

英語問題

(平成29年度)

【注意事項】

1. この問題冊子は「英語」である。
2. 試験時間は90分である。
3. 試験開始の合図まで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。ただし、表紙はあらかじめよく読んでおくこと。
4. 試験開始後すぐに、以下の5および6に記載されていることを確認すること。
5. この問題冊子の印刷は1ページから9ページまでである。
6. 解答用紙は問題冊子中央に3枚はさみこんである。
7. 問題冊子に落丁、乱丁、印刷不鮮明な箇所等があった場合および解答用紙が不足している場合は、手をあげて監督者に申し出ること。
8. 試験開始後、3枚ある解答用紙の所定の欄に、受験番号と氏名を記入すること（1枚につき受験番号は2箇所、氏名は1箇所）。
9. 解答は必ず解答用紙の指定された箇所に記入すること。解答用紙の裏面に記入してはいけない。
10. 問題番号に対応した解答用紙に解答していない場合は、採点されない場合もあるので注意すること。
11. 問題冊子の中の白紙部分は下書き等に使用してよい。
12. 解答用紙を切り離したり、持ち帰ってはいけない。
13. 試験終了時刻まで退室を認めない。試験中の気分不快やトイレ等、やむを得ない場合には、手をあげて監督者を呼び、指示に従うこと。
14. 試験終了後は問題冊子を持ち帰ること。

〔 I 〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

\*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

When the Austrian housekeeper Maria Turnsek agreed to \*smuggle a young Jewish boy out of Nazi-occupied Vienna, she had no idea of the price she would pay. Betrayed by a former friend, she was accused of kidnap and could not get back home to her own seven-year-old son, Helmut. It would be nine years before they met again.

Now, almost 60 years after her death, Irma Maria Turnsek, who arrived in Britain in the 1930s and was known as Maria, is finally being recognised for her heroism. She will be \*posthumously awarded the title of \*Righteous Among the Nations at the Israeli Embassy in London this week.

Administered by Yad Vashem, the Holocaust centre in Israel, the title is awarded to non-Jews such as the German industrialist Oskar Schindler and Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish architect, who risked their lives to save Jews during the Second World War.

しかし、もし好奇心の強いソーシャルワーカーがいなかったら、マリアは歴史の上で見過ごされていたかもしれない。 For more than 50 years, her son Helmut had shared little about his story with his wife and children, preferring not to burden them with the traumas of his past. But in the late stages of lung cancer, Mr Turnsek opened up to Anne Mossack, a visiting social worker from the North London Hospice. At his home in Finchley, north London, Mr Turnsek told her about his mother's heroism and his desire to see her recognised.

In 1938 Maria, a Catholic, worked as a housekeeper in Vienna for Käthe Leichter, a Jewish sociologist. The women, both members of the banned Socialist party, had young sons who played together and were friends. As the situation worsened, Mrs Leichter, who as a Jew was banned from travel, begged her housekeeper to take her son, Franz, to join his father in Paris. After \*agonising \*deliberations, Maria agreed to smuggle the boy out of the country by passing him off as her own. Once Franz was with his father, she intended to return to Helmut, who was being cared for by his \*childminders.

The women were betrayed by an \*informant. Mrs Leichter was arrested and sent to Ravensbrück \*concentration camp, where she died in 1942. Wanted for kidnap, Maria was unable to return and so fled to England. Nine years passed before she saw her son again. In the \*interim, Helmut's childminders died, and he was sent to a series of \*orphanages. It was only through the Red Cross that mother and son were able to exchange 25 words twice a year.

Soon after arriving in London, Maria was taken on as a housekeeper for Geoffrey Hutchinson, a prominent lawyer and Tory \*MP who later became a life peer. Maria was helped by her employer to get her son, who was a \*displaced person, out of Austria. Mother and son

rebuilt their lives in London. Helmut married, qualified as a lawyer and went on to become deputy legal adviser to the Crown Estate.

After his mother died in 1956, Mr Turnsek spoke little of his past. Decades later, he told the social worker that he had contacted Yad Vashem about his mother but that nothing had come of it. Mrs Mossack then decided to contact the centre herself. She said: "I had to see if I could try to get Maria the recognition she deserved."

