

The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert

Transcript

Opening song: Charlene, “Never Been to Me” (1976)

Hey, lady / You, lady / Cursing at your life. / You're a discontented mother / And a regimented wife. / I've no doubt you dream about / The things you'll never do. / But I wish someone had of talked to me / Like I want to talk to you. / Ooh, I've been to Georgia / And California / And anywhere I could run. / Took the hand of a preacher man / And we made love in the sun. / But I ran out of places / And friendly faces / Because I had to be free. / I've been to paradise / But I've never been to me.

☞ ドラッグクイーンが歌う (lip-sync) する女性の気持ち。映画のテーマがよく表れている。

0:06:29. How it happens

Tick: I've got to get some space. I've been asked to do a show out of town.

Bernadette: That's nice.

Tick: Why don't you come with me? I'll need some help and I think we could both use the break.

Bernadette: You're not wrong. Where is it?

Tick: Alice Springs.

Bernadette: You've got to be fucking joking.

(Tick attends to his customer.)

Tick: Hello?

Bernadette: How long is the run?

Tick: Four weeks. Equity minimum, two shows a night, accommodation included.

Bernadette: I can't just sit around here crying all the time. Jesus. My mascara keeps running. I look like a raccoon.

Tick: Good girl. That's the spirit.

Bernadette: Here's hoping the desert's big enough for two of us.

Tick: Um, three of us.

(Felicia sings.)

Bernadette: Why?

Tick: Why not? Look, he's turned into a bloody good little performer.

Bernadette: That's right. A bloody good little performer, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. I thought we're getting away from all this shit!

Felicia: Two's company, three's a party, Bernadette, my sweet.

Bernadette: We're unplugging out curling wands and going bush, Felicia. Why would you and leave all this glamour for a hike into the middle of nowhere?

Felicia: Do you really want to know?

Bernadette: Desperately.

Felicia: Well, ever since I was a lad, I had this dream, a dream that I now, finally, have a chance to fulfill.

Bernadette: And that is?

Felicia: To travel to the center of Australia, climb King's Canyon—as a queen—in a full-length Gautier sequin, heels, and a tiara.

Bernadette: Great. That's just what this country needs. . . a cock in a frock on a rock.

Tick: Get back in your kennels, both of you. Now, the first thing we have to work out is how the hell we're going to get there.

☞オープニング～旅に出るまで。都会での暮らしを離れて旅に出るのはなぜなのか、注意して観ておきたい。会話では、オーストラリア式の発音と口の悪さに注目。ドラッグクイーンや性転換者などは“queer”という蔑称で呼ばれることがあるが、そうした人々特有のスタイルも注目に値する。

0:16:06. On the road.

Tick: Perhaps we should have flown.

☞このシーンにはどういう意味があるだろうか。

00:23:19 Going out for drinks

Shirl: Well. Look what the cat dragged in. What have we got here, eh? A couple of show girls, have we? Where did you ladies come in from? Uranus?

Bernadette: Could I please have a St. . .

Shirl: No! You can't have. You can't have nothing. We've got nothing here for people like you. Nothing!

Bernadette: Now listen here, you mullet. Why don't you just light your tampon and blow your box apart? Because it's the only bang you're ever gonna get, sweetheart.

☞オーストラリアの飲酒文化。田舎 (bush) のバーは男たちの社交場になっている (mateship)。そこでは奇異な格好をしたよそ者への風当たりが強い。

00:32:20 Trapped in the outback

Bernadette: Oh, Felicia. Where the fuck are we?

Felicia: Shit!

Tick: Oh, shit. Well, I've had a look around and I think we can safely assume that I now know less about motors than when I first lifted up that. . . bonnety thing.

Bernadette: Now what?

Tick: Let's just not think about for the moment and eat brekkie, shall we?

Bernadette: Oh, that's a novel idea. Let's stuff ourselves to death. Imagine the headlines. “Whales beach themselves in the Outback.” “Mystery Boomsticks dead in drag.”

Felicia: There's no point in walking back. The only life I saw for the last million miles were the hypnotized bunnies. Mostly they're now wedged in the tires.

Tick: Somebody will drive past for sure. We'll keep the fire burning.

☞アウトバックの光景。昔から、荒野に消えて消息を絶つ事件が多くあった。探検・開拓時代から続く、オーストラリアの原風景。

1:10:02. Bernadette tries to console Felicia

Bernadette: It's funny. We all sit around mindlessly slagging off that vile stinkhole of a city, but in its own strange way it takes care of us. I don't know if that ugly wall of suburbia has been put there to stop them getting in or us getting out. Come on. Don't let it drag you down. Let it toughen you up. I can only fight because I've learned to. Being a man one day and a woman the next is not an easy thing to do.

⇒ 都会を離れて、都会での暮らしが違う意味を帯びてくる。

1:10:49 On the road again

Man: Sorry. Can't help you.

Bob: No worries, mate.

Tick: Well, are we bunny hopping all the way to Alice?

Bob: No good. He says the man to help is a fair way out of town.

Bernadette: Like how fair?

Bob: Couple hundred clicks fair. No matter. I've got nothing else to do today. Let's get out of here. Come on, Adam, we're not here.

1:16:33 At the hotel in Alice Springs

Doorman: Uh, excuse me sir. You can't park your bus here. Are you planning on staying at the hotel?

Tick: Sorry. Could you direct me to Marion Barber, please? We're the cabaret act from Sydney.

Doorman: Oh, right, right. Yeah. Just go through to reception and they'll take you right through.

Tick: Thanks.

Doorman: No worries. It's all right, Lenny. These are the drag queens.

Felicia: Come on, Bob. Let's go try on your new frock.

Doorman: G'day.

1:31:57. Felicia's dream comes true.

Felicia: I had a dream. . . . Well, we did it.

Bernadette: It never ends, does it? All that space.

Felicia: So what now?

Tick: I think I want to go home.

Felicia: Me, too.

Bernadette: Well, then. . . let's finish the shows and go home.

⇒ 帰る場所としての“home”の意味が、旅を経験することで変化した。

Australia

Transcript

Opening messages: Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islander viewers should exercise caution when

watching this film as it may contain images and voices of deceased persons.

⇒先住民の観客への注意。なぜこういったメッセージが出されるかは、映画の中で説明されている。

Historical background: After the bombing of Pearl Harbor on the 7th of December 1941, the Imperial Japanese Navy steamed south, unleashing their fire on Darwin, a city in the Northern Territory of Australia.

“The Territory” was a land of crocodiles, cattle barons and warrior chiefs where adventure and romance was a way of life.

It was also a place where Aboriginal children of mixed-race were taken by force from their families and trained for service in white society.

These children became known as the Stolen Generations.

⇒この説明は非常に重要。物語の後半、日本はどちらかという悪者として描かれている。ただし、島に軍隊が上陸したという事実はないので、そこはあくまで演出として理解したい。半世紀以上前の The Northern Territory の雰囲気と、白人と先住民の関係などはかなり史実に忠実に描かれているようだ。

オーストラリア出身の監督がオーストラリア出身の俳優を配して撮影した意欲作だが、残念ながら日本では壮大なラブストーリーとして宣伝されてしまった。しかしながら、英国からやってきた貴婦人が、戦争という時代背景の中で、地元のワイルドな男性と恋に落ちるという設定は、どこことなく『風と共に去りぬ』を彷彿とさせる。英国的なものオーストラリア的なものの対比、オーストラリア先住民が白人に向けるまなざし、楽園の現実に直面するなかで徐々に形成されていく “home” の感覚など、見どころは多い。

00:01:43. Nullah’s opening narration

My grandfather, King George, he take me walkabout. Teach me black fella way. Grandfather teach me most important lesson of all. Tell ’em story. That day I down the billabong. King George, he teach me how to catch ’em fish using magic song. See, I not black fella, I not white fella, either. Them white fellas call me mixed blood. Half-caste. Creamy. I belong no one. That day I see ’em, them white fellas, they were pushing them cheeky bulls across the river onto Carney land. King George angry at them white fellas. King George say them white fellas bad spirit. Must be taken from this land.

Them coppers come take me away! They want to put me on that Mission Island. Make me into a white fella. But they’re not coppers. And that first time I saw her, that Missus Boss. The strangest woman I ever seen! She’s not from this land. This land my people got many names for. But white fellas call it. . . Australia.

⇒Nullah の英語は文法が簡素化されたピジン英語 (pidgin English)。白人でもアボリジニでもないという彼の存在を象徴的に表している。祖父の King George が体現する世界と、Missus Boss こと Sarah Ashley の体現する世界との狭間で、Nullah は物語の語り手としての役割を果たすことになる。彼のナレーションが映画の「枠物語」(frame narrative) を成していると言えるが、そうした語りの視点設定には重要な意味があるだろう。彼は白人と先住民の間に立って、その両者がどう折り合いを付けていくのか

を見守り、時には積極的にその交渉に関わっていく。依然解決されていないオーストラリア社会の問題を、Nullah という「盗まれた世代」の眼を通して描いている点で、この映画にはきわめて政治的なテーマも込められている。

00: 12:59. Into the outback

Sarah: “Trusted man.” Typical of my husband.

Drover: Actually, your husband’s a pretty good bloke.

Sarah: Yes, well, he certainly knows how to choose his employees.

Drover: Employee?

Sarah: No wonder the place is bankrupt!

Drover: Lady, I’m not an employee.

Sarah: Really. So, you’re just driving me all the way out to Faraway Downs as a personal favor to my husband, are you?

Drover: No.

Sarah: Him being such a good bloke and all?

Drover: I’m driving you out there because he promised me a drove of 1,500 head of cattle.

Sarah: What? To buy?

Drover: No, you goose, to drove. I’m a drover, right? I move the cattle from A to B, all right? I work on commission. No man hires me, no man fires me.

Sarah: That’s. . .

Drover: Everything I own I can fit in my saddlebag, which is the way I like it.

Sarah: Yes, well, it’s all very outback adventure, isn’t it?

Drover: I’m not saying it’s for everyone.

Sarah: No. Definitely not for everyone.

Drover: Most people like to own things. You know, land, luggage, other people. Makes them feel secure. But all that can be taken away. And in the end, the only thing you really own is your story. Just trying to live a good one.

Sarah: Yes, yes, an adventure story. You sound just like my husband.

☞ Sarah と Drover の話の嘯み合わなさに注目。自らオーストラリアまで出向いてくるほどだから Sarah もかなり行動的な人物だが、アウトバックの現実に対しては無知で、いかにも英国人女性らしい理想を抱いている。一方の Drover は、オーストラリアの典型的で神話的なヒーロー像を体現している。つまり都市生活を嫌って荒野に生き、人間関係のしがらみや、文明世界の罪悪に背を向ける男性的で力強いヒーローである（クロコダイル・ダンディーなどもその一種）。こういう人物が現代オーストラリア人にアピールするのは、実際にはもうそのようなヒーローはどこにもいないからである。言い換えれば、典型

的なオーストラリアのアウトバックというものが、既に失われつつあるということである。

都市と荒野、文明と自然などの対比が、Sarah と Drover の関係のなかで寓意的に描き出されていることは間違いない。

“Over the Rainbow” from *The Wizard of Oz*

もう一点注目したいのは、映画『オズの魔法使い』から “Over the Rainbow” の歌が効果的に引用されていること。Sarah が母親を亡くした Nullah を慰めるために、たまたま手元にあった新聞に広告が載っていたこの映画の話をするのだが、後になって、『オズの魔法使い』がもう一つの枠物語になっていたことが分かる。

『オズの魔法使い』と言えば、主人公の少女が見知らぬ場所を旅し、最後は “home” が一番いいことに気づいて帰って行くというお話だが、『プリシラ』と同じように、『オーストラリア』も、“home” とは何かを再確認してそこに戻るといふ筋書きになっている。物語の終盤 Sarah が “Let’s go home” と言い、Drover が “There’s no place like it” と応えるところがあり、これはそのまま『オズ』からの引用になっている。その彼らは Nullah とともに牧場に戻って行くのだが、結末には少しだけひねりが加えてあって、“home” の件は必ずしも一件落着とはならない。

まとめ

『プリシラ』と『オーストラリア』に共通しているのは、オーストラリアの見知らぬ荒野を旅するなかで、次第に “home” が形成されていく、または再発見されていくというプロット展開である。近年のアメリカ映画では「家族」が大きなテーマになっているとよく言われるが、オーストラリアの場合も似ているかもしれない。ただし、オーストラリアと “home” の関係は、少し特殊な事情がありそうなので、さらに突き詰めて考えてみる必要があるだろう。

資料 1

Source: Atwood, Margaret. *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. 1972. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2004. 40-42.

A. National Symbols

I'd like to begin with a sweeping generalization and argue that every country or culture has a single unifying and informing symbol at its core. (Please don't take any of my oversimplifications as articles of dogma which allow of no exceptions; they are proposed simply to create vantage points from which the literature may be viewed.) The symbol, then—be it word, phrase, idea, image, or all of these—functions like a system of beliefs (it *is* a system of beliefs, though not always a formal one) which holds the country together and helps the people in it to co-operate for common ends.

B. American National Symbol

Possibly the symbol for America is The Frontier, a flexible idea that contains many elements dear to the American heart: it suggests a place that is *new*, where the old order can be discarded (as it was when America was instituted by a crop of disaffected Protestants, and later at the time of the Revolution); a line that is always expanding, taking in or “conquering” ever-fresh virgin territory (be it The West, the rest of the world, outer space, Poverty or The Regions of the Mind); it holds out a hope, never fulfilled but always promised, of Utopia, the perfect human society. Most twentieth century American literature is about the gap between the promise and the actuality, between the imagined ideal Golden West or City Upon a Hill, the model for all the world postulated by the Puritans, and the actual squalid materialism, dotty small town, nasty city, or redneck-filled outback. Some Americans have even confused the actuality with the promise: in that case Heaven is a Hilton hotel with a Coke machine in it.

C. English National Symbol

The corresponding symbol for England is perhaps The Island, convenient for obvious reasons. In the Seventeenth century a poet called Phineas Fletcher wrote a long poem called *The Purple Island*, which is based on an extended body-as-island metaphor, and, dreadful though the poem is, that's the kind of island I mean: island-as-body, self-contained, a Body Politic, evolving organically, with a hierarchical structure in which the King is the Head, the statesmen the hands, the peasants or farmers or workers the feet, and so on. The Englishman's home as his castle if the popular form of this symbol, the feudal castle being not only an insular structure but a self-contained microcosm of the entire Body Politic.

D. Canadian National Symbol

The central symbol for Canada—and this is based on numerous instances of its occurrence in both English and French Canadian literature—is undoubtedly Survival, *la Survivance*. Like the Frontier and The Island, it is a multifaceted and adaptable idea. For early explorers and settlers, it meant bare survival in the face of “hostile” elements and/or natives: carving out a place and a way of keeping alive. But the word can also suggest survival of a crisis or disaster, like a hurricane or a wreck, and many Canadian poems have this kind of survival as a theme; what you might call “grim” survival as opposed to “bare” survival. For French Canada after the English took over it became cultural survival, hanging on as a people, retaining a religion and a language under an alien government. And in English Canada now while the Americans are taking over it is acquiring a similar meaning. There is another use of the word as well: a survival can be a vestige of a vanished order which has managed to persist after its time is past, like a primitive reptile. This version crops up in Canadian thinking too, usually among those who believe that Canada is obsolete.

