

資料解読

以下の〔A〕～〔I〕の資料解読問題のうちから、1題をえらび、その設問に答えよ。

問題〔A〕

設問 以下のフランス語の文章を日本語に全訳しなさい。

En art, la révolte s'achève et se perpétue dans la vraie création, non dans la critique ou le commentaire. La révolution, de son côté, ne peut s'affirmer que dans une civilisation, non dans la terreur ou la tyrannie. Les deux questions que pose désormais notre temps à une société dans l'impasse : la création est-elle possible, la révolution est-elle possible, n'en font qu'une, qui concerne la renaissance d'une civilisation.

La révolution et l'art du xx^e siècle sont tributaires du même nihilisme et vivent dans la même contradiction. Ils nient¹ ce qu'ils affirment pourtant dans leur mouvement même et cherchent tous deux une issue impossible, à travers la terreur. La révolution contemporaine croit inaugurer un nouveau monde et elle n'est que l'aboutissement contradictoire de l'ancien. Finalement, la société capitaliste et la société révolutionnaire n'en font qu'une

dans la mesure où elles s'asservissent au même moyen, la production industrielle, et à la même promesse. Mais l'une fait sa promesse au nom de principes formels qu'elle est incapable d'incarner et qui sont niés par le moyen qu'elle emploie. L'autre justifie sa prophétie au nom de la seule réalité et finit par mutiler la réalité. La société de la production est seulement productrice, non créatrice.

L'art contemporain, parce qu'il est nihiliste, se débat aussi entre le formalisme et le réalisme. Le réalisme, d'ailleurs, est aussi bien bourgeois — mais il est alors noir — que socialiste, et il devient édifiant. Le formalisme appartient aussi bien à la société du passé, quand il est abstraction gratuite, qu'à la société qui se prétend de l'avenir; il définit alors la propagande. Le langage détruit par la négation irrationnelle se perd dans le délire verbal; soumis à l'idéologie déterministe, il se résume dans le mot d'ordre. Entre les deux, se tient l'art¹. Si le révolté doit refuser à la fois la fureur du néant et le consentement à la totalité, l'artiste doit échapper en même temps à la frénésie formelle et à l'esthétique totalitaire de la réalité. Le monde d'aujourd'hui est un, en effet, mais son unité est celle du nihilisme. La civilisation n'est possible que si, renonçant au nihilisme des principes formels et au nihilisme sans principes, ce monde retrouve le chemin d'une synthèse créatrice. De la même manière, en art, le temps du commentaire perpétuel et du reportage agonise; il annonce alors le temps des créateurs.

Mais l'art et la société, la création et la révolution doivent, pour cela, retrouver la source de la révolte où refus et consentement, singularité et universel, individu et histoire s'équilibrent dans la tension la plus dure. La révolte n'est pas en elle-même un élément de civilisation. Mais elle est préalable à toute civilisation. Elle seule, dans l'impasse où nous vivons, permet d'espérer l'avenir dont rêvait Nietzsche : « Au lieu du juge et du répressur, le créateur. » Formule qui ne peut pas autoriser l'illusion dérisoire d'une cité dirigée par des artistes. Elle éclaire seulement le drame de notre époque où le travail, soumis entièrement à la production, a cessé d'être créateur. La société industrielle n'ouvrira les chemins d'une civilisation qu'en redonnant au travailleur la dignité du créateur, c'est-à-dire en appliquant son intérêt et sa

civilisation désormais nécessaire ne pourra pas séparer, dans les classes comme dans l'individu, le travailleur et le créateur; pas plus que la création artistique ne songe à séparer la forme et le fond, l'esprit et l'histoire. C'est ainsi qu'elle reconnaîtra à tous la dignité affirmée par la révolte. Il serait injuste, et d'ailleurs utopique, que Shakespeare dirigeât la société des cordonniers. Mais il serait tout aussi désastreux que la société des cordonniers prétendît se passer de Shakespeare. Shakespeare sans le cordonnier sert d'alibi à la tyrannie. Le cordonnier sans Shakespeare est absorbé par la tyrannie quand il ne contribue pas à l'étendre. Toute création nie, en elle-même, le monde du maître et de l'esclave. La hideuse société de tyrans et d'esclaves où nous nous survivons ne trouvera sa mort et sa transfiguration qu'au niveau de la création.