Yad Vashem tracked Franz Leichter down in New York, where he had lived since 1940. Like Mr Turnsek, he was a lawyer and later went on to serve as a state senator. The two men got in touch via email.

"All this really borders on the miraculous!" wrote Mr Turnsek to his childhood friend.

Mr Leichter replied: "I feel indebted to you, who suffered because of your mother's heroic and generous act in taking me out of Austria as her son."

In April 2014 Mr Leichter flew to London for an emotional reunion but Mr Turnsek died a week later.

His widow, Doreen, told *The Times*: "When Franz walked into the house after all those years he said to Helmut, 'I owe you my life.'" She added: "Maybe he was holding on to meet Franz, maybe he let go knowing his mother's story would be told."

Now, 18 months after his death, Mr Turnsek's mother will be added to the Wall of Honour in the Garden of the Righteous at Yad Vashem. Mr Leichter and his family will return to London for the ceremony. "I wouldn't miss it," Mr Leichter said from New York. "Irma risked her life to save me. Crossing through Germany at that time was very dangerous. If anyone had questioned her papers she would have been arrested and, at the very least, sent to a concentration camp."

Irena Stienfeldt, director of the Righteous Among the Nations department, said: "Despite the passing of time, Yad Vashem is deeply committed to commemorating the rescuers. In this case, Irma Turnsek and her son had lost touch with the rescued person, and we were able, more than 70 years after the events, to trace Franz Leichter in the United States and obtain his testimony."

(出典 Lianne Kolirin, "Schindler's Honour for Housekeeper Hero" in *The Times* (*The Japan News*, Nov. 15, 2015))

## Notes

smuggle: move (goods) illegally into or out of a country.

posthumously (*adv.*) < posthumous (*adj.*): happening, done, published, etc. after a person has died.

righteous: morally right and good.

agonising: causing great physical or mental pain.

deliberation: long and careful consideration.

childminder: a person who looks after children in their own home for payment.

informant: a person who gives secret information about someone to the police or a newspaper.

concentration camp: a type of prison where large numbers of people who are not soldiers are kept during a war and are usually forced to live in very bad conditions.

interim: the period of time between two events.

orphanage: a home for children whose parents are dead or unable to care for them.

MP: Member of Parliament.

displaced person: someone who has been forced to leave their country because of war or cruel treatment.

- (1) 下線部 (ア) の内容を本文に即して具体的に日本語で説明しなさい。
- (2) 下線部 (イ) はどのような人に与えられているかを本文に即して日本語で述べなさい。
- (3) 下線部 (ウ) を英訳しなさい。
- (4) 約 70 年ぶりに再会した 2 人の男性の姓名を記しなさい。
- (5) 下線部 (エ) を和訳しなさい。

〔Ⅱ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

\*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

Each of us has memories that we wish we could erase, and memories that we cannot<sup>(ア)</sup>  
summon no matter how hard we try. At New York University and other institutions, scientists have begun to identify genes that appear to make proteins that \*enhance memory, and genes that clearly interfere with it. Both kinds of discovery raise the \*tantalizing, if preliminary, hope of a new generation of drugs, some of which could help people remember and some that might help them forget.

Until memories are fixed, they are fragile and easily destroyed. これまで電話番号や住所を覚えようとしている間に邪魔されたことのない人はいるだろうか。<sup>(イ)</sup> That memory almost invariably slips away, because it never had time to form. (This also explains why accident victims often have trouble recalling events that occurred just before a car crash or other severe trauma.) It takes a few hours for new experiences to complete the \*biochemical and electrical process that transforms them from short-term to long-term memories. Over time, they become stronger and less vulnerable to interference, and, as scientists have argued for nearly a century, they eventually become \*imprinted onto the \*circuitry of our brains. That process is referred to as \*consolidation. Until recently, few researchers challenged the \*paradigm; the only significant question about consolidation seemed to be how long it took for the cement to dry.