E. Canadian National Symbol 2: What It Means

But the main idea is the first one: hanging on, staying alive. Canadians are forever taking the national pulse like doctors at a sickbed: the aim is not to see whether the patient will live well but simply whether he will live at all. Our central idea is one which generates, not the excitement and sense of adventure or danger which The Frontier holds out, not the smugness and/or sense of security, of everything in its place, which The Island can offer, but an almost intolerable anxiety. Our stories are likely to be tales not of those who made it but of those who made it back from the awful experience—the North, the snowstorm, the sinking ship—that killed everyone else. The survivor has no triumph or victory but the fact of his survival; he has little after his ordeal that he did not have before, except gratitude for having escaped with his life.

Activities

- パラグラフ A～E をよく読んでください。まずは細かいところは無視して、「何について書いてあるか」を理解するように努めてください。
- パラグラフ B、C、D をそれぞれのグループに割り当てますので、じっくり読んでください。英語の表現が分かりにくいところや、リサーチの必要な話題にチェックを入れておいてください。
- グループで話し合い、文章をどう解釈するかを決めて、発表用の原稿を作成します。補足の資料が必要な場合は、ウェブ上でサーチしてみてください。
- Impress を使って、説明用の簡単な資料を作成します。
- 各パラグラフについて、クラスの前で発表していただきます。
- 発表で使用した Impress のファイルは、講師に提出してください。

※講師が各グループを回りますので、コンピュータの使い方や資料のまとめ方その他の質問がありましたら、何でも聞いてください。

資料 2

Source: Bingham, Harry. *This Little Britain: How One Small Country Built the Modern World*. London: Fourth Estate, 2007. 321-330.

F. British Origin of Football

Although records exist of other foot- and ball-based games, such as the Chinese *cuju* or the Japanese *kemari*, the forerunner of football seems to have been largely concentrated in Celtic and Anglo-Saxon areas, and it seems more than likely that the Anglo-Saxons took the game from the Celts. By medieval times, the game was popular enough that it had to be banned. Often. Edward II, Henry V, Edward IV, Henry VII and Henry VIII all sought to ban or restrict the sport, with obvious lack of success. The sport continued—rough, fast, unlegislated—into the nineteenth century, played by the working classes of town and country, and by the public schoolboys who aped the same sports. There were no fixed rules to these games, beyond certain local customary forms. Some variants of the game involved plenty of handling, other variants less. There was no such thing as a foul and “hacking”, or chopping away at an opponent’s shins, was a core part of the sport’s delights.

G. Renaissance of Football

When Joseph Strutt surveyed the sports of England in 1801, he said of football that “the game was formerly much in vogue among the common people, though of late years it seems to have fallen into disrepute and is but little practised.” Overlooked by aristocrats, disliked by urbanites, reduced by rural depopulation, campaigned against by Methodists, the game seemed destined to peter out.

What saved it was the collision between the emerging Victorian ethic of Christian manliness and the unreconstructed thuggishness of those public school sports. Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby school from 1828 to 1842, launched the reform programme for public schools generally, though he himself had little interest in sport. Nevertheless, some of his key disciples became evangelical on the topic. Sports, properly organized and played, might turn those individualistic thugs into responsible team players; God would surely prefer honest, rule-bound, collective endeavour to all that physical scrapping; and just possibly, if all those hormonal teenagers could be rendered tired enough, then they might keep their hands away from their own (or each other’s) private parts. While it’s safe to say that not every one of those hopes was fulfilled, public schools suddenly found a passion for sport which had never once been there before.

H. Setting the Rules

As the new generations of public schoolboys made their way on into the universities and armed forces, the philosophy spread, and as it did so one particular problem became prominent. It was all very well for one particular school to fashion its own particular rules for its own particular game, but what if one school team wanted to play another? Worse still, what game would be played by a mixed bunch of Old Harrovians, Etonians, Wykehamists, Carthusians and so on once they got to Oxford or Cambridge? Compromise was both required and hard to find. For decades, the problem lingered on,

unresolved, plagued by issues of tradition and prestige. Finally, in 1863, a group of former public schoolboys met in London to hammer out a common code. The two principal difficulties arose from the dispute between those who favoured a kicking/dribbling game and those preferring a catching/running one, and between those who favoured “hacking” and those who wanted to ban such physical contact. Finally, and after compromise with a near-simultaneous codification effort based in Sheffield, the Association Football rules weren’t simply agreed on paper, but on the mud and turf of the nation’s pitches. In 1871, the aficionados of handling set up their own Rugby Football Union.

I. “Clubbishness” Characterizes the British Culture

Most societies in the world used bows and arrows, yet Brits were the first to set up archery clubs and tournaments for fun. Though countless people have ridden horses, it took Brits to think that clubs and rules were essential. In sailing and rowing too, the same thing happened. All the oldest sports clubs in the world are British: the Southampton Town Bowling Club (1299), the Society of Kilwinning Archers (1483), the Guild of the Fraternity of St George (1537), the Kilsyth Curling Club (1716), the Royal Cork Yacht Club (1720), and the Edinburgh Skating Club and the Honourable Society of Edinburgh Golfers (both 1744). As soon as you have clubs, you need rules: what’s permitted?; what’s not permitted?; how should competitions be organized?; who can our club compete against? That habit of clubbishness is the clue, the reason why the pastimes of others became sports of ours.

So why were we so very clubbable? The answer must surely lie in how very organized the country was. From Anglo-Saxon times on, the country was ordered, from national parliament down to local parish or manor. Members of Parliament were appointed or elected; laws were made, were locally applied, were enforced through the courts. Nowhere else was society as minutely ordered; nowhere else was that order so little disrupted by war, conquest or revolution. Nowhere else was physical roughhousing less likely to spill over into serious crime.

And perhaps that’s the secret: British love of rough-and-tumble games plus British clubbishness equals the British creation of sport. If so, it would be tempting to do as most historians have done, and relegate the whole story of sport to little more than a colourful footnote to the main story of Britain. Tempting, but wrong. Clubbishness *matters*. It’s the insight of Robert Putnam, an American social scientist, whose book *Bowling Alone* traced the vast amount of social capital stored in a nation’s clubs and associations. That social capital manifests itself as economic success, better health, social cohesiveness—all the good things a society seeks. If Britain was vastly more associative as a nation than others, then it almost certainly had way more social capital too. That’s no mere footnote; that’s an observation that goes to the heart of what has made Britain distinctive, what has shaped British national success.

D. John F. Kennedy, Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speech (Los Angeles, July 15, 1960)

(JFK の大統領就任の後半部分。かつて「最後のフロンティア」と呼ばれたカリフォルニアの地で、新世代のリーダーとして自分を売り込むために、JFK は「新たなフロンティア」に言及している。)

For I stand tonight facing west on what was once the last frontier. From the lands that stretch three thousand miles behind me, the pioneers of old gave up their safety, their comfort and sometimes their own lives to build a new world here in the West. They were not the captives of their own doubts, the prisoners of their own price tags. Their motto was not “every man for himself” but “all for the common cause.” They were determined to make that new world strong and free, to overcome its hazards and its hardships, to conquer the enemies that threatened from without and within.

Today some would say that those struggles are all over – that all the horizons have been explored – that all the battles have been won – that there is no longer an American frontier.

But I trust that no one in this vast assemblage will agree with those sentiments. For the problems are not all solved and the battles are not all won – and we stand today on the edge of a New Frontier – the frontier of the 1960's – a frontier of unknown opportunities and perils, a frontier of unfulfilled hopes and threats.

Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom promised our nation a new political and economic framework. Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal promised security and succor to those in need. But the New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises, it is a set of challenges. It sums up not what I intend to offer the American people, but what I intend to ask of them. It appeals to their pride, not to their pocketbook – it holds out the promise of more sacrifice instead of more security.

But I tell you the New Frontier is here, whether we seek it or not. Beyond that frontier are the uncharted areas of science and space, unsolved problems of peace and war, unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and surplus. It would be easier to shrink back from that frontier, to look to the safe mediocrity of the past, to be lulled by good intentions and high rhetoric – and those who prefer that course should not cast their votes for me regardless of party.

But I believe the times demand new invention, innovation, imagination, decision. I am asking each of you to be pioneers on that New Frontier. My call is to the young in heart, regardless of age – to all who respond to the Scriptural call: “Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed.”

E. John Winthrop, “A Model of Christian Charity” (1630)

(John Winthrop はマサチューセッツ・ベイ植民地総督としてイギリスから派遣された。到着間際に船上で行った以下のスピーチが、一般に「丘の上の町」演説と呼ばれるものである。「汝の敵を愛せ」や俗に黄金律と呼ばれる「何でも人にしてもらいたいと思うことは、その人にしなさい」などで有名で、「豚に真珠」「砂上の楼閣」といった言いまわしの出典でもある新約聖書「マタイによる福音書」中の「山頂の垂訓」を下敷きになっている。)

Now the onely way to avoyde this shipwracke and to provide for our posterity is to followe the Counsell of Micah, to doe Justly, to love mercy, to walke humbly with our God, for this end, wee must be knitt together in this worke as one man, wee must entertaine each other in brotherly Affeccion, wee must be willing to abridge our selves of our superfluties, for the supply of others necessities, wee must uphold a familiar Commerce together in all meekenes, gentlenes, patience and liberallity, wee must delight in eache other, make others Conditions our owne rejoyce together, mourne together, labour, and suffer together, allwayes haveing before our eyes our Commission and Community in the worke, our Community as members of the same body, soe shall wee keepe the unitie of the spirit in the bond of peace, the Lord will be our God and delight to dwell among us, as his owne people and will commaund a blessing upon us in all our wayes, soe that wee shall see much more of his wisdome power goodnes and truthe then formerly wee have beene acquainted with, wee shall finde that the God of Israell is among us, when tenn of us shall be able to resist a thousand of our enemies, when hee shall make us a prayse and glory, that men shall say of succeeding plantacions: the lord make it like that of New England: for wee must Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the eies of all people are uppon us; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke wee have undertaken and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a byword through the world, wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speake evill of the wayes of god and all professours for Gods sake; wee shall shame the faces of many of gods worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into Cursses upon us till wee be consumed out of the good land whether wee are going: And to shutt upp this discourse with that exhortacion of Moses that faithfull servant of the Lord in his last farewell to Israell Deut. 30. Beloved there is now sett before us life, and good, deathe and evill in that wee are Commaunded this day to love the Lord our God, and to love one another to walke in his wayes and to keepe his Commaundements and his Ordinance, and his lawes, and the Articles of our Covenant with him that wee may live and be multiplyed, and that the Lord our God may blesse us in the land whether wee goe to possesse it: But if our heartes shall turne away soe that wee will not obey, but shall be seduced and worshipp other Gods our pleasures, and proffitts, and serve them, it is propounded unto us this day, wee shall surely perishe out of the good Land whether wee passe over this vast Sea to possesse it;

Therefore lett us choose life, / that wee, and our Seede, /may live; by obeyeing his voyce, and cleaveing to him, / for hee is our life, and / our prosperity.

※地理的概念としての「フロンティア」が、アメリカの発展は神の祝福を受けた使命であるという意識と結びつくことで、アメリカ例外主義（American exceptionalism）が生まれた。またアメリカを世界に誇るモデル社会であるとみなす考えも、植民初期から既に存在していた。JFK の演説からも分かるように、既にアメリカの大地にはフロンティアが存在せず、キリスト教的な選民思想も意味を失いつつある時代においても、シンボルとしての「フロンティア」は、アメリカを駆動する力を持ち続けている。バラク・オバマがいう“Change”とは、まさにフロンティア精神の発露であり、きわめてアメリカ的な価値を思い起こさせるシンボルなのである。

資料 2

出典：上岡伸雄編著『名演説で学ぶアメリカの文化と社会』研究社、2009年

A. Barack Obama, Keynote Speech at the Democratic National Convention (Boston, July 27, 2004)

John Kerry believes in America. And he knows that it's not enough for just some of us to prosper—for alongside our famous individualism, there's another ingredient in the American saga, a belief that we're all connected as one people. . . . It is that fundamental belief: I am my brother's keeper. I am my sister's keeper that makes this country work. It's what allows us to pursue our individual dreams and yet still come together as one American family. . . .

Now even as we speak, there are those who are preparing to divide us—the spin masters, the negative ad peddlers who embrace the politics of “anything goes.” Well, I say to them tonight, there is not a liberal America and a conservative America—there is the United States of America. There is not a Black America and a White America and Latino America and Asian America—there's the United States of America. . . . We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the stars and stripes, all of us defending the United States of America.

In the end, that is God's greatest gift to us, the bedrock of this nation. A belief in things not seen. A belief that there are better days ahead. I believe that we can give our middle class relief and provide working families with a road to opportunity. I believe we can provide jobs to the jobless, homes to the homeless, and reclaim young people in cities across America from violence and despair. I believe that we have a righteous wind at our backs and that we stand on the crossroads of history, we can make the right choices, and meet the challenges that face us.

America! Tonight, if you feel the same energy that I do, if you feel the same urgency that I do, if you feel the same passion that I do, if you feel the same hopefulness that I do—if we do what we must do, then I have no doubt that all across the country, from Florida to Oregon, from Washington to Maine, the people will rise up in November, and John Kerry will be sworn in as President, and John Edwards will be sworn in as Vice President, and this country will reclaim its promise, and out of this long political darkness a brighter day will come.

B. Barack Obama, Running for the presidential election (Philadelphia, March 18, 2008)

“We the people, in order to form a more perfect union.” Two hundred and twenty years ago, in a hall that still stands across the street, a group of men gathered and, with these simple words, launched America's improbable experiment in democracy. Farmers and scholars, statesmen and patriots who had traveled across the ocean to escape tyranny and persecution finally made real their Declaration of Independence at a Philadelphia convention that lasted through the spring of 1787.

The document they produced was eventually signed, but ultimately unfinished. It was stained by

this nation's original sin of slavery, a question that divided the colonies and brought the convention to a stalemate until the founders chose to allow the slave trade to continue for at least 20 more years, and to leave any final resolution to future generations. Of course, the answer to the slavery question was already embedded within our Constitution—a Constitution that had at its very core the ideal of equal citizenship under the law; a Constitution that promised its people liberty and justice, and a union that could be and should be perfected over time.

And yet words on a parchment would not be enough to deliver slaves from bondage, or provide men and women of every color and creed their full rights and obligations as citizens of the United States. What would be needed were Americans in successive generations who were willing to do their part. . . to narrow that gap between the promise of our ideals and the reality of their time.

This was one of the tasks we set forth at the beginning of this presidential campaign: to continue the long march of those who came before us, a march for a more just, more equal, more free, more caring, and more prosperous America. I chose to run for President at this moment in history because I believe deeply that we cannot solve the challenges of our time unless we solve them together, unless we perfect our union by understanding that we may have different stories, but we hold common hopes; that we may not look the same and may not have come from the same place, but we all want to move in the same direction: towards a better future for our children and our grandchildren.

C. Barack Obama, Proclamation of victory (Chicago, November 4, 2008)

This election had many firsts and many stories that will be told for generations. But one that's on my mind tonight is about a woman who cast her ballot in Atlanta. She's a lot like the millions of others who stood in line to make their voice heard in this election except for one thing: Ann Nixon Cooper is 106 years old. She was born just a generation past slavery; a time when there were no cars on the road or planes in the sky; when someone like her couldn't vote for two reasons—because she was a woman and because of the color of her skin.

And tonight, I think about all that she's seen throughout her century in America—the headache and the hope; the struggle and the progress; the times we were told that we can't, and the people who pressed one with that American creed: Yes we can.

At the time when women's voices were silenced and their hopes dismissed, she lived to see them stand up and speak out and reach for the ballot. Yes we can. . . .

A man touched down on the moon, a wall came down in Berlin, a world was connected by our own science and imagination. And this year, in this election, she touched her finger to a screen, and cast her vote, because after 106 years in America, through the best of times and darkest of hours, she

knows how America can change. Yes we can.

