國立成功大學

115學年度碩士班招生考試試題

編　號：28

系　所：台灣文學系

科　目：外文文學文獻解讀（英文）

日　期：0203

節　次：第 4 節

注　意：1.不可使用計算機
2.請於答案卷(卡)作答，於試題上作答，不予計分。
3.此考科可攜帶紙本字典入試場。

1. Translate the following passages into Chinese. (25%)

But the concept is also inherently relational. 'Masculinity' does not exist except in contrast with 'femininity'. A culture which does not treat women and men as bearers of polarized character types, at least in principle, does not have a concept of masculinity in the sense of modern European/American culture.

Historical research suggests that this was true of European culture itself before the eighteenth century. Women were certainly regarded as different from men, but different in the sense of being incomplete or inferior examples of the same character (for instance, having less of the faculty of reason). Women and men were not seen as bearers of qualitatively different characters; this conception accompanied the bourgeois ideology of 'separate spheres' in the nineteenth century.

(R.W. Connell, 1995, *Masculinities*)

2. Translate the following passages into Chinese. (25%)

The concept of representation has come to occupy a new and important place in the study of culture. Representation connects meaning and language to culture. But what exactly do people mean by it? What does representation have to do with culture and meaning? One common-sense usage of the term is as follows: 'Representation means using language to say something meaningful about, or to represent, the world meaningfully, to other people.' You may well ask, 'Is that all?' Well, yes and no. Representation *is* an essential part of the process by which meaning is produced and exchanged between members of a culture. It *does* involve the use of language, of signs and images which stand for or represent things. But this is a far from simple or straightforward process, as you will soon discover.

(Stuart Hall, 1997, *Representation*)

3. Please translate the following paragraph into Chinese. (25%)

It is important to differentiate between belonging and the politics of belonging. Belonging is about emotional attachment, about feeling 'at home'. As Ghassan Hage (1997:103) points out, however, 'home is an on-going project entailing a sense of hope for the future'. (See also Taylor 2009). Part of this feeling of hope relates to home as a 'safe' space (Ignatieff, 2001). In the daily reality of early 21st century, in so many places on the globe, the emphasis on safety gets a new poignancy. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that feeling 'at home' does not necessarily only generate positive and warm feelings. It also allows the safety as well as the emotional engagement to be, at times, angry, resentful, ashamed, indignant (Hessel, 2010).

Belonging tends to be naturalized and be part of everyday practices (Fenster, 2004). It becomes articulated, formally structured and politicized only when it is threatened in some way. The politics of belonging comprise of specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging to particular collectivity/ies which are themselves being constructed in these projects in very specific ways and in very specific boundaries (i.e. whether or not, according to specific political projects of belonging Jews could be considered to be German, for example, or abortion advocates can be considered Catholic).

As Ulf Hannerz (2002) claims, home is essentially a contrastive concept, linked to some notion of what it means to be away from home. It can involve a sense of rootedness in a socio-geographic site or be constructed as an intensely imagined affiliation with a distant local where self realization can occur.

Nira Yuval-Davis, 2011, *Power, Intersectionality and the Politics of Belonging*

4. Please summarize the following paragraphs in Chinese and explain your understanding. (25%)

There are two kinds of claims in *Is Taiwan Chinese*? – empirical claims about specific identities in both Taiwan and China and theoretical claims about general processes of identity formation and their implications for collective action. In order to understand the empirical claims, we must first realise two fundamental theoretical points: (1) identities are fluid and changeable, not fixed as ideologies claim, and (2) the people who share an identity are variable, not homogeneous as ideologies claim. There is a lot to unpack in these two deceptively simple statements.

First, ideologies, which usually take the form of narratives of unfolding, work to manipulate specific identities in order to serve current political purposes. These narratives portray identities of individuals as fixed by birth – to particular parents (ancestry) and in a particular culture. These narratives also imagine collective identities as the inevitable result of some primordial essence that is rooted in antiquity and merely unfolds according to some internally driven destiny. People construct narratives about the unfolding of their own groups (charter myths) and also about the unfolding of other groups, which they may idolise or villainise. The interweaving of ancestry and culture in these narratives is often deterministic to the point of racism – fuelling, for example, anti-immigrant sentiment. But fluidity and changeability of collective identities come from identities' actual formation through social (including political and economic) processes, not some predestined unfolding of genes (ancestry) or culture. Social circumstances shift constantly – when different political factions gain power, when technological 'revolutions' reorganise production and economic dynamics, when environmental disasters destroy populations and resources, and so on. Thus, when we realise that identities are socially constructed, it is no longer surprising that identities change. Sometimes people are involuntarily reclassified by external sources (fluidity): the borders of identity shift around a community, whose populace has not changed in ancestry or cultural practices. Sometimes people voluntarily negotiate a new selflabel (changeability): these people push across the identity border, perhaps embracing or discarding some cultural practices. Whatever way that people end up with a new identity label, the new label marks –

both reflects and invites – different social experience; thus, over a very short time, these people authentically belong to the 'new' classificatory group.

A second main theoretical point recognises that there is variation within any and every human group – what is remarkable is not the existence of individual variability but rather the social processes that form a single collective identity across ubiquitous variation. Social experience builds on but is different from lived experience: lived experience refers to the actual experiences of specific individuals, whereas social experience refers to negotiations over power positions. Thus, social experience is passed down across generations, perhaps as oral history or written law, with particularly galvanising events passed down in more detail and for longer periods. The 2:28 Incident was galvanising for Taiwanese and Mainlanders – not only for those who lived through the tumultuous events of 1947, but also for younger generations because martial law, which arose out of those events, shaped all aspects of Taiwan's society for decades. When individuals' lived experiences are both similar to the lived experiences of others and connected to the social experience of a labelled group, those individuals develop an authentic collective identity under that label.

Brown, Melissa J. .2020. "Tigers on the Mountain: Assessing Is Taiwan Chinese? In 2018," in *Taiwan Studies Revisited*