For years, though, there have been indications that the process is less straightforward than it seems. In 1968, a team at Rutgers University, led by Donald J. Lewis, published the results of an experiment in which rats were conditioned to retrieve memories that had, presumably, been stored permanently. First, the scientists trained the rats to fear a sound. The next day, Lewis played the sound again and followed it immediately with a shock to the head. To his surprise, the rats seemed to have forgotten the negative association; they no longer feared the sound. That seemed odd; if the memory had truly been wired into the rat's brain, a mild shock shouldn't have been able to \*dislodge it. The experiment wasn't easily repeated by others, though, and few \*neuroscientists paid much attention to such a \*singular and \*contradictory finding.

Not long afterward, in seemingly unrelated research, the psychologist Elizabeth Loftus embarked upon what has turned into a decades-long examination of the ways in which misleading information can \*insinuate itself into one's memory. In her most famous study, she gave two dozen subjects a journal<sup>(ウ)</sup> filled with details of three events from their childhoods. To make memories as accurate and compelling as possible, Loftus \*enlisted family members to assemble the information. She then added a fourth, completely \*fictitious experience that

described how, at the age of five, each child had been lost in a mall and finally rescued by an elderly stranger. Loftus seeded the false memories with plausible information, such as the name of the mall each subject would have visited. When she interviewed the subjects later, a quarter of them recalled having been lost in the mall, and some did so in remarkable detail.

“I was crying and I remember that day... I thought I’d never see my family again,” one participant said, in a taped interview. “An older man approached me.... He had a flannel shirt on.... I remember my mom told me never to do that again.” These assertions were delivered with a precision and a certainty that few people could have doubted, except that there was no man in a flannel shirt and no admonition from the subject’s mother. Memory “works a little bit more like a Wikipedia page,” Loftus said in a recent speech. “You can go in there and change it, but so can other people.”

Loftus has been vilified for demonstrating that even the most vivid and detailed eyewitness accounts—a “recovered memory” of sexual abuse, for example—can be inaccurate or completely false. “She changed the world.” Elizabeth Phelps told me recently, when we met in her office at New York University, where she is the Silver Professor of Psychology and Neural Science. “The notion of the unreliability of memory has changed courtrooms in America, and it is completely owing to Elizabeth’s persistence in the face of a very harsh backlash.”

(出典 Michael Specter, “Partial Recall” in *The New Yorker*, May 19, 2014 Issue 一部改変)

## Notes

enhance: to improve the quality, amount, or strength of something.

tantalizing (*adj.*) < tantalize (*v.*): to make a person or an animal want something that they cannot have or do.

biochemical: connected with the chemistry of living things.

imprint: to become fixed in your mind or memory so that you never forget.

circuitry: nerve connections in the brain.

consolidation (*n.*) < consolidate (*v.*): to make solid or firm.

paradigm: a model or example that shows how something works or is produced.

dislodge: to force or knock something out of its position.

neuroscientist < neuroscience: the scientific study of nerves and especially of how nerves affect learning and behavior.

singular: very unusual or strange.

contradictory: containing a contradiction.

insinuate: to bring or introduce into a position or relation by indirect or artful methods.

enlist: to persuade someone to help you to do something.

fictitious: not true, or not real.

admonition: a warning or expression of disapproval about someone's behavior.

vilify: to say or write bad things about someone or something.

eyewitness: a person who sees something happen and is able to describe it.

persistence: determination to do something even though it is difficult or other people oppose it.

backlash: a strong negative reaction by a number of people against recent events, especially against political or social developments.

(1) 下線部 (ア) を和訳しなさい。

(2) 下線部 (イ) を英訳しなさい。

(3) Elizabeth Loftus の研究で, (a)被験者たちに与えた下線部 (ウ) の "a journal" には何が書かれていたか, (b)その後被験者と面談した時に, どういうことが起こったか, の2点について, 本文に即して日本語で答えなさい。

(4) 下線部 (エ) の内容を, 文章全体の論旨を踏まえて, 日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

〔Ⅲ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

\*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

Charity—humanity's most \*benevolent impulse—is a timeless and borderless virtue, dating at least to the dawn of religious teaching. Philanthropy as we understand it today, however, is a distinctly American phenomenon, inseparable from the nation that shaped it. From colonial leaders to modern \*billionaires like Buffett, Gates and Zuckerberg, the tradition of giving is woven into our national DNA.

