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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・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。
No book has any meaning on its own, in a vacuum. The meaning of a book is in large part a product of its differences from and similarities to other books. If a novel did not bear some resemblance to other novels we should not know how to read it, and if it wasn’t different from all other novels we shouldn’t want to read it. Any adequate reading of a text, therefore, involves identifying and classifying it in relation to other texts, according to content, genre, mode, period, and so on. The fact that a literary taxonomy can never be as exact as a botanical taxonomy does not affect the basic principle: the classification of data into larger groups and categories—if only Animal, Vegetable and Mineral—is a primary act of human intelligence without which neither Nature nor Culture can be made intelligible. (1) Likewise, even if we agree with Lawrence that the essential core of literary criticism is the effect of a book upon an individual reader, the fact that this effect, or “feeling” as he calls it, is produced by language and by language alone, means that we cannot explain how it works unless we have some understanding of “style and form.” In short, without some notion of literature as a system—a system of possibilities of which the corpus of literary works is a partial realization—Lawrence’s advice to critics to rely on their “sincere and vital emotion and nothing else” is itself very likely to produce critical twiddle-twaddle, particularly from critics with less interesting sensibilities and more limited rhetorical skills than he possessed.

(2) What I propose to do here, in a necessarily simplified and schematic fashion, is to suggest some ways in which the enormous mass of texts that make up modern English literature can be ordered and classified. It is, if you like, the sketch of a literary history of the modern period—which I take to be now about a hundred years old—but a history of writing rather than of writers, a history of literary style, fashion, or mode, of what contemporary French critics call écriture; and it will reflect my own particular interests in being biased somewhat towards the novel, in occasionally stepping over the boundary between English and American literature, and in applying concepts and methods of analysis drawn from the European structuralist tradition in linguistics and poetics.

I have already invoked that tradition in describing literature as a system of possibilities, of which the corpus of literary works is a partial realization, for this is essentially the distinction made by Saussure between langue and parole, a language and individual speech acts in that language. Saussure defined the verbal sign, or word, as the union of a signifier (that is, a sound or written symbolization of a sound) and a signified (that is, a concept) and asserted that the relationship between signifiant and signifié is an arbitrary one. That is, there is no natural or necessary reason why the sound cat should denote a feline quadruped and the sound dog a canine quadruped, and the English language would work equally well if cat and dog changed places in the system, as long as all users were aware of the change. (3) This nucleus of arbitrariness at the heart of language means that it is the systematic relationships between words that enable them to communicate rather than the relationships between words and things; and it exposes the idea of any resemblance between words and things as an illusion. Since language provides a model for all systems of signs, the idea has profound implications for the study of culture as a whole. In brief, it implies the priority of form over content, of the signifier over the signified.

One way of defining the art that is peculiar to the modern period—which I shall distinguish by calling modernist—one way of defining modernist art, and especially modernist literature, is to say that it intuitively accepted or anticipated (4) Saussure’s view of the relationship between signs and reality. Modernism turned its back on the traditional idea of art as imitation and substituted the idea of art as an autonomous activity. One of
its most characteristic slogans was Walter Pater's assertion, "All art constantly aspires to the condition of music"—music being, of all the arts, the most purely formal, the least referential, a system of signifiers without signifieds, one might say. The fundamental principle of aesthetics before the modern era was that art imitates life, and is therefore in the last analysis answerable to it: art must tell the truth about life, and contributes to making it better, or at least more bearable. There was always, of course, a diversity of opinion about the kind of imitation that was most desirable—about whether one should imitate the actual or the ideal—but the basic premise that art imitated life prevailed in the West from classical times till the late eighteenth century, when it began to be challenged by Romantic theories of the imagination. It was temporarily reinforced by the considerable achievement of the realistic novel in the nineteenth century, but by the end of that century (just after the Civil War, as it had been turned on its head. "Life imitates art," declared Oscar Wilde, meaning that we compose the reality we perceive by mental structures that are cultural, not natural in origin, and that it is art which is most likely to change and renew those structures when they become inadequate or unsatisfying. "Where, if not from Impressionists," he asked, "do we get those wonderful brown fogs that come creeping down our streets, blurring the gaslamps and changing the houses into monstrous shadows?"

—from David Lodge, *Working with Structuralism*

設問 1 下線部(1)を和訳しなさい。

設問 2 下線部(2)を和訳しなさい。

設問 3 下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。
設問4 下線部(4)で言われていることの具体的な内容を、本文に即して説明しなさい。

設問5 下線部(5)で言われていることの具体的な内容を、本文に即して説明しなさい。

II 次の(1)～(4)の英文は詩の一部です。それぞれの作品が書かれた時代と作者名を推測して答えなさい。また、その理由を簡潔に説明しなさい。

(1)
Like as a huntean after weary chase,
Seeing the game from him escap'd away,
Sits down to rest him in some shady place,
With panting hounds beguiled of their prey;
So after long pursuit and vain assay,
When I all weary had the chase forsook,
The gentle deer return'd the self' same way,
Thinking to quench her thirst at the next brook.

(2)
Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright,
The bridal of the earth and sky;
The dew shall weep thy fall to' night,
For thou must die.

(3)
I caught this morning morning's minion, king
   dom of daylight's dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon, in his riding
Of the rolling level underneath him steady air, and striding
High there, how he rung upon the rein of a wimpling wing
In his ecstasy! then off, off forth on swing,
   As a skate's heel sweeps smooth on a bow-bend: the hurl and gliding
Rebuffed the big wind. My heart in hiding
Stirred for a bird, – the achieve of, the mastery of the thing!

(4)
He disappeared in the dead of winter:
The brooks were frozen, the airports almost deserted,
And snow disfigured the public statues:
The mercury sank in the mouth of the dying day.
What instruments we have agree
The day of his death was a dark cold day.
III 次の用語を簡潔に説明しなさい。
(1) imagism  (2) invocation  (3) intertextuality  (4) dramatic monologue  (5) dream vision

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

IV Choose one author or work of literature in English that you especially enjoy reading. Explain reasons why you like this author or work. Your answer should mention any particular details about the writing (such as style or themes) that you think are significant. Write your answer in more than 300 words in English.