

2023年度大学院博士前期課程一般入学試験（第Ⅲ期）問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.1)

哲学歴史学専修の哲学分野の志望者は（1）、歴史学分野の志望者は（2）、日本文学日本語学専修の志望者は（3）の問に答えなさい。

- (1) 次の英文を和訳しなさい。
(下線部の語については注を参照して良い)

Anaxagoras held that everything is infinitely divisible, and that even the smallest portion of matter contains some of each element. Things appear to be that of which they contain most. Thus, for example, everything contains some fire, but we only call it fire if that element preponderates. [...]

He differed from his predecessors in regarding mind (*nous*) as a substance which enters into the composition of living things, and distinguishes them from dead matter. In everything, he says, there is a portion of everything except mind, and some things contain mind also. Mind has power over all things that have life; it is infinite and self-ruled, and is mixed with nothing. Except as regards mind, everything, however small, contains portions of all opposites, such as hot and cold, white and black. He maintained that snow is black (in part).

Mind is the source of all motion. It causes a rotation, which is gradually spreading throughout the world, and is causing the lightest things to go to the circumference, and the heaviest to fall towards the centre. Mind is uniform, and is just as good in animals as in man. Man's apparent superiority is due to the fact that he has hands; all seeming differences of intelligence are really due to bodily differences.

Both Aristotle and the Platonic Socrates complain that Anaxagoras, after introducing mind, makes very little use of it. Aristotle points out that he only introduces mind as a cause when he knows no other. Whenever he can, he gives a mechanical explanation. He rejected necessity and chance as giving the origins of things; nevertheless, there was no "Providence" in his cosmology. He does not seem to have thought much about ethics or religion; probably he was an atheist, as his prosecutors maintained. All his predecessors influenced him, except Pythagoras. The influence of Parmenides was the same in his case as in that of Empedocles.

In science he had great merit. It was he who first explained that the moon shines by reflected light, though there is a cryptic fragment in Parmenides suggesting that he also knew this. Anaxagoras gave the correct theory of eclipses, and knew that the moon is below the sun. The sun and stars, he said, are fiery stones, but we do not feel the heat of the stars because they are too distant. The sun is larger than the Peloponnesus. The moon has mountains, and (he thought) inhabitants.

注

preponderates : 優勢である

Providence : 摂理

cryptic : 謎めいた

出典 : Bertrand Russell,
History of Western Philosophy.

2023年度大学院博士前期課程一般入学試験（第Ⅲ期）問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.2)

(2) 次の英文を和訳しなさい。

Like other scholars, historians reject the notion that a question can be settled forever, however brilliant and scrupulous¹ the researcher. We are constantly discovering new sources, posing new questions, considering new contexts, and suggesting new ideas about the past. Historians routinely revisit events previously studied by others, believing that old versions of the past may no longer serve today's needs.

There can be something unsettling about seeing today's historians reject previous interpretations, since it implies that today's interpretations will soon lose their value. Why work so hard to produce a product so ephemeral²? In practice, however, the best interpretive debates produce not stalemate but synthesis. In 1989, Lawrence Levine wrote of historians' "confidence that, although we might operate in cycles of historical interpretations, the general movement was upward toward an increasingly sophisticated understanding of the past." And even when interpretations grow too stale to use, basic factual findings endure. I have relied on the work of historians who wrote decades ago, whose conclusions I may question, but whose research I trust. I would like to think that whatever they think of my own interpretations, future historians will learn something from my own factual discoveries.

Historians enjoy tracing the history of their own enterprise, retelling the clashes between conservatives and insurgents; the expansion of the discipline from a study of past politics to a wider exploration of human experience; the rise and fall of such approaches as psychohistory and cliometrics³; the entry into the profession of women, ethnic and religious minorities, and people of color; and the waxing and waning of historians' influence on popular culture and public policy. Even the definition of historian is fluid. At the start of the twentieth century, the term embraced people who today might use other titles — archivist, political scientist, or teacher — even as they pursue historical knowledge.

Yet for all this, I am more struck by the continuities in the history of historical research than I am by the changes. Today's historians write of topics that might have baffled Edward Gibbon (1737-94) or Henry Adams (1838-1918), yet they tell their stories in ways that Gibbon, Adams, and even Thucydides and Tacitus — writing thousands of year ago — could recognize. And they do so in the same confidence that writing history is a core function of any civilization.

The most innovative tools work best when combined with more traditional approaches. For instance, a computer algorithm can help answer questions, but older methods of posing questions and searching archives still have great value. The same continuities appear when historians ask new questions; even those who wish to overturn existing histories can do so using established tools. Jean O'Brien (White Earth Ojibwe⁴), for example, has shown how nineteenth-century New England historians misled readers about their region's Native past and denied the continued residence of Indians in their states. Yet she bases this critique on her own meticulous research into primary sources preserved in archives. Rather than rejecting the methods of previous generations of historians, she deploys them with a different perspective and greater skill than her predecessors.

注

1. scrupulous : 誠実な、几帳面な

2. ephemeral : 一時的な、儚い

3. cliometrics : 数量経済史

4. White Earth Ojibwe : ホワイト・アース (保留地) のオジブワ族

出典 : Zachary M. Schrag, «History Is an Ongoing Debate»,

The Princeton Guide to Historical Research, Princeton, 2021, pp.21-23.

2023年度大学院博士前期課程一般入学試験（第Ⅲ期）問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 人文学専攻	英語 (No.3)

(3) 次の英文を読み、全文を和訳しなさい。

Students of literature brought up in the tradition of Anglo-American New Criticism with its emphasis on ‘practical criticism’ and the organic unity of the text might expect to feel at home with Russian Formalism. Both kinds of criticism aim to explore what is specifically *literary* in texts, and both reject the limp spirituality of late Romantic poetics in favour of a detailed and empirical approach to reading. That being said, it must be admitted that the Russian Formalists were much more interested in ‘method’, much more concerned to establish a ‘scientific’ basis for the theory of literature. The New Critics combined attention to the specific verbal ordering of texts with an emphasis on the *non-conceptual* nature of literary meaning: a poem’s complexity embodied a subtle response to life, which could not be reduced to logical statements or paraphrases. Their approach, despite the emphasis on close reading of texts, remained fundamentally humanistic. For example, Cleanth Brooks¹ insisted that Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’² is not a political statement of Marvell’s position on the Civil War but a dramatisation of opposed views, unified into a poetic whole. Brooks concluded his account by arguing that like all ‘great poetry’ the poem embodies ‘honesty and insight and whole-mindedness’. The first Russian Formalists on the other hand considered that human ‘content’ (emotions, ideas and ‘reality’ in general) possessed no literary significance in itself, but merely provided a context for the functioning of literary ‘devices’. As we shall see, this sharp division of form and content was modified by the later Formalists, but it remains true that the Formalists avoided the New Critics’ tendency to endow aesthetic form with moral and cultural significance. They aimed rather to outline models and hypotheses (in a scientific spirit) to explain how aesthetic effects are produced by literary devices, and how the ‘literary’ is distinguished from and related to the ‘extra-literary’. While the New Critics regarded literature as a form of human understanding, the Formalists thought of it as a special use of language.

出典：Raman Selden *A Reader’s Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory 2nd ed.*

〈注〉

1. Cleanth Brooks (1906-1994) アメリカの文芸批評家であり大学教授。ニュー・クリティシズムの中心人物として、アメリカの高等教育における「詩の教育」に革命を起こしたと言われる人物。
2. Andrew Marvell(1621-1678)の"An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland"（「ホラティウス風の頌歌ー Cromwellがアイルランド遠征から戻った折にー」）を指す。