問題 [B]

設問1 (1)に入る人名を記入せよ(日本語でもアルファベットでも可)。

設問2 下線部を和訳せよ。

※この問題は、著作権の関係により掲載ができません。

問題 [C]

以下の英文資料を和訳しなさい。

IN JEAN-LUC GODARD'S *CONTEMPT* (1963), the seventy-three-year-old director Fritz Lang plays a version of himself in an otherwise fictional scenario concerned with the production of a film version of Homer's *The Odyssey* being directed by Lang at Cinecittà studios in Rome. Lang and his producer, Jeremy Prokosch (Jack Palance), attempt to interest the writer Paul Javal (Michel Piccoli) in helping them create a workable screenplay for this project. At one point in the film, Lang tells Javal that he believes the particular power of *The Odyssey* resides in Homer's harmonious relationship with the world in which he creates. "The world of Homer," Lang says, "is a real world. The poet belonged to his own civilization, one that developed in harmony with nature, not in opposition to it. That is precisely the beauty of *The Odyssey*, its faith in reality as it exists . . . in a form that could not be tampered with." These lines were written not by Lang but by Godard and may be taken as Godard's attempt to define the nature of the moment in which his own film is being made—that of the early 1960s, at the height of the influence and creative power of the French New Wave.

An international coproduction packaged by Carlo Ponti and Joseph E. Levine, featuring a major star, Brigitte Bardot, and adapted from a novel by Alberto Moravia, *Contempt* was Godard's single major attempt to enjoy widespread international success and to create a film on a scale that would evoke, however distantly, the world of epic narrative. Within the context of film history up to this point, what such a citation of the epic inevitably suggested was classical cinema, a form which also, one could argue, developed "in harmony" with civilization for approximately the first fifty years of existence. And although written by Godard, these words are spoken by a filmmaker who, in Germany in the 1920s and early 1930s, forged not simply a style but, in the words of Noël Burch, "a series of achievements that match the history of the cinema's crestline of discovery stage by stage." Unlike the improvisational Godard, Lang's cinema depends on a rigorous and inflexible preconception, working within a "form that could not be tampered with." In the grandiose and overdetermined world of Lang, little is left to chance.

Both Homer and Lang function for *Contempt* as the sites of far-removed and mythical realms, creating epic narratives designed for a wide audience and in worlds markedly different from the one in which Godard himself is now working—or at least that is the implication here. As many commentators on the film have noted, *Contempt* self-consciously draws on the language of this type of filmmaking to the point where the film becomes, as Jacques Aumont has phrased it, "a sort of compendium of classical cinema." This relationship to classical cinema includes a narrative with an almost classical three-act structure; a fluid, long-take style; romantic musical underscoring; and a use of color and anamorphic widescreen that evokes the world of big-budget spectacle. But *Contempt* reproduces these elements in a very idiosyncratic manner so that the film seems to be, at once, an example of classical cinema and a commentary on it.

問題 [D]

設問 以下の英文を和訳しなさい。

By the late 1970s the French and the Germans had taken a new word into their languages. This word was necessary because it enabled them to specify an activity for which there was otherwise no available term. The new word that entered their languages was the English word 'performance'.

The activity to which it was applied consisted of circumstances in which one or more people communicated in real time and shared space with another group of people. The method of communication did not explicitly refer to, and often made a point of rejecting, the conventions of what could be recognised as 'theatre'. It was a communicative activity seen to take place much more widely and variously than the practice of theatre. Indeed, although never before systematically recognised as such, it was identified as a regular occurrence in general human behaviour, capable of being done by most human beings in whatever society.

This insight came out of a widespread interest in analysing and explaining behaviour that had hitherto been assumed to be simply everyday, normal, natural. It gathered pace, across various disciplines, from the mid-1950s onwards. The first part of the book thus tracks the differing theories and definitions of human interactional behaviour which, beginning in different places, when taken together bring into being a concept of something which is called 'performance'.

By 1979 'performance' seemed to have gained so much currency, to have spread so far, that it was, some thought, a catch-all term, used to describe almost anything. Over a period of about twenty-five years, then, a concept comes into being, is felt to have such potency that it moves across academic disciplines and arts practices and gets formalised into degree programmes. That coming into being in part resulted from the work of scholars studying the world around them, but a lot of the potency that is attached to the concept of performance was put in place outside the academy, in the work of political activists and artists. A new concept of performance was formed in a new practice of performance, a practice shaped by its interactions with, its battles against the limitations of, the specific presiding economic and social

structures, the institutions and violent hierarchies of capitalism, in post-1945 western Europe and the United States, and going on still. The emergence of the concept of performance is tangled up with, brought into being by, a set of particular historical circumstances, and it always carries their bruises.

