

國立臺灣師範大學 113 年度博士班招生考試試題

科目：英文

適用系所：美術學系美學、媒體藝術與藝術史組

注意：1.本試題共 3 頁，請依序在答案卷上作答，並標明題號，不必抄題。2.答案必須寫在指定作答區內，否則依規定扣分。

考試時間:113 年 4 月 26 日(週五)9:30-12:00；同一時間考生一併進行「專業領域」考科考試，請把握作答時間。

一、翻譯下面段落文字為中文 (30 分)

In saying that semiotics "merely redescribes" traditional accounts of the mind and aesthetic objects in terms drawn mainly from language theory, I don't mean to suggest that this redescription is lacking in force or interest. On the contrary, as a conventionalist/ nominalist, I would have to admit that a systematic renaming of a field of inquiry is, in effect, an important change in the nature of that field. The shift of terms reflects important changes in the culture's understanding of its own symbolic productions, and effects changes in the way those symbols are produced and consumed. As Wendy Steiner points out:

Semiotics has made the painting-literature analogy once more an interesting area to investigate, for even the dissimilarities that emerge are different from those understood to exist before. Sign theory, we might say, has changed the rules of the game, and so made it worth playing. Artists in this century have responded to this stimulus, producing new orders of phenomena to be studied from this angle. The concrete poets, for example, quote an astonishing array of semiotic theories, and at least one, Max Bense, is himself a semiotician who composes concrete poems often in order to realize the theories that he has previously proposed.

Understood this way, as a kind of modernist or "Cubist" rhetoric, an ensemble of terms for reflection on symbolic practices, semiotics has considerable interest. Where it "fails" however, is in its claim to be a science, its claim not merely to have changes the rules of the game but to have a theoretical account that explains why the game must have the rule s that it does. Semiotics would be better understood in something like the way we understand Renaissance rhetoric, as a

burgeoning meta-language that proliferates endless networks of distinctions and semiotic "entities." Renaissance rhetoric displays exactly the same tendency to multiply names for the tropes and figures of discourse, and the tendency to make these figures into entities. (W.J.T. Mitchell, *Iconology*, pp.61-62)

二、翻譯下面段落文字為中文(20 分)

The juxtaposition of the 'fragile human body' with a landscape destroyed by modern industrial warfare vividly figures a world that has been utterly changed by modernization (all that was solid has melted into air - so to speak). Everything has been transformed: the tempo of every life and the landscape the body exists in. The loss of experience that the passage articulates is to do not with a lessening of the 'event-ness' or 'episode' of the everyday, but with the meaningfulness and communicability of its modern form. We may experience more in a quantitative manner but we cannot make more of it. It cannot be incorporated into the meaningfulness of life. The modern experience of the everyday leaves us silent. It is this silence that needs to be challenged, not so as to provide coherence or amelioration, but so that it can be recognized, criticized and changed. Finding forms for articulating the everyday is for Benjamin a politics of everyday life.

(B. Highmore, *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory*, p.66)

三、以下文字出自 Susan Sontag 的《On Photography》，請描述作者在文中意圖指出的現象，並提出你個人對此的分析與看法。(50 分)

Reality has always been interpreted through the reports given by images; and philosophers since Plato have tried to loosen our dependence on images by evoking a standard of an image-free way of apprehending the real. But when, in the mid-nineteenth century, the standard seemed finally attainable, the retreat of the old religious and political illusions before the advance of humanistic and scientific thinking did not—as anticipated—create mass defections to the real. On the contrary, in the new age of unbelief the allegiance to images was strengthened. The credence that could no longer be given to realities understood in the form of images was now being given to realities understood to be images, illusions. In the preface to the second edition (1844) of *The Essence of*

Christianity, Feuerbach observes that “our era” “prefers the image to the thing, the copy to the original, the representation to the reality, appearance to being”—while being aware of these preferences. And his premonitory complaint has been transformed in the twentieth century into a widely agreed on diagnosis: that a society becomes “modern” when one of its chief activities is producing and consuming images, when images that have extraordinary powers to determine our demands upon reality, and are themselves coveted substitutes for firsthand experience, become indispensable to the health of the economy, the stability of the polity, and the pursuit of private happiness.