Like so many of our social structures, the formal practice of giving money to aid society traces its origin to a Founding Father. Benjamin Franklin, an \*icon of individual industry and \*frugality even in his own day, understood that with the privilege of doing well came the price of doing good. When he died in 1790, Franklin thought of future generations, leaving in trust two gifts of 1,000 \*lb. of \*sterling silver—one to the city of Boston, the other to Philadelphia. \*Per his instruction, a portion of the money and its \*dividends could not be used for 200 years.

While Franklin's gifts lay in wait, the tradition he established evolved alongside the young nation. After the Civil War, rapid industrialization concentrated \*unfathomable wealth in the hands of a few, creating a period of unprecedented inequality. In response, the steel \*magnate Andrew Carnegie pioneered scientific philanthropy, which sought to address the underlying causes of social ills, rather than their symptoms. In his lifetime, Carnegie gave away more than \$350 million, the equivalent of some \$9 billion today. His 1889 essay "Wealth"—now better known as Carnegie's "The Gospel of Wealth"—effectively launched modern philanthropy by creating a model that the wealthy continue to follow.

Two decades later, John D. Rockefeller \*endowed the Rockefeller Foundation, which soon became the largest such "benevolent trust" in the world. Prior to World War II, the Rockefeller Foundation provided more foreign aid than the entire federal government.

America's philanthropic instinct is not limited to the rich. The nation's history is \*rife with people like Oseola McCarty, a Mississippi washerwoman who gave away her life savings of \$150,000 in 1995 to fund college scholarships for low-income students with promise.

What accounts for this culture of generosity? The answer is not solely \*altruistic. Incentives in the tax \*code, for one, encourage the well-off to give. And philanthropy has long helped improve the public image of everyone from robber barons to the new tech elite.

More troubling, however, are the foundational problems that make philanthropy so necessary. Just before his death, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote, "Philanthropy is \*commendable, but it must not cause the philanthropist to overlook the circumstances of economic injustice which make philanthropy necessary."



Indeed, King illuminates a central contradiction: philanthropy is an \*offspring of the market, conceived and sustained by <sup>(+)</sup> returns on capital, yet its most important responsibility is to help address the market's imbalances and inadequacies.

Only ( 才 ) years ago, the last of Franklin's gifts were finally made available; having multiplied to \$6.5 million. More than the sum, they represent a broader principle: We are \*custodians of a public trust, even if our capital was derived from private enterprise, and our most important obligation is ensuring that the system works more equally and more justly for more people. This belief is core to our national character. America's greatest strength is not the fact of perfection, but rather the act of perfecting.

(出典 Darren Walker, "Giving Back Is a Birthright" in *Time*, July 11/July 18, 2016  
一部省略・改変)

## Notes

benevolent: well meaning and kindly.

billionaire: a rich person who has at least a billion dollars, pounds, etc.

icon: someone famous who is admired by many people and is thought to represent an important idea.

frugality (*n.*) < frugal (*adj.*): careful about spending money.

lb.: pound.

sterling silver: silver of 92.25 percent purity.

per: as directed by or stated in.

dividend: an amount of a company's profits that the company pays to people who own stock.

unfathomable: impossible to understand.

magnate: a person who has great wealth and power in a particular business or industry.

endow: to give a large amount of money to a school, hospital, etc., in order to pay for the creation or continuing support.

rife: numerous.

altruistic (*adj.*) < altruism (*n.*): feeling and behavior that show a desire to help other people and a lack of selfishness.

code: a system of laws or written rules.

commendable: deserving praise and approval.

offspring: that which springs from or is produced by something; outcome, result.

custodian: someone who helps and protects something valuable for another person.

- (1) 下線部 (ア) を 5 語で具体的に言い換えた箇所を本文から抜き出さない。
- (2) 下線部 (イ) をその内容がわかるように本文に即して日本語で説明しない。
- (3) 下線部 (ウ) が発達した要因として本文で挙げられていることを日本語で 3 つ指摘しない。
- (4) 下線部 (エ) の内容について本文に即して日本語で説明しない。
- (5) この記事が 2016 年に書かれたものであることを踏まえて、空欄 (オ) に入る正しい数字を答えない。