America, we have come so far. We have seen so much. But there is so much more to do. So tonight, let us ask ourselves—if our children should live to see the next century; if my daughters should be so lucky to live as long as Ann Nixon Cooper, what change will they see? What progress will we have made? This is our chance to answer that call. This is our moment. This is our time—to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace; to reclaim the American Dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth—that out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism, and doubt, and those who tell us that we can't, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes we can. Thank you, God bless you. And may God bless the United States of America.

D. Bruce Springsteen, An endorsement speech for Obama (Philadelphia, October 4, 2008)

I've spent 35 years writing about America, its people, and the meaning of the American Promise. That's the promise that was handed down to us, right here in this city from our Founding Fathers, with one instruction and that was: Do your best to make these things real: It was opportunity, equality, social-economic justice, a fair shake for all of our citizens—the American idea, as a positive influence, around the world for a more just and peaceful existence. These are the things that give our lives hope, and they give our lives shape and meaning. And these are the ties that bind us together and give us faith in our contract with one another.

I've spent most of my creative life measuring the distance between the American promise and American reality. And for many Americans, who are today losing their jobs, and their homes, . . . who have no healthcare, who have been abandoned in our inner cities, the distance between that promise and that reality has never been greater or more painful for people.

Now I believe that Senator Obama has taken the measure of that distance in his own life and in his work. And I think he understands in his heart the cost of that distance in blood and in suffering, in the lives of everyday Americans. And I believe that as President—I think he would work to restore that promise to so many of our fellow citizens who have justifiably lost faith in its meaning. After the disastrous Administration of the past eight years, what we really need is we need somebody to lead us in an American reclamation project.

Now in my job, I travel around the world and I occasionally play big stadiums, just like Senator Obama. And I've continued to find, wherever I go, that America remains a repository of people's hopes and possibilities and desires, and that despite the terrible erosion to our standing in the world,

accomplished by our recent Administration, we remain for many, many people this House of Dreams. And one thousand George Bushes and one thousand Dick Cheneys will never be able to tear that house down. . . .

So, I say now's the time to stand with Barack Obama and Joe Biden, roll up our sleeves, and come on up for the rising.

資料3

A. 多様なものをいかにして統合するか

(...) 確かに近年急激にアメリカの人口構成、文化が多元化し多様化しているが、元来、アメリカという国は昔から多民族的な社会ではなかったか。昔から人種的にも民族的にもいろいろな人種・民族があり、したがって文化的にも宗教的にもきわめて多様であったのであって、その多元性・多様性はアメリカ社会の形成以来つきまとっていることではなかったか、ということがまず話の前提になります。(...)

そういう意味で、アメリカ社会は元来「ストレンジヤーズ」、相互に他者、よそ者、知らない者同士、見知らぬ者同士の社会である。(...) したがって、それだけに、そういう元来縁のない人間がどうやって一つのアメリカ社会を構成するのか、一つのアメリカという国を構成するのかということがアメリカの昔からの一つの大きな課題であったわけです。

では、そういう本来別々のもの、分裂しそうなものをいかに統合していくのか、ユナイトしていく契機は何か。一つは、互いの間の契約関係ではないか。他者同士が契約を相互に結んで縁を作る（法縁？）ということがあります。しかし、そういう法的な契約関係で無縁の者を結び合わせるだけでは、ほんとうの一つのまとまり、ナショナル・コミュニティというものは出来にくい。そうするとそこにもう一つ、何か共通な考え方とか価値の観念とか、あるいは信条というところ堅苦しくなりますが、クリード、——そういうものを育てていく、共有することが必要であったと言えるのではないかと思います。(斉藤 344-345)

B. 「メイフラワー誓約」全文

(この誓約は、イギリスからの移民をアメリカの植民地に運んできたメイフラワー号の船上で読み上げられたものである。当初予定していた場所に上陸できず、乗客の間で意見の食い違いが生じ、それぞれ別行動を取ろうという雰囲気になった。そこで全員をまとめ上げるための「契約書」として、この誓約が急遽作られたと考えられている。)

Mayflower Compact, Agreement Between the Settlers at New Plymouth (1620)

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King *James*, by the Grace of God, of *Great Britain, France, and Ireland*, King, *Defender of the Faith*, &c. Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of *Virginia*; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid: And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general Good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience. IN WITNESS whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at *Cape-Cod* the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King *James*, of *England, France, and Ireland*, the eighteenth, and of *Scotland* the fifty-fourth, *Anno Domini* 1620.

「メイフラワー誓約」邦訳

神の名に於いて、アーメン。我等の統治者たる君主、又神意により英王国（グレート・ブリトン）、フランス及びアイルランドの王にして又信仰の擁護者たるジェームズ王の忠誠なる臣民たる我等下名は、神の栄光のため、基督教の信仰の増進のため、及び我が国王と祖国の名誉のために、ヴァージニアの北部地方に於ける最初の植民地を創設せんとして航海を企てたものであるが、ここに本証書により、厳肅かつ相互に契約し、神と各自相互の前で、契約により結合して政治団体を作り、以て我等の共同の秩序と安全を保ち進め、且つ上掲の目的の遂行を図ろうとする。そして今後之に基き、植民地一般の幸福のため最も適当と認められる所により、随時、正義公正な、法律、命令等を発し、憲法を制定し、又公職を組織すべく、我等はすべて之等に対し、当然の服従をすべきことを誓約する。A・D・1620年、英王国、フランス及びアイルランド王としてのジェームズ王の治世の第18年、スコットランド王としての治世第54年、11月11日、ケープコッドに於いて、

以下41名の署名
(高木八尺訳：斎藤 358-359)

C. 独立宣言が生み出す新たな共通の価値

アメリカ社会というのは、結局、当初はヨーロッパから、後には世界各地から人種・民族・宗教・文化その他の異なる人たちが移住してきて形成した、あるいは形成しつつある社会です。その意味で、繰り返しになりますが、本質的には他者、よそ者、見知らぬ者同士の集団です。それを一つの社会に統合していくという場合、一つには法的な契約で相互をまとめて一つの政治体を作っていくことが必要になります。植民地時代に西へ移住しますと、その移住した人たちの間でそういう契約を作って、新しいタウンを作り、後から来た人はその契約に参加するという形を取ります。(…) 独立にさいし、かくして13のステイトが出来るわけですが、そういう各ステイトを代表する人びとが1787年に集まり、今度はアメリカ全体を一つの国にする、「ザ・ユナイテッド・ステイツ」形成の案を作る。ユナイテッド・ステイツというのは、それまでは国家の集まりであったのですが、「われわれ、ユナイテッド・ステイツの人民が」合衆国憲法を制定することによって、ザ・ユナイテッド・ステイツ・オブ・アメリカを改めて一つの国家にする。つまり、歴史的に、アメリカ社会は、元来多元的なものを契約で結んで一つのものに統合するということをしてきたと思います。

ただ、その場合にもう一つ重要なことは、ただ縁なき者が何か契約で結ばれるということだけではなく、やはりそこに何か共通の価値、信条を共有するということが前提とされるということです。先ほど申し上げたように、このプリマスの場合には、ピューリタンもよそ者も広い意味のプロテスタントですから、「神の栄光のために」とか、あるいはいずれもイギリス人ですから「祖国のために」ということで共通の目的を持ち得たわけです。しかし、その後アメリカ社会にいろいろな人々が移住してくる。ドイツ、フランスからも来る、カトリック系の人も来る、ユダヤ教の人も少しではあるが来るということになります。さらに、啓蒙主義の影響も出てくる、理神論も不可知論も入るということになると、もう「神の栄光のために」というわけにはいかない。より広く共有できるものが必要とされてきます。個人的にはそれぞれ別の信仰、別の考え方をもちつつ、しかし、アメリカ社会全体としてそれらと矛盾しない一つの共通の価値を持つ必要がある。それを、提示したのが独立宣言ではないでしょうか。

独立宣言というのは、イギリスから独立するというだけの宣言ではございません。「独立宣言」と呼ばれておりますが（正式にはそういうタイトルはついておりません）、元来は、なぜイギリスから独立しなければならぬか、という理由、大義。コースの宣言です。イギリスから分離する大義が、実は同時に、これからアメリカという新しい国（当初は国の連合ですが）を作っていく大義になるわけです。そういう意味で、独立宣言はイギリスからの分離宣言であるが、同時に、アメリカを統合する統合宣言でもあると私は解釈しております。

D. 独立宣言

Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776)

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. . . .

独立宣言邦訳

我々は、次の真理は別に説明を必要としないほど明らかなものであると信じる。すなわち、全て人間は平等に作られている。全て人間は創造主によって、誰にも譲ることのできない一定の権利を与えられている。これらの権利の中には、生命、自由、そして幸福の追求が含まれる。これらの権利を確保するために、人びとの間に政府が設置されるのであって、政府の権力はそれに被治者が同意を与える場合にのみ、正当とされるのである。いかなる形体の政府であれ、こうした政府本来の目的を破壊するようになれば、そうした政府をいつでも改変し廃止することは国民の権利である。そして、国民の安全と幸福とに最も役立つと思われる原理や権限組織に基づいて、新しい政府を設立する権利を国民は持っている。(斉藤真訳：斉藤 134)

E. Constitution of the United States: Preamble

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

F. Abraham Lincoln, The Gettysburg Address (Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, November 19, 1863)

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that this nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate. . . we cannot consecrate. . . we cannot hallow. . . this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can

never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us. . . that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

G. Martin Luther King, Jr. "I have a dream" (Lincoln Memorial, Washington D.C., August 28, 1963)

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. And so we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition.

In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the "unalienable Rights" of "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note, insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds". . .

We cannot walk alone. And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. . . .

Let us not wallow in the valley of despair, I say to you today, my friends.

And so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a *dream* today!

I have a dream that one day, down in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of "interposition" and "nullification" -- one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a *dream* today!

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; "and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together."

This is our hope, and this is the faith that I go back to the South with. . . .

And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. And so let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that: Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia. Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee. Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

And when this happens, when we allow freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when *all* of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual:

Free at last! Free at last!

Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!

H. アメリカは分裂しているのか——資料2、スピーチAについての反論

Barack Obama's speech to the Democratic National Convention was widely applauded, in part, we suspect, because many heard it as a welcome call for reconciliation—a plea for Americans to overcome their differences and discover their commonalities. As we will show in Chapters 3-6, however, contemporary Americans are not particularly polarized in their political positions, nor have they become appreciably more so in recent decades. Widespread beliefs to the contrary notwithstanding, the notion of a deeply divided population is largely a myth. (Fiorina, et al. 11-12)

資料1

Source: Bryson, Bill. *I'm a Stranger Here Myself: Notes on Returning to America After Twenty Years Away*. New York: Broadway Books, 1999. 101-104.

A. An astonishing research result

A researcher at the University of California at Berkeley recently made a study of the nation's

walking habits and found that the average person in the United States walks less than 75 miles a year—about 1.4 miles a week, barely 350 yards a day. I'm no stranger to sloth myself, but that's appallingly little. I rack up more mileage than that just looking for the channel changer.

Eighty-percent of us, according to the Berkeley study, are “essentially” sedentary and 35 percent are “totally” sedentary. We have become a nation of sitters and riders.

One of the things my wife and I wanted when we decided to move back to America was to live in a manageably sized town within walking distance of a central business district. Hanover, where we settled, is a small, typical New England town, pleasant, sedate, and compact. It has a broad central green surrounded by the venerable buildings of Dartmouth College, a trim Main Street, and leafy residential streets. It is, in short, an agreeable, easy place to go about one's business on foot, and yet as far as I can tell no one does.

I walk to town nearly every day when I am at home. I go to the post office or library or bookstore, and sometimes, if I am feeling particularly debonair, I stop at Rosey Jekes Cafe for a cappuccino. Occasionally in the evenings my wife and I stroll up to the Nugget Theater for a movie or to Murphy's for a beer. All this is a big part of my life and I wouldn't dream of doing it other than on foot. People have gotten used to this curious and eccentric behavior now, but several times in the early days passing acquaintances would slow by the curb and ask if I wanted a ride.

“But, I'm going your way,” they would insist when I politely declined. “Really, it's no bother.”

“Honestly, I enjoy walking.”

“Well, if you're absolutely *sure*,” they would say and depart reluctantly, even guiltily, as if leaving the scene of an accident without giving their name.

B. Why so fit?

People have become so habituated to using the car for everything that it would never occur to them to unfurl their legs and see what those lower limbs can do. It is worth noting that 93 percent of all trips outside the property in the United States now involve the use of a car. . . .

We have reached an age where college students expect to drive between classes, where parents will get in a car and drive three blocks to pick up their children from a friend's house, where the mailman takes his van up and down every driveway on a street. We will go through the most extraordinary contortions to save ourselves twenty feet of walking.

Sometimes it's almost ludicrous. The other day I was in the little nearby town of Etna waiting to bring home one of my children from a piano lesson when a car stopped outside the local post office and a man about my age popped out and dashed inside (and left the engine running—something else that exercises me inordinately). He was inside for about three or four minutes, then came out, got in the car, and drove exactly sixteen feet (I had nothing better to do so I paced it off) to the general store next door, and popped in again, engine still running.

And the thing is, this man looked really fit. I'm sure he jogs extravagant distances and plays squash and does all kinds of exuberantly healthful things, but I'm just as sure that he drives to each of these undertakings. It's crazy. An acquaintance of ours was complaining the other day about the

difficulty of finding a place to park outside the local gymnasium. She goes there several times a week to walk on a treadmill. The gymnasium is, at most, a six-minute walk from her front door. I asked her why she doesn't walk to the gym and do six minutes less on the treadmill.

C. Not a place for pedestrians

According to a concerned and faintly horrified recent editorial in the *Boston Globe*, the United States spends less than 1 percent of its \$25 billion-a-year highway budget on facilities for pedestrians. Actually, I'm surprised it's that much. Go to almost any suburb developed in the last thirty years and you will not find a sidewalk anywhere. Often you won't find a single pedestrian crossing.

I had this brought home to me last summer when we were driving across Maine and stopped for coffee on Route 1 in one of those endless zones of shopping malls, motels, gas stations, and fast food places that sprout everywhere these days. I noticed there was a bookstore across the street, so I decided to skip coffee and pop over. I needed a particular book for some work I was doing and anyway I figured this would give my wife a chance to spend some important quality time with four restive, overheated children.

Although the bookstore was no more than seventy or eighty feet away, I discovered that there was no way to get there on foot. There was a traffic outlet for cars, but no provision for pedestrians, and no way to cross on foot without dodging over six lanes of swiftly moving traffic. In the end, I had to get in our car and drive across. There was simply no other way. At the time it seemed ridiculous and exasperating, but afterward I realized that I was possibly the only person ever even to have entertained the notion of negotiating that intersection on foot.

The fact is, we not only don't walk anywhere anymore in this country, we *won't* walk anywhere, and woe to anyone who tries to make us, as a town here in New Hampshire called Laconia discovered to its cost. A few years ago, Laconia spent \$5 million pedestrianizing its downtown, to make it a pleasant shopping environment. Esthetically it was a triumph—urban planners came from all over to coo and take photos—but commercially it was a disaster. Forced to walk one whole block from a parking lot, shoppers abandoned downtown Laconia for suburban malls.

In 1994, Laconia dug up its pretty brick paving, took away the benches, tubs of geranium, and decorative trees, and put the street back to the way it had been in the first place. Now people can park right in front of the stores again, and downtown Laconia thrives anew.

And if that isn't sad, I don't know what is.

