

## 2023 年度 早稲田大学文学部 学士入学試験問題

【 英文学コース 】  
 【科目名： 専門科目 】

※解答は別紙（横書）

【 I 】 以下の文章を読み、設問に答えよ。

Let us pause for a moment to ask what is meant by having, or taking, a particular “approach” to literature. In both of the last two universities where it has been my privilege to teach, <sup>(1)</sup>the introductory course on literary theory was named “Approaches to Literature” on the basis that the word *theory* in the title “Introduction to Literary Theory” might seem daunting, or just plain boring, to students in their first year of university study. Why should it be any less intimidating, or any more exciting, to have an “approach” to literature than to have a “theory” of it? What, indeed, does it *mean* to “approach” a text?

American philosopher Stanley Cavell sets himself this very question in the introduction to his study of a text by Ludwig Wittgenstein:

I was supposed to be saying something more. First, by way of introducing myself, and concerning how we should approach Wittgenstein’s text. Accordingly, I will say, second, that there is no approach to it, anyway I have none. Approach suggests moving nearer, getting closer; hence it suggests that we are not already near or close enough; hence suggests we know some orderly direction to it not already taken within it; that we sense some distance between us and it which useful criticism could close.

Looking at it this way, one wonders what gives us the very idea that we *can* “approach” literature, as if somehow it lay too far off from where we are and we needed either to move it from its present position toward ours or else to pack our critical baggage together and move to within commutable distance of it.

Literary theory—and literary studies as a discipline—has all too often fostered in its students the assumption that a specific method, theory, or approach can get us closer to literature, or can get literature closer to us. Such an assumption is not so much either true or false as it is unquestioned, unexamined, and hence potentially suspect. It is not that the various theories of literature and their claims are simply wrong or unable to withstand scrutiny—one could hardly argue that of such a broad and complex field without descending to oversimplification or obscurantism—but rather that they underscore, at the same time as they profess that their procedures furnish us with an *approach* to literature, the very sense of critical distance from it that approaching it aright ought to efface. <sup>(2)</sup>No theory of literature that I am aware of is altogether exempt from the paradoxical tendency to regard its object from a position of scholarly remoteness while simultaneously promising to yield a fresh, heightened degree of intimacy with the very same object.

Stanley Cavell, in his writings on literature, does not feel the need to spell out an “approach.” For example, when writing on <sup>(ア)</sup>William Shakespeare, he prefers each play to set before us its own conception of the key philosophical issues behind it. Shakespeare’s plays turn out to offer us critical insights into such crucial themes as history, philosophy, and even theatricality itself. Similarly, <sup>(イ)</sup>William Wordsworth’s poetry is said to articulate its own understanding of poetic language and how it works, while <sup>(ウ)</sup>Edgar Allan Poe’s story also turns out to meditate on the theme of writing, and <sup>(エ)</sup>Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden* on the theme of reading *Walden*. Rather than approach these texts from afar, viewing them through the lens of a theory that constructs the critical difference we perceive between ourselves and it, Cavell prefers that literature itself teach us how to approach it and, indeed, whether any closer proximity to it—so often a wistful fantasy of intimacy—is necessary or even desirable. <sup>(3)</sup>Perhaps this is an indirect way of saying that instead of needing a set of theoretical terms with which to approach literature, we must learn to read it on its own terms.

(Adapted from David Rudrum, *Stanley Cavell and the Claim of Literature*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013, pp. 36-37.)

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。  
 Rudrum, David. *Stanley Cavell and the Claim of Literature*. pp.36-37.  
 © 2013 Johns Hopkins University Press.  
 Reprinted with permission of The Johns Hopkins University Press

問1. 下線部(1)を和訳せよ。

問2. 下線部(2)を和訳せよ。

問3. 下線部(3)を和訳せよ。

問4. 下線部(ア)～(エ)の作者による作品を以下の A～L から 1 つ選び、その記号を記入せよ。

- A. *The Scarlet Letter*
- B. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*
- C. “The Fall of the House of Usher”
- D. “Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey”
- E. *Moby-Dick; or, The Whale*
- F. “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner”
- G. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*
- H. “Ode on a Grecian Urn”
- I. *The Old Man and the Sea*
- J. “Civil Disobedience”
- K. “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock”
- L. *The Canterbury Tales*

