

國立清華大學命題紙

九十三年學年度 社會學研究所 甲、乙組 碩士班入學考試

科目：英文

科號：5303、5404

*作答位置在每題中皆有指定。

A. 閱讀填充題：以下這段文章中有些遺漏的字詞，都標以括弧的阿拉伯數字編號。所有遺漏的字詞都按字母順序列在文後方框的左欄中，請將它們填回到文章中適當的編號位置（即方框右欄）。提示：編號所在位置的寬窄和字數多寡有關。（本題須在【第二頁的方框】內作答）(30%)

Let us take the ideal figure of the soldier as it was still seen in the early seventeenth century. To begin with, the soldier was someone who could be recognized from afar; he bore certain signs: the natural signs of his strength and his courage, the marks, too, of his pride; his body was the blazon of his strength and valour; and although it is true that he had to learn the profession of arms little by little - generally in actual fighting - movements like marching and attitudes like the bearing of the head belonged for the most part to a ----(01)----- of honour; 'The signs for recognizing those most suited to this profession are a lively, alert manner, an erect head, a taut stomach, ----(02)-----, long arms, strong fingers, a small belly, thick thighs, slender legs and dry feet, because a man of such a figure could not fail to be ----(03)----'; when he becomes a pike-bearer, the soldier 'will have to ----(04)----- in order to have as much grace and gravity as possible, for the pike is an honourable weapon, worthy to be borne with gravity and boldness'(Montgommery, 6 and 7). By the late eighteenth century, the soldier has become something that can be made; out of a ----(05)-----, an inapt body, the machine required can be constructed; posture is gradually corrected; a calculated constraint runs slowly through each part of the body, mastering it, -----(06)-----, ready at all times, turning silently into the -----(07)-----; in short, one has 'got rid of the peasant' and given him 'the air of a soldier' (ordinance of 20 March 1764). Recruits become accustomed to 'holding their heads high and erect; to standing upright, without bending the back, to------(08)-----, throwing out the chest and throwing back the shoulders; and, to help them acquire the habit, they are given this position while standing against a wall in such a way that the heels, -----(09)----- and the shoulders touch it, as also do the backs of the hands, as one turns the arms outwards, without moving them away from the body.... Likewise, they will be taught never to fix their eyes on the ground, but to look straight at those they pass...to remain ---(10)---- until the order is given, without moving the head the hands or the feet. . . lastly to march with a bold step with knee and ham taut, on the points of the feet, which should face outwards' (ordinance of 20 March 1764).

---取自Michel Foucault: Discipline and Punishment

【本頁專供 A題 作答之用】

注意：以下的方框中，左欄是上文所遺漏的字詞，右欄是遺漏處的編號。請把左欄的大寫字母填到右欄的適當編號格中。

A. agile	(01)_____
B. automatism of habit	(02)_____
C. bodily rhetoric	(03)_____
D. broad shoulders	(04)_____
E. formless clay	(05)_____
F. making it pliable	(06)_____
G. march in step	(07)_____
H. motionless	(08)_____
I. sticking out the belly	(09)_____
J. the heels, the thighs, the waist	(10)_____

B. 簡答題：請閱讀以下一段文章，然後以最簡要的文字回答文後的六個問題（用中文回答；在必須使用學術名詞時，可以不必翻譯。）（本題請在答案卷作答）(30%)

Essentialism vs. Constructionism

Essentialism is classically defined as a belief in true essence—that which is most irreducible, unchanging, and therefore constitutive of a given person or thing. This definition represents the traditional Aristotelian understanding of essence, the definition with the greatest amount of currency in the history of Western metaphysics. In feminist theory, essentialism articulates itself in a variety of ways and subtends a number of related assumptions. Most obviously, essentialism can be located in appeals to a pure or original femininity, a female essence, outside the boundaries of the social and thereby untainted (though perhaps repressed) by a patriarchal order. It can also be read in the accounts of universal female oppression, the assumption of a totalizing symbolic system which subjugates all women everywhere, throughout history and across cultures. Further, essentialism underwrites claims for the autonomy of a female voice and the potentiality of a feminine language (notions which find their most sophisticated expression in the much discussed concept of *écriture féminine*). Essentialism emerges perhaps most strongly within the very discourse of feminism, a discourse which presumes upon the unity of its object of inquiry (women) even when it is at pains to demonstrate the differences within this admittedly generalizing and imprecise category.

