

2021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)

問題Ⅰと問題Ⅱについて日本語で解答しなさい。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 以下の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

Many new students join a student society when they enter university. Quite frequently, these student societies have initiation rituals (also called 'hazing'). Examples of behaviors that novices (or 'pledges') have to perform are asking strangers absurd questions, dressing up in embarrassing clothes and singing embarrassing songs in front of an audience (see e.g. Keating et al., 2005; Lodewijckx & Syroit, 1997).

Keating et al. (2005) argued that the precise activities that are performed during hazing are by no means random or coincidental. (1)They found that initiation in sports teams often involved physical and painful activities, while initiations in student societies often involved having to perform embarrassing and socially deviant activities. Keating and colleagues note that these specific rituals seem quite functional: sports clubs like to distinguish themselves from other sports clubs by appearing tough and strong, while student societies might want to distinguish themselves from other groups by emphasizing that they are socially distinct (e.g. higher class; that they do not have to follow the rules of 'ordinary people').

(2)Unfortunately, hazing activities sometimes go tragically wrong. In many countries there have been incidents in which pledges of student societies suffered injuries or even died during initiation rituals. Often, these incidents involve alcohol abuse (see e.g. Nuwer, 1999, for an overview of hazing incidents in the US). However, they need not involve alcohol. In The Netherlands, for example, a student almost died in 2005 after drinking six litres of water: each time he had lost a round during a game he had to drink a glass of water. (3)Nobody had realized that drinking that much water within a short period of time is extremely dangerous (drinking too much water can lead to a condition known as water intoxication, and to a related problem resulting from the dilution of sodium in the body).

(4)The question of why these rituals are performed, and why students are still interested in membership of societies that

perform these harsh rituals, are of interest to social psychologists. Some answers to these questions can be found in this chapter.

– from Miles Hewstone et al., eds., *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, Fifth Edition.

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）を和訳しなさい。

II 以下の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

The increasingly interdisciplinary nature of translation studies has multiplied theories of translation. A shared interest in a topic, however, is no guarantee that what is acceptable as a theory in one discipline or approach will satisfy the conceptual requirements of a theory in others. (1)In the West, from antiquity to the late nineteenth century, theoretical statements about translation fell into traditionally defined areas of thinking about language and culture: rhetoric, literary theory, philosophy. And the most frequently cited theorists comprised a fairly limited group. One such catalogue might include: Cicero, Horace, Quintilian, Jerome, Augustine, Dryden, Goethe, Schleiermacher, Arnold, Nietzsche. (2)Since the beginning of the twentieth century, translation theory has revealed a much expanded range of disciplines and approaches in line with the differentiation of modern culture: not only varieties of linguistics, literary criticism, philosophical speculation, and cultural theory, but experimental studies and anthropological fieldwork, as well as translator training and translation practice. Any account of theoretical concepts and trends must acknowledge the disciplinary sites in which they arose in order to understand and evaluate them. At the same time, it is possible to locate recurrent themes and celebrated topoi, if not broad areas of agreement.

Louis Kelly has argued that a “complete” theory of translation “has three components: specification of function and goal; description and analysis of operations; and critical comment on relationships between goal and operations” (Kelly 1979: 1). Kelly is careful to observe that throughout history theorists have tended to emphasize one of these components at the expense of the others. The component that receives the greatest emphasis, I would add, often devolves into a recommendation or prescription for good translating.

The Roman poet Horace asserted in his *Ars Poetica* (c. 18 BCE) that the poet who resorts to translation should avoid a certain operation – namely, word-for-word rendering – in order to write distinctive poetry. Here the function of translating is to construct poetic authorship, and the immediate goal is a good poem in Horatian or Roman terms. In a lecture entitled “On the Different Methods of Translating” (1813), the German philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher advocated word-for-word literalism in language that “departs from the quotidian” to create an effect of foreignness in the translation: “for the more precisely the translation adheres to the turns and figures of the original, the more foreign it will seem to its reader” (Schleiermacher, this volume: 53). For Schleiermacher, textual operations produce cognitive effects and serve cultural and political functions. These operations, effects, and functions are described and judged according to values that are literary and nationalist, according to whether the translation helps to build a German language and literature during the Napoleonic wars. (3)Even with modern approaches that are based on linguistics and tend to assume a scientific or value-free treatment of language, the emphasis on one theoretical component might be linked to prescription. During the 1960s and 1970s, linguistics-oriented theorists stressed the description and analysis of translation operations, constructing typologies of

equivalence that act as normative principles to guide translator training.

The surveys of theoretical trends in the section introductions have both benefited from and revised Kelly's useful scheme. To my mind, however, the key category in any translation research and commentary is what I shall call the relative autonomy of translation, the factors that distinguish it from the source text and from texts initially written in the translating language. These factors include textual features and strategies performed by the agents who produce the translation, not only the translator but editors too. We must also figure in the practices of circulation and reception by which the translation continues to accrue meanings and values that differ from those invested in the source text: forms of publication, marketing, and promotion, editions and adaptations, academic research and course adoptions, reviews and blogs. (4)These complicated factors are what prevent translating from being unmediated or transparent communication; they both enable and set up obstacles to cross-cultural understanding by working over the source text in the receiving culture. They substantiate the arguments for the impossibility of translation that recur throughout the twentieth century. (5)Yet without some sense of distinctive features, strategies, and practices, translation can never be defined as an object of study in its own right.

— from Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translation Studies Reader*, Third Edition.

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)を和訳しなさい。

設問5 下線部(5)を和訳しなさい。