資料2

Source: Powers, Richard. *Operation Wandering Soul*. 1993. New York: Perennial, 2002. 5-8.

D. Cruising?

Kraft cruises down the Golden State: would it were so. “Cruise” is a generous figure of speech at best, label from another time and biome still imbued with quaint, midcentury vigor, the incurably sanguine suggestion of motion more forward than lateral. “Cruise” is for the *Autobahn*, the Jet Stream, Club Med. What’s the real word, local parlance? Shoosh. Shunt. Slalom.

(クラフトはゴールデン・ステートをクルーズする。もしそう言っていえばだが。「クルーズ」とは気前の良い言葉のあやで、古風な世紀中頃の活気と、横方向よりも前方への動きという救い難いほど楽天的な考えが染みついた、別の時代の別の生物群系に属する名称だ。「クルーズ」とは、アウトバーンやジェット・ストリームやクラブ・メッドのための言葉だ。本当は何と言うのだろう、地元の言葉では。シーシュ。シャント。スラロームだろうか。)

- ・ midcentury とは、第二次世界大戦を経て、戦後の繁栄期までを指す。アメリカの黄金時代としてしばしばノスタルジックの対象となる。当時はどこまでも前向きに発展していけるという雰囲気があった。
- ・ アウトバーンはご存じドイツの自動車専用道路。一般に信じられているのとは異なってちゃんと制限速度があるが、高速で飛ばしても大丈夫な道の代名詞となっている。後ほど引用中にナチスの話が出てくるが、これは、ヒットラーがアウトバーンの整備に力を注いだという事実に関及している。

E. Lane changes

Several hoods in front of him, sleek little fuel-injected Alpha particle manned by sandalwood-haired guy hugging cellular phone swaps places with convertible Stuttgart-apparatus piloted by blond bombshell lip-synching to the same song Kraft himself has tuned in on the radio. Eight seconds later, for no reason in creation, the two swap back. The exchange is duplicated all across the event horizon, a synchronized, pointless, mass red shift.

(数台先では、携帯電話を握りしめたくすんだ金髪の男が乗った燃料満タンのアルファ粒子が、クラフトが聞いているラジオ局から流れているのと同じ曲に合わせて口を動かすブロードのセクシーな女が操るシュトゥットガルト製のコンバーチブルと入れ替わる。八秒後、全く何の理由もなく、二台は再び入れ替わる。そのやりとりは事象の地平一面に繰り返される、シンクロした、無意味な質量赤方偏移だ。)

- ・ lip-synching とは、いわゆる「口パク」のこと。歌に合わせて声は出さずに口だけ動かす。英米のゴシップ紙では、どの歌手が lip-synch したとかしなかったとかという記事をよく見かける。
- ・ 事象の地平、赤方偏移はともに物理学・天文学の用語。前者はブラックホールの入口の所にある境界線で、それ以上進むと逃れられなくなる地点を指し、後者は光などの波長が長くなり、光でいえば赤色の方へずれる現象を指す。作者 Powers はもともと物理学専攻なので、しばしばこういった用語が小説に登場する。

F. Kraft's experiment

Fortunately, most everyone is a diploma holder here. Driver's Ed: the backbone of the high school certificate. One might emerge from the system unable to add, predicate, or point to Canada on a map, but thanks to rigorous requirements would still be able to Aim High in Steering, Leave Oneself an Out, Second-guess the Other Guy. . . . He takes his hands from the steering wheel, passes his extended fingers in front of one another in unconscious imitation. Time. . . for an experiment: infinitesimal easing up on the throttle produces a gap between his grille and the nether parts of the Marquis in front of him. The instant this following distance exceeds a car length, the two vehicles on either side both try to slither in.

(幸い、ほぼ全員が学位を持っている。運転講習——高校卒業証書の重要な要素だ。学校システムを経てなお足し算もできず、述語もうまく扱えず、地図をみてカナダの場所を当てられないかもしれないが、厳しい卒業要件のおかげで、ハンドル越しに遠くをよく見て、車間距離を大きく取り、他人を疑ってかかることができるようにはなる。(…)彼はハンドルから手を放し、無意識に、伸ばした両手の指を交互にすれ違わせる。実験の時間だ。ほんのわずかアクセルを緩めることで、彼の車のフロントグリルと前を走るマークウイスの後部の間に隙間ができる。その距離が車一台分を超えた瞬間に、両側の二台の車が割って入ろうとする。)

・Driver's Ed(ucation)とは、運転講習のこと。16歳で免許が取れて、自動車で通学する生徒も多いので、アメリカでは高校にもこういった教科がある。Harold Smithらが考案したSmith System of Defensive Drivingの中の安全運転五カ条が良く教材として教えられる。引用中のAim High in SteeringとLeave Oneself an Outなどのスローガンはそこから来ている。(Second-guess the Other Guyは作者の創作。)

G. The result

Proof. This short-blast stream of continuous lane change is not prompted by anything so naïve as the belief that the other queue is actually moving faster. The open spot simply must be filled on moral grounds. A question of commonweal. Switching into a slower-moving lane gives you something to do while tooling (*tooling*; that's the ticket) along at substandard speed through the work crews surfacing the next supplementary sixteen-lane expansion. Fills the otherwise-idle nanosecond. A way to absorb extraneous frontier spirit.

(証明。この目にも止まらぬ一連の絶え間ない車線変更は、他の車線の方が速く動いていると素朴に信じているせいで起こるのではない。空いている場所を埋めるのは道徳的に正しいからだ。つまりは公共の福祉の問題だ。流れの遅い車線に移り、十六車線の新たに追加される道路を舗装中の作業員のあいだを、標準以下の速度でツーリング (ツーリング、それだ!) していると、面倒なことになる。そのままでは無駄になるナノ秒の空き時間があれば埋めてしまえ。そうやって筋を外れたフロンティア精神を我がものとするのだ。)

・車線変更については日本でも似たような事情がありそうだが、ここでは車線変更とフロンティア精神を結びつけているところが面白い。最終行の extraneous は、「本来のものではない、本質から外れた」という意味でいまひとつ分かりにくい、かつてのフロンティア精神からするとかなり様変わりしてしまった、現代 LA でのフロンティア概念を指してそう言っているのだろうか。

H. How much it takes to build freeways

He read somewhere, a year ago, while still in the honeymoon, guidebook phase, that a mile of

freeway eats up forty acres of land, give or take the mule. The whole idea came from the Nazis. Shoulders, median, dual carriageway, transition-free exit and entry ramps: the total driving environment. How many thousand acres thrashed in Angelinoland alone? Lord, I'm five hundred continuous north-south miles without a traffic light away from home. Throw in the east-west, the redundant routes, the clover leaf, the switchbacks and tributaries, and pretty soon you're talking real real estate. . . .

一年前のまだ希望に満ちてガイドブックを読みあさっていた頃、彼はどこかで読んだことがある。一マイル分のフリーウェイのためには、ラバーヘッド分の誤差はあるが、四十エーカーの土地が必要らしい。そもそもこれは全部ナチスが考えたことだった。路肩、中央分離帯、往復分離道路、変換不要の出入り口——運転を取り巻く全てがだ。何てことだ、家を出て一度も信号を通らずに、北から南にノンストップで五百マイルも走ってきた。東西に走る道や、余分な無用のルートや、クローバー型の立体交差路や、山の斜面をジグザグに走る道や脇道も加えると、これぞまさにリアル・エステートと呼べる。

- ・「ラバーヘッド」とあるのは、Kraft が今、かつて家畜を追って歩いた道の上を走っているフリーウェイを走行中だから。LA では、他にも開拓者が通った道や、スペイン系の修道士が布教のために歩んだ道などに沿って幹線道路が作られていることが多い。道路脇に“Historic Route”というサインが出ているのでそれと分かる。
- ・一度も信号のあるところを通らずに遠くまで移動できるというのは大事なポイント。Bryson も書いていたが、アメリカでは道を渡るのにも一苦労することが多い。特に日本人の感覚からすると、LA には驚くほど歩行者用信号が少なく、車社会というものが強く実感される。

I. The moment

He merges right, having long ago noticed that nine of ten pileups originate in the outside lanes. Across the divider, oncoming traffic starts to bottle up too. The drivers smell something burning. Both directions max out to full carrying potential, a premature peak-volume hour. All hours are rush, here and throughout the network. Everybody on earth and his poor relations are desperate to relocate. Kraft can hardly wait until the Chinese can claim what so proudly we already hail: a national front-seat capacity fitting every citizen on the books with seats to spare. The curve of mobility will sidle up ever more intimately to asymptote until that moment at decade's, century's, and millennium's end when the last living road-certified creature not yet on rolling stock will creep out onto the ramp in whatever vehicle it can muster, and poof: perpetual gridlock.

(玉突き事故の九割は外側車線で起こることに、とうに気付いていた彼は、右車線に合流する。分離帯の向こうでは、対向車の流れも詰まり始める。ドライバーたちには何かが燃えている臭いがする。いちばん込み合う時間にはまだ早い、両方向ともに満車状態になる。ここでも、あるいは道路網の全体でも、四六時中がラッシュ時なのだ。地球上の全ての人とそのあわれな親族が、やけを起こしてよそへ移ろうとする。免許登録されている全国民がフロントシートに座ってもなお空いた座席があるのは良いことだと、私たちは誇らしげに考えるが、中国人が同じことを主張しだす日を、クラフトは今か今かと待ち構えている。移動性を示す曲線がますます漸近線に沿うようにじわじわと上昇していき、この十年、一世紀あるいは一千年の終わりに、それまで乗り遅れていた、運転免許を持った何者かがやっと手に入れた車に乗って入口ランプに這い出してきた瞬間に、ポン！——永遠に続く大渋滞が訪れる。)

- ・幸いまだ経験したことはないが、LA のフリーウェイの渋滞は凄まじい。特に混む道路というのがあるそうで、住

民は慣れっこになっている。とはいえ文字通り Free(無料)で移動に便利なので、LA ではフリーウェイの活用法をまず覚えると良い。

- ・ここで Kraft は、いつの日にか世界中で道路渋滞が限界を超えて、永遠に車が動けなくなる最悪の gridlock が訪れる日を想像している。gridlock とは、ひとつの道路網全体が渋滞に陥る状態を指す言葉で、一般にどうにもならない膠着状態を比喩的に表現することもある。LA といえば gridlock というほどに、当地では恒常的な問題となっている。Tom Hanks のスピーチは、この gridlock の解消法という話題から始まっている。

J. The consequences of American entrepreneurship

He has lived through evacuations, but never one on this scale. The fabled civil-defense drill gone real, all the more panic-stricken in that everybody in this one acts piecemeal, deep in the dream of free agency. Given the apotheosis of private transport all around him, Kraft finds it hard to credit the shrill fact beloved of the guidebooks, that Angel City once possessed the most extensive urban transit system in the country. The tales of spanking red turn-of-the-century electric carriages smack now of Hans Christian Andersen. Nothing in human ingenuity's arsenal could have staved off this freeway. It is the peak of private enterprise, as inevitable and consummate as death.

(彼はこれまでに幾度か避難した経験があるが、これほどの規模のものは初めてだ。噂の民間防衛活動訓練が現実になったかのようなのだが、今回のこれはひどいパニック状態で、皆が皆、自分は自分の意思で動いていると思いついて、まとまりなく行動している。プライベートな交通手段の完成形を目の当たりにしたクラフトには、ガイドブックが好んで載せるあの無視できない事実、つまりエンジェル・シティーにはかつて国内最大規模の公共交通機関があったという事実を認めることは困難だ。世紀の変わり目に疾走していたという赤い電動の客車の話などは、もはやアンデルセンの童話のように思える。人間の発揮しうる創意工夫を総動員しても、このフリーウェイを食い止めることはできなかつただろう。これは進取の気性の頂点を成すものであり、死と同じくらいに避けがたく完成されたものなのだ。)

- ・かつて LA では公共交通機関が整備されていたというのは事実で、長距離列車の到着地である Union Station (1939 年建造)は、ロサンゼルス発祥の地とされるオルベラ街にもほど近く、由緒ある建物である。しかし 1970 年代以降は飛行機と自動車に主要な移動手段の座を奪われ、LA では鉄道やバスはあまり重要視されなくなった。アメリカ人の多くが自動車での移動を好むのは、公共交通機関が整備されていないからと考えがちだが、実際は全く順序が逆なのである。
- ・車社会にはアメリカの個人主義が反映されていると考える人もいる。伝統的なアメリカの個人主義とは、まさにフロンティア精神を体現するもので、誰にも頼らず自分の力で我が道を切り開くという理想的な人間のあり方である。ここでいう現代の個人主義は、どちらかといえば引きこもりの感覚に近いもので、訳の分からない他人とむやみに接触したくないという気持ちを指している。移民の多い多文化社会らしいと言えそう。そのために公共交通機関は好まれないということらしい。とはいえ、ニューヨークならまだしも、LA の人はおしなべてフレンドリーなので、必ずしもそれが理由ではないと思うのだが。Powers も、引用箇所をみる限りでは、個人主義の行きつく先が車社会であり、永遠に終わらない gridlock だと言っているようだ。Hanks の意見も聞いたうえで、さらに考えてみたい。

資料3

出典：上岡伸雄編著『名演説で学ぶアメリカの文化と社会』研究社、2009年

K. Tom Hanks, “The Power of Four” (At Vassar Collage, New York, May 22, 2005)

Not long ago I was reading about the problem of gridlock on the freeways of Southern California, the traffic jams which cripple the city, stranding millions and laying waste to time and energy and the environment. Gridlock is as serious and as impenetrable a problem as any we face, a dilemma without cure, without solution, like everything else in the world it seems.

Some smart folks concocted a computer simulation of gridlock to determine how many cars should be taken off the road to turn a completely jammed and stilled highway into a free-flowing one. How many cars must be removed from that commute until a twenty-mile drive takes twenty-five minutes instead of two hours? The results were startling.

Four cars needed to be removed from that virtually stuck highway to free up that simulated commute—four cars out of each one hundred cars. . . .

Now, if this simulation is correct, it is the most dramatic definition in earthly science and human nature of how a simple choice will make a jaw-dropping difference to our world. Call it “The Power of Four.” One commuter in your neighborhood could put the rush back into rush hour. So, if merely for people out of a hundred can make gridlock go away by choosing not to use their car, imagine the other changes that can be wrought by just four of us—four of you—out of a hundred. . . .

If only one out of four of each hundred of you choose to help on any given day, in any given cause, incredible things will happen in the world you live in. Help publicly. Help privately. Help in your actions by recycling and conserving and protecting, but help also in your attitude. Help make sense where sense has gone missing. Help bring reason and respect to discourse and debate. Help science to solve and faith to soothe. Help law bring justice, until justice is commonplace. Help and you will abolish apathy—the void which is so quickly filled by ignorance and evil.

Life outside of college is just like life in it: one nutty thing after another, some of them horrible, but all interspersed with enough beauty and goodness to keep you going. That’s your job—to keep going. Your duty is to *help*—without ceasing.

<ディスカッションのポイント>

- ・「4の力」とは何か？ またその言葉は一般的な言い回しのパロディになっているが、それは何か？
- ・gridlock はあくまで話の枕で、問題はもっと一般的である。ではそうした問題を解決するために乗り越えなければならないことは何だと、ハンクスは言っているだろうか？
- ・第4段落3行目、“put the rush back into rush hour” とはどういう意味か？
- ・アメリカの個人主義という文脈で考えると、ハンクスの主張にはどんな意義があるだろうか？

資料 4

Source: Gaunt, Jon. *Gaunt's Best of British: It's Called Great Britain Not Rubbish Britain*. London: Virgin Books, 2008. 69-72.