Constructionism, articulated in opposition to essentialism and concerned with its philosophical refutation, insists that essence is itself a historical construction. Constructionists take the refusal of essence as the inaugural moment of their own projects and proceed to demonstrate the way previously assumed self-evident kinds (like "man" or "woman") are in fact the effects of complicated discursive practices. Anti-essentialists are engaged in interrogating the intricate and interlacing processes which work together to produce all seemingly "natural" or "given" objects. What is at stake for a constructionist are systems of representations, social and material practices, laws of discourses, and ideological effects. In short, constructionists are concerned above all with the production and organization of differences, and they therefore reject the idea that any essential or natural givens precede the processes of social determination.

Essentialists and constructionists are most polarized around the issue of the relation between the social and the natural. For the essentialist, the natural provides the raw material and determinative starting point for the practices and laws of the social. For example, sexual difference (the division into "male" and "female") is taken as prior to social differences which are presumed to be mapped on to, *a posteriori*, the biological subject. For the constructionist, the natural is itself posited as a construction of the social. In this view, sexual difference is discursively produced, elaborated as an effect of the social rather than its *tabula rasa*, its prior object. Thus while the essentialist holds that the natural is repressed by the social, the constructionist maintains that the natural is produced by the social. The difference in philosophical positions can be summed up by Ernest Jones's question: "Is woman born or made?" For an essentialist like Jones, woman is born not made; for an anti-essentialist like Simone de Beauvoir, woman is made not born.

1. 根據本文，essentialism（本質論）最簡要的定義是什麼？
2. 本質論是說：女性本質不受任何社會影響，在任何時代都會表現出來；女性受到永恆的壓迫，是歷史的必然。但是，在本質論之內，有沒有辦法說明女性本身之間的相互差異？
3. Constructionism（建構論）者認為：像「女人」、「男人」這麼簡單的範疇，事實上是怎麼來的？
4. 所有看來似乎是「自然的」（“natural”）、「給定的」（“given”）客體，在建構論中卻都岌岌可危。這些「自然的、給定的客體」問題出在哪裡？
5. 「性別差異」對於本質論者和建構論者來說，分別是指什麼意思？
6. 對於Ernest Jones的問題：「女人到底是天生的，還是被造成的？」（"Is woman born or made?"）本質論者和反本質論者分別怎麼回答？

C. 翻譯題：以下這段文字係節錄自 James Scott (1985)的著作 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*，請將它逐句翻譯成中文。（本題請在答案卷作答）（40%）

The fact is that, for all their importance when they do occur, peasant rebellions, let alone peasant “revolution”, are few and far between. Not only are the circumstances that favor large-scale peasant uprisings comparatively rare, but when they do appear the revolts that develop are nearly crushed unceremoniously. To be sure, even a failed revolt may achieve something: a few concessions from the state or landlords, a brief respite from new and painful relations of production and, not least, a memory of resistance and courage that may lie in wait for the future. Such gains, however, are uncertain, while the carnage, the repression, and the demoralization of defeat are all too certain and real. It is worth recalling as well that even at those extraordinary historical moments when a peasant-backed revolution actually succeeds in taking power, the results are, at the very best, a mixed blessing for the peasantry. Whatever else the revolution may achieve, it almost always creates a more coercive and hegemonic state apparatus—one that is often able to batten itself on the rural population like no other before it. All too frequently the peasantry finds itself in the ironic position of having helped to power a ruling group whose plans for industrialization, taxation, and collectivization are very much at odd with the goals for which peasants had imagined they were fighting.