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（秋期・一般選抜）問題

専門科目I 英文学

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。
What conception of authorship, what ideas about its nature, simultaneously attracted hundreds of English women to that career in the nineteenth century and severely handicapped them in practicing it? Many of you will immediately think that this question, of all questions about women writers, has been amply answered, for you will recall that Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, as well as numerous other feminist critics, point to the historical association of authorship with generative paternity. Women, presumably, were driven to write in order to “create” for themselves, but they found that the male metaphor of literary creativity—the patriarchal metaphor—excluded them from the province of letters, and their books consequently repressed this sense of exclusion and handicapped (castrated) creativity. Such an analysis concentrates on the historical connections linking author, father, and male God to the exclusion of all other associations that might have occurred to nineteenth-century writers.

Moreover, the critics themselves seem to subscribe to the underlying assumption of writing with creative generativity. They are merely offended that women were thought unfit for this procreative art. Although these critics sometimes suggest that the male myth of the generative Word was designed to compensate for the fictional nature of all fatherhood, they seldom carry this critique of creativity very far, and remain content to point out that generativity is a “naturally” female characteristic, implying that the natural metaphor of the mother-author was the very thing the patriarchal metaphor was designed to preempt.

I would like to argue that another, very different association also helped structure the conjunction of gender and authorship in the nineteenth century. When women entered the career of authorship, they did not enter an inappropriately male territory, but a degradingly female one. They did not need to find a female metaphor for authorship; they needed to avoid or transform the one that was already there. The historical association—disabling, empowering and central to nineteenth-century consciousness—that I would like to discuss is not the metaphor of the writer as father, but the metaphor of the author as whore.

This metaphor has an ancient pedigree. Classicists tell us that although few women in the Greek classical period actually wrote, the association of writing with femininity in general and prostitution in particular spread with the increase in literacy itself. A link between writing and malevolent forms of male power can be found in several fragments; a too-close association with letters was also believed to emasculate a man. Underlying these associations is a notion of written language far removed from the idea of the procreative Word. It has been noted that Aristotle was uncertain about whether writing most resembled the natural generativity of plants and animals or the unnatural generation of money, which, in usury, proliferates through mere circulation but brings nothing qualitatively new into being. At times, Aristotle speaks of poetic making as a method of natural reproduction; at other times, he speaks of the written word as an arbitrary and conventional sign multiplying unnaturally in the mere process of exchange. The former idea of language promotes the metaphor of literary paternity; the latter the metaphor of literary usury and, ultimately, literary prostitution.

The whole sphere to which usury belongs, the sphere of exchange as opposed to that of production, is traditionally associated with women. Women are items of exchange, a form of currency and also a type of commodity. Of course, in normal kinship arrangements, when the exchange is completed and the woman becomes a wife, she enters the realm of “natural” (in the Aristotelian sense) production. But the prostitute never makes this transition from exchange to production; she retains her commodity form at all times. Like money, the prostitute, according to ancient accounts, is incapable of natural procreation. For all her sexual activity, indeed because of all of her sexual activity, she fails to bring new substances, children, into the world. Her womb, it seems, is too slippery. And yet she is a source of proliferation. What multiplies through her, though, is not a substance but a sign: money. Prostitution, then, like usury, is a metaphor for one of the ancient models of linguistic production: the unnatural multiplication of interchangeable signs.

From ancient times, then, we have evidence of two radically different ways of thinking about authors, one based on a masculine metaphor, the other on a feminine metaphor. Both are associated with forms of multiplication, of proliferation, and yet they cannot be made parallel, for they operate on completely different assumptions about the nature of linguistic procreation.
The gender distinction in literary theory is not between male fathers who can multiply and female eunuchs who cannot, not between male language and female silence, but between the natural production of new things in the world and the "unnatural" reproduction of mere signs. According to the father metaphor, the author generates real things in the world through language; according to the whore metaphor, language proliferates itself in a process of exchange through the author.

—from Catherine Gallagher, “George Eliot and Daniel Deronda” (1994)

問１ 下線部（A）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問２ 下線部（B）について、その意味するところを、本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

問３ 下線部（C）を日本語に訳しなさい。
問4 下線部（D）について、何故そのような運想が働くのか、本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

問5 下線部（E）を日本語に訳しなさい。

以下、用語の意味を簡潔に説明しなさい。

(1) ballad metre  (2) prolepsis  (3) objective correlative  (4) comedy of humours

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)
III 以下の引用を読み、作者と作品名を同定しなさい。
分からないときは、推定される時代とその理由を簡潔に説明しなさい。

(1) Wee, sleeket, cowran, tim'rous beastie,
O, what a panic's in thy breastie!
Thou need na start awa sae hasty,
Wi' bickering brattle!
I wad be laith to rin an' chase thee,
Wi' murd'ring pattle!

(2) Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickle's compass come;
Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,
But bears it out even to the edge of doom.
If this be error and upon me proved,
I never writ, nor no man ever loved.

(3) There's a stake in your fat black heart
And the villagers never liked you.
They are dancing and stamping on you.
They always knew it was you.
Daddy, daddy, you bastard, I'm through.

(4) Eight times emerging from the flood.
She mew'd to ev'ry wat'ry God,
Some speedy aid to send.
No Dolphin came, no Nereid stirr'd:
Nor cruel Tom, nor Susan heard.
A Fav'rite has no friend!

IV Write a short summary of your research for your graduation thesis, containing specific information such as the author, the work(s), and your critical point of view. Your answer should be more than 200 words in English.