【Ⅱ】以下の文章を読み、設問に答えよ。

In the story, while exploring the Kirke mansion one rainy day, the children discover an upstairs room with a large wardrobe. The youngest, Lucy, ventures into the wardrobe by herself. I suspect everyone knows what she discovers inside, from whatever version of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* they remember. Lucy finds herself in what could be called an ‘alternative universe’ —a universe of the ( 1 ); but as real, essentially, as the London she left. And quite as violent as that burning city because of the nighttime air raids in 1941 and 1942. Narnia is not a safe place, any more than lions or witches are generally safe for human beings to hang out with.

(A) As it's narrated, Narnia is not Lucy's dream, something inside her heard, a 'fantasy'; it is actually there, as much a thing outside her wakeful self as the wooden wardrobe, or the looking-glass through which Alice goes into Wonderland, in Lewis Carroll's children's story published eighty-five years earlier. But to understand how Narnia can be both real and imaginary, we need to know how to process literature's complex machinery. (Children pick up the knowledge as quickly and intuitively as, in their earliest years, they pick up the complex machinery of ( 2 ).)

*The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* is an ‘allegory’ – that is to say, it pictures something in terms of something else; it depicts something very real in terms of something wholly unreal. Even if the ( 3 ) expands for ever, as astronomers nowadays tell us it might, there will never be a Narina in it. That world is a ( 4 ); and its inhabitants (even Lucy) are mere figments (fictional inventions, that is) of the creative imagination of the author C. S. Lewis. But nonetheless we feel (and Lewis certainly meant his reader to feel) that a solid core of ( 5 ) is contained in Narnia's manifest untruths.

Ultimately, then, we could say that the purpose of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* is theological, a matter of ( 6 ). (Lewis was, in fact, a theologian as well as a story-teller.) The story makes sense of the human condition in terms of what the author suggests are larger truths. (B)Every work of literature, however humble, is at some level asking: ‘What's it all about? Why are we here?’ Philosophers and ministers of religion and scientists answer those questions in their own ways. In literature it is ‘imagination’ that grapples with those basic questions.

(Adapted from John Sutherland, *A Little History of Literature*, Yale University Press, 2013, pp. 3-4.)

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。  
From A Little History of Literature. John Sutherland.  
Copy right © 2013 by John Sutherland.  
Yale University Press. Reproduced with permission of  
the Licensor through PLSclear.

問1 空所 (1)～(6) に入れるべき単語を以下から選び、記号で答えよ。

- a. universe
- b. truth
- c. language
- d. religion
- e. fiction
- f. imagination

問2 下線部 (A)、(B)をそれぞれ和訳せよ。

【Ⅲ】 次の英文を読み、(1) ～ (8) の空所に最もふさわしい文を下の a ～ h から1つずつ選び、その記号を解答欄に記入しなさい。

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

※この部分は、著作権の関係により掲載できません。

〔以 下 余 白〕

受験番号	
氏名	カナ
	漢字

この欄以外に受験番号、氏名を記入しないこと。  
漢字氏名がない場合は、ひらがなで記入すること。

学士入学試験 解答用紙

【 英文学コース 】  
【 科目名：専門科目 】

総 点

--

【 I 】

問 1

---

---

---

問 2

---

---

---

問 3

---

---

---

問 4

(ア) \_\_\_\_ (イ) \_\_\_\_ (ウ) \_\_\_\_ (エ) \_\_\_\_

【Ⅱ】

問 1

- ( 1 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 2 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 3 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 4 ) \_\_\_\_\_
- ( 5 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 6 ) \_\_\_\_\_

問 2

(A)

(B)

【Ⅲ】

- ( 1 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 2 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 3 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 4 ) \_\_\_\_\_
- ( 5 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 6 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 7 ) \_\_\_\_\_ ( 8 ) \_\_\_\_\_

[以 下 余 白]