

請將以下兩段英文譯成中文

一)  
(50%)

The design of buildings can be viewed in a number of ways. First, it can be seen from the perspective of the historical record of production—the lines, shapes, and masses of past buildings and urban artifacts—interpreted according to various aesthetic canons, social circumstances, and technical opportunities. Second, it can be examined for its conformity with theoretical prescriptions of what constitutes "proper" architecture and "good" design. Some recent examples of this approach are Krier's *Urban Space*, Lynch's *A Theory of Good City Form*, and Rossi's *The Architecture of the City* (Krier 1979, Lynch 1981, Rossi 1982). Third, its study can take the form of observing what designers do and how they undertake their tasks. Seen in this last way, design has often occupied an ambivalent position, being characterized as either a form of fine art or a form of technical science. From all perspectives, however, design appears to be a fundamental means of inquiry by which man realizes and gives shape to ideas of dwelling and settlement. Furthermore, design is a practical form of inquiry insofar as it is concerned with making and a certain commonplace usefulness, quite apart from its more esoteric benefits (Harrison 1978).

二)  
(50%)

In speaking of logic, we do not need to be concerned with processes of inference at all. While it is true that a great deal of what is generally understood to be logic is concerned with deduction, logic, in the widest sense, refers to something far more general. It is concerned with the form of abstract structures, and is involved the moment we make pictures of reality and then seek to manipulate these pictures so that we may look further into the reality itself. It is the business of logic to invent purely artificial structures of elements and relations. Sometimes one of these structures is close enough to a real situation to be allowed to represent it. And then, because the logic is so tightly drawn, we gain insight into the reality which was previously withheld from us.

The use of logical structures to represent design problems has an important consequence. It brings with it the loss of innocence. A logical picture is easier to criticize than a vague picture since the assumptions it is based on are brought out into the open. Its increased precision gives us the chance to sharpen our conception of what the design process involves. But once what we do intuitively can be described and compared with nonintuitive ways of doing the same things, we cannot go on accepting the intuitive method innocently. Whether we decide to stand for or against pure intuition as a method, we must do so for reasons which can be discussed.