To be accurate, what came into being was not a single concept so much as a set of closely related concepts, emerging from a set of circumstances. Together these circumstances all constituted a massive change in modes of thinking, but within that the concepts of performance developed as a variety of specific understandings and formulations, and they had generally specifiable genealogies. That it's necessary to make this point is again to do with language. While the French and Germans may have needed to import a term they did not have, English-speaking peoples have the reverse problem. In English the word 'performance' has a range of applications that is promiscuous to the point of gaudy. At one end it can be a synonym for general words such as 'do' or 'achieve' or 'work'. At the other end it has specific application to the work of actors. If you say a machine performs efficiently, you don't imply that it is presenting a fiction for the delight of an audience. If you say a child performs well in school you are not usually talking about a drama class. For the machine the word 'work' would do, for the child the word 'achieve'. While attempts are made to blur these meanings together, it's an English-language game, and nobody seems to want to do it with other verbs, such as 'operate'. But we could, with similar logic, say that a train company operates efficiently and thereby claim that it's handy at removing gallbladders.

At the specific end of its English range of meanings, 'performance' is used of what actors and other entertainers do in theatre institutions. There is a large body of writing about this activity and it could all be taken to constitute a theory of how performing is done in various times and places. It could indeed be called 'performance theory' but it could just as legitimately be called 'acting theory', and its materials, generated over centuries, would mainly be of interest to those who work in or study theatre. The French and German languages can adequately label this body of work without needing the term 'performance'.

問題 (E)

設問 以下の英文を和訳しなさい。ただし注番号は無視すること。

The last major philosopher to express sustained interest in the dramatic form was Friedrich Nietzsche, whose resonance in modern and contemporary theater has not even now been fully accounted for. Writing half a century after Hegel, Nietzsche leaves intact, and even builds on, the great idealist's promotion of the aesthetic to the rank of "absolute" philosophic concerns. "Art is the highest human task," Nietzsche proclaims in his 1871 introduction to *The Birth of Tragedy*, "the highest task and the truly metaphysical activity of this life. . . ." ²⁴ Hegel's linkage of the Absolute with subjectivity results in a quasi-sacralization of dramatic character (which partakes of the absolutes of art and of subjectivity). But Nietzsche breaks the Hegelian connection between character and the Absolute. Individual subjectivity now becomes not a gateway but a barrier to deep connection with universal psychic forces.

Nietzsche's radical new theory of the tragic describes not so much a concrete dramatic form with articulated constituents as an archeological stage in human self-understanding. The stage of "tragic culture" was a moment suspended between self-consciousness (represented by the Apollonian plastic forms), and an earlier stage of primordial self-abandon, now sublimated in the aesthetic (represented by the Dionysian element of music). The devotees of Dionysus at the tragic festivals, Nietzsche argues, understood that "a world torn asunder and shattered into individuals" was the very definition of suffering, and celebrated art as "the joyous hope that the spell of individuation may be broken in augury of a restored oneness." ²⁵

To Nietzsche, this moment of balance between separation and oneness begins to erode in Attic culture with the advent of the "demon" Socrates and his theatrical proxy, Euripides. Nietzsche accuses Socrates of introducing to human culture the self of optimism and reason, whose concern it is to understand itself as a separated, self-conscious individual. From this moment on, "theoretical man," cut off from his roots in Dionysian surrender, begins to loom on the psychic horizon of the West. The Greeks knew better than to "suffer individuals on the tragic stage," ²⁶ but character begins already to be sickly individualized by Euripides, and ancient drama rapidly deteriorates into psychological refinement. This falling out of the Dionysian prepares the way for the "Alexandrian" period of analysis and reference, the period of the "librarian and corrector of proofs." ²⁷

At the material plane of actual works for the stage, it would follow, Nietzsche has nothing but contempt for the representation of individuated dramatic character. Among the most damning charges Nietzsche can level against the post-mythic drama produced by "theoretical culture" is "character representation." Character is above all the fatal flaw of the "death leap into the bourgeois drama." ²⁸ At the threshold of modernism, Hegel's defense of the individualistic "romantic" hero has curdled into Nietzsche's revulsion against all that smacks of the individual and the "characteristic," projected backward over nearly two and a half millennia of Western history.

問題 [F]

以下を英訳してください。

Every act of communication is a miracle of translation.

At this moment, in this place, the shifting action potentials in my neurons cascade into certain arrangements, patterns, thoughts; they flow down my spine, branch into my arms, my fingers, until muscles twitch and thought is translated into motion; mechanical levers are pressed; electrons are rearranged; marks are made on paper.

