

## 京大過去問 2000年 第1問

次の文の下線をほどこした部分(1), (2)を和訳せよ。

There are historians and others who would like to make a neat division between “historical facts” and “values.” (1)The trouble is that values even enter into deciding what count as facts — there is a big leap involved in moving from “raw data” to a judgement of fact. More important, one finds that the more complex and multi-levelled the history is, and the more important the issues it raises for today, the less it is possible to sustain a fact-value division. But this by no means implies that there has simply to be a conflict of prejudices and biases, as the data are manipulated to suit one worldview or another. What it does mean is that the self of the historian is an important factor. The historian is shaped by experiences, contexts, norms, values, and beliefs. When dealing with history, especially the sort of history that is of most significance in philosophy, that shaping is bound to be relevant. As far as possible it needs to be articulated and open to discussion.

The best historians are well aware of this. They are alert to many dimensions of bias and to the endless (and therefore endlessly discussable) significance of their own horizons and presuppositions. A great deal can of course be learned from those who do not share our presuppositions. Our capacity to make wise, well-supported judgements in matters of historical fact and significance can only be formed over years of discussion with others, many of whom have very different horizons from our own. (2)It is possible to have a 12-year-old chess champion or mathematical or musical genius, but it is unimaginable that the world’s greatest expert on Socrates could be that age. The difficulty is not just one of the time to assimilate information; it is also the time to mature judgement and come to decisions which only ring true after complex studies and discussions with others and with oneself.