to make 100 widgets? The setup of the question tempts you to answer 100. But it's a trick. The right answer is 5 minutes.

These puzzles are two of the three questions that make up the world's shortest intelligence test. It's called the Cognitive Reflection Test (CRT). It was invented by the Yale professor Shane Frederick, and (2) it measures your ability to understand when something is more complex than it appears—to move past impulsive answers to deeper, analytic judgments.

Frederick argues that if you want a quick way to sort people according to their level of basic cognitive ability, his little test is almost as useful as tests that have hundreds of items and take several hours to finish. To prove his point, Frederick gave the CRT to students at nine American colleges, and the results track pretty closely with how students from those colleges would rank on more traditional intelligence tests. Students from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)—perhaps the brainiest college in the world—averaged 2.18 correct answers out of three. Harvard students scored 1.43; the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1.18; and the University of Toledo 0.57.

The CRT is really hard. But here's the strange thing. Do you know the easiest way to raise people's scores on the test? Make it just a little bit *harder*. The psychologists Adam Alter and Daniel Oppenheimer tried this a few years ago with a group of undergraduates at Princeton University. First they gave the CRT the normal way, and the students averaged 1.9 correct answers out of three. That's pretty good, though it is well short of the 2.18 that MIT students averaged. Then Alter and Oppenheimer printed out the test questions in pale gray, smaller-sized italic characters, which were really hard to read. The average score this time around? 2.45. Suddenly, the students were doing much better than their counterparts at MIT.

That's strange, isn't it? Normally, we think that we are better at solving problems when they are presented clearly and simply. But here the opposite happened. A pale gray, smaller-sized italic font makes reading really frustrating. You have to squint a little bit and maybe read the sentence twice, and you probably wonder halfway through who on earth thought it was a good idea to print out the test this way. Suddenly you have to work to read the question.

Yet all that extra effort pays off. As Alter says, (3) making the questions "disfluent" causes people to think more deeply about whatever they come across. They'll use more resources on it. They'll process more deeply or think more carefully about what's going on. If they have to overcome a hurdle, they'll overcome it better when you force them to think a little harder. Alter and Oppenheimer made the CRT more difficult. But that difficulty turned out to be *desirable*.

(出典：Malcom Gladwell, *David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants*. Little, Brown Company. 2013. 一部変更あり)

Ⅲ　下線部を英訳せよ。

(1) 地球温暖化は，我々に現代社会の基盤全体を検討させる数少ない問題のうちのひとつである。ほぼ間違いなく，地球温暖化は近い未来，世界の気候状況を変化させるだろう。(2) 我々の見積もりは，約４℃の平均気温上昇，少なくとも 50 cm の海面上昇，そして天候パターンの重大な変化を示唆している。これは数十億の人間にとって大変に悲惨な状況を意味する。(3) この危機に対して何ができるかという問いに答えるには，我々は社会の基本的ルールのいくつかを変更し，今日よりもはるかに地球的規模でかつ長期的なアプローチを採用しなければならない。