At another time, in another place, light strikes the marks, reflects into a pair of high-precision optical instruments sculpted by nature after billions of years of random mutations; upside-down images are formed against two screens made up of millions of light-sensitive cells, which translate light into electrical pulses that go up the optic nerves, cross the chiasm, down the optic tracts, and into the visual cortex, where the pulses are reassembled into letters, punctuation marks, words, sentences, vehicles, tenors, thoughts.

The entire system seems fragile, preposterous, science fictional.

Who can say if the thoughts you have in your mind as you read these words are the same thoughts I had in my mind as I typed them? We are different, you and I, and the qualia of our consciousnesses are as divergent as two stars at the ends of the universe.

And yet, whatever has been lost in translation in the long journey of my thoughts through the maze of civilization to your mind, I think you do understand me, and you think you do understand me. Our minds managed to touch, if but briefly and imperfectly.

Does the thought not make the universe seem just a bit kinder, a bit brighter, a bit warmer and more human?

We live for such miracles.

問題 [G]

次の言語学に関する文章を訳しなさい。

One crucial function of language is to express thoughts and ideas. That is, language encodes and externalises our thoughts. The way language does this is by using symbols. Symbols are 'bits of language'. These might be meaningful subparts of words (for example, *dis-* as in *distaste*), whole words (for example, *cat*, *run*, *tomorrow*), or 'strings' of words (for example, *He couldn't write a pop jingle let alone a whole musical*). These symbols consist of forms, which may be spoken, written or signed, and meanings with which the forms are conventionally paired. In fact, a symbol is better referred to as a symbolic assembly, as it consists of two parts that are conventionally associated. In other words, this symbolic assembly is a form-meaning pairing.

A form can be a sound, as in [kæt] (here, the speech sounds are represented by symbols from the International Phonetic Alphabet). A form might be the orthographic representation that we see on the written page: *cat*, or a signed gesture in a sign language. A meaning is the conventional ideational or semantic content associated with the symbol. A symbolic assembly of form and meaning is represented in Figure 1.



Figure 1.1

It is important to make it clear that the image of the cat in Figure 1 is intended to represent not a particular referent in the world, but the idea of a cat. That is, the image represents the meaning conventionally paired with the form pronounced in English as [kæt]. The meaning associated with a linguistic symbol is linked to a particular mental representation termed a concept. Concepts, in turn, derive from percepts. For instance, consider a piece of fruit like a pear. Different parts of the brain perceive its shape, colour, texture, taste, smell and so on. This diverse range of perceptual information deriving from the world 'out there' is integrated into a single mental image (a representation available to consciousness), which gives rise to the concept of PEAR. When we use language and utter the form pear, this symbol corresponds to a conventional meaning, and therefore 'connects' to a concept rather than directly to a physical object in the external world.

Our cognitive abilities integrate raw perceptual information into a coherent and well defined mental image. The meanings encoded by linguistic symbols then, refer to our projected reality: a mental representation of reality, as construed by the human mind, mediated by our unique perceptual and conceptual systems.

問題 [H]

次にある、BOB DYLANが1976年に発表した作品、“Hurricane”の詩を読み、そこで語られているテーマについて、現在の日本において起こっている現象を例にあげ、自身の考えを述べよ。

Hurricane (with Jacques Levy)

Pistol shots ring out in the barroom night
Enter Patty Valentine from the upper hall.
She sees the bartender in a pool of blood,
Cries out, “My God, they killed them all!”
Here comes the story of the Hurricane,
The man the authorities came to blame
For somethin’ that he never done.
Put in a prison cell, but one time he could-a been
The champion of the world.

Three bodies lyin’ there does Patty see
And another man named Bello, movin’ around mysteriously.
“I didn’t do it,” he says, and he throws up his hands
“I was only robbin’ the register, I hope you understand.
I saw them leavin’,” he says, and he stops
“One of us had better call up the cops.”
And so Patty calls the cops
And they arrive on the scene with their red lights flashin’
In the hot New Jersey night.

Meanwhile, far away in another part of town
Rubin Carter and a couple of friends are drivin’ around.
Number one contender for the middleweight crown
Had no idea what kinda shit was about to go down
When a cop pulled him over to the side of the road
Just like the time before and the time before that.
In Paterson that’s just the way things go.
If you’re black you might as well not show up on the street
’Less you wanna draw the heat.

Alfred Bello had a partner and he had a rap for the cops.
Him and Arthur Dexter Bradley were just out prowlin’ around
He said, “I saw two men runnin’ out, they looked like middleweights
They jumped into a white car with out-of-state plates.”
And Miss Patty Valentine just nodded her head.
Cop said, “Wait a minute, boys, this one’s not dead”
So they took him to the infirmary
And though this man could hardly see
They told him that he could identify the guilty men.

