

※ 考生請注意：本試題不可使用計算機。請於答案卷(卡)作答，於本試題紙上作答者，不予計分。

1. Please translate the following passage into Chinese: (25%)

A definition of language is always, implicitly or explicitly, a definition of human beings in the world. The received major categories – ‘world’, ‘reality’, ‘nature’, ‘human’ – may be counter-posed or related to the category ‘language’, but it is now a commonplace to observe that all categories, including the category ‘language’, are themselves constructions in language, and can thus only with an effort, and within a particular system of thought, be separated from language for relational inquiry.

(Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature*)

2. Please translate the following passage into Chinese: (25%)

To speak of self-representation in this way, however, involves familiar but potentially misleading distinction between experience and expression, content and form, distinctions that need to be set aside if we are to achieve a useful understanding of what I call *narrative identity* in the pages that follow. When it comes to autobiography, *narrative* and *identity* are so intimately linked that each constantly and properly gravitates into the conceptual field of the other.

(Paul John Eakin, *How Our Lives Become Stories*)

3. Please interpret this paragraph and if possible, use examples to illustrate its meaning

(1) Raymond Williams, *Marxism And Literature*. (25%)

Structure of feeling:

The term is difficult, but ‘feeling’ is chosen to emphasize a distinction from more formal concept of ‘world-view’ or ideology... It is that we are concerned with meanings and values as they are actively lived and felt... An alternative definition would be structures of experience... We are talking about characteristic elements of impulse, restraint, and tone; specifically affective elements of consciousness and relationships: not feeling against thought, but thought as felt and feeling as thought: practical consciousness of a present kind, in a living and inter-relating continuity. We are then defining these elements as ‘structure’: as a set, with specific internal relations, at once interlocking and in tension. Yet

we are also defining a social experience which is still in process, often indeed not yet recognized as social but taken to be private, idiosyncratic, and even isolating, but which in analysis (though rarely otherwise) has its emergent, connecting, and dominant characteristics, indeed its specific hierarchies.

(2) Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*. (25%)

Myth is depoliticized speech. One must naturally understand political in its deeper meaning, as describing the whole of human relations in their real, social structure, in their power of making their world; one must above all give an active value to the prefix de-: here it represents an operational movement, it permanently embodies a defaulting... Myth does not denying things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact. If I state the fact of French imperialism without explaining it, I am very near to finding that it is natural and goes without saying: I am reassured. In passing from history to nature, myth acts economically: it abolishes the complexity of human acts, it gives them the simplicity of essences, it does away with all dialectics, with any going back beyond what is immediately visible, it organizes a world which is without contradictions because it is without depth, a world wide open and wallowing in the evident, it establishes a blissful clarity: things appear to mean something by themselves.