平成２９年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（　秋期・社会人特別選抜　）問題

筆記試験　　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。

受験番号	

平成２９年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（秋期・社会人特別選抜）問題

筆記試験（英文学）

成績	

I 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

The natural and sensible starting-point for work in literary scholarship is the interpretation and analysis of the works of literature themselves. After all, only the works themselves justify all our interest in the life of an author, in his social environment and the whole process of literature. (1)But, curiously enough, literary history has been so preoccupied with the setting of a work of literature that its attempts at an analysis of the works themselves have been slight in comparison with the enormous efforts expended on the study of environment. Some reasons for this over-emphasis on the conditioning circumstances rather than on the works themselves are not far to seek. Modern literary history arose in close connexion with the (2)Romantic movement, which could subvert the critical system of Neo-Classicism only with the relativist argument that different times required different standards. Thus the emphasis shifted from the literature to its historical background, which was used to justify the new values ascribed to old literature. In the nineteenth century, explanation by causes became the great watchword, largely in an endeavour to emulate the methods of the natural sciences. Besides, the breakdown of the old poetics, which occurred with the shift of interest to the individual taste of the reader, strengthened the conviction that art, being fundamentally irrational, should be left to 'appreciation'. Sir Sidney Lee, in his inaugural lecture, merely summed up the theory of most academic literary scholarship when he said: 'In literary history we seek the external circumstances—political, social, economic—in which literature is produced'. (3)The result of a lack of clarity on questions of poetics has been the astonishing helplessness of most scholars when confronted with the task of actually analysing and evaluating a work of art.

In recent years a healthy reaction has taken place which recognizes that the study of literature should, first and foremost, concentrate on the actual works of art themselves. The old methods of classical rhetoric, poetics, or metrics are and must be reviewed and restated in modern terms. New methods based on a survey of the wider range of forms in modern literature are being introduced. In France the method of *explication de textes*, in Germany the formal analyses based on parallels with the history of fine arts, cultivated by Oskar Walzel, and especially the brilliant movement of the Russian formalists and their Czech and Polish followers have brought new stimuli to the study of the literary work, which we are only beginning to see properly and to analyse adequately.

The Russian formalists most vigorously objected to the old dichotomy of 'content versus form', which cuts a work of art into two halves: a crude content and a superimposed, purely external form. Clearly, the aesthetic effect of a work of art does not reside in what is commonly called its content. There are few works of art which are not ridiculous or meaningless in synopsis (which can be justified only as a pedagogical device). But a distinction between form as the factor aesthetically active and a content aesthetically indifferent meets with (4)insuperable difficulties. At first sight the boundary line may seem fairly definite. If we understand by content the ideas and emotions conveyed in a work of literature, the form would include all linguistic elements by which contents are expressed. But if we examine this distinction more closely, we see that content implies some elements of form: e.g. the events told in a novel are parts of the content, while the way in which they are arranged into a 'plot' is part of the form. Dissociated from this way of arrangement they have no artistic effect whatsoever. The common remedy proposed and widely used by Germans, i.e. the introduction of the term 'inner form', which originally dates back to Plotinus and

受験番号	

Shaftesbury, is merely complicating matters, as the boundary line between inner and outer form remains completely obscure. It must simply be admitted that the manner in which events are arranged in a plot is part of the form. (5)Things become even more disastrous for the traditional concepts when we realize that even in the language, commonly considered part of the form, it is necessary to distinguish between words in themselves, aesthetically indifferent, and the manner in which individual words make up units of sound and meaning, aesthetically effective. It would be better to rechristen all the aesthetically indifferent elements 'materials', while the manner in which they acquire aesthetic efficacy may be called 'structure'. This distinction is by no means a simple renaming of the old pair, content and form. It cuts right across the old boundary lines. 'Materials' include elements formerly considered part of the content, and parts formerly considered formal. 'Structure' is a concept including both content and form so far as they are organized for aesthetic purposes. The work of art is, then, considered as a whole system of signs, or structure of signs, serving a specific aesthetic purpose.

— *from* René Wellek & Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature*

設問 1　下線部(1)を和訳しなさい。

設問 2　下線部(2) "Romantic movement"は文学研究に何をもたらしたと筆者は言っていますか。本文に即して説明しなさい。

設問 3　下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。

受験番号	

設問 4　下線部(4) “insuperable difficulties”の具体的な内容は何ですか。本文に即して説明しなさい。

設問 5　下線部(5)を和訳しなさい。

II　次の用語を説明しなさい。

(1) neoclassicism　(2) stream of consciousness　(3) realism　(4) mock-epic

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

受験番号	

III Why do you want to study English literature in the graduate school? Write your answer in more than 300 words in English.