L. Brits love the motorcar, but. . .

Ford may have invented the modern motor car but it was Britain and Brits who styled the Jaguar, the Roller, the Mini and dreamed up the Aston Martin. Mr Ford gave you it in any color as long as it was black, but British engineering gave the motoring world flair, culture, design classics and a motoring heritage that most countries would die for. Then there are the British motoring heroes from Stirling Moss through Jackie Stewart and Roger Clarke to Colin Macrae and now Lewis Hamilton. And only British could create a programme like *Top Gear* where three petrol heads can command an audience of millions (350 million in fact—it's one of our most successful TV exports and also one of the most popular TV shows anywhere in the world). Us Brits are proud of our motoring history and love our motors.

So that's why for a nation whose economic strength is largely built on our heavy industrial heritage and the motor industry in particular, I find it amazing the way the British motorist is treated by politicians of all parties.

Instead of being seen as a potential electoral force motorists are treated as cash cows and pariahs by the self-serving pigs of Westminster.

However, if a political party actually became the motorists ally they would be bound to win the next election, but instead they just continue to burden us with ever-increasing taxes and regulations which we have plenty of time to think about when we are stuck in traffic jams in gridlocked Britain. . . .

M. Public transport is not for everyone

Politicians, who are largely based in London, don't understand that the majority of us haven't got any choice but to use our cars; we haven't got chauffeur-driven cars or even the tube or late night buses to transport us to and from our workplaces.

I commute into London every day from Milton Keynes and I'll be honest the service is pretty reliable, but to guarantee a seat—and in my opinion therefore my safety—I am forced effectively to buy a first-class season ticket. Either that or be transported in conditions that loopy animal-rights protesters would be bombing scientists' homes for if animals were force to travel like that. I also live in a rural environment where the bus service, along with the police and every other public service, is woefully inadequate. For my neighbours and myself the car is definitely a necessity—for some even a lifesaver— and without a shadow of a doubt never a luxury.

However, even if you live in the city, why is it such a sin to want to drive? The car was and it the liberator of the working class. It allowed, for the first time in the early Sixties, ordinary working-class people to get into the car and get out and about without the necessity of having Mussolini's standard of understanding of a rail timetable. Just as cheap budget airlines are now opening up

major European cities to families that would have been previously out of reach for ordinary working-class people, the car fulfilled the same role and still does. . . .

N. Greens are the new red: What does it mean?

Clearly the unrepresentative greens have seized too much of the agenda and for those of us with more important and urgent issues to worry about, such as immigration, law and order, and knife and gun crime, they are dictating social and taxation policy. That's why I believe that green has become the new red. It's just a new way of screwing more and more money out of us who are working and already contributing to British society. If you don't believe me let's have another fact: did you know that the environmental costs associated with motoring are less than £6 billion a year? So again, if you deduct that £6 billion from the £48 billion we are all paying you can still see there is massive imbalance and that motorists are clearly paying through the nose for other public spending initiatives that have nothing to do with motoring or motorists.

I might not even mind this rip-off if I actually thought that green issues were as high up on the political agenda of most ordinary Brits as pompous politicians and of course the Biased Broadcasting Corporation would have us believe. But green issues are clearly not our biggest concern because if they were we would have more of the lentil-eating, yoghurt-knitting 2CV drivers in Parliament, getting their noses into the no doubt organic trough.

The reality of course is that for the majority of us feeding the kids, keeping a roof over our heads and protecting both our borders and our loved ones are of much more importance than whether or not a polar bear is having to take swimming lessons. . . .

The political elite are so far removed from the real-life experience of the rest of us and they must start listening to motorists and our concerns. Instead of tinkering at the edges of our transport problems with congestion charges, road pricing or the ridiculous idea of using hard shoulder, they need to fund a massive road-building programme.

<ディスカッションのポイント>

- ・イギリスは車の利用に対して厳しいとのことだが、具体的にはどう厳しいのだろうか？
- ・Gaunt の論調では、善と悪がはっきりしている。では、彼が考える善とは誰で、悪とは誰のことだろうか？ また悪玉はなぜ悪いと言っている？
- ・Green が新たな Red だというのはどういう意味か？
- ・Gaunt の環境問題に対する意見は果たして正しいだろうか？ 反論するとしたらどう切り込むべきか？ あるいはトム・ハンクスのスピーチと比較してみるとどうか？

資料 5

Bryson, Bill. *In a Sunburned Country*. New York: Broadway Books, 2001. 73-75.

O. It reminds me of something

And yet the striking thing about this area [around the Blue Mountains, west of Sydney] was how thoroughly delightful and accommodating it appeared. The farms were neat and trim, and the towns I passed through gave every air of a comfortable prosperity. It was impossible to believe that a metropolis of 4 million people lay just over the hills behind. I felt as if I had stumbled into some forgotten, magically self-contained world. There were things out here I hadn't seen in years. Gas stations with old-fashioned pumps and no canopies over the forecourt, so that you pumped your gas in full sun, as I am sure God intended it. Metal windmills of the sort that used to stand in every Kansas farm field. Little towns with people in them—people going about their business, greeting each other with a smile and a nod. It all had a familiarity about it, but the familiarity of something half forgotten. Gradually it dawned on me that I *was* in the American Midwest—but it was the American Midwest of long ago. I was, in short, in the process of making the marvelous and heartwarming discovery that outside the cities it is still 1958 in Australia. Hardly seems possible, but there you are. I was driving through my childhood.

P. The first reason

Partly it was to do with that dazzling light. It was the kind of pure, undiffused light that can come only from a really hot blue sky, the kind that makes even a concrete highway painful to behold and turns every distant reflective surface into a little glint of flame. Do you know how sometimes on very fine days the sun will shine with a particular intensity that makes the most mundane objects in the landscape glow with an unusual radiance, so that buildings and structures you normally pass without a glance suddenly become arresting, even beautiful? Well, they seem to have that light in Australia nearly all the time. It took me a while to recognize that this was precisely the light of Iowa summers from my childhood, and it was a shock to realize just how long it had been since I had seen it.

Q. The second reason

Partly, too, it was to do with the road. Almost all Australian highways are still just two lanes wide, and what a difference that makes. You're not cut off from the wider world, as you are on a superhighway, but part of it, intimately connected. All the million details of the landscape are there beside you, up close, not blurred into some distant, tediously epic backdrop. It changes your whole outlook. There's no point in hurrying when all it's going to do is put you in the feathery wake of that old chicken truck half a mile ahead. Might as well hold back and enjoy the scenery. So there's none of that mad, pointless urgency—gotta pass this guy, gotta keep pushing, gotta make some miles—that makes any drive on an interstate such an exhausting and unsatisfying business. When you come to a town on such a road it is an event. You don't fly through at speed, but slow down and *glide* through,

in a stately manner, like a float in a parade, slow enough to nod to pedestrians if you wish and to check out the goods in the windows on Main Street. “Oh, there’s a good price on men’s double-knit shirts,” you observe in a thoughtful tone, or “Those lawn chairs were cheaper in Bathurst,” for, needless to say, you are talking to yourself by now. Sometimes—quite often, in fact—you stop for a coffee and a browse around the shops.

Afterward you return to the open road and naturally at first you go a little too fast, for speed is an instinct, but then—whoops!—you round a bend to find yourself fast approaching the back of a dump truck kicking out smoke and laboring heavily up a slope. So you drop back and take it easy. You lean an arm on the windowsill, lay a finger on the wheel, and cruise. You haven’t done this for years. You haven’t been on a drive like this since you were a kid. You’d forgotten motoring could be fun. I loved it.

<ディスカッションのポイント>

- **Bryson** はオーストラリアの風景をみて何を思い出したのだろうか？ そして、つまりオーストラリアはどんな場所だと彼は感じたのだろうか？
- 理由その一として挙げられている特徴は何か？ またそれに関連してオーストラリアならではの話題を何か思いつくだろうか？
- 理由その二として挙げられているのはズバリ道路だが、**Bryson** は何に驚いているのだろうか？ 言い換えれば、アメリカとはどう違うというのだろうか？
- オーストラリアについて **Bryson** が感じたことは正しいのだろうか？ 彼なりの偏見が混じってはいないだろうか？

※比較のためには少しオーストラリアについても調べる必要があるので、次回はオーストラリアについて、**Bryson** の本の他の箇所やその他の資料を読んでいくことにします。

資料 1

正式名称：The Commonwealth of Australia——Commonwealth は連邦と訳され、かつては大英帝国の一部だったが後に独立した国々（およびその属領）からなる結合体を指す。オーストラリアは、1901年に六つの植民地が連合し、独立オーストラリアが形成された。

国家最高権力者：イギリス国王。現在も形の上ではエリザベス女王がオーストラリア女王となっている。イギリスによる統治を廃止し、大統領を選出しアメリカのような共和制に移行するかどうかの議論が盛んに行われたが、1999年の国民投票の結果、現行体制の継続が決まった。国旗には南十字星とユニオンジャックのデザインが施されている。

首都：Canberra。シドニーやメルボルンの方が大都市なので、そちらが首都だと思われがちだが、それらは旧植民地（現在は州）の州都。キャンベラは、アメリカのワシントン D.C.と同じく、連邦の首都として割譲され、新たに建造された特別行政区で、どの州にも属していない（Australian Capital Territory として別に分類されている）。

国土面積：約 760 万平方キロメートル。世界最小の大陸であり、世界最大の島。また一つの大陸が一つの国家で占有されている唯一の例。広大なため、国内に三つの標準時（time zones）が設定されている。

人口（2009年推計）：約 2,200 万人。したがって、人口密度は一平方キロメートル当たり 2.8 人程度と極めて低い。

言語：実質的には英語が国語だが、正式にそう決められているわけではない。移民が多いので、外国語での放送も充実している。英語はイギリス英語を基本にしており、独自の言い回しが多数用いられるものの、比較的分かりやすい発音となっている。良く引き合いに出されるオーストラリア英語の例としては、“Good day, mate” や “No worries” がある。前者をはっきりと「グッダイ、マイト」と発音するのが、いかにもオージーらしいと思われるが、個人差はあるだろう。

Key words and phrases：オーストラリアについての本や映画などには、次のような言葉が良く出てくる。それぞれどのような意味だろうか。調べてみよう。

- Bush

- Outback

- Tall poppies

- Uluru

- Australian salute

- Pokies

- Anzac Day

Bush, outback and Uluru

I believe I first realized I was going to like the Australian outback when I read that the Simpson Desert, an area bigger than some European countries, was named in 1932 for a manufacturer of washing machines. (Specifically, Alfred Simpson, who funded an aerial survey.) It wasn't so much the pleasingly unheroic nature of the name as the knowledge that an expanse of Australia more than 100,000 miles square didn't even *have* a name until less than seventy years ago. I have near relatives who have had names longer than that.

But then that's the thing about the outback—it's so vast and forbidding that much of it is still scarcely charted. Even Uluru, as we must learn to call Ayers Rock, was unseen by anyone but its Aboriginal caretakers until only a little over a century ago. It's not even possible to say quite where the outback is. To Australians anything vaguely rural is "the bush." At some indeterminate point "the bush" becomes "the outback." Push on for another tow thousand miles or so and eventually you come to bush again, and then a city, and then the sea. And that's Australia. (Bryson 20)

Tall poppies

ひなげしの花も伸び過ぎると良くありません。目立ち過ぎます。このような人、つまり金持ち、権力者、成功者をオーストラリア人は「ノッポのひなげし」[tall poppies]と呼び、彼らを疑いの目で見ます。そして、ちょっとでも自惚れが目立つと、適当なサイズに切り詰めるのです。この行為を「ノッポのひなげし症候群」[tall poppy syndrome]と言いますが、これこそオーストラリア社会の健全さの現れのひとつと言えるでしょう。このような気風は流刑時代に培われたものと考えられます。シドニー湾付近の屋外監獄に収容された流刑囚が看守に抵抗する唯一の方法は、彼らに関する下品なゴシップを飛ばすことでした。今日、その矛先はもっとも一般的には、政治家や企業家、さらには海外に移り住んでアメリカ英語訛りで話す芸能人たちに向けられます。

「ノッポのひなげし症候群」の被害者たちは、これは自分たちに対する嫉妬によるもの、平凡が望ましいとする考えからきている、と言います。しかし、オーストラリア人は英雄を乱造することの馬鹿馬鹿しさを知っています。それは後になってがっかりさせられる恐れがあるからです。アメリカ人の場合はもっと素直に有名人を崇拜しますから、それだけによく失望させられるのです。(デーラ 55-56)

Pokies

壁をよじ登っている 2 匹のハエにもオーストラリア人は賭けをする、と言われていますが、実際に、国民 1 人あたり年間 2100 ドルという数字は、欧米のどの国よりもギャンブルにお金を使っていることを表しています。しかし、本当にギャンブル中毒になっているのは、個人よりむしろ州政府の方です。州政府はその運用資金の多くを、ポーカーゲーム機、くじ、競馬そしてカジノからの収入に頼っています。州政府はギャンブル産業から年間 21 億ドルを税金として徴収しています。もしその収入がなければ、住民に余計な税を課さなければならなくなるでしょう。さらに、州政府が良く指摘することですが、ギャンブル産業のおかげで 3 万 2000 人に対する仕事が確保されています。

オーストラリア人が一番お金を使うのは、アメリカで言ういわゆる「スロット・マシーン」です。オーストラリアではそれを「ポーキー」と呼んでいます。オーストラリアには 12 万台のポーキー（人呼んで「片腕の追いはぎ」）があり、年間 250 億ドルがつきこまれ、そのうち 210 億ドルが払い戻されていま

す。(デール 146)

Australian salute

オーストラリアの海岸線を探検した 18 世紀のヨーロッパ人の日記に、不思議にも記載されていない生き物があります。この生き物はそこいらじゅうにいるので、それを追い払うジェスチャーは、「グレート・オーストラリアン・サルート[*great Australian salute*]」（偉大なるオーストラリア式敬礼）と呼ばれています。(…) 19 世紀までには、ハエは国のシンボルの 1 つとなりました。白人がハエをオーストラリアに運んできたのでしょうか？ そうではありません。でも、白人は牛や羊を運んできました。

ハエは湿った糞を好み、そこで繁殖します。カンガルーやエミュの干からびた糞しか選択の余地がなかった頃には、生存率は低いものでした。ヨーロッパや南アフリカから連れて来られた牛や羊が、貴重な贈り物を大地に残し始めたとき、ハエはその繁殖活動を謳歌し始め、毎年活発になっていきました。(デール 220-221)

Anzac Day

4 月 25 日はオーストラリアの国民の祝日です。わが国最大の戦没者を出した戦いのひとつを記念する日です。第一次世界大戦において、連合軍はトルコ軍の壊滅をねらって、イスタンブールを占拠するというイギリスの作戦案を実行しました。その結果、7600 人のオーストラリア軍将兵と、2500 人のニュージーランド軍将兵がトルコの南岸のガリポリで没しました。

1915 年 4 月 25 日、オーストラリア・ニュージーランド連合軍（アンザック）はガリポリ岬のガバ・ペデに上陸を敢行しました。知らされていたよりも背後の崖ははるかに険しく、敵の守りもはるかに堅固でした。翌日さっそく上層部に撤退案が提出されましたが、返事は、塹壕を掘れ、という命令でした。結局、トルコ軍に対して効果的な攻撃ができないまま 8 ヶ月が過ぎ、とうとう 12 月に撤退することになりました。

いまでもときどき議論されますが、イギリスはトルコ軍の注意をそらすために意図的にアンザックを捨て石に使ったのではないか、ということです。しかし、イギリスもガリポリで 4 万人の将兵を失っていますから、そういう意図ではなく、単にイギリス軍上層部が間抜けだったというのが実態ではないでしょうか。

今日、アンザック・デイには第一次世界大戦だけではなく、すべての戦争に出征したオーストラリア人将兵に敬意を表すことになっています。午前中は陸海空の退役軍人たちが各州都のメイン・ストリートのパレードし、午後は戦友たちと酒を酌み交わして昔話に花を咲かせる、というのが習わしです。(…) アンザック・デイが愛国のシンボルの代わりをつとめてきたとも言えます。(デール 26-27)

※ガリポリの戦いは、映画『誓い』(*Gallipoli*, 1981) で詳細に描かれているので是非観ていただきたい。

特にラストシーンが印象的で、今なお映画好きの語り草になっている。イギリスとの関係や、愛国心について注目して観ると、なぜこの出来事がオーストラリア人にとってこれほまでに重要なのか分かる。

資料 2

A. A heritage-sights guide in Sydney: Part 1

Guide: Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name's James and I'm going to be your delightful⁽¹⁾ host over the next hour and three quarters as we take in some of the beautiful heritage⁽²⁾ sights in the Rocks here in Sydney. Tonight we'll be going to three heritage pubs. You'll be hearing stories, some of the, I guess, more saucy stories embedded in the walls of some of our more famous drinking institutions. You'll also be taking in three delightful ales, as well as any other stories that you might be interested in. Just before we head off I'd like to point out this area behind you. It's now called Circular Quay. It used to be called Sydney Cove and even before that by the Cadigal people of the Eora nation, this body of water in front of you was called "Warrang." Can you say that? Can you say with me a-one (**Tourist:** Warang.) two. . . no, no, wait for it, one, two, three. . .

