

D国1 (一般・留学生)

2019年度 大学院入学試験問題【Ⅱ期】

国際日本学研究科 国際日本学専攻 (博士後期課程)

科目：英語【言語・国際交流研究分野】(辞書使用不可)

[問題番号 D1] 田中 牧郎 教授 研究指導志願者対象

注意) 解答用紙は、指定された用紙を使用しなさい。

次の英文を読み、まず、300字程度で要約しなさい。その上で、日本語の接続詞を例にあげて文章における接続関係について論じなさい。解答は日本語で書くこと。

Various suggestions could be taken up for classifying the phenomena which we are grouping together under the heading of CONJUNCTION. There is no single, uniquely correct inventory of the types of conjunctive relation; different classifications are possible, each of which would highlight different aspects of the facts.

We shall adopt a scheme of just four categories: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. Here is an example of each:

For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping.

- a. And in all this time he met no one. (additive)
- b. Yet he was hardly aware of being tired. (adversative)
- c. So by night time the valley was far below him. (causal)
- d. Then, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest. (temporal)

The words *and*, *yet*, *so* and *then* can be taken as typifying these four very general conjunctive relations, which they express in their simplest form.

Naturally if we reduce the many very varied kinds of conjunction to this small number of basic types, there is scope for a considerable amount of subclassifying within them. A very simple overall framework like this does not ELIMINATE the complexity of the facts; it relegates it to a later, or more 'delicate', stage of the analysis. Our reason for preferring this framework is just that: it seems to have the right priorities, making it possible to handle a text without unnecessary complication. A detailed systematization of all the possible subclasses would be more complex than is needed for the understanding and analysis of cohesion; moreover, they are quite indeterminate, so that it would be difficult to select one version in preference to another. We shall introduce some subclassification under each of the four headings, but not of any very rigid kind.

Source: M. A. K. Halliday & Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, Routledge, 2013

2019年度 大学院入学試験問題【Ⅱ期】

国際日本学研究科 国際日本学専攻 (博士後期課程)

科目：英語【言語・国際交流研究分野】(辞書使用不可)

[問題番号 D2] 佐藤 郡衛 特任教授 研究指導志願者対象

注意) 解答用紙は、指定された用紙を使用しなさい。

次の英文を読み、1000字程度で要約しなさい。

An individual life and the role it plays in the larger community are best understood through story. We become fully aware, fully conscious, of our own lives through the process of putting them together in story form. It is through story that we gain context and recognize meaning. Reclaiming story is part of our birthright. Telling our stories enables us to be heard, recognized, and acknowledged by others. Telling a life story makes the implicit explicit, the hidden seen, the unformed formed, and the confusing clear.

A life story is the story a person chooses to tell about the life he or she has lived, told as completely and honestly as possible, what the person remembers of it and what he or she wants others to know of it, usually as a result of a guided interview by another. The resulting life story is the narrative essence of what has happened to the person. It can cover the time from birth to the present or before and beyond. It includes the important events, experiences, and feelings of a lifetime.

There is very little difference between a life story and a life history. The two terms are often used interchangeably. The difference between a life story and an oral history is usually emphasis and scope. An oral history most often focuses on a specific aspect of a person's life, such as work life or a special role in some part of the life of a community. An oral history most often focuses on the community or on what someone remembers about a specific historical event, issue, time, or place. When an oral interview focuses on a person's entire life, it is usually referred to as a life story or life history.

A life story can take a factual form a metaphorical form, a poetic form, or any other creatively expressive form. What is important is that the life story be told in the form, shape, and style that is most comfortable to the person telling it. Whatever form it takes, a life story always brings order and meaning to the life being told, for both the teller and the listener. It is a way to understand the past and the present more fully, and a way to leave a personal legacy for the future.

A life story is a fairly complete narrative of an individual's entire experience of life as a whole, highlighting the most important aspects. A life story gives us a vantage point from which to see how one person experiences and understands life, his or her own especially, over time. It enables us

to see and identify threads and, links that connect one part of a person's life to another, that connect childhood to adulthood.

Life stories are told on many occasions. We are in fact continually telling others who we are and what we are about. Through the daily chores of life, and at every stage of life, we share pieces of ourselves with those we come in contact with. Whether it is the solitary, social, or dramatic play of childhood, a rite of passage of adolescence, a wedding, or a retirement banquet, we are continually telling episodes and chapters of our life stories, both as we live them and as we relive them in our everyday actions, behaviors, creations, and the words we speak about them.

We keep memories, experiences, and collective values alive by telling others about them or putting them in a form that may last longer than ourselves. In a life story interview, the interviewee is a story teller, the narrator of the story of his or her own life; the interviewer is a guide, or director, in this process. The two together are collaborators, composing and constructing a story the teller can be pleased with.

