

2021年度大学院博士前期課程学内選考試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.1)

次の英文を読み、それぞれの設問に答えなさい。なお、哲学歴史学専修の哲学分野を希望する人は【問題Ⅰ】を、哲学歴史学専修の歴史学分野を希望する人は【問題Ⅱ】を、日本文学日本語学専修を希望する人は【問題Ⅲ】を選ぶこと。

【問題Ⅰ】 次の英文を和訳しなさい。（下線部については文末注を参照のこと）

Plato held in the *Republic*¹ that emotions such as pity and fear are powerful impediments to rational deliberation. And in the *Phaedo*² he depicted the soul's search for understanding as a process that required separating intellect as much as possible from the impeding influence of these and other emotions. He spoke of this process as a "clearing up" or "cleaning up" - using a family of words (katharós, katharsis, katharmos³) that were familiar in many different contexts - everyday practical, educational, medical, religious, literary - always, however, with the general sense of "clearing or cleaning up by removal of an obstacle or obstacles." Ancient evidence suggests that Aristotle's idea of poetic katharsis is some sort of response to Plato. Therefore, although nothing we have said so far about pity, fear, or even tragic learning and tragic pleasure presupposes any particular interpretation of katharsis, and although any interpretation of this difficult material must remain tentative, it seems appropriate to do what we can to make sense of it.

In *Fragility*⁴ I studied the kathairō⁵ word group in some detail, showing its wide range of uses in the sense "cleaning up," "clearing up." There seems to me to be no reason to suppose that the word katharsis ever became separated from the rest of the word group and turned into a technical term: it seems to retain both the ordinariness and the range of its cognates. Katharsis is just the process that yields a *katharos* result, i.e. one free of dirt or impediment. The word group may of course be used in specialized religious and medical and literary contexts. And often in those contexts there will be specialized views about what counts as the achievement of katharsis. But there seems to be no reason to think that the word itself has taken on a technical sense, no reason not to go on translating it in its ordinary sense of "cleaning" or "clearing up." If there is any group of specialized contexts that seems especially pertinent in understanding Aristotle's use here, it would seem to be the group of rhetorical, philosophical, and literary passages in

2021年度大学院博士前期課程学内選考試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.2)

which the "clearing up" in question is cognitive, a getting clear about obscure matters. But Plato's uses give us an even better reason to investigate a cognitive application of *katharsis* in the *Poetics*⁶, since Plato clearly does envisage the "getting clear" in question as an improvement in understanding by the removal of some obstacles to understanding.

出典：Martha C. Nussbaum, "Tragedy and Self-sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity"

(注)

¹ *Republic*：プラトン著『国家』のこと。

² *Phaedo*：プラトン著『パイドン』のこと。

³ *katharós*, *katharsis*, *katharmos*：清潔な、浄化、純化（古代ギリシア語）

⁴ *Fragility*：Martha C. Nussbaum 著 *The Fragility of Goodness* (1986)を指す。

⁵ *kathairō*：刈り込む、浄め落とす（古代ギリシア語）

⁶ *Poetics*：アリストテレス著『詩学』のこと。

2021年度大学院博士前期課程学内選考試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.3)

【問題Ⅱ】 次の英文を和訳しなさい。

Agrarian society played a critical role in the economic transformation of Meiji Japan. It was a vital source of the labor power, food, tax revenues, and export earnings that made the industrial revolution possible.

From 1880 through 1900, Japan's population rose from about thirty-five million to forty-five million people. At the same time, the rural, agricultural population declined slightly. Millions of people migrated from villages to towns or from towns to major cities. They moved as well from agriculture to commerce, mining, and manufacturing. Given these shifts, a demographic crisis could be avoided only by food imports or increased domestic output. Until about 1920, Japanese farmers supported the growing population with increased output. Agricultural productivity steadily increased for three reasons. First, the best practice of existing farms, previously limited to the most advanced areas, diffused more broadly. Second, new crops, new seeds, and more fertilizer came into use. In addition to traditional reliance on night soil and green fertilizers gathered from forests, farmers also made use of organic sources of nitrogen from the expanding frontiers of Meiji Japan and beyond. Production of herring meal from the seas around Hokkaido, already underway in Tokugawa times, expanded dramatically through more efficient and mobile fishing technologies. Soybean cakes from the fields of northern China added another source of nitrogen. Both these processes exacted an environmental toll at the points of origin (not until the 1920s would Japan begin to use inorganic fertilizers in significant quantities). Third, the acreage under cultivation expanded significantly, in part through land reclamation on the home islands of Kyushu, Shikoku, and Honshu. More significant was reclamation in Hokkaido, where state-supported programs led migrants to open dryland fields, pasture for livestock, and eventually rice fields thanks to new cold-resistant strains. By 1920, Hokkaido accounted for 15 percent of Japan's arable land.

出典 : Andrew Gordon A Modern History of Japan
Oxford University Press

2021年度大学院博士前期課程学内選考試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.4)

【問題Ⅲ】 次の英文を読み、下線部 A、B、C を和訳しなさい。

A. Is literature a special kind of language or is it a special use of language? Is it language organized in distinctive ways or is it language granted special privileges? I argued in Chapter 2 that it won't work to choose one option or the other: literature involves both properties of language and a special kind of attention to language. As this debate indicates, questions about the nature and the roles of language and how to analyse it have been central to theory. Some of the major issues can be focused through the problem of meaning. What is involved in thinking about meaning?

Meaning in literature

Take the lines which we earlier treated as literature, a two-line poem by Robert Frost:

THE SECRET SITS

We dance round in a ring and suppose,
But the Secret sits in the middle and knows.

B. What is 'meaning' here? Well, there's a difference between asking about the meaning of a text (the poem as a whole) and the meaning of a word. We can say that *dance* means 'to perform a succession of rhythmic and patterned movements', but what does this text mean? It suggests, you might say, the futility of human doings: we go round and around; we can only suppose. More than that, with its rhyme and its air of knowing what it is doing, this text engages the reader in a process of puzzling over dancing and supposing. That effect, the process the text can provoke, is part of its meaning. So, we have the meaning of a word and the meaning or provocations of a text; then, in between, there's what we might call the meaning of an utterance: the meaning of the act of uttering these words in particular circumstances. What *act* is this utterance performing: is it *warning* or *admitting*, *lamenting* or *boasting*, for example? Who is *we* here and what does 'dancing' mean in this utterance?

We can't just ask about 'meaning', then. There are at least three different dimensions or levels of meaning: the meaning of a word, of an utterance, and of a text. Possible meanings of words contribute to the meaning of an utterance, which is an act by a speaker. (And the meanings of words, in turn, come from the things they might do in utterances.) Finally, the text, which here represents an unknown speaker making this enigmatical utterance, is something an author has constructed, and its meaning is not a proposition but what it *does*, its potential to affect readers.

2021年度大学院博士前期課程学内選考試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.5)

C. We have different kinds of meaning, but one thing we can say in general is that meaning is based on difference. We don't know who 'we' refers to in this text; only that it is 'we' as opposed to 'I' alone, and to 'he', 'she', 'it', 'you' and 'they'. 'We' is some indefinite plural group that includes whatever speaker we think is involved. Is the reader included in 'we' or not? Is 'we' everyone except the Secret, or is it a special group? Such questions, which have no easy answers, come up in any attempt to interpret the poem. What we have are contrasts, differences.

出典 : Jonathan Culler, *Literary Theory : A Very Short Introduction*