All: Warrang!

Guide: That's very good, congratulations.

Tourist: Thank you.

Guide: Thank you very much. Now I hope you all like a drink.

Tourist: Yep.

Guide: Yep? Delightful. Because that's one of the basic building blocks of our fine nation, and that's alcohol. We have a great tradition here in Australia of drinking right from the time the first fleet arrived⁽³⁾. One of our first trading currencies was in fact rum, or grog. Grog, by the way, was the generic term for anything that could get you drunk, so we'll be looking at far more refined types of alcohol today. So, are we all thirsty?

Tourist: Yep.

Guide: Delightful. You'll have to wait, just hold back. . . hold back, haha. . . ok, the first pub that we're gonna go to today is one of Australia's oldest pubs. It's called "The Lord Nelson Hotel." They have a microbrewery on site and 90% of the ales they serve there are brewed actually in the building and I have to say it's one of my personal favorites is a particular beer called "Quayle Ale."

註1 delightful という言い回しはこの人の口癖のようだ。こういう文脈で、あまりアメリカ人は使わなさそうな言葉。発音は基本的にはイギリス英語的で、オーストラリア英語の特徴とされる、「エイ」の音が「アイ」になるところが割とはっきりしている。

註2 heritage は「遺産」「文化的伝統」と言った意味。今回聞いたスピーチでは、この言葉が繰り返される。オーストラリアはご存知の通り歴史が浅く、独自の伝統がないということが特徴である(次のBおよびDを参照)。伝統の欠如をどう考えるかが、オーストラリア人のアイデンティティ形成にとっては重要となる。

註3 イギリスから持ち込まれ定着した伝統として、飲酒の習慣があるということ。オーストラリアにはイギリス式のパブが多くある。またワインが美味しいことでも有名で、紙パック入りのワインはオーストラリア人が発明した(しかし外国ではあまり普及していない)。最初の船団(the first fleet)は、囚人を運んできた船団のことで、1788年1月26日にシドニー湾の近くに上陸しイギリス国旗を掲げた。1月26日はオーストラリア・デイとして祝日になっている。

B. A heritage-sights guide in Sydney: Part 2

Guide: Compared to many of the countries that you people would have come from, our heritage is, European heritage in Australia is really, really quite short. I mean if you compare it to some of the temples you might see in Southeast Asia, most of our structures only go back, you know, roughly 150, 200 years but the areas that you'll be walking through today are some of the oldest.

Obviously, if you look around now you'll see lots of beautiful restaurants and pubs and hotels for people to stay⁽⁴⁾. But if you went back to around 1900 you would have found a very, very different atmosphere whilst walking through these streets. We used to have a particular type of chap that inhabited this area. They were called "Larrikins"⁽⁵⁾ and they were gang members, really quite vicious.

註4 hotels for people to stay「宿泊のためのホテル」——つまり宿泊するためのものではないホテルもあるということ。

"I should just note that in an Australian context "hotel" can signify many things: a hotel, a pub, a hotel *and* pub" (Bryson 36)と言われるように、パブのことをホテルと呼ぶことも多い。

註5 Larrikins は「不良」とでも訳すことができるオーストラリア独特の言葉。オーストラリア英語は地域ごとの方言があまりなく、全国で比較的同じような英語が話される(むしろ社会階層による違いの方が大きい)。また前述のように、この話者が話すようなイギリス式の発音がベースになっていて、そこにアメリカ風の語彙がミックスされているものを想像すると、オーストラリア英語の実像に近い。とはいえ、larrikins のような、外国人には理解しがたい独特の言葉も依然多用される。詳しくは資料3の記事を参照のこと。

C. A media coordinator from Melbourne

Duglass Hocking: Melbourne was actually settled⁽⁶⁾, whereas Sydney was actually. . . well that's when the. . . the convicts⁽⁷⁾ came and landed here and they developed Australia from Sydney. But because Melbourne was settled, it was actually designed. The shapes of the roads are in a grid pattern and are very, very easy to understand. The people that went and stayed in Melbourne had a little bit of money behind them, so they brought their European heritage with them, and a lot of this European feel⁽⁸⁾ is still left in Melbourne and so when you go and when people go to visit Melbourne, they do feel like they're stepping back into a little bit of Europe.

They've got fabulous arcades; they're absolutely beautiful. They've got fabulous foods that they go to. Sitting outside chatting with friends is one of the great things Melbournians like to do. The fashion is great here, the music scene is fantastic, the people are friendly. Melbourne is a city you go to, for you to enjoy the city.

註6 settled「定住した」——次の註7とは別に、自らオーストラリアにやってきて定住した人々もおり、メルボルンはそうした人々が作った町で、計画的に作られた。オーストラリアの都市は、このようにプランに基づいて作られていることが多く、特に広大な緑地公園などからその計画性を感じることができる。(都市の緑地についても資料3に記事がある。)

註7 the convicts「受刑囚」——註3でも述べたとおり、イギリスから犯罪者を送り込むための流刑地として、西洋人によるオーストラリアの植民が開始された。詳細はさらに資料3でも確認するが、こうした歴史をよく思わないオーストラリア人も少なからずおり、学校で教えるかどうかの問題となる。

註8 European feel「ヨーロッパの雰囲気」——ヨーロッパ、特にイギリスにルーツを持つ人が多いオーストラリアでは、国としての伝統がないために、故郷であるヨーロッパの伝統を持ち込むケースが多い。定住植民地として始まった

メルボルンの場合は、特にヨーロッパの影響が色濃く残っている。このスピーチでも比較されているが、シドニーとメルボルンは何かにつけて競い合っている。街ごとに雰囲気が違うというのも、オーストラリアの特徴のようだ。

D. A culinary educator in Melbourne

Graham Dark: Australian cuisine⁽⁹⁾: what is it? We're very lucky⁽¹⁰⁾ in Australia to have a great range of influences from nationalities from all over the world. We're also very lucky that we don't have a long tradition or a long history⁽¹¹⁾ that has influenced the cuisine and the influences are in fact from the new Australians⁽¹²⁾. When immigrants have come here they have brought demand for the ingredients that they have been used to eating and so with advances in horticultural techniques and people being prepared to grow those ingredients, it then allows us to cook those foods as well.

So, Australian cuisine is in fact a combination of a whole host of cuisines from different nationalities⁽¹³⁾. We are lucky that we are. . . each of those cuisines readily accepts the food from other nationalities and the Australian people are very happy to readily try something that's new, something that they haven't done before. Cookery techniques tend to be a combination from all of those influences as well.

註9 Australian cuisine 「オーストラリア料理」——cuisine は特に洗練された料理の場合に使う。オーストラリアと言えばオージービーフでバーベキューのイメージが強く、あまり有名なオーストラリア料理というものは思いつかない。あるいはビールを作る時の酵母かすで作った塩辛いベジマイトをパンに塗ったりとか。魚介や新鮮な食材が豊富にあるのに、缶詰や加工食品ばかり食べているとも言われる。オーストラリア料理とはつまり何であると説明されているだろうか。

註10 この人は、オーストラリアは「幸運だ」と繰り返し言っている。どういう意味でそうなのだろうか。

註11 やはり長い伝統や歴史がないことが言及されている。しかし料理に関しては、そのことがプラスに働いたという。

註12 the new Australians は第二次世界大戦後に移住してきたイタリア人やギリシャ人、アジア各国の出身者を指す。彼らが持ち込んだ食文化が、オーストラリア料理に革命をもたらした。新移民については資料3の記事も参照のこと。

註13 つまり「これ」というオーストラリア料理があるわけではなく、様々な国から持ち込まれた食文化を柔軟に取り入れ、ミックスした結果が、現在のオーストラリア料理となっている。他の英語圏諸国の例にもれず多文化社会であるオーストラリアでは、異質な人びととその文化をどう扱うかが常に大きなテーマとなってきた。その経緯を知らずして、現代オーストラリアの文化を理解することはできない。資料3でさらに詳しく見ておきたい。

資料3

E. A vast space, small population

オーストラリア人は汗水たらしながら広大な褐色の大地を切り開いている田舎者だ、というイメージをお持ちなら、そのイメージを捨ててください。オーストラリアは世界に名だたる都市型国家なのです。1800万人の人口の80パーセント近くが、たった10の都市に住んでいます。それもみな海沿いの都市で、まるで必死に海岸にしがみついて、イギリスへの帰還船を待っているように思えます。そんなわけで、典型的なオーストラリア人の姿と言え、ツバ広の帽子をかぶった褐色の農夫ではなく、スーツを着込んだ会社員、あるいはバミューダ・パンツを履いたサーファーといったところでしょう。

国土の大半はガラガラです。人口密度は世界最低の1平方キロあたり2人。ちなみに、カナダですら3人ですし、アメリカは26人、インドネシアは99人、イギリスは235人、日本は328人です。

実を言うと、「都市型」という言葉はオーストラリア人を言い表すのにはあまり正確ではないかもしれません。むしろ、「郊外型」と言った方が妥当でしょう。それというのも、人口のおよそ70パーセントが郊外に住み、家のローンの返済をしているからです。家を持っている人の割合は世界でも指折りです。もっとも一般的な家の形は赤い屋根瓦の煉瓦造りの一戸建てで、前庭と裏庭があり、裏には当然、回転式の物干し竿であるヒルズ・ホイストとバーベキュー設備があります。(デール 3)

My intention over the next couple of weeks was to wander through what I think of as Civilized Australia—the lower right-hand corner of the country, extending from Brisbane in the north to Adelaide in the south and west. This area covers perhaps 5 percent of the nation's land surface but contains 80 percent of its people and nearly all its important cities (specifically Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Canberra, and Adelaide). In the whole of the vast continent this is pretty much the only part that is conventionally habitable. Because of its curving shape, it is sometimes called the Boomerang Coast. . . . (Bryson 66-67)

F. The New Australians

世界で一番つまらない国と思われていたオーストラリアは1950年代から1990年代の間に世界で一番面白い国に変わりました。第二次世界大戦の直後、人口増加政策が導入され、その一環としてヨーロッパやアジアから500万人の移民がやってきました。その人たちがこの変化の主な要因です。新移民たちは保守的な文化の中に自分たちの技術や考え方をゆっくりと、時には苦勞しながら植え込んでいきました。その結果、旧移民たちは文化が多様であることの素晴らしさを認識するようになったのです。

1947年の国勢調査によりますと、人口の90パーセントがオーストラリア生まれで、8パーセントがイギリスおよびニュージーランド生まれでした。当時は移民を希望する外国人にとって、白豪主義が壁になっていました。1901年の移民制限法の下、移住希望者は「ヨーロッパ言語」の聞き取りテストに合格しなければなりません。アフリカやアジアの人たちにとって、たとえばゲール語やルーマニア語などの知識はまったくありませんから、その結果は惨めなものでした。このような白豪主義は1959年に正式に廃止されましたが、水面下では1973年まで続きました。この年、ホイットラム労働党政権は「人種や肌の色によるいかなる差別も無効」とする法案を通過させたのです。

今日、人口の78パーセントがオーストラリア生まれで、イギリス生まれが6パーセント、ニュージー

ランドとイタリアがそれぞれ 2 パーセント、旧ユーゴと中国または香港がそれぞれ 1.5 パーセント、ギリシャとベトナムがそれぞれ 1 パーセントです。

近年、移民の受け入れを極端に抑えていて、現在では年間 7 万人しか受け入れていません。ところが、新しくやって来た人たちは、前からいる人たちよりも頭が良いと見えて、その 11.4 パーセントが「管理職」にあります。後者の場合は 10.9 パーセントです。(デール 5-6)

In World War II it had suffered a kind of blunt trauma when, after the fall of Burma and Singapore, Britain pulled out of the Far East, leaving Australia suddenly alone and dangerously exposed. . . .

Australia escaped but it was left with two scars—a realization that Britain could not be counted on to come to its rescue in a crisis, and a sense of immense vulnerability to the teeming and unstable countries to the north. Both of these matters deeply influenced Australian attitudes in the postwar years—indeed still do. Australia became seized with the conviction that it must populate or perish—that if it didn't use all that empty land and fill all those empty spaces someone from outside might do it for them. So in the years after the war, the country threw open its doors. In the half century after 1945 its population soared, from 7 million to 18 million.

