

# 國立成功大學

## 112學年度碩士班招生考試試題

編 號： 29

系 所： 台灣文學系

科 目： 外文文學文獻解讀（英文）

日 期： 0206

節 次： 第 4 節

備 註： 1.不可使用計算機  
2.此考科可攜帶紙本字典入試場

※ 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%)

The complexity of a culture is to be found not only in its variable processes and their social definitions – traditions, institutions, and formations – but also in the dynamic interrelations, at every point in the process, of historically varied and variable elements. In what I have called ‘epochal’ analysis, a crucial process is seized as a cultural system, with determinate dominant features: feudal culture or bourgeois culture or a transition from one to the other. (Raymond Williams, ‘Dominant, Residual and Emergent’, in *Marxism and Literature*.)

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

In principle a work of art has always been reproducible. Man-made artifacts could always be imitated by men. Replicas were made by pupils in practice of their craft, by masters for diffusing their works, and, finally, by third parties in the pursuit of gain. Mechanical reproduction of a work of art, however, represents something new...The enormous changes which printing, the mechanical reproduction of writing, has brought about in literature are a familiar story. (Walter Benjamin, ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’)

3. Please translate the following paragraph and give your comment on it. (25%)

The Taiwanese tropism of Mainlanders has often been considered as a process of ‘indigenization’ (*tuzhuhua*). I believe it does not entirely do justice to the reality of a mutual acculturation of both the Mainlanders and the native Taiwanese, nor to how different the result of this symmetrical movement may be for each population, compared to ‘original’ Mainlander and Taiwanese identities. We could characterize Mainlanders’ Taiwanization as a still enfolding process of ‘creolization’ of a former colonial minority in a chaotic postcolonial context agitated by a phenomenon called ‘identity politics’ – a direct effect of Taiwan’s ethnically fraught democracy. Mainlanders’ identity journey is ‘postcolonial’ in the sense that a former minority, elitist, ruling class that came from abroad/outside and was culturally, linguistically and ethnically close to, yet distinct from, the ruled majority, has lost its hold on the majority and that its worldview has ceased, at least during the period under consideration here (before 2008) to be the mainstream political standard, an original postcolonial situation. And Taiwan’s second and third generations of *waishengren* could be seen as ‘creole’, a word originally designating locally born, offspring generations of the European settlers in America, in the sense that they were born on the offshore island of Taiwan of Chinese mainland

parents, yet still not fully identifying themselves as Taiwanese. In what Chang and Simon called the 'diasporic identity' of Mainlanders, the question can be asked which one of the two territories is offshore vis-à-vis the other: Taiwan, as an island away from China, or China and the Asian continent, separated from Taiwan, where Mainlanders are now situated, by a sea?

(From "Liminality and Taiwan tropism in a postcolonial context" by Stéphane Corcuff in *Politics of Difference in Taiwan*, 2011 )

4. Please summarize the following paragraphs with your interpretation in Chinese. (25%)

For the most part, feminist theory has assumed that there is some existing identity, understood through the category of women, who not only initiates feminist interests and goals within discourse, but constitutes the subject for whom political representation is pursued. But politics and representation are controversial terms. On the one hand, representation serves as the operative term within a political process that seeks to extend visibility and legitimacy to women as political subjects; on the other hand, representation is the normative function of a language which is said either to reveal or to distort what is assumed to be true about the category of women. For feminist theory, the development of a language that fully or adequately represents women has seemed necessary to foster the political visibility of women. This has seemed obviously important considering the pervasive cultural condition in which women's lives were either mis-represented or not represented at all.

Recently, this prevailing conception of the relation between feminist theory and politics has come under challenge from within feminist discourse. The very subject of women is no longer understood in stable or abiding terms. There is a great deal of material that not only questions the viability of "the subject" as the ultimate candidate for representation or, indeed, liberation, but there is very little agreement after all on what it is that constitutes, or ought to constitute, the category of women. The domains of political and linguistic "representation" set out in advance the criterion by which subjects themselves are formed, with the result that representation is extended only to what can be acknowledged as a subject. In other words, the qualifications for being a subject must first be met before representation can be extended.

Foucault points out that juridical systems of power produce the subjects they subsequently come to represent. Juridical notions of power appear to regulate political life in purely negative terms—that is, through the limitation, prohibition, regulation, control and even "protection" of individuals related to that political structure through the contingent and retractable operation of choice. But the subjects regulated by such structures are, by virtue of being subjected to them, formed, defined, and reproduced in accordance with the requirements of those structures. If this analysis is right, then the juridical formation of language and politics that represents women as "the subject" of feminism is itself a discursive formation and effect of a given version of representational politics. And the feminist subject turns out to be discursively constituted

by the very political system that is supposed to facilitate its emancipation. This becomes politically problematic if that system can be shown to produce gendered subjects along a differential axis of domination or to produce subjects who are presumed to be masculine. In such cases, an uncritical appeal to such a system for the emancipation of "women" will be clearly self-defeating.

The question of "the subject" is crucial for politics, and for feminist politics in particular, because juridical subjects are invariably produced through certain exclusionary practices that do not "show" once the juridical structure of politics has been established. In other words, the political construction of the subject proceeds with certain legitimating and exclusionary aims, and these political operations are effectively concealed and naturalized by a political analysis that takes juridical structures as their foundation. Juridical power inevitably "produces" what it claims merely to represent; hence, politics must be concerned with this dual function of power: the juridical and the productive. In effect, the law produces and then conceals the notion of "a subject before the law" in order to invoke that discursive formation as a naturalized foundational premise that subsequently legitimates that law's own regulatory hegemony. It is not enough to inquire into how women might become more fully represented in language and politics. Feminist critique ought also to understand how the category of "women," the subject of feminism, is produced and restrained by the very structures of power through which emancipation is sought.

(From *Gender Trouble* by Judith Butler)