As collaborator in an open-ended process, the researcher/guide is never really in control of the story actually told. The process may not always go as smoothly as hoped. The person asked to tell his or her story may be brief, unembellishing, and unemotional in the telling. This could result in a short listing of factual events that have occurred. In some cases, there may be more that can be done to help a storyteller to develop a more fully told, feeling-based story; in other cases, a recitation of facts may be all an interview will be able to get.

At other times, the teller may present a conjured, fabricated, or strategic story. If this happens, the interview need not run out for a lie detector; it may be that this type of story will also serve his or her research interests. The researcher could ask, and include some interpretation about, why the individual chose a fabricated story—that is, what purpose this served for the storyteller.

A researcher may also use corroborators or seek indicators of internal consistency. It may be that the researcher can use whatever story an interviewee tells to accomplish the research goals, finding an interpretation that will be useful. The point of the life story interview is to give the person interviewed the opportunity to tell his or her story in the way that person chooses to tell it. Coherence and honesty can be part of the collaborative process, if necessary, but achieving this will depend on how open the storyteller is to coherence and honesty in the first place.

(Gubrium, J.F. & Holstein, J.A. (Eds), 2002, *Handbook of Interview Research*, Sage Publications, London, pp 125-126)

2019年度 大学院入学試験問題【Ⅱ期】

国際日本学研究科 国際日本学専攻 (博士後期課程)

科目：英語【文化・思想研究分野】(辞書使用不可)

【問題番号 D3】 美濃部 仁 教授 研究指導志願者対象

注意) 解答用紙は、指定された用紙を使用しなさい。

西田幾多郎の「弁証法的一般者」について書いた次の英文を読み、重要であると考えられるテーマをいくつか取り出し、それについて自分自身の見解を日本語で述べなさい。

On Dialectical Universal

(A) Nishida placed the concept "dialectical universal" at the center of his philosophy in the 1930's, that is, at the time when his system was almost completed. Nishida was of the opinion that our experience is to be explained from neither the thing nor the mind, but rather from the world in which we live. The dialectical universal marks the structure of the world in which our experience arises.

The concept "universal" already plays an important role in Nishida's first book *An Inquiry Into the Good* (*zen no kenkyu*. 1911)¹. There he refers mainly to "the universal" of Hegel. He feels sympathy especially for Hegel's idea of the "concrete universal".

During the writing of the book *From That Which Acts to That Which Sees* (*hatarakumono kara mirumono e*. 1927, NKZa 4: 1-378) Nishida's philosophy entered a new period with the introduction of the term "place (*basho*)". Accordingly, the concept of the universal was also examined anew. In the course of this reexamination Nishida comes to the realization that the universal carries in its deepest foundation the character of "nothingness", and thus finds that his understanding of the universal does not completely coincide with that of Hegel.

In the time of the writing of the book *The Self-awakening Determination of Nothingness* (*mu no jikakuteki gentei*. 1932, NKZa 6: 1-451), Nishida directed his attention to the individual and observed that an individual faces always other individuals. And on the basis of this observation, the universal becomes more clearly defined in his next book *The Fundamental Problems of Philosophy. The World of Action* (*tetsugaku no konponmondai. koui no sekai*. 1933, NKZa 7: 3-200): the universal is the medium of mutual determination of the individuals which are independent of one another. Nishida calls this universal, which includes the individuals within itself, "the actual world" or simply "the world (*sekai*)" (see NKZa 7: 57ff.).

¹ *Nishida Kitaro zenshu* (Complete Works of Nishida Kitaro), 4th edition in 19 vols., 1987-89 Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten = NKZa 1: 1-200

It is a contradiction that the individuals, who are independent of one another, also determine one another. Nishida regards this contradictory character as the essence of the world and marks it with the word "dialectical." The dialectical universal thus expresses the structure of the world, which can only be explained with contradictory concepts.

(B) Nishida asks for reality. Reality consists neither in the thing nor in the mind, but rather in the immediate experience before the separation of thing and mind. This reality is to be thought only in the form of the self-determination of the universal. The universal does not mean here the system of knowledge. For from this system all the possible determinations of experience can be explained, but not the experience of the actual single thing by the individual. To explain this, the universal must be the reality as a whole that goes beyond the system of knowledge and includes this within itself. Such a universal is what Nishida calls the "place of absolute nothingness", since it by no means becomes object of knowledge. The self-determination of the universal is that of the place of absolute nothingness, which is called, unlike the determination of being which is characterized as act, the "self-awakening of absolute nothingness (*zettaimu no jikaku*)". The experience of the actual single thing, that is, the true reality arises, according to Nishida, from the self-awakening of absolute nothingness. The self-determination of the world as the dialectical universal can be regarded as the concretization of this self-awakening of absolute nothingness.

以上