Britain alone couldn't provide the necessary bodies, so people were welcomed from all over Europe, particularly Greece and Italy in the immediate postwar years, making the nation vastly more cosmopolitan. Suddenly Australia was full of people who liked wine and good coffee and olives and eggplants, and realized that spaghetti didn't have to be a vivid orange and come from cans. The whole warp and rhythm of life changed. Good Neighbor Councils were established everywhere to help the immigrants settle and feel welcomed, and the Australian Broadcasting Corporation offered English-language courses which were enthusiastically taken up by tens of thousands. By 1970 the country could boast of 2.5 million "New Australians," as they were known. (Bryson 159)

G. Australian English

残念ながら「グッダイ」[Good day]はハリウッド映画に出てくるような言葉ではありません。オーストラリア人と言えどもその点は認めざるを得ません。しかし、実際、オーストラリア人は挨拶言葉として使いますし、男性は本当によく使います。相手の名前が思い出せない時とか、「ああ～」とか「うう～」とかの代わりの言葉が欲しい時、あるいは背後から人の背中を刺そうとする時にでも使うでしょう。オーストラリア人は伝統的に「仲間意識」[mateship]、つまり飲み友達同士が強い絆で結ばれていますし、「一蓮托生」[old mates' act] の考えのもと、お互いに助け合うことが必要だと思っています。しかし、この美風も最近では政治や警察の汚職に悪用され、何とも恰好のつかないありさまです。

現在、オーストラリアの英語に見られる特徴の大部分は、囚人たちの用いた素性のはっきりしない方言からきています。たとえば、swag (ナップサック)、larrikin (チンピラ)、open slather (全くの自由)、shout (酒を奢る)、skerrick (ちよと) などがそうです。アボリジニの言語からは何千もの地名をもらっています。そのほかにも、kangaroo、dingo、gone bung (壊れた)、hard yakka (きつい仕事)、within cooee (声の届く範囲) など約 400 語が日常用いられています。

しかし、多くの伝統的な言い回しがアメリカ英語に代わりつつあります。いまや女性のことを sheila という人はほとんどいませんし、fair dinkum (正真正銘の、正直な) や true blue (根っからの保守)

などは地方のお年寄りが使うだけです。また、cobber（友だち）や bonzer（すばらしい）は 1956 年のテレビの到来と共に廃れました。一方、bastard と bugger は現在でも「奴」くらいの意味で使われていますが、「偉大なるオーストラリア形容詞」の異名を持つ bloody の方は、もっとインターナショナルな f で始まる語に大きく取って代わられました。悲しいのは、goodonya（でかした）が go for it（がんばれ）になりつつある点です。しかし、いまでもアメリカ人をまごつかせる言い方があります。たとえば、ダサイ人を dag（もともとの意味は、羊のお尻のまわりにある糞まみれの毛）と言ったりしますが、アメリカ人にはピンとこないでしょう。また、うぬぼれた人を wanker と呼び、マスターベーション（アメリカ人なら jerk-off と言うでしょう）を big wank と言います。

オーストラリア人なら、小エビ（shrimp）のようなちっぽけなエビをバーベキューにはしません。もっと大きな車エビ（prawn）です。しかし、言葉を切り詰めて小さくするのは相変わらず大好きです。たとえば、「garbos（清掃局員たち）は arvo（午後）に a smoko（一服）する。ただし、take a sickie（ずる休み）しなければ」などと言ったりします。また、プールサイド・パーティーの招待状に、「今年は我が家の barbie（バーベキュー）のところで kiddies（子供たち）に Chrissie pressies（クリスマス・プレゼント）を渡そうかと思うので、tinnies（缶ビール）と cossie（水着）と mossies（蚊）除けを持参のこと。」と書いてあったとしても誰ひとり驚かないでしょう。（デール 28-29）

オーストラリアにとってニュージーランドは、イギリスにとってのアイランド、フランスにとってのベルギー、アメリカにとってのカナダと同じ役割を担っています。オーストラリア人は、ニュージーランド人についてのジョークを言ったり、ニュージーランド人をひいき目で見たり、ニュージーランドで休暇を過ごしたりします。さらに、毎年 50 万ものニュージーランド人を受け入れています。（...）

ニュージーランドの 2 つの島が、オーストラリアと合併して、第 7、第 8 の州になる理由は十分にありますが、キウイたちは意外に渋っています。オーストラリア人が自分たちの経済を破壊してしまう、と多分考えているのですが、恐らくその見方は正しいでしょう。

ニュージーランド人の特徴の中で、オーストラリア人が一番おかしいと思っていることは、彼らの言葉、特に母音の発音です。フィッシュ・アンド・チップスを彼らが言うと、ファッシュ・アンド・チャップス、「アパート探し」という意味のフラット・ハンティングは、フレット・ハンティングなどとオーストラリア人の耳には聞こえます。

1994 年にオーストラリア人はショックを受けました。それは、間もなくオーストラリア人もニュージーランド人のような発音で話すようになるだろう、という研究発表があったからです。ビクトリア大学の言語学（英語でリングイスティックスですが、リンガスタックスと発音すべきでしょうか？）の教授ジャネット・ホームズのこの発表は、次のような内容です。つまり、英語は母音推移が起こっている。ニュージーランド人はすでにその推移を完了し、“ear”（耳）と“air”（空気）、“here”（ここ）と“hair”（毛）、“beer”（ビール）と“bear”（熊）などを同じように発音している。オーストラリアはその途上にある。推移が終われば、コミュニケーションは少なくとももっと楽になるだろう [Et least ut wull make communucation easier]、と。（デール 218-219）

H. Transportation of the convicts: the origin of Australia

Never before had so many people been moved such a great distance at such expense—and all to be incarcerated. By modern standards (by any standards really), their punishments were ludicrously

disproportionate. Most were small-time thieves. Britain wasn't trying to rid itself of dangerous criminals so much as thin our an underclass. The bulk were being sent to the ends of the earth for stealing trifles. One famously luckless soul had been caught taking twelve cucumber plants. Another had unwisely pocketed a book called *A Summary Account of the Flourishing State of the Island Tobago*. Most of the crimes smacked either of desperation or of temptation unsuccessfully resisted.

Generally the term of "transportation" was seven years, but since there was no provision for their return and few could hope to raise the fare, passage to Australia was effectively a life sentence. But then this was an unforgiving age. By the late eighteenth century Britain's statute books were weighty with capital offenses; you could be hanged for any of two hundred acts, including, notably, "impersonating an Egyptian." In such circumstances, transportation was quite a merciful alternative. (Bryson 48-49)

The gold rush transformed Australia's destiny. Before it, people could scarcely be induced to settle there. Now a stampede rose from every quarter of the globe. In less than a decade, the country took in 600,000 new faces, more than doubling its population. The bulk of that growth was in Victoria, where the richest goldfields were. Melbourne became larger than Sydney and for a time was probably the richest city in the world per head of population. But the real effect of gold was to put an end to transportation. When it was realized in London that transportation was seen as an opportunity rather than a punishment, the convicts *desired* to be sent to Australia, the notion of keeping the country a prison became unsustainable. A few boatloads of convicts were sent to Western Australia until 1868 (they would find gold there as well, in equally gratifying quantities) but essentially the gold rush of the 1850s marked the end of Australia as a concentration camp and its beginning as a nation. (Bryson 80-81)

I. Parks in Australian cities: a British heritage

Central Adelaide boasts almost eighteen hundred acres of parks, less than Canberra, but a great deal more than most other cities of its size. As so often in Australia, they reflect an effort to recreate a familiarly British ambience in an antipodean setting. Of all the things people longed for when they first came to Australia, an English backdrop was perhaps the most outstanding. It is notable, when you look at early paintings of the country, how awkward, how strikingly un-Australian, the landscape so often appears. . . . Australia was a disappointment to the early settlers. They ached for English air and English vistas. So when they built their cities, they laid them out with rolling English-style parks arrayed with stands of oak, beech, chestnut, and elm. . . . Adelaide is the driest city in the driest state in the driest continent, but you would never guess it from wandering through its parks. Here it is forever Sussex. (Bryson 124)

資料 4

J. Australiana

Probably because new books have always been expensive in Australia, the country has outstanding secondhand bookshops. These always have a large section devoted to “Australiana,” and these sections never fail to amaze, if only because they show you what a remarkably self-absorbed people the Australians are. I don’t mean that as a criticism. If the rest of the world is going to pay them no attention, then they must do it themselves surely. That seems fair enough to me. But you do find in any trawl through the jumbled stacks the most wondrous titles. One of the first I took down now was called *That’s Where I Met My Wife: A Story of the First Swimming Pool in the National Capital at Canberra*. Nearby was a plump volume entitled *A Sense of Union: A History of Sydney University Football Club*. Beside that was a history of the South Australia Ambulance Service. There were hundreds of titles like this—books about things that could never possibly have been of interest to more than a handful of people. It’s quite encouraging that these books exist, but somehow faintly worrying as well. (Bryson 121)

K. The Northern Territory

The Northern Territory has always had something of a frontier mentality. In late 1998 the inhabitants were invited to become Australia’s seventh state and roundly rejected the notion in a referendum. It appears they quite like being outsiders. In consequence, an area of 523,000 square miles, or about one-fifth of the country, is *in* Australia but not entirely *of* it. This throws up some interesting anomalies. All Australians are required by law to vote in federal elections, including residents of the Northern Territory. However, since the Northern Territory is not a state, it has no seats in Parliament. So the Territorians elect representatives who go to Canberra and attend sessions of Parliament (at least that’s what they say in their letters home) but don’t actually vote or take part or have any consequence at all. Even more interestingly, during national referendums the citizens of the Northern Territory are also required to vote, but the votes don’t actually count toward anything. They’re just put in a drawer or something. Seems a little odd to me, but then, as I say, the people seem content with the arrangement. (Bryson 224)

L. Pessimistic?

One of the oddest things for an outsider to do is watch Australians assessing themselves. They are an extraordinarily self-critical people. You encounter it constantly in newspapers and on television and radio—a nagging conviction that no matter how good things are in Australia, they are bound to be better elsewhere. . . .

If Australians lack one thing in their lonely eminence Down Under, it is perspective. For four

decades they have watched in quiet dismay as one country after another —Switzerland, Sweden, Japan, Kuwait, and many others—has climbed over them on the per capita GDP table. When news came out in 1996 that Hong Kong and Singapore had also squeezed ahead, you'd have thought from the newspaper editorials and analyses that Asian armies had come ashore somewhere around Darwin and were fanning out across the country, appropriating consumer durables as they went. . . . At the time of my visit, Australia was booming as never before. It was enjoying one of the fastest rates of economic growth in the developed world, inflation was invisible, unemployment was at its lowest level in years. Yet according to a study by the Australian Institute, 36 percent of Australians felt life was getting worse and barely a fifth saw any hope of its getting better. (Bryson 128)

資料 1

A. New Yawk Tawk

Some time ago I received an email from William Safire's research assistant. "For a special issue on New York (a survival guide for newcomers and immigrants)," she wrote, "can you give Mr. Safire a rundown on New York-specific pronunciation and what might be the most difficult for new arrivals?"

When the longtime language maven of *The New York Times Magazine* asks for your help, you don't tell him where to get off the subway. You hop to it and do your best.

In a New York minute, I composed this reply:

You say you want to know what New Yawk Tawk might be most difficult for new arrivals, and I'm assuming you mean most difficult to understand rather than to master. Well, because New York speech is some of the speediest English on the planet, I'd say the first challenge for a New York newcomer would be simply distinguishing where one word ends and the next begins.

Particularly difficult to decipher are the many slurred exclamations—the various grunts, growls, and barks—for which New Yorkers are infamous. Here are some of the printable ones: *whaddayanutz*, *whaddayatawkinabaw*, *yagoddaprollumwiddat*, the much-imitated *fuggeddaboudid*, and *geddaddaheeuh*. These are *what are you, nuts?*; *what are you talking about* (typically pronounced without an interrogative inflection); *you got a problem with that?*; *forget about it*; and *get out of here* (which usually means "I don't believe it" rather than "please leave").

Some of my other favorite high-RPM New York Slurvianisms include *smatter* for "What's the matter?"; *omina* or *ongana* for "I'm going to"; *jeet* for "Did you eat?"; and *alluhyuz* for "all of you," in which *yuz* (or *yooz* in a stressed position) is the New York equivalent of the Southern *y'all*.

The New Yorker's propensity for slurvy pronunciation can sometimes be nothing short of miraculous. When I lived in New York, I remember how conductors on the Long Island Rail Road managed to slur the name of a certain station, Woodside, into the unintelligible *wuss-eye* (the eye of a wuss?).

New Yawk Tawk also features a diphthongal /aw/ sound that in heavy Nooyawkese sounds almost disyllabic. It's impossible for me to transliterate this elongated /aw/ here, but ask a dyed-in-wool New Yorker to pronounce *talk*, *lawn*, *dog*, *coffee*, or *because* and you will hear it. In fact, *because* could well serve as a shibboleth for identifying a New Yawk Tawker. In the purest Nooyawkese, it comes out almost like bee-KOO-uhz. Think of the /aw/ sound of *fall*, put a heavier /w/ in it, and you'll come close. (This sound typically does not occur in *frog* and *golf*, as some now-New Yorkers believe. They are pronounced with the dentist's /ah/.)

Another notable characteristic of the New York accent that may confuse newcomers is the distinct way of pronouncing the consonant blend /th/. *Father* and *mother* often come out *fahdda* and *mudda*, *with* becomes *wid* of *wit*, and *this and that* becomes *dis'n dat*.

New Yorkers are also renowned *r*-droppers. *Day eat wid a fawk* (they eat with a fork), *day wawk onna flaw* (they walk on a floor), *an day drink adda bah* (and they drink at a bar). The

superintendent on their apartment building is *da soopuh*, and *The New York Times* is *da paypuh*. When newcomers attend a Mets or Yankees game, they will need to know that *bee-uh-hee-uh!* means “[I’m selling] beer here.” (Elster 206-207)

B. Americanization and Mexicanization

Let’s talk more about food. While I was staying in the city, *West* (the Sunday magazine of the *Los Angeles Times*) carried a fine, quirky article by Dagoberto Gilb about how in the past couple of generations, Mexican food has become Americanized. Apart from words like “tortilla” and “taco,” which are now so familiar it’s hard to imagine any English-speaker in North America not understanding them, Gilb deployed the following terms: *masa*, *serranos*, *carne picada*, *queso fresco*, *rajas*, *huevos rancheros*, *árbol*, *espinaca*, *hongo*, *pozple*, *taquería*, *menudo*, *lengua*, *machacado*, *carne guisada*, *chicharrón*, *caraitas*, *manteca*, *limón*, *hijole*, *lonche*, *chalupa*, *fideo*, *grito* and *cochinita pibil*. All these words, remember, appeared not in some scholarly journal but in a mainstream magazine, one that aims to deliver an up-to-the-minute portrait of life in LA.

Gilb also used the phrases *N’hombre, que pinche desmadre!* (not translated) and *lo barato sale caro* (translated), and he finished his piece with a joke: *el perro caliente*. This is not a Spanish phrase—yet. But to catch the point, you have to know that *perro* is a dog and *caliente* means hot. Gilb was making a bilingual pun in a single language. On the magazine’s cover was the word *chalupa*, untranslated. Editors are paid to know their readers. And what these decisions suggest is that the Americanizing of Mexico’s food goes fork in fist with the Mexicanizing of America’s language.

My elephant in the room, of course, is the phenomenal growth of Latin-American communities, cultures and languages in southern California. A few numbers are perhaps in order. Figures from the California Department of Education show that in 2005, in Los Angeles County alone, more than 561,000 children were classified as “EL”: they had a mother tongue other than English, a language in which their skills were deemed inadequate for success in school. Of that total, almost 504,000 spoke Spanish. The combined figure for all other languages was only 57,000.

If you add in the numbers from Orange, Riverside, Ventura and San Bernardino counties—what might be called “Greater Los Angeles” or “the LA sprawl”—you find more than 823,000 Spanish-speaking children were said to be struggling with English. The five counties also contained 461,000 Spanish-speaking children who had moved up from EL to “FEP”: in other words, they once had trouble with English but now spoke it fluently. The total number of residents in LA County exceeds 10 million; Latinos are very close to (indeed, they may already form) an absolute majority. In today’s Los Angeles United School Districts, roughly 73 percent of children are Latin American by origin; blacks, whites and Asians make up the remaining quarter.

I mentioned this last statistic to a woman whom I met over lattes at a museum. “Yes, but that’s just the public system,” she replied, as though private academies could somehow transform the picture, or as if children in public schools don’t matter. In her world—the 2006 movie *Friends with Money* gives a fair idea of it—Mexican Americans are scarcely visible. You see them as janitors, cooks, waiters, gardeners, garage attendants, maids, construction workers, nannies, cashiers, chauffeurs,

street cleaners, busboys—in short, you don't really see them at all. They form the unobtrusive backdrop of your life. You certainly don't listen to their voices. (Abley 129-131)

C. English: Whose language is it?

We could start by considering what the English have given the world.

