

國 立 清 華 大 學 命 題 紙

97 學年度 \_\_\_\_\_ 外國語文學 \_\_\_\_\_ 系 (所) \_\_\_\_\_ 外國文學 \_\_\_\_\_ 組碩士班入學考試

科目 \_\_\_\_\_ 文學批評與理論 \_\_\_\_\_ 科目代碼 4003 共 2 頁第 1 頁 \*請在【答案卷卡】內作答

**LITERARY CRITICISM**

**I. Identify the authors of the following critical texts. 40%**

1. A Vindication of the Rights of Woman
2. Culture and Anarchy
3. On the sublime
4. Discipline and Punish
5. The Laugh of the Mudusa
6. Rabelais and His World
7. Black Skin, White Masks
8. The Political Unconscious
9. On the Principles of Genial Criticism
10. The Revolution in Poetic Language

**II. Briefly explain the following critical terms. 20%**

1. catharsis
2. negative capacity
3. dissociation of sensibility
4. phallogocentric

**III. Translate the following passage and analyze it in the context of literary theory. 20%**

In order to distinguish whether anything is beautiful or not, we refer the representation, not by the understanding to the object for cognition, but by the imagination (perhaps in conjunction with the understanding) to the subject and its feeling of pleasure or pain. The judgment of taste is therefore not a judgment of cognition, and is consequently not logical but aesthetical, by which we understand that whose determining ground can be no other than subjective. Every reference of representations, even that of sensations, may be objective (and then it signifies the real [element] of an empirical representation), save only the reference to the feeling of pleasure and pain, by which nothing in the object is signified, but through which there is a feeling in the subject as it is affected by the representation.

Immanuel Kant, Critique of Judgment (1790)

國 立 清 華 大 學 命 題 紙

97 學年度 \_\_\_\_\_ 外國語文學 \_\_\_\_\_ 系 (所) \_\_\_\_\_ 外國文學 \_\_\_\_\_ 組碩士班入學考試

科目 \_\_\_\_\_ 文學批評與理論 \_\_\_\_\_ 科目代碼 \_\_\_\_\_ 4003 共 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 頁第 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 頁 \*請在【答案卷卡】內作答

**IV Summarize the following critical text in the your own words (around 200 words) and elaborate the major arguments. 20%**

Since the advent, in the course of the nineteenth century, of a subjectivistic critical vocabulary, the traditional forms of rhetoric have fallen into disrepute. It is becoming increasingly clear, however, that this was only a temporary eclipse: recent developments in criticism reveal the possibility of a rhetoric that would no longer be normative or descriptive but that would more or less openly raise the question of intentionality of rhetorical figures. Such concerns are implicitly present in many works in which the terms “mimesis,” “metaphor,” “allegory,” or “irony” play a prominent part. One of the main difficulties that still hamper these investigations stems from the association of rhetorical terms with value judgments that blur distinctions and hide the real structures. In most cases, their use is governed by assumptions that go back at least as far as the romantic period; hence the need for historical clarification as a preliminary to a more systematic treatment of an intentional rhetoric. One has to return, in the history of European literature, to the moment when the rhetorical key-terms undergo significant changes and are at the center of important tensions. A first and obvious example would be the change that takes place in the latter half of the eighteenth century when the word “symbol” tends to supplant other denominations for figural language, including that of “allegory.”

Paul de Man, “The Rhetoric of Temporality” in *Blindness and Insight*