Four in the mornin' and they haul Rubin in,
Take him to the hospital and they bring him upstairs.
The wounded man looks up through his one dyin' eye
Says, "Wha'd you bring him in here for? He ain't the guy!"
Yes, here's the story of the Hurricane,
The man the authorities came to blame
For somethin' that he never done.
Put in a prison cell, but one time he could-a been
The champion of the world.

Four months later, the ghettos are in flame,
Rubin's in South America, fightin' for his name
While Arthur Dexter Bradley's still in the robbery game
And the cops are puttin' the screws to him, lookin' for somebody to blame.
"Remember that murder that happened in a bar?"
"Remember you said you saw the getaway car?"
"You think you'd like to play ball with the law?"
"Think it might-a been that fighter that you saw runnin' that night?"
"Don't forget that you are white."

Arthur Dexter Bradley said, "I'm really not sure."
Cops said, "A poor boy like you could use a break
We got you fer the motel job and we're talkin' to your friend Bello
Now you don't wanta have to go back to jail, be a nice fellow.
You'll be doin' society a favor.
That sonofabitch is brave and gettin' braver.
We want to put his ass in stir
We want to pin this triple murder on him
He ain't no Gentleman Jim."

Rubin could take a man out with just one punch
But he never did like to talk about it all that much.
It's my work, he'd say, and I do it for pay
And when it's over I'd just as soon go on my way
Up to some paradise
Where the trout streams flow and the air is nice
And ride a horse along a trail.
But then they took him to the jailhouse
Where they try to turn a man into a mouse.

All of Rubin's cards were marked in advance
The trial was a pig-circus, he never had a chance.
The judge made Rubin's witnesses drunkards from the slums
To the white folks who watched he was a revolutionary bum
And to the black folks he was just a crazy nigger.
No one doubted that he pulled the trigger.
And though they could not produce the gun,
The D.A. said he was the one who did the deed
And the all-white jury agreed.

Rubin Carter was falsely tried.
The crime was murder "one," guess who testified?
Bello and Bradley and they both baldly lied
And the newspapers, they all went along for the ride.
How can the life of such a man
Be in the palm of some fool's hand?
To see him obviously framed
Couldn't help but make me feel ashamed to live in a land
Where justice is a game.

Now all the criminals in their coats and their ties
Are free to drink martinis and watch the sun rise
While Rubin sits like Buddha in a ten-foot cell
An innocent man in a living hell.
That's the story of the Hurricane,
But it won't be over till they clear his name
And give him back the time he's done.
Put in a prison cell, but one time he could-a been
The champion of the world.

問題 [I]

設問1 以下の英文資料を和訳せよ。

設問2 以下の資料の見解とは反対に、“formal analysis”の利点を各自の研究領域に即して述べよ。

What has surprised me about research on Japanese animations and anime is the general lack of interest in animation as such, in animation as *moving images*. The bulk of anime commentary ignores that its “object” consists of moving images, as if animations were just another text. Such a treatment of anime as a textual object has tended in two directions. On the one hand, even when anime is treated largely as text, some commentators will call on the novelty and popularity of anime to bypass the tough questions that usually arise around the analysis of texts. Anime is, in effect, treated as a textual object that does not or cannot pose any difficult textual questions. Analysis is relegated to re-presenting anime narratives, almost in the manner of book reports or movie reviews. On the other hand, some commentators treat anime as text in order to pose “high textual” speculative questions (such as the nature of reality, or the relation of mind and body), again ignoring the moving image altogether but for different reasons. In this kind of textual treatment, the anime stories serve as the point of departure for philosophical speculation, without any consideration of the materiality of animation. A third common approach bypasses textual questions and the materiality of animation in favor of sociological and anthropological readings: anime is a source of information about Japan, especially about Japanese youth.

Even though I think all these approaches have their place and their merits, it is nevertheless in response to the tendency to bypass questions about animation and the moving image in favor of textual description, metatextual speculation, or sociological analysis that I wish to focus greater attention on “how to read anime.” Yet I do not want to present a list of elements for formal analysis in the manner of David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson’s *Film Art*, with sections and chapters devoted to lighting, sound, narrative, color, shots, takes, and editing. While such a presentation is useful, it tends to eliminate a sense of what is at stake in approaching the moving image at the level of form to begin with. Rather than rely on formal analysis as a point of departure, I thus begin with the materiality of the moving image itself.