And here is the first problem. For the greatest legacy the English have bequeathed the rest of humanity is their language. When an Icelander meets a Peruvian, each reaches for his English. Even in the Second World War, when the foundations were being laid for the Axis pact between Germany, Japan and Italy, Yosuke Matsuoka was negotiating for the Emperor in English. It is the medium of technology, science, travel and international politics. Three quarters of the world's mail is written in English, four fifths of all data stored on computers is in English and the language is used by two thirds of the world's scientists. It is the Malay of the world, easy to learn, very easy to speak badly; a little learning will take you quite a long way, which is why an estimated one quarter of the entire world population can speak the language to some degree. By the late 1990s, the British Council was predicting that at the turn of the millennium 1 billion (thousand million) people would be learning English.

Some of these students will become highly fluent, like the Dutch Secretary General of NATO, Dr Josef Luns, who once remarked that he preferred English because "when I speak in my own language I feel as though I am vomiting." But most want to learn the language as a means to an end. The compilers of the *Oxford English Dictionary*—the Bible of the English language—keep no records on where new words originate, but it is a safe bet that of the 3,000 or so new words which enter their database each year, only a minority have been minted in England; the rest come from America, Australia or the international language of computing and science. After all, of the 650 million or so people who speak English as a first or second language, perhaps 8 per cent are English.

The moment a Frenchman opens his mouth, he declares his identity. The French speak French. The English speak a language which belongs to no one. Professor Michael Dummett, Wykeham professor of Logic at Oxford, once stood in line to buy a railway ticket in Chicago and struck up a conversation with a fellow traveller. After a time, the man said, "You must be from Europe." "Yes, from England," said Dummett. To which the Spinoza beside him replied, "You speak pretty good English." Dummett was so astonished that he found himself blurting out that he *was* English. It was only later that he realized that for many Americans, "English" is just the name of a language spoken in America, as "Dutch" is the language spoken in Holland. The paradox of language is that it is at once precious and personal to the speaker and at the same time the property of everyone. What happens to a people if they cease to own their language? (Paxman 234-235)

資料 2

a. Karen Higgins: A white woman in the South

My name is Karen Higgins. I live in North Carolina. I er. . . speak with a typical southern accent. I was born and raised in the, um, central part of North Carolina. . . near Charlotte. I have had people who, er, tell me that dialects are different from one end of this state to the other, so I've, I've not found that to be true myself because, um, I don't know, I think we all sound the same. (Track 7)

Always I, er, have been many places where my accent was remarked upon. I have had, um, people in California make fun of the way we talk. Of course we are bad to drop our "gs" and the tireder I get and the more drink or course the more "gs" I drop. (Track 8)

So we're "drinkin" instead of "drinking." I've also had the experience I've been to New York several times, New York City, and had the experience of, er, meeting people there who I could hardly understand because they talk so fast. It's true that southerners do talk a little bit slow at times. (Track 9)

b. Tim Kane: An African-American man in Philadelphia

My name is Tim Kane. I'm originally from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. My father is a southerner from North Carolina. My mother grew up in Philadelphia but her parents grew up in New England. When I go home I find myself talking with my boys and it's more of a "yo bro 'sup," ehm, "how ya doin'?" Everything is. . . everything, you know, it's er very quick, very casual relaxed sound, er quite a bit of difference between most of the conversation or "conversatin" that I have to do outside of that in the business, but er you do find yourself falling back into it. It's a part of the color of speech. It's part of the color of music. Music is very big in Philadelphia. (Track 22)

I find that when I go down South to visit my family down there it takes actually several hours before I can really understand what they're saying. Ehm, it's a completely different sound. It's voweled out where a simple word like "had" just lasts for days, it seems like. A simple example of that is a phrase like "are you going to go to the store?" In Philadelphia with my boys, it would probably be more something like "hey brother you ready to head out?" or er "are you ready to bounce to the store?" and in the South it would be something like "Tim, you finnin' to roll to the store?" and that phrase alone was enough to send me into confusion. I didn't know what "finnin" was, but it's "fixin." Sometimes it's er an amalgamation of a few different words er but it all means "prepared," "ready," "set to go." (Track 23)

My father grew up in central North Carolina. He moved to Philadelphia in his late teens, early

twenties. He still holds very much the southern cadence of his speech. I always laugh at him because one of his little expressions, you know, before we're getting ready for dinner is "er, Tim, you wash your hand?," making hand a singular er is one of my favorite little things that he does. He also er likes to ask me er "we're going out to the store later on today, I want you to get right." Ehm, another one of those "get prepared," you know, er "if you fixin' to go to the store you better get right." (Track 24)

I went to school in Western Pennsylvania which has another speech pattern that I was unfamiliar with. It's not a huge difference but there are other regionalisms and I think it was living out there that made me realize that Philadelphia had its own set of speech patterns and unique phrases. From there, spending time in the South, ah, in the Virginia Tidewater area and having worked in Jackson, Mississippi and in Florida which also has er more of a southern sound than I guess I expected, ehm, these experiences introduced me to the idea or at least to a better understanding that your speech can set you apart. (Track 25)

<解説>

アメリカ南部の独特の発音は **southern drawl** と呼ばれ、アメリカ英語の方言の一つとして最もよく引き合いに出されるもの。母音を引きずるように間延びして発音するところが特徴的（b のスピーチでは "voweled out" と表現されている）。元アメリカ大統領のビル・クリントンは南部訛りが強く、しばしばそのことをからかわれていた。南部訛りは他の人々からの偏見と嘲笑の対象となることが多く、コメディアンが真似して笑いをとったりする一方で、妙にほのぼのしていて好感を抱きやすくもある。奇異の目で見られる点では、イギリスでいうところのバーミンガム訛りと同じである。

また **Tim Kane** さんが解説しているように、南部方言には独特の言い回しや文の構造がある。例えば **Karen Higgins** さんが言うように、"ing" の **g** を発音しないことが多く、ブルースやロックの歌詞などで一般にも広まった。また「a+動詞+ing」の言い回しも多く（a-goin', a-comin'など）、これも歌の歌詞でよく見かける（例えば多くのアーティストがカバーしている "Train Kept A-Rollin'" や、ボブ・ディランの "The Times They're A-Changin'" など）。資料1のAに出てきた "y'all" も南部方言の典型的な例で、you の複数形として用いられる。

一方アフリカ系の英語はヒップホップの影響とそのイメージが強い。相手を "brother" "sister" と呼んだり、"What's up"（調子はどう？ という挨拶）などの言い回しが独特。これらを黒人以外が真似して使うと反感を招くことが多い。クリント・イーストウッドの映画『グラン・トリノ』にそういうシーンがあり、人種差別を複雑に風刺してかなり面白い場面になっている。

また "Are you ready to go?" の "are" を省略したりすることが多いが、**Kane** さんの説明にもあるように、これは南部方言も同様である。いわゆるアメリカの黒人英語は、元をたどればアメリカ南部の白人が話していた言葉に行きつくという。それはつまりイギリス各地で話されていた方言に行きつくということである。しかし黒人英語はそもそも英語ではないという意見も出されており、これにまつわる議論はしばしば政治的な熱を帯びる。

資料 3

D. American Black English

It goes by several names, all of them problematic: Black English, Black Vernacular, African American English (AAE) and African American Vernacular English (AAVE), to mention a few. In the mid-1990s the term Ebonics (a blend of “ebony” and “phonics”) lurched to sudden fame after the Oakland Unified School Board passed a well-meaning but misguided resolution declaring Ebonics to be the “predominantly primary” language of black children. Many of those children floundered in school, where teachers scorned their accents and their speaking habits. But instead of focusing on practical ways to improve the teaching or to boost inner-city kids’ chances in the classroom, the creators of the Oakland resolution announced that Ebonics was no kind of English—not even, they said, any kind of Indo-European language—but rather a “genetically based” member of the “West and Niger-Congo African Language Systems.” If they wanted to make their cause look intellectually ridiculous, they could hardly have made a better job of it.

In fact, the informal English spoken on occasion by most black Americans is closely related to the dialect of southern whites. The lengthening of short vowels, a reliance on double negatives, some systematic changes in verb forms—all these are qualities of white speech in states like Alabama and South Carolina and of black speech across the United States. Given the cruelties of history, the resemblance may appear ironic. But it should not be surprising, given that both dialects emerged from the same principal source: the nonstandard English that belonged to the Scots, Welsh, Irish and emigrants from rural England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There were the colonists who had the greatest contact with newly arrived African slaves, sometimes overseeing their labor, sometimes working beside them in fields and plantations. These were the people whose voices most strongly influenced the slaves as they embarked on the painful task of becoming English-speakers. (Abley 146-147)

E. The Southern drawl

The phonological feature most associated with Southern English is the so-called “southern drawl.” This is realized by the prolongation of certain vowel sounds and the “breaking of vowels and diphthongs into triphthongs.” For example, “there” can be pronounced /ðajæ/ and “bad” /bæeɛd/. Upliding diphthongs occur in “pass,” “bath” and “after” to give the vowel sound /æɛ/ or /æy/.

Another distinctive characteristic of Southern English is the merging of the vowel sounds /i/ and /e/ as in the words “pin” and “pen.” This distinctive southern drawl excites prejudice in some people, as illustrated in the following quotes. . . . The first demonstrates the speaker’s surprise that someone who spoke with a southern drawl might be intelligent and the second. . . that a highly educated person—a one-time President of the United States—could speak with a southern drawl:

“. . . Beneath that deceptive North Carolina drawl, there’s a crisp intelligence.”

“Governor Clinton, you attended Oxford University in England and Yale Law School in the Ivy

League, two of the finest institutions of learning in the world. So how come you still talk like a hillbilly?"

These quotes show that people who speak with the southern drawl may be considered ill-educated. The quotes were about men's speech, however. The third quote below is from a woman, herself a speaker of the southern drawl, expressing frustration that her accent means that listeners do not take her seriously:

"Instead of listening to what you're saying, they're passing the phone around the office saying, 'Listen to this little honey from South Carolina.'"

... The different type of prejudice to the southern drawl if the speaker is a woman is also evident in the next quote. The speaker is a woman who sells mailing lists over the phone. She is describing the effect her southern drawl has on men:

"It's hilarious how these businessmen turn to gray when they hear it. I get some of the most callous, and I start talkin' to them in a mellow southern drawl, I slow their heart rate down and I can sell them a list in a heartbeat."

As we can see from this quote, attitudes towards the southern drawl and "style" are not always negative. Southerners are thought to have "elaborate civility" and to be more polite, more eloquent and less direct than their northern compatriots. (Kirkpatrick 65-66)

<解説>

英語には無数のヴァリエーションがあり、いわゆる「ネイティブ」とされる人々の英語にもかなり変わったものがある。南部方言のように地域的な違いがあれば、黒人英語のように人種的な差異に関わるものもある。あるいは職業ごとの言葉づかいの違いや、世代間の違い、さらには特定の趣味嗜好でまとまったグループに特有の言葉づかいもあり、人の数だけ英語のヴァリエーションがあると言っても過言ではない。

問題は、特定のヴァリエーションが他よりも低く見られ、教育や仕事の場面で差別が起きることである。都市に暮らす移民やマイノリティーの人々は、標準英語の基準からするとかなり風変りな英語を話すし、中には家庭では全く英語を使わない者もいる。そのため学校で教師から差別されて不登校になり、悪い仲間とつるんで犯罪に走るといったケースが後を絶たず、さらに就職しようにも可能な職種が制限され、その分収入も平均以下になってしまうことが多く、慢性的な悪循環となっている。

極端な話をすれば、標準英語という意味での英語ができなくてもアメリカ人として暮らしていくことは可能であり、今後アメリカはますます多言語化していくと見られている。

資料 4

F. Differences between British and American variations of English

What are some of the differences between the standard British and American dialects? As with all varieties, the most noticeable difference between them is in their different pronunciations. One difference is that the /j/ glide after certain consonants does not occur in American English. Thus a “duke” is a /dju:k/ in conservative RP, but is a /du:k/ in American English, although /dʒu:k/ is also common in Britain. Stress patterns on words also differ. A British “laboratory” has four syllables with the main stress on the second, an American “laboratory” has five syllables with more or less equal stress on each. “Extraordinary” has four syllables with the main stress on the second syllable in British English, but six syllables and main stresses on the first and third syllables in American English. “Fertile” is /fɜ:təɪl/ in British English and /fɜ:təl/ in American. Similarly, a “missile” is a /mɪsaɪl/ in British and a /mɪsəl/ in American. The American pronunciations are not necessarily newer than the British ones. For example, the American pronunciations of “fertile” and “missile” retain the original English pronunciations of these two words.

There are also many differences in vocabulary. . . . [W]hen the British and Americans talk about cars and driving, you would think they were talking about completely different things. In England, cars have bonnets, boots, gear levers, number plates, tyres and windscreens. In America, they have hoods, trunks, stick shifts, license plates, tires and windshields. In England, drivers stop at pedestrian or zebra crossings and at traffic lights. They go round roundabouts and avoid driving on the pavement. They drive on motorways and ring roads, they pull off at junctions and pull up on the hard shoulder. In America, drivers stop at crosswalks and stop lights. They go round traffic circles and avoid driving on the sidewalk. They drive on interstates and beltways and exit at exits and pull off at pull offs.

There are also grammatical differences. In certain contexts, an American can use the past simple tense when a British speaker would use the present perfect. For example, “Did you buy your car yet?” is possible in American English but, in British English, a speaker would say “Have you bought your car yet?”

Differences also exist in the way people speak to each other. For example, when greeting and leave taking the British may say “How are you?” and “Goodbye,” while Americans may say “How are you doing?” and “Have a nice day.” (Kirkpatrick 58)

G. Classification of World Englishes

Perhaps the most common classification of Englishes, especially in the language teaching world, has been to distinguish between English as a native language (ENL), English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL).

In this classification, ENL is spoken in countries where English is the primary language of the great majority of the population. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States are countries in which English is said to be spoken and used as a native language.

In contrast, ESL is spoken in countries where English is an important and usually official language, but not the main language of the country. These countries are typically ex-colonies of the United Kingdom or the United States. Nigeria, India, Malaysia and the Philippines are examples of countries in which English is said to be spoken and used as a second language.

The final classification of this model is EFL. EFL occurs in countries where English is not actually used or spoken very much in the normal course of daily life. In these countries, English is typically learned at school, but students have little opportunity to use English outside the classroom and therefore little motivation to learn English. China, Indonesia, Japan and many countries in the Middle East are countries in which English is said to operate as an EFL.

This ENL/ESL/EFL distinction has been helpful in certain contexts. There is no doubt, for example, that the motivation to learn English is likely to be far greater in countries where English plays an institutional or official role than in countries where students are unlikely to hear any English outside the classroom or ever need to use it. This classification, however, has shortcomings. One is that the term “native language” is open to misunderstanding. As speakers in ENL countries are described as native speakers, people feel that the variety used is a standard variety that is spoken by **all** of the people. People then feel that ENL is innately superior to ESL and EFL varieties and that it therefore represents a good model of English for people in ESL and EFL countries to follow. In actual fact, however, many different varieties of English are spoken in ENL countries. The idea that everyone speaks the same “standard model” is simply incorrect. Second, the suggestion to use ENL as “the model” ignores the fact that such a model might be inappropriate in ESL countries where the local variety would be a more acceptable model, as there are many fluent speakers and expert users of that particular variety.

A second shortcoming of the classification is that the spread of English also means that it is more difficult to find countries that can be accurately classified as EFL countries. As we shall see, English is playing an increasing role in EFL countries such as China and Japan. The ESL vs EFL distinction appears to be more valid when applied to the contrast between city and countryside. City dwellers in both ESL and EFL countries have far more opportunity and need to use English than their rural counterparts. Furthermore, ESL varieties are said to operate in countries that were once colonies of Britain or America, but. . . the type of colony has influenced the current roles of English in such countries. (Kirkpatrick 27-28)