２０２０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

（　春期・一般選抜　）問題

外国語　　　　英語

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。

成
績

２０２０年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程試験問題

（春期・一般選抜）問題

外 国 語 （ 英 語 ）

問題 **I** と **II** について<u>日本語で解答</u>しなさい。ただし、外国人受験者にかぎり問題 **II** の代わりに問題 **III** を選択できます。

I 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

　　Not long ago we attended a talk at an academic conference where the speaker's central claim seemed to be that a certain sociologist—call him Dr. X—had done very good work in a number of areas of the discipline. The speaker proceeded to illustrate his thesis by referring extensively and in great detail to various books and articles by Dr. X and by quoting long passages from them. The speaker was obviously both learned and impassioned, but as we listened to his talk (1)<u>we found ourselves somewhat puzzled</u>: the argument—that Dr. X's work was very important—was clear enough, but why did the speaker need to make it in the first place? Did anyone dispute it? Were there commentators in the field who had argued against X's work or challenged its value? Was the speaker's interpretation of what X had done somehow novel or revolutionary? Since the speaker gave no hint of an answer to any of these questions, we could only wonder why he was going on and on about X. It was only after the speaker finished and took questions from the audience that we got a clue: in response to one questioner, he referred to several critics who had vigorously questioned Dr. X's ideas and convinced many sociologists that Dr. X's work was unsound.

　　(2)<u>This story illustrates an important lesson: that to give writing the most important thing of all—namely, a point—a writer needs to indicate clearly not only what his or her thesis is, but also what larger conversation that thesis is responding to. Because our speaker failed to mention what others had said about Dr. X's work, he left his audience unsure about why he felt the need to say what he was saying.</u> Perhaps the point was clear to other sociologists in the audience who were more familiar with the debates over Dr. X's work than we were. But even they, we bet, would have understood the speaker's point better if he'd sketched in some of the larger conversation his own claims were a part of and reminded the audience about what (3)<u>"they say."</u>

　　This story also illustrates an important lesson about the *order* in which things are said: to keep an audience engaged, a writer needs to explain what he or she is responding to—either before offering that response or, at least, very early in the discussion. Delaying this explanation for more than one or two paragraphs in a very short essay or blog entry, three or four pages in a longer work, or more than ten or so pages in a book reverses the natural order in which readers process material—and in which writers think and develop ideas. (4)<u>After all, it seems very unlikely that our conference speaker first developed his defense of Dr. X and only later came across Dr. X's critics. As someone knowledgeable in his field, the speaker surely encountered the criticisms first and only then was compelled to respond and, as he saw it, set the record straight.</u>

　　Therefore, when it comes to constructing an argument (whether orally or in writing), we offer you the following advice: remember that you are entering a conversation and therefore need to start with "what others are saying," and then introduce your own ideas as a response. Specifically, we suggest that you summarize what "they say" as soon as you can in your text, and remind readers of it at strategic points as your text unfolds. Though it's true that not all texts follow this practice, we think it's important for all writers to master it before they depart from it.

　　This is not to say that you must start with a detailed list of everyone who has written on your subject before you offer your own ideas. (5)<u>Had our conference speaker gone to the opposite extreme and spent most of his talk summarizing Dr. X's critics with no hint of what he himself had to say, the audience probably would have had the same frustrated "why-is-he-going-on-like-this?" reaction.</u> What we suggest, then, is that as soon as possible you state your own position and the one it's responding to *together*, and that you think of the two as a unit. It is generally best to summarize the ideas you're responding to briefly, at the start of your text, and to delay detailed elaboration until later. The point is to give your readers a quick preview of what is motivating your argument, not to drown them in details right away.

<div align="right">—from Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein, They Say / I Say, 3rd edition.</div>

問1　下線部（1）について、なぜ著者はこのような状態になったのか、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問2　下線部（2）を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問3　下線部（3）"they say" とは何を意味しているのかを、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）を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

II　次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

　　Mistakes are at the very base of human thought, embedded there, feeding the structure like root nodules. If we were not provided with the knack of being wrong, we could never get anything useful done. We think our way along by choosing between right and wrong alternatives, and the wrong choices have to be made as frequently as the right ones. We get along in life (1)this way. We are built to make mistakes, coded for error.

　　We learn, as we say, by "trial and error." Why do we always say that? Why not "trial and rightness" or "trail and triumph"? The old phrase puts it that way because that is, in real life, the way it is done.

　　A good laboratory, like a good bank or a corporation or government, has to run like a computer. Almost everything is done flawlessly, by the book, and all the numbers add up to the predicted sums. The days go by. And then, if it is a lucky day, and a lucky laboratory, somebody makes a mistake: the wrong buffer, something in one of the blanks, a decimal misplaced in reading counts, the warm room off by a degree and a half, a mouse out of his box, or just a misreading of the day's protocol. Whatever, when the results come in, something is obviously screwed up, and then the action can begin.

　　The misreading is not the important error; it opens the way. The next step is the crucial one. (2)If the investigator can bring himself to say, "But even so, look at that!" then the new finding, whatever it is, is ready for snatching. What is needed, for progress to be made, is the move based on the error.

　　Whenever new kinds of thinking are about to be accomplished, or new varieties of music, there has to be an argument beforehand. With two sides debating in the same mind, haranguing, there is an amiable understanding that one is right and the other wrong. Sooner or later the thing is settled, but there can be no action at all if there are not the two sides, and the argument. The hope is in the faculty of wrongness, the tendency toward error. The capacity to leap across mountains of information to land lightly on the wrong side represents the highest of human endowments.

　　It may be that this is a uniquely human gift, perhaps even stipulated in our genetic instructions. (3)Other creatures do not seem to have DNA sequences for making mistakes as a routine part of daily living, certainly not for programmed error as a guide for action.

　　We are at our human finest, dancing with our minds, when there are more choices than two. Sometimes there are ten, even twenty different ways to go, all but one bound to be wrong, and the richness of selection in such situations can lift us onto totally new ground. This process is called exploration and is based on human fallibility. If we had only a single center in our brains, capable of responding only when a correct decision was to be made, instead of the jumble of different, credulous, easily conned clusters of neurones that provide for being flung off into blind alleys, up trees, down dead ends, out into blue sky, along wrong turnings, around bends, we could only stay the way we are today, stuck fast.

　　The lower animals do not have this splendid freedom. They are limited, most of them, to absolute infallibility. Cats, for all their good side, never make mistakes. I have never seen a maladroit, clumsy, or blundering cat. (4)Dogs are sometimes fallible, occasionally able to make charming minor mistakes, but they get this way by trying to mimic their masters. Fish are flawless in everything they do. Individual cells in a tissue are mindless machines, perfect in their performance, as absolutely inhuman as bees.

　　We should have (5)this in mind as we become dependent on more complex computers for the arrangement of our affairs. Give the computers their heads, I say; let them go their way. If we can learn to do this, turning our heads to one side and wincing while the work proceeds, the possibilities for the future of mankind, and computerkind, are limitless.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　—from Lewis Thomas, *The Medusa and the Snail*

問1 下線部（1）"this way" とは何を意味しているのかを、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問2 下線部（2）を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問3 下線部（3）を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問4 下線部（4）を日本語に訳しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

問5 下線部（5）"this" とは何を意味しているのかを、本文に即して説明しなさい。

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

III　　（この問題を選択できるのは外国人受験者のみです。）

Instead of answering Question **II**, only foreign students can choose to write an essay in English on "Humanities and Their Roles in International Society." Your essay should be more than 200 words in length.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

受験記号番号

_____

_____

_____