２０２４年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程後期３年の課程入学試験

（　冬期・一般選抜　）問題

筆記試験 　　　英文学　　　 専攻分野

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

２０２４年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程後期３年の課程入学試験

（冬期・一般選抜）問題

専門科目 （ 英文学 専攻分野）

I 次の（1）〜（3）は詩作品の一部です。それぞれについての文体、イメージ、韻律などの特徴について説明し、書いた作家を推測しなさい。解答は日本語で書くこと。

(1)　Happy ye leaves when as those lilly hands,
　　　Which hold my life in their dead doing might
　　　Shall handle you and hold in loves soft bands,
　　　Lyke captives trembling at the victors sight.
　　　And happy lines, on which with starry light,
　　　Those lamping eyes will deigne sometimes to look
　　　And reade the sorrowes of my dying spright,
　　　Written with teares in harts close bleeding book.

(2)　The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
　　　　　The lowing herd wind slowly o'er the lea,
　　　The plowman homeward plods his weary way,
　　　　　And leaves the world to darkness and to me.

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

II　次の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

　　It is a task for the historian of culture to explain why there has been in the past four decades a heavy and largely victorious assault on the sensible belief that a text means what its author meant. In the earliest and most decisive wave of the attack (launched by Eliot, Pound, and their associates) the battleground was literary: the proposition that textual meaning is independent of the author's control was associated with the literary doctrine that the best poetry is impersonal, objective, and autonomous; that it leads an afterlife of its own, totally cut off from the life of its author. (1)This programmatic notion of what poetry should be became subtly identified with a notion of what all poetry and indeed all forms of literature necessarily must be. It was not simply desirable that literature should detach itself from the subjective realm of the author's personal thoughts and feelings; it was, rather, an indubitable fact that all written language remains independent of that subjective realm. At a slightly later period, and for different reasons, this same notion of (2)semantic autonomy was advanced by Heidegger and his followers. The idea also has been advocated by writers who believe with Jung that individual expressions may quite unwittingly express archetypal, communal meanings. In some branches of linguistics, particularly in so-called information theory, the semantic autonomy of language has been a working assumption. The theory has found another home in the work of non-Jungians who have interested themselves (as Eliot did earlier) in symbolism, though Cassirer, whose name is sometimes invoked by such writers, did not believe in the semantic autonomy of language. As I said, it is the job of the cultural historian to explain why this doctrine should have gained currency in recent times, but it is the theorist's job to determine how far the theory of semantic autonomy deserves acceptance.

　　Literary scholars have often contended that the theory of authorial irrelevance was entirely beneficial to literary criticism and scholarship because it shifted the focus of discussion from the author to his work. Made confident by the theory, the modern critic has faithfully and closely examined the text to ferret out its independent meaning instead of its supposed significance to the author's life. That this shift toward exegesis has been desirable most critics would agree, whether or not they adhere to the theory of semantic autonomy. But the theory accompanied the exegetical movement for historical not logical reasons, since no logical necessity compels a critic to banish an author in order to analyze his text. Nevertheless, through its historical association with close exegesis, the theory has liberated much subtlety and intelligence. Unfortunately, it has also frequently encouraged willful arbitrariness and extravagance in academic criticism and has been one very important cause of the prevailing skepticism which calls into doubt the possibility of objectively valid interpretation. (3)These disadvantages would be tolerable, of course, if the theory were true. In intellectual affairs skepticism is preferable to illusion.

　　The disadvantages of the theory could not have been easily predicted in the exciting days when the old order of academic criticism was being overthrown. At that time such naïvetés as the positivistic biases of literary history, the casting about for influences and other causal patterns, and the post-romantic fascination with the habits, feelings, and experiences surrounding the act of composition were very justly brought under attack. It became increasingly obvious that the theoretical foundations of the old criticism were weak and inadequate. It cannot be said, therefore, that the theory of authorial irrelevance was inferior to the theories or quasi-theories it replaced, nor can it be doubted that the immediate effect of banishing the author was wholly beneficial and invigorating. (4)Now, at a distance of several decades, the difficulties that attend the theory of semantic autonomy have clearly emerged and are responsible for that uneasiness which persists in the academies, although the theory has long been victorious.

　　（中略）

　　What had not been noticed in the earliest enthusiasm for going back to 'what the text says' was that the text had to represent *somebody's* meaning—if not the author's, then the critic's. It is true that a theory was erected under which the meaning of the text was equated with everything it could plausibly be taken to mean. (I have described in Appendix I the fallacies of this and other descriptions of meaning that were contrived to escape the difficulties of authorial irrelevance.) The theory of semantic autonomy forced itself into such unsatisfactory, ad hoc formulations because in its zeal to banish the author it ignored the fact that meaning is an affair of consciousness not of words. Almost any word sequence can, under the conventions of language, legitimately represent more than one complex of meaning. A word sequence means nothing in particular until somebody either means something by it or understands something from it. There is no magic

land of meanings outside human consciousness. Whenever meaning is connected to words, a person is making the connection, and the particular meanings he lends to them are never the only legitimate ones under the norms and conventions of his language.

One proof that the conventions of language can sponsor different meanings from the same sequence of words resides in the fact that interpreters can and do disagree. When these disagreements occur, how are they to be resolved? Under the theory of semantic autonomy they cannot be resolved, since the meaning is not what the author meant, but 'what the poem means to different sensitive readers.' One interpretation is as valid as another, so long as it is 'sensitive' or 'plausible.' Yet the teacher of literature who adheres to Eliot's theory is also by profession the preserver of a heritage and the conveyor of knowledge. On what ground does he claim that his 'reading' is more valid than that of any pupil? On no very firm ground. (5)This impasse is a principal cause of the loss of bearings sometimes felt though not often confessed by academic critics.

—*from* E. D. Hirsch Jr., *Validity of Interpretation.*

問1　下線部(1)を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問2　下線部(2) semantic autonomy　とは何か、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問3　下線部(3) These disadvantages　とは何か、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問4　下線部(4)を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問5　下線部(5) This impasse とは何か、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

III　次の（1）〜（9）の事項から三つを選び、それぞれ 200 字程度の日本語で説明しなさい。解答は順不同でかまわないが、選んだ事項の番号を最初に明記すること。

(1) イギリス・ルネッサンスの抒情詩における「宮廷恋愛」(courtly love) の主題
(2) 17 世紀形而上詩における「奇想」(conceit) の特徴
(3) 18 世紀イギリスにおける近代小説の勃興
(4) William Wordsworth と「崇高」(the sublime)
(5) Jane Austen の小説とジェントルマン階級
(6) モダニズム小説と「意識の流れ」
(7) T. S. Eliot の「伝統」(tradition) の理論
(8) Edward Said と「オリエンタリズム」(orientalism)
(9) 現代批評と構造主義

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV What are the possible criteria to decide between a "good" work of literature and a "bad" work?   Please try to write